

Separation of methane emissions from agricultural and natural gas sources in the Colorado Front Range

N. Kille, R. Chiu, <u>M. Frey</u>, F. Hase, M. K. Sha, T. Blumenstock, J. W. Hannigan, J. Orphal, D. Bon, R. Volkamer

Institute for Meteorology and Climate Research, Atmospheric Trace Gases and Remote Sensing (IMK-ASF, KIT)





Outline

- Campaign overview
- Instrumentation
- Data analysis
- Campaign results
- Summary and outlook







Campaign Overview

- Three COCCON EM27/SUN spectrometer (CH₄ detection, no CO channel)
- One CU mobile solar occultation flux (SOF) instrument (C₂H₆ and NH₃ detection)
- Measurements from 14 to 23 March 2015 in the Colorado Front Range
- Five days with clear sky conditions
- Temperatures from 8 to 28 °C
- Surface wind speeds from 1.5 to 13.9 m/s



CU mobile SOF instrument

- Digital mobile solar tracker
- UV-Vis grating spectrometer
- EM27 spectrometer
- Resolution: 0.5 cm⁻¹
- MCT detector
 - Spectral range: 700 1850 cm⁻¹
- InSb detector
 - Spectral range: 1850 5000 cm⁻¹
- SFIT4 retrieval code





CU mobile SOF instrument + EM27/SUN



UV-Vis grating spectrometer EM27 spectrometer Resolution: 0.5 cm⁻¹ MCT detector Spectral range: 700 – 1850 cm⁻¹ InSb detector Spectral range: 1850 – 5000 cm⁻¹ SFIT4 retrieval code C_2H_6 NH₂ H_2O 0, CH₄ 12000 11000 10000 9000 8000 7000 5000 4000 3000 2000 6000 wavenumbers cm

Digital mobile solar tracker



Data analysis



Dry air mole fractions (XGas) are derived from total columns (VC) as

$$XGas = 0.2095 \frac{VC (Gas)}{VC (O2)}$$

Enhancement over the background

 $\Delta XGas = XGas - XGasBKG$

XGas_{BKG} is determined as the second percentile of pooled time series data, for XCH₄ on a daily basis from the three measurement sites, for the other gases as a constant value over the whole time series

Data analysis



• Linear regression analysis on ΔXCH_4 timeseries

 $\Delta XCH_4 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \Delta XC_2H_6 + \beta_2 \cdot \Delta XNH_3$

- Regression parameters $β_1$, $β_2$ represent ΔXCH₄/ΔXC₂H₆, ΔXCH₄/ΔXNH₃ ratio at the source
- **β**₀ is excess ΔXCH_4 not attributable to tracers
- Several sensitivity studies with different constraints for β_i performed

 β_i used to calculate contributions of natural gas (NG), agriculture (AG) and other sources

$$\% NG = \frac{\beta_1 \cdot \Delta XC_2 H_6}{\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \Delta XC_2 H_6 + \beta_2 \cdot \Delta XN H_3}$$
$$\% AG = \frac{\beta_2 \cdot \Delta XNH_3}{\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \Delta XC_2 H_6 + \beta_2 \cdot \Delta XN H_3}$$
$$\% Other = \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \Delta XC_2 H_6 + \beta_2 \cdot \Delta XN H_3}$$



XGas and ΔXGas timeseries





Time series data for 16 March 2015



Time series data full campaign







Source attribution

- Inferred regression parameters
 - $\beta_0 = 0.64 \pm 0.64 \text{ ppb}$
 - $β_1 = 6.20 \pm 0.81$ ppb/ppb
 - β₂ = 2.34 ± 0.65 ppb/ppb
- Percent-contributions of sources and comparison with in situ studies

NG	AG	Other	Study period	Reference
62.8 ± 17.1	25.4 ± 9.6	11.8 ± 11.8	March 2015	This work
74	15	11	May 2012	Petron et al. (2014)
31 - 61	39 - 69		July/August 2014	Townsend- Small et al. (2016)
75 ± 37	-	-	March/April 2015	Peischl et al. (2018)

Summary and Outlook



- Measurement campaign in Colorado Front Range March 2015
- Methane enhancements up to $\Delta XCH_4 = 17$ ppb
- ΔXCH₄ variance explained by variations in C₂H₆ NH₃ tracer pair using a linear regression analysis
 - 63 ± 17 % natural gas
 - 25 ± 10 % agriculture
 - 12 ± 12 % other sources
- Good agreement with in situ studies
- $\Delta XC_2H_6/\Delta XCH_4$ ratio of 16 ± 2 % indicates wet natural gas



Extra slides



Percent contributions from different sources as function of β_0





Percent contributions as function of ΔXCH₄







Averaging kernels

