Supplement of

Depletion of atmospheric gaseous elemental mercury by plant uptake at Mt. Changbai, Northeast China

Xuewu Fu et al.

Correspondence to: Xinbin Feng (fengxinbin@vip.skleg.cn)

1

2

Contents of the Supporting Information

4

1 Supplementary Text

1.1 Nocturnal boundary layer

The Nocturnal boundary layer (NBL) was calculated by <u>Weather Research and Forecasting Model</u> (WRF) 3.5 with two-way nested runs. The spatial resolution for course domain is 30 km with 100×100 grid cells, and for the nested domain is 10 km with 30×30 grid cells. As our studied site is 100-200 km away from Sea of Japan, we chose the MYJ scheme for NBL as earlier studies suggested that MYJ scheme was as first choice for marine atmospheric boundary layer simulations without *a priori* information of atmospheric stability in the region of interest (Huang et al., 2013; Krogsaeter and Reuder, 2015). For other parameterizations, we selected Kain and Fritsch cumulus scheme for cumulus parameterization, Lin (Purdue) scheme for microphysics options RRTM scheme for Radiation Physics Options.

1.2 Simulations of atmospheric GEM at Mt. Changbai forest using a box model

A box model was applied to estimate the GEM concentration at the height of 24 m agl. Based on the measured characteristics of the GEM depletion events, the model assumes that vegetative uptake (in terms of dry deposition flux) is the only pathway for the GEM removal and chemical transformation is not included in the box modeling. A sensitivity analysis was performed on three parameters: (1) dry deposition flux (0-10 ng m^{-2} h^{-1}, the range of measured deposition flux using flux bags), (2) turbulent diffusivity of the atmosphere (0.1-10 cm s^{-1}, typical value under low wind condition), and (3) a typical nocturnal boundary layer height (100 m agl). GEM concentration above the stable nocturnal boundary layer was assigned to 1.56 ng m^{-3}, the mean observed at 45 m during daytime when the vertical mixing is strong. The flux of vegetative uptake (F_C) and the resulted concentration gradient was calculated based on the on the algorithm:

$$F_C^{AGM} = -\underbrace{\frac{\kappa \cdot u_*}{\Phi_H(\varsigma_1)}}_{K_C} \cdot \frac{\partial C}{\partial \ln(z)} \qquad (1)$$

where k is von Kármán constant (~0.41), u_* is the friction velocity (m s^{-1}), $\psi_H(\varsigma_1)$ is the integrated universal function for sensible heat to correct for deviations from the ideal logarithmic profile, K_C term is the turbulent diffusivity (m s^{-1}), C is the

53 concentration parameter for GEM concentration (ng m^{-3}), z is the height parameter

54 (m).

55

1.3 The turbulent diffusivity (K$_c$)

57   The flux-gradient approach (Kaimal and Finnigan, 1994) expresses a scalar flux (F, e.g.

58 ng m^{-2} s^{-1}) as the product between the turbulent diffusivity (K_C, m^2 s^{-1}) and a concentration

59 gradient ($\partial c / \partial z$, ng m^{-4}) assuming that measurements are made within a vertical layer of

60 constant flux that forms over homogeneous terrain:

61
$$F = -K_C \cdot \frac{\partial c}{\partial z} = -\frac{u_* \cdot \kappa \cdot (z-d)}{\phi_H(\varsigma)} \cdot \frac{\partial c}{\partial z} = -\frac{u_* \cdot \kappa}{\phi_H(\varsigma)} \cdot \frac{\partial c}{\partial \ln z} \quad (2),$$

62 where, u_* is the friction velocity (m s^{-1}), κ is the von Kármán constant (taken as 0.4),

63 $\phi_H(\varsigma)$ is the diabatic influence function for heat (parameterized as a function of

64 $\varsigma = (z - d)/L$, where L is the Obukhov length),   whereas z and d are the

65 measurement and (canopy) displacement height (m) respectively. An empirical form of

66 $\phi_H(\varsigma)$ is $0.95/\sqrt{(1 - 11.6\varsigma)}$ and $0.95 + 7.8\varsigma$ for unstable ($\varsigma < 0$) and stable ($2 > \varsigma \geq 0$)

67 atmospheric conditions respectively (Foken, 2008).

68

69   For flux-gradient measurements made within the roughness sublayer above the canopy

70 height (i.e. $h_{canopy} < z < z_*$), Eq. 1 is not valid (*underestimates* the magnitude of scalar

71 flux) and requires further correction following e.g. Garratt (Garratt, 1992) and Simpson et al.

72 (Simpson et al., 1998):

73
$$F = -\frac{u_* \cdot \kappa \cdot (z-d)}{\phi_h(\varsigma) \cdot \phi_*(z/z_*)} \cdot \frac{\partial c}{\partial z} \quad (3)$$

74 In contrast to $\phi_H(\varsigma)$, the additional correction function $\phi_*(z/z_*)$ in Eq. 2 is independent of

75 stability. A common type of parameterization for ϕ_* is $\exp\left[-0.7\left(1 - \frac{z}{z_*}\right)\right]$ (Garratt, 1992).

76 In-turn, the upper limit of the roughness sublayer (z_*) can be estimated by $2 \cdot h_{canopy} - d$

77 (Raupach, 1994) .

78

79   Figure S1. Map showing the location of Mt. Changbai forest and coal fired power plants in
80   Northeast Asia.

81

82

83

84

85   Figure S2. GEM at 4 m agl in the clear spot measured by the Tekran speciation unit, 24 m agl (~3

86   m above forest canopy, long-term GEM sampling site) and 45 m agl (~24 m above forest

87   canopy) measured by the Tekran 2537 from 10 to 14 July 2013.


88
89

90

91

92   Figure S3. Time series of soil/air GEM flux and meteorological parameters in Mt. Changbai forest
93   in July 2013.

94

95

96

97

98   Figure S4. Diurnal trends in vertical gradient of GEM concentrations between the height of 45-24
99   m, 24-10 m and 10-1m in Mt. Changbai forest from 10 to 15 July 2013.

100

101

102

103

104   Figure S5. Diurnal variations of air temperature (A), wind speed (B), relative humidity (RH, C)
105   and ozone concentrations (D) in Mt. Changbai forest in leaf-growing season from October 2008 to
106   December 2014.

107

108

109

110

111   Figure S6. Temporal variation of the turbulent diffusivity at Mt. Changbai forest from 10 to 19
112   July 2013

113

114

115

116

117   Figure S7. Wind frequency distributions in leaf-growing season and non-leaf-growing season from
118   Aug 2009 to Jul 2013 (A), monthly mean wind speed from Aug 2009 to Jul 2013 (B), and Leaf
119   areas index in leaf-growing season during 2003-2005(C) (Shi et al., 2008).

120

121

Table S1. Statistical summary of litterfall Hg concentrations and litter mass in Mt. Changbai forest

Litterfall collection site	Time	Species	Concentration (ng g^{-1})	Litter mass (g m^{-2})	Mass-weight concentration (ng g^{-1})
Collector-1	2013-09	*Pinus koraiensis*	44.5	51.70	74.8
		Acer pseudo-sieboldianum	138.5	24.95	
		Quercus mongolica	170.4	35.60	
		Fraxinus mandshurica	44.5	51.70	
		Tilia amurensis	138.5	24.95	
		Others	170.4	35.60	
Collector-1	2013-10	*Acer mono*	60.2	1.8	60.2
Collector-2	2013-09	*Pinus koraiensis*	40.4	6.48	39.7
		Acer pseudo-sieboldianum	46.8	5.38	
		Quercus mongolica	31.2	9.49	
		Acer mono	58.0	4.81	
		Fraxinus mandshurica	34.5	18.54	
		Tilia amurensis	45.7	52.12	
		Others	36.80	91.16	
Collector-2	2013-10	*Pinus koraiensis*	34.1	4.4	53.3
		Quercus mongolica	30.3	8.8	
		Acer mono	70.7	5.8	
		Others	81.3	6.6	
Collector-3	2013-09	*Acer ginnala Maxim*	38.1	5.8	31.1
		Pinus koraiensis	29.4	19.0	
		Acer pseudo-sieboldianum	49.6	4.6	
		Quercus mongolica	32.5	10.8	
		Acer mono	46.9	6.0	
		Fraxinus mandshurica	23.4	1.5	
		Tilia amurensis	40.4	19.6	
		Others	29.8	283.3	
Collector-3	2013-10	*Pinus koraiensis*	21.7	1.5	35.8
		Quercus mongolica	42.3	3.2	
Collector-4	2013-09	*Pinus koraiensis*	31.4	70.6	34.2
		Acer pseudo-sieboldianum	47.4	2.7	
		Quercus mongolica	26.3	4.1	
		Acer mono	50.9	15.5	
		Tilia amurensis	43.0	11.8	
		Others	32.8	121.1	
Collector-4	2013-10	*Pinus koraiensis*	40.1	19.4	64.4
		Quercus mongolica	46.0	21.7	
		Others	100.9	23.9	
Overall mean					**43.0±29.5**

124   Table S2. Concentration of atmospheric speciated Hg (GEM, PBM, and GOM) and isotopic

125   composition of atmospheric GEM at Mt. Changbai forest

Sample ID	Sampling period	GEM conc.	PBM conc.	GOM conc.	δ^{202}Hg	δ^{202}Hg	Δ^{199}Hg	Δ^{199}Hg	Δ^{200}Hg	Δ^{200}Hg	Δ^{201}Hg	Δ^{201}Hg
		ng m^{-3}	pg m^{-3}	pg m^{-3}	‰	2σ, ‰	‰	2σ, ‰	‰	2σ, ‰	‰	2σ, ‰
GEM-1	2013/7/8 13:40-2013/7/9 15:30	1.60	2	4	-0.06	0.09	-0.05	0.04	0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.06
GEM-2	2013/7/9 15:30-2013/7/10 15:30	1.46	2	2	0.35	0.09	-0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.12	0.06
GEM-3	2013/7/10 15:30-2013/7/11 15:45	1.23	4	2	0.61	0.09	-0.09	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.08	0.06
GEM-4	2013/7/11 15:45-2013/7/12 15:50	1.14	5	2	0.80	0.09	-0.08	0.04	-0.03	0.04	-0.06	0.06
GEM-5	2013/7/12 15:50-2013/7/13 16:00	0.91	6	1	0.91	0.09	-0.06	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.07	0.06
GEM-6	2013/7/13 16:00-2013/7/14 15:40	1.32	4	2	0.58	0.09	-0.06	0.04	-0.06	0.04	-0.05	0.06
GEM-7	2013/7/14 15:40-2013/7/15 17:10	1.37	2	2	0.58	0.09	-0.08	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.06
GEM-8	2013/7/15 17:15-2013/7/16 17:30	1.24	2	2	0.08	0.09	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.06
GEM-9	2013/7/16 17:30-2013/7/17 18:10	1.57	5	1	-0.34	0.09	-0.11	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.06	0.06
GEM-10	2013/7/17 18:10-2013/7/18 18:35	1.30	8	1	-0.01	0.09	-0.08	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.04	0.06

126

127

128 Table S3. A statistical summary of reported litterfall Hg deposition fluxes and estimated annual

129   litterfall Hg deposition of Hg over the world.

Region	Litterfall Hg deposition flux (μg m^{-2} yr^{-1})			Forest area (km^2)	Estimated litterfall deposition (Mg yr^{-1})	Reference
	Range	Median	N			
Asia	20.9-220	37.5±76.1	6	5,775,220	217	(Wang et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2010a; Fu et al., 2010b; Zhou et al., 2013)
North America	3.8-30.9	13.9±5.6	47	6,847,010	95	(Lindberg, 1996; Rea et al., 1996; Grigal et al., 2000; St Louis et al., 2001; Sheehan et al., 2006; Demers et al., 2007; Bushey et al., 2008; Fisher and Wolfe, 2012; Juillerat et al., 2012; Risch et al., 2012; Benoit et al., 2013)
Europe (including Russia)	2.7-25.2	14.2±8.9	6	10,156,300	144	(Iverfeldt, 1991; Munthe et al., 1995; Lee et al., 2000; Schwesig and Matzner, 2000; Lindberg et al., 2007; Larssen et al., 2008)
South America	43.0-184	60.0±49.0	9	9,436,410	566	(Roulet et al., 1998; Fostier et al., 2003; Mélières et al., 2003; Silva-Filho et al., 2006; Teixeira et al., 2012)
Africa				6,164,310	159*	Lack of observational data
Oceania				1,951,370	50*	Lack of observational data
Global total					**1232**	

130 (Estimated litterfall deposition: * indicates the values were calculated using the global median litterfall Hg deposition flux and the forest

131 area in these regions)

132

133

134 Table S4. A statistical summary of reported throughfall Hg deposition fluxes and estimated annual

135   throughfall Hg deposition of Hg over the world

Region	Throughfall Hg deposition flux ($\mu g \ m^{-2} \ yr^{-1}$)			Forest area (km^2)	Estimated throughfall deposition ($mg \ yr^{-1}$)	Reference
	Range	Median	N			
Asia	10.5-71.3	36.8±29.9	4	5,775,220	213	(Wan et al., 2009; Wang et al., 2009; Fu et al., 2010a; Fu et al., 2010b)
North America	3.8-30.9	11.8±3.3	10	6,847,010	81	(Lindberg, 1996; Rea et al., 1996; Grigal et al., 2000; St Louis et al., 2001; Sheehan et al., 2006; Choi et al., 2008; Fisher and Wolfe, 2012)
Europe (including Russia)	6.8-39.0	15.2±10.7	8	10,156,300	154	(Iverfeldt, 1991; Munthe et al., 1995; Lee et al., 2000; Schwesig and Matzner, 2000; Lindberg et al., 2007; Larssen et al., 2008)
South America	72	72	1	9,436,410	679	(Fostier et al., 2000)
Africa				6,164,310	160*	Lack of observational data
Oceania				1,951,370	51*	Lack of observational data
Global total					**1338**	

136 (Estimated throughfall deposition: * indicates the values were calculated using the global median throughfall Hg deposition flux and the

137 forest area in these regions)

138

139

140

141   Table S5. A statistical summary of reported forest soil emission fluxes and estimated annual forest

142   soil emission fluxes over the world

143

Region	Forest soil Hg emission flux ($\mu g\ m^{-2}\ yr^{-1}$)			Forest area (km^2)	Estimated forest soil emission ($Mg\ yr^{-1}$)	Reference
	Range	Median	N			
Asia	3.3-81.2	30.4±23.5	11	5,775,220	176	(Wang et al., 2006; Fu et al., 2008; Fu et al., 2012; Ma et al., 2013)
North America	-1.3-45.9	9.2±11.4	15	6,847,010	63	(Carpi and Lindberg, 1998; Poissant and Casimir, 1998; Zhang et al., 2001; Nacht and Gustin, 2004; Schroeder et al., 2005; Kuiken et al., 2008a; Kuiken et al., 2008b; Choi and Holsen, 2009)
Europe (including Russia)	-0.1-9.6	2.4±4.3	4	10,156,300	24	(Schroeder et al., 1989; Xiao et al., 1991; Ferrara et al., 1997; Lindberg et al., 1998)
South America	6.0	6.0	1	9,436,410	57	(Carpi et al., 2014)
Africa				6,164,310	47*	Lack of observational data
Oceania				1,951,370	15*	Lack of observational data
Global total					**381**	

144 (Estimated forest soil emission: * indicates the values were calculated using the global median forest soil Hg emission flux and the forest

145 area in these regions)

146

147

148

149   *Reference:*

150   Benoit, J. M., Cato, D. A., Denison, K. C., and Moreira, A. E.: Seasonal Mercury Dynamics in a New
151   England Vernal Pool, Wetlands, 33, 887-894, DOI 10.1007/s13157-013-0447-4, 2013.

152   Bushey, J. T., Nallana, A. G., Montesdeoca, M. R., and Driscoll, C. T.: Mercury dynamics of a
153   northern hardwood canopy, Atmos Environ, 42, 6905-6914, DOI
154   10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.05.043, 2008.

155   Carpi, A., and Lindberg, S. E.: Application of a Teflon (TM) dynamic flux chamber for quantifying
156   soil mercury flux: Tests and results over background soil, Atmos Environ, 32, 873-882, Doi
157   10.1016/S1352-2310(97)00133-7, 1998.

158   Carpi, A., Fostier, A. H., Orta, O. R., dos Santos, J. C., and Gittings, M.: Gaseous mercury emissions
159   from soil following forest loss and land use changes: Field experiments in the United States and
160   Brazil, Atmos Environ, 96, 423-429, DOI 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.08.004, 2014.

161   Choi, H. D., Sharac, T. J., and Holsen, T. M.: Mercury deposition in the Adirondacks: A comparison
162   between precipitation and throughfall, Atmos Environ, 42, 1818-1827, DOI
163   10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.11.036, 2008.

164   Choi, H. D., and Holsen, T. M.: Gaseous mercury fluxes from the forest floor of the Adirondacks,
165   Environ Pollut, 157, 592-600, DOI 10.1016/j.envpol.2008.08.020, 2009.

166   Demers, J. D., Driscoll, C. T., Fahey, T. J., and Yavitt, J. B.: Mercury cycling in litter and soil in
167   different forest types in the Adirondack region, New York, USA, Ecol Appl, 17, 1341-1351, Doi
168   10.1890/06-1697.1, 2007.

169   Ferrara, R., Maserti, B. E., Andersson, M., Edner, H., Ragnarson, P., and Svanberg, S.: Mercury
170   degassing rate from mineralized areas in the Mediterranean basin, Water Air Soil Poll, 93, 59-66,
171   Doi 10.1023/A:1022107205659, 1997.

172   Fisher, L. S., and Wolfe, M. H.: Examination of mercury inputs by throughfall and litterfall in the
173   Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Atmos Environ, 47, 554-559, DOI
174   10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.10.017, 2012.

175   Foken, T.: Micrometeorology, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008.

176   Fostier, A. H., Forti, M. C., Guimaraes, J. R. D., Melfi, A. J., Boulet, R., Santo, C. M. E., and Krug, F.
177   J.: Mercury fluxes in a natural forested Amazonian catchment (Serra do Navio, Amapa State,
178   Brazil), Sci Total Environ, 260, 201-211, Doi 10.1016/S0048-9697(00)00564-7, 2000.

179   Fostier, A. H., Cecon, K., and Forti, M. C.: Urban influence on litterfall trace metals fluxes in the
180   Atlantic forest of Sao Paulo (Brazil), J Phys Iv, 107, 491-494, Doi 10.1051/Jp4:20030348, 2003.

181   Fu, X., Feng, X., Zhu, W., Rothenberg, S., Yao, H., and Zhang, H.: Elevated atmospheric deposition
182   and dynamics of mercury in a remote upland forest of southwestern China, Environ Pollut, 158,
183   2324-2333, 10.1016/j.envpol.2010.01.032, 2010a.

184   Fu, X. W., Feng, X. B., and Wang, S. F.: Exchange fluxes of Hg between surfaces and atmosphere in
185   the eastern flank of Mount Gongga, Sichuan province, southwestern China, J Geophys
186   Res-Atmos, 113, Artn D20306

187   Doi 10.1029/2008jd009814, 2008.

188   Fu, X. W., Feng, X., Dong, Z. Q., Yin, R. S., Wang, J. X., Yang, Z. R., and Zhang, H.: Atmospheric
189   gaseous elemental mercury (GEM) concentrations and mercury depositions at a high-altitude
190   mountain peak in south China, Atmos Chem Phys, 10, 2425-2437, 2010b.

191   Fu, X. W., Feng, X. B., Zhang, H., Yu, B., and Chen, L. G.: Mercury emissions from natural surfaces
192   highly impacted by human activities in Guangzhou province, South China, Atmos Environ, 54,

193   185-193, DOI 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.02.008, 2012.

194   Garratt, J. R.: The atmospheric boundary layer, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1992.

195   Grigal, D. F., Kolka, R. K., Fleck, J. A., and Nater, E. A.: Mercury budget of an upland-peatland
196   watershed, Biogeochemistry, 50, 95-109, Doi 10.1023/A:1006322705566, 2000.

197   Huang, H. Y., Hall, A., and Teixeira, J.: Evaluation of the WRF PBL Parameterizations for Marine
198   Boundary Layer Clouds: Cumulus and Stratocumulus, Mon Weather Rev, 141, 2265-2271,
199   10.1175/Mwr-D-12-00292.1, 2013.

200   Iverfeldt, A.: Mercury in forest canopy throughfall water and its relation to atmospheric deposition,
201   Water Air Soil Poll, 56, 553-564, Doi 10.1007/Bf00342299, 1991.

202   Juillerat, J. I., Ross, D. S., and Bank, M. S.: Mercury in litterfall and upper soil horizons in forested
203   ecosystems in Vermont, USA, Environ Toxicol Chem, 31, 1720-1729, Doi 10.1002/Etc.1896,
204   2012.

205   Kaimal, J. C., and Finnigan, J. J.: Atmospheric Boundary Layer Flows, Oxford University Press, New
206   York, Oxford, 1994.

207   Krogsaeter, O., and Reuder, J.: Validation of boundary layer parameterization schemes in the Weather
208   Research and Forecasting (WRF) model under the aspect of offshore wind energy
209   applicationspart II: boundary layer height and atmospheric stability, Wind Energy, 18,
210   1291-1302, 10.1002/we.1765, 2015.

211   Kuiken, T., Gustin, M., Zhang, H., Lindberg, S., and Sedinger, B.: Mercury emission from terrestrial
212   background surfaces in the eastern USA. II: Air/surface exchange of mercury within forests
213   from South Carolina to New England, Appl Geochem, 23, 356-368, DOI
214   10.1016/j.apgeochem.2007.12.007, 2008a.

215   Kuiken, T., Zhang, H., Gustin, M., and Lindberg, S.: Mercury emission from terrestrial background
216   surfaces in the eastern USA. Part I: Air/surface exchange of mercury within a southeastern
217   deciduous forest (Tennessee) over one year, Appl Geochem, 23, 345-355, DOI
218   10.1016/j.apgeocliem.2007.12.006, 2008b.

219   Larssen, T., de Wit, H. A., Wiker, M., and Halse, K.: Mercury budget of a small forested boreal
220   catchment in southeast Norway, Sci Total Environ, 404, 290-296, DOI
221   10.1016/j.scitotenv.2008.03.013, 2008.

222   Lee, Y. H., Bishop, K. H., and Munthe, J.: Do concepts about catchment cycling of methylmercury
223   and mercury in boreal catchments stand the test of time? Six years of atmospheric inputs and
224   runoff export at Svartberget, northern Sweden, Sci Total Environ, 260, 11-20, Doi
225   10.1016/S0048-9697(00)00538-6, 2000.

226   Lindberg, S., Bullock, R., Ebinghaus, R., Engstrom, D., Feng, X. B., Fitzgerald, W., Pirrone, N.,
227   Prestbo, E., and Seigneur, C.: A synthesis of progress and uncertainties in attributing the sources
228   of mercury in deposition, Ambio, 36, 19-32, 2007.

229   Lindberg, S. E.: Forests and the global biogeochemical cycle of mercury: The importance of
230   understanding air/vegetation exchange processes, Nato Asi 2, 21, 359-380, 1996.

231   Lindberg, S. E., Hanson, P. J., Meyers, T. P., and Kim, K. H.: Air/surface exchange of mercury vapor
232   over forests - The need for a reassessment of continental biogenic emissions, Atmos Environ, 32,
233   895-908, Doi 10.1016/S1352-2310(97)00173-8, 1998.

234   Mélières, M. A., Pourchet, M., Charles-Dominique, P., and Gaucher, P.: Mercury in canopy leaves of
235   French Guiana in remote areas, Sci Total Environ, 311, 261-267, Doi
236   10.1016/S0048-9697(03)00142-6, 2003.

237 Ma, M., Wang, D. Y., Sun, R. G., Shen, Y. Y., and Huang, L. X.: Gaseous mercury emissions from
238   subtropical forested and open field soils in a national nature reserve, southwest China, Atmos
239   Environ, 64, 116-123, DOI 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.09.038, 2013.

240 Munthe, J., Hultberg, H., and Iverfeldt, A.: Mechanisms of Deposition of Methylmercury and
241   Mercury to Coniferous Forests, Water Air Soil Poll, 80, 363-371, Doi 10.1007/Bf01189686,
242   1995.

243 Nacht, D. M., and Gustin, M. S.: Mercury emissions from background and altered geologic units
244   throughout Nevada, Water Air Soil Poll, 151, 179-193, Doi
245   10.1023/B:Wate.0000009907.49577.A8, 2004.

246 Poissant, L., and Casimir, A.: Water-air and soil-air exchange rate of total gaseous mercury measured
247   at background sites, Atmos Environ, 32, 883-893, Doi 10.1016/S1352-2310(97)00132-5, 1998.

248 Raupach, M. R.: Simplified Expressions for Vegetation Roughness Length and Zero-Plane
249   Displacement as Functions of Canopy Height and Area Index, Bound-Lay Meteorol, 71,
250   211-216, Doi 10.1007/Bf00709229, 1994.

251 Rea, A. W., Keeler, G. J., and Scherbatskoy, T.: The deposition of mercury in throughfall and litterfall
252   in the lake champlain watershed: A short-term study, Atmos Environ, 30, 3257-3263, Doi
253   10.1016/1352-2310(96)00087-8, 1996.

254 Risch, M. R., DeWild, J. F., Krabbenhoft, D. P., Kolka, R. K., and Zhang, L. M.: Litterfall mercury
255   dry deposition in the eastern USA, Environ Pollut, 161, 284-290, DOI
256   10.1016/j.envpol.2011.06.005, 2012.

257 Roulet, M., Lucotte, M., Saint-Aubin, A., Tran, S., Rheault, I., Farella, N., Da Silva, E. D.,
258   Dezencourt, J., Passos, C. J. S., Soares, G. S., Guimaraes, J. R. D., Mergler, D., and Amorim, M.:
259   The geochemistry of mercury in central Amazonian soils developed on the Alter-do-Chao
260   formation of the lower Tapajos River Valley, Para state, Brazil, Sci Total Environ, 223, 1-24, Doi
261   10.1016/S0048-9697(98)00265-4, 1998.

262 Schroeder, W. H., Munthe, J., and Lindqvist, O.: Cycling of Mercury between Water, Air, and Soil
263   Compartments of the Environment, Water Air Soil Poll, 48, 337-347, 1989.

264 Schroeder, W. H., Beauchamp, S., Edwards, G., Poissant, L., Rasmussen, P., Tordon, R., Dias, G.,
265   Kemp, J., Van Heyst, B., and Banic, C. M.: Gaseous mercury emissions from natural sources in
266   Canadian landscapes, J Geophys Res-Atmos, 110, Artn D18302, Doi 10.1029/2004jd005699,
267   2005.

268 Schwesig, D., and Matzner, E.: Pools and fluxes of mercury and methylmercury in two forested
269   catchments in Germany, Sci Total Environ, 260, 213-223, Doi 10.1016/S0048-9697(00)00565-9,
270   2000.

271 Sheehan, K. D., Fernandez, I. J., Kahl, J. S., and Amirbahman, A.: Litterfall mercury in two forested
272   watersheds at Acadia National Park, Maine, USA, Water Air Soil Poll, 170, 249-265, DOI
273   10.1007/s11270-006-3034-y, 2006.

274 Shi, T. T., Guan, D. X., Wang, A. Z., Wu, J. B., Jin, C. J., and Han, S. J.: Comparison of three models
275   to estimate evapotranspiration for a temperate mixed forest, Hydrol Process, 22, 3431-3443,
276   10.1002/hyp.6922, 2008.

277 Silva-Filho, E. V., Machado, W., Oliveira, R. R., Sella, S. M., and Lacerda, L. D.: Mercury deposition
278   through litterfall in an Atlantic Forest at Ilha Grande, southeast Brazil, Chemosphere, 65,
279   2477-2484, DOI 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.04.053, 2006.

280 Simpson, I. J., Thurtell, G. W., Neumann, H. H., Den Hartog, G., and Edwards, G. C.: The validity of

281 similarity theory in the roughness sublayer above forests, Bound-Lay Meteorol, 87, 69-99, Doi
282 10.1023/A:1000809902980, 1998.

283 St Louis, V. L., Rudd, J. W. M., Kelly, C. A., Hall, B. D., Rolfhus, K. R., Scott, K. J., Lindberg, S. E.,
284 and Dong, W.: Importance of the forest canopy to fluxes of methyl mercury and total mercury to
285 boreal ecosystems, Environmental Science & Technology, 35, 3089-3098, Doi
286 10.1021/Es001924p, 2001.

287 Teixeira, D. C., Montezuma, R. C., Oliveira, R. R., and Silva, E. V.: Litterfall mercury deposition in
288 Atlantic forest ecosystem from SE - Brazil, Environ Pollut, 164, 11-15, DOI
289 10.1016/j.envpol.2011.10.032, 2012.

290 Wan, Q., Feng, X. B., Lu, J., Zheng, W., Song, X. J., Li, P., Han, S. J., and Xu, H.: Atmospheric
291 mercury in Changbai Mountain area, northeastern China II. The distribution of reactive gaseous
292 mercury and particulate mercury and mercury deposition fluxes, Environ Res, 109, 721-727,
293 DOI 10.1016/j.envres.2009.05.006, 2009.

294 Wang, D. Y., He, L., Shi, X. J., Wei, S. Q., and Feng, X. B.: Release flux of mercury from different
295 environmental surfaces in Chongqing, China, Chemosphere, 64, 1845-1854, DOI
296 10.1016/j.chemosphere.2006.01.054, 2006.

297 Wang, Z. W., Zhang, X. S., Xiao, J. S., Zhijia, C., and Yu, P. Z.: Mercury fluxes and pools in three
298 subtropical forested catchments, southwest China, Environ Pollut, 157, 801-808, DOI
299 10.1016/j.envpol.2008.11.018, 2009.

300 Xiao, Z. F., Munthe, J., Schroeder, W. H., and Lindqvist, O.: Vertical Fluxes of Volatile Mercury over
301 Forest Soil and Lake Surfaces in Sweden, Tellus B, 43, 267-279, DOI
302 10.1034/j.1600-0889.1990.t01-1-00009.x-i1, 1991.

303 Zhang, H., Lindberg, S. E., Marsik, F. J., and Keeler, G. J.: Mercury air/surface exchange kinetics of
304 background soils of the Tahquamenon River watershed in the Michigan Upper Peninsula, Water
305 Air Soil Poll, 126, 151-169, Doi 10.1023/A:1005227802306, 2001.

306 Zhou, J., Feng, X. B., Liu, H. Y., Zhang, H., Fu, X. W., Bao, Z. D., Wang, X., and Zhang, Y. P.:
307 Examination of total mercury inputs by precipitation and litterfall in a remote upland forest of
308 Southwestern China, Atmos Environ, 81, 364-372, DOI 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2013.09.010, 2013.

309