Forward Modeling and Optimization of Methane Emissions in the South Central United States Using Aircraft Transects Across Frontal Boundaries
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Abstract The South Central United States is a hot spot for anthropogenic methane (CH4) emissions, with contributions from the oil/gas (O&G) and animal agriculture sectors. During frontal weather events, airflow combines enhancements from these emissions into a large plume. In this study, we take CH4 and ethane (C2H6) observations from the Atmospheric Carbon and Transport-America campaign and adjust O&G and animal agriculture emissions such that modeled CH4 and C2H6 enhancements match the observed plume. Results from the joint CH4-C2H6 optimization indicate that emissions from the O&G sector are 1.8 ± 0.7 (2σ) times larger than EPA inventory estimates. These results match synthesis work from recent literature and reject the possibility that this increase compared to inventories is due to a potential bias in daytime-only measurements of these facilities. Successful modeling from this study raises the possibility of using trace gas measurements along frontal crossings to solve for emissions in other regions of the United States.

1. Introduction

Methane (CH4) is a potent greenhouse gas with 28–35 times the warming potential of carbon dioxide (CO2) over a 100 year period. Increases in global CH4 concentrations since the preindustrial era have contributed approximately 20% to the increased radiative forcing on the planet (Myhre et al., 2013). According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the two largest sources of anthropogenic CH4 emissions in the United States originate from oil and natural gas (O&G) production and animal agriculture. Together these sources contributed 18 Tg CH4 in the year 2016, or 67% of anthropogenic CH4 emissions in the United States (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2018). However, large uncertainties exist regarding the accuracy of these assessments.

CH4 emissions from O&G infrastructure are a complex source to quantify. Numerous opportunities exist for CH4 to escape into the atmosphere through both planned and unplanned releases in the O&G supply chain, from the drilling and production of the wells (Allen et al., 2013), to the gathering and processing facilities (Mitchell et al., 2015), to the transmission and storage of the gas (Zimmerle et al., 2015), and finally, the distribution for end use (McKain et al., 2015; Balashov et al., 2019). To document and quantify these emissions, the EPA primarily relies on a bottom-up methodology, collecting component and device-level counts and multiplying them by an average emission rate based on values found in scientific literature (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2019). Independent top-down measurements of O&G basins in the last decade have found varying CH4 emission rates across basins (Peischl et al., 2016, Peischl et al., 2018), but almost always with a total emission rate higher than EPA-derived bottom-up estimates (Brandt et al., 2014; Barkley et al., 2019). Synthesis work accounting for various independent site-level measurements of wellpads and facilities estimate that EPA emission estimates from the O&G production sector are low by a factor of 1.5 or more (Alvarez et al., 2018; Omara et al., 2018). The discrepancy between these inventory estimates is thought to be caused by an underattribution of emissions related to abnormal operating conditions, sources with less predictable spatial and temporal variability that may be difficult to capture in a bottom-up inventory.
(Zavala-Araiza et al., 2015). Because CH4 emissions from the production sector are the largest source of emissions from O&G operations, uncertainty from these sources dominate the overall uncertainty of emissions from O&G operations. (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2019; Alvarez et al., 2018).

Similar issues have arisen concerning CH4 emissions from the animal agriculture sector. CH4 emissions from animal agriculture come from two primary sources: emissions from enteric fermentation in ruminants and emissions through manure management. Through the use of emission factors and inventory counts, the EPA provides annual estimates of CH4 emissions from enteric fermentation and manure management (US Environmental Protection Agency, 2019). This bottom-up inventory estimate matches total emission estimates from two independent bottom-up assessments, though spatial discrepancies exist between them (Hristov et al., 2017; EDGAR, 2011). However, top-down estimates performed on the scale of individual farms (Desjardins et al., 2018), states (Cui et al., 2017), and continents (Miller et al., 2013) have attributed higher CH4 emissions to animal agriculture compared to their bottom-up counterparts.

One of the largest regions of CH4 emissions in the United States from both O&G and animal agriculture can be found in the South Central United States. The objective of this study is to independently quantify emissions from these sectors in the South Central United States through a top-down approach. Observations from frontal transects downwind of the region are combined with forward modeling techniques to quantify CH4 emissions from the O&G and animal agriculture sector and compare them directly with the EPA 2012 Gridded CH4 inventory (Maasakkers et al., 2016). Continuous ethane (C2H6) observations are used to separate out and solve for CH4 emissions specifically from O&G sector.

2. Methods
2.1. Observations and Study Region
Observations from this study come from aircraft measurements obtained in the Atmospheric Carbon and Transport-America (ACT-America) campaign. Airborne CH4 from the ACT-America flights was measured using a commercial PICARRO G2401-m instrument adapted with a custom inlet system for drying and conditioning the sample air (DiGangi et al., 2018). Calibrations were performed hourly in-flight using standards obtained from NOAA ESRL and traceable to the WMO X2004A scale (Dlugokencky et al., 2005). Continuous C2H6 measurements were acquired from the CAMS-2 (Compact Airborne Multi-Species Spectrometer) instrument designed and operated by the University of Colorado (Barkley et al., 2019). Continuous measurements for both CH4 and C2H6 were averaged over 5 min time intervals to reduce structural noise created by more local sources. For two flights (2 November 2017 and 18 October 2017 northern transect), continuous C2H6 data from the CAMS-2 were not available. For these flights, multispecies flask samples with a temporal frequency of approximately 20 min were used to quantify C2H6 concentrations (Sweeney et al., 2015).

The focus of this study was to quantify CH4 emissions from the South central region of the United States (27–42°N 90–105°W; see Figure 1). Spatially, a large percentage of United States CH4 emissions are concentrated in this region, primarily due to presence of both O&G production as well as animal agriculture (Maasakkers et al., 2016). Major O&G basins can be found in this area, such as the Anadarko, Eagle Ford, Fayetteville, Haynesville, Permian, and Barnett. When added together, these basins account for 40% of O&G produced in the United States in 2017 (US Energy Information Administration, 2018). In addition, this region also contains 25% of cattle raised in the country (USDA, 2014). The combination of these sources makes the entire South Central United States a hot spot for CH4 emissions.

Observations in the atmospheric boundary layer (ABL) from five ACT flights were used in this study that specifically target emissions from the South Central United States, four of which took place in fall of 2017 and one of which occurred in February of 2017 (Figure S2). The flight on 18 October 2017 was separated into two transects (south and north) during analysis, resulting in six total transects. A potential seventh frontal transect occurring on 30 October 2017 was not used in the analysis due to a failure to accurately model the meteorology on that day (see supporting information section S3). Flights that crossed frontal systems were specifically selected for this experiment. These flights share certain characteristics that make them useful for emissions quantification; persistent southerly steady-state winds east of a frontal system transport air quickly across the various sources in the South Central United States and converge along the frontal boundary, combining their enhancements into an identifiable plume, which can be observed in all transects (see supporting information section S1). Furthermore, the distinct features of frontal systems along the boundaries (i.e., wind shifts and temperature changes) make it easier to characterize differences between
the observed versus the modeled transport of the plumes and quantify errors in the atmospheric transport reanalysis.

2.2. Model and Emissions Inventory
To model CH$_4$ enhancements for the six transects, the Weather Research and Forecasting model was used with chemistry enabled. A 9 km resolution domain was created encompassing the South Central and Midwestern United States, with multiple chemically-inert tracers used to track different sources of CH$_4$. The Weather Research and Forecasting configuration for the model physics used in this research includes the use of the double-moment scheme for cloud microphysical processes, the rapid radiative transfer method for general circulation models, the Level 2.5 turbulence kinetic energy predicting Mellor–Yamada–Nakanishi–Niino (MYNN) planetary boundary layer scheme, and the Noah 4-layer land-surface model. Additionally, three different reanalysis products were used as initialization and driver data to create three separate model runs for each flight: the North American Regional Reanalysis model, the Global Forecasting System, and the ERA-I reanalysis product (Mesinger et al., 2006; Dee et al., 2011). These differing runs were used as a method to assess potential transport errors for each flight (Díaz-Isaac et al., 2018).

Anthropogenic CH$_4$ emissions used as input for the model come from the Gridded 2012 Methane Emissions Inventory (Maasakkers et al., 2016). Separate tracers were used for emissions from the O&G sector, enteric fermentation, and manure management (animal agriculture), and an additional tracer for all other small sources. The O&G sector was broken down further into tracers roughly outlining the Anadarko, Woodford, Permian, Fort Worth, East Texas, and Gulf. Potential emissions from sources in northern Mexico were insignificant compared to emissions within the South Central United States and are not included in the model inventory (Sheng et al., 2017; EDGAR, 2011). For wetland emissions, the mean ensemble value of
Figure 2. (top left) Observed vs. modeled CH$_4$ for the northern transect of the flight on 18 October 2017 using the unadjusted emissions from the EPA Gridded Methane Inventory. (bottom left) Time series of observed (blue) versus modeled (red) CH$_4$ enhancements along the flight track, with a breakdown of the O&G, animal agriculture, and other modeled CH$_4$ enhancements contributing to the total model enhancement. (right) Same as left, but after optimizing emissions from O&G and animal agriculture.

WetCHARTs v1.0 was used to show that wetland sources had minimal mole fraction on flights used in this study but was not utilized in the final solution due to limited data on their emissions (Bloom et al., 2017). Only one flight (21 October 2017) had a modeled wetlands plume intersecting the transect, but the spatial pattern of the enhancement did not coincide with enhancements from the main O&G and animal agriculture plume and observations did not indicate an enhancement within the wetlands CH$_4$ plume. In addition to a CH$_4$ emissions inventory, a simplified C$_2$H$_6$ inventory is created for the region by multiplying CH$_4$ emissions from different basins with their respective C$_2$H$_6$:CH$_4$ ratios (TCEQ, 2012; Ellis, 2014) (see supporting information section S2 for details).

2.3. Methane Optimization Technique

For each flight, the objective is to scale CH$_4$ emissions for O&G and animal agriculture sources within the model by a linear coefficient to find optimized emission rates that closest match the observed plumes (Figure 2). This is done through minimizing the squared error as shown in the following equation:

$$J_{CH_4} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}{(X_i^{CH_4} - Y_i^{CH_4})^2}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $X_i$ is the observed CH$_4$, $Y_i$ is the modeled CH$_4$ at each observation, and $J$ is a cost function we are trying to minimize. Whereas $X_i$ is only the aircraft-observed CH$_4$ along the transect, the model CH$_4$ $Y_i$ is composed of multiple terms, given in the equation below

$$Y_i^{CH_4} = C_1 Y_i^{OG} + C_2 Y_i^{agriculture} + Y_i^{Other} + BCH_6$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where the total modeled CH$_4$ $Y_i^{CH_4}$ is composed of four terms. $Y_i^{OG}$ and $Y_i^{agriculture}$ are the modeled O&G and animal agriculture enhancements and are both preceded by a constant $C_1$ and $C_2$ to allow their concentrations to vary linearly in the optimization. Because modeled concentrations adjust linearly with their emissions, the $C_1$ and $C_2$ values that minimize equation (1) represent emission rate multipliers for each sector that optimize the match between the observations and the model. $Y_i^{Other}$ is the modeled enhancement
from the remaining sources and is not solved for in the optimization approach. $B^{CH4}$ is a background value applied to the modeled enhancement that accounts for CH$_4$ concentrations specific to the air mass that originate from outside the model domain. Because frontal flights contain observations in two different air masses, a background $B^{CH4}$ must be applied to data points specific to each air mass. We determine the location of the change in air mass by a sharp transition in potential temperature, dew point, and wind direction, and then calculate $B^{CH4}$ for each air mass. To calculate $B^{CH4}$, we first find the CH$_4$ mole fraction from the lowest 10th percentile of observations in the ABL from that air mass. This value typically comes from the edge of a transect away from the major regional CH$_4$ plume and is closest to representing the background value of the regional air mass. After selecting this observed background concentration we then select the modeled background concentration, found by choosing the lowest 10th percentile of modeled enhancements along the flight path within the same air mass. By taking the difference between the observed background and modeled background concentrations, we create a background value $B^{CH4}$ that can be added to the modeled enhancements to align the low points in the observations with the low points in the model. This can be represented through the following equation:

$$B^{CH4} = X^{CH4}_{10\%} - Y^{CH4}_{10\%}$$

where $X_{10\%}$ and $Y_{10\%}$ are the 10th percentile of observations and modeled enhancements in a given air mass. Because the chosen background value is partially dependent on modeled enhancements, different $C_1$ and $C_2$ values in the model optimization will produce different $Y_{10\%}$ (and, thus, a different $B$). Because regional sources dominate over chemistry sinks at the surface for CH$_4$, a lower limit can be placed on the background concentration, found by choosing the lowest 10th percentile of modeled enhancements along the flight path within the same air mass. By taking the difference between the observed background and modeled background concentrations, we create a background value $B^{CH4}$ that can be added to the modeled enhancements to align the low points in the observations with the low points in the model. This can be represented through the following equation:

$$B^{CH4} = X^{CH4}_{10\%} - Y^{CH4}_{10\%}$$

where $X_{10\%}$ and $Y_{10\%}$ are the 10th percentile of observations and modeled enhancements in a given air mass. Because the chosen background value is partially dependent on modeled enhancements, different $C_1$ and $C_2$ values in the model optimization will produce different $Y_{10\%}$ (and, thus, a different $B$). Because regional sources dominate over chemistry sinks at the surface for CH$_4$, a lower limit can be placed on the background concentration, found by choosing the lowest 10th percentile of modeled enhancements along the flight path within the same air mass. By taking the difference between the observed background and modeled background concentrations, we create a background value $B^{CH4}$ that can be added to the modeled enhancements to align the low points in the observations with the low points in the model. This can be represented through the following equation:

$$J_{Joint} = \frac{1}{\text{iqr}(X^{CH4})} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X^{CH4}_i - C^{CH4}_i)^2} + \frac{1}{\text{iqr}(X^{C2H6})} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X^{C2H6}_i - C^{C2H6}_i)^2}$$

where $J_{Joint}$ is the sum of both the CH$_4$ and C$_2$H$_6$ cost functions normalized by the interquartile range of their respective observations. By normalizing each cost function by the interquartile range of their observations, each cost function is given a near-equal weighting in its contribution toward the joint cost function.
2.5. Uncertainty Analysis
Throughout the optimization, four categories of uncertainty exist that can influence the final result: uncertainty in the simulated atmospheric transport, uncertainty in the background value, uncertainty in the nonoptimized emissions, and uncertainty in the C2H6:CH4 ratios of the O&G basins (used in the C2H6 optimization). To quantify these uncertainties, a Monte Carlo is used to draw random variables for each category and apply them in the optimization formula. For atmospheric transport errors, at the start of the optimization process one of the three transport models runs is randomly drawn and its enhancements are used, creating variability in the plume structures. To account for uncertainty in the background value, the value is first selected based on the observations and then a normal random variable with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = \pm 5$ ppb is added to the chosen background. Uncertainty in the unsolved emissions comes mostly from landfills and is represented by scaling enhancements from $Y_{\text{Other}}$ by a normal random multiplier with $\mu = 1$ and $\sigma = \pm 0.25$. Finally, for uncertainty in the assumed C2H6:CH4 ratio of each O&G basin, a normal random variable is drawn with $\mu = 0$ and $\sigma = \pm 0.03$ for each basin and applied to their ratio. This process is performed 1,000 times for each flight, and the spread produced in the optimized O&G and animal agriculture solutions is used to represent the uncertainty range. For more information on each source of uncertainty, the values chosen to represent them, and their impacts on the overall solution, refer to section S4 in the supporting information section.

A final source of uncertainty exists related to errors in the modeled wind speed and plume mixing depth. These errors can impact the magnitude of the modeled enhancement within the ABL, with high/low biases in modeled winds and mixing height resulting in a diluted/increased modeled tracer enhancement inside the ABL. To correct these biases, the following equation is applied (Barkley et al., 2017) to the modeled enhancements:

$$Y_{\text{adj}} = Y \cdot \frac{U_m}{U_{\text{obs}}} \cdot \frac{z_m}{z_{\text{obs}}}$$

(7)

where $Y_{\text{adj}}$ is the corrected model enhancement calculated for each flight, $Y$ is the original modeled enhancement, $U_m/U_{\text{obs}}$ is the mean modeled wind speed divided by the mean observed wind speed along the transect, and $z_m/z_{\text{obs}}$ is the mean modeled ABL depth divided by the observed ABL depth along the transect. To calculate the ABL depth, observations from aircraft vertical spirals performed along each transect are compared to the model data at the same location to find the height where CO2, CH4, and H2O values experience a significant change to free tropospheric values and a sharp increase in potential temperature is observed (see supporting information section S3 for model performance).

The Eulerian-based methodology to scale emissions using a forward modeling approach is dependent on having a reliable spatial mapping of the locations of CH4 emitters. The EPA gridded CH4 emissions inventory used as the prior in this study is based on county-level or higher resolution data containing the locations of all anthropogenic sources of CH4 in the United States. Though the magnitude of emissions from sources within this prior can potentially be flawed, the location of sources is well documented, reducing the likelihood of potential errors in the optimization from poor spatial mapping of the emissions. However, if major sources of CH4 are missing or misplaced within the inventory, it would present errors that are not accounted for in the uncertainty assessment performed in this study.

3. Results and Discussion
Through the adjustment of O&G and animal agriculture emissions with a linear multiplier, modeled results of frontal flights are able to match observations from the ACT-America campaign to a high degree of accuracy (see Figure S5). The mean Pearson correlation coefficient for the six transects used in this study is 0.94, providing confidence in the ability of the model to reconstruct the location of the major CH4 plume. Despite this accuracy, correctly desegregating and attributing the observed CH4 to either the O&G or animal agriculture sector is difficult when only using CH4 data. The mean optimized O&G and animal agriculture emissions across all flights center around 1.3 times their EPA inventory estimates, indicating that the EPA’s total CH4 inventory estimate for the South Central United States is too low. However, the potential range of solutions for each source individually is broad, with mean and 2$\sigma$ confidence intervals of 1.5x ± 0.7 and 1.3x ± 0.9 for O&G and animal agriculture respectively (Figure 3). Part of the reason for the large variances on these sources is the colinearity of the optimized animal agriculture and O&G emission solutions. In many cases, similar matches between the model and the observations can be achieved by lowering emissions from
one sector and raising the other equivalently. This colinearity is a consequence of using frontal flights to solve for emissions, as transport from these systems leads to the development of a single, well-defined plume along the boundary mixing together enhancements from all sources along its path.

Results from the C2H6 optimization can be used as a separate means to solve for O&G emissions and identify which source is responsible for the increased total CH4 emissions observed from the CH4 optimization. Similar to the CH4 optimization, modeled C2H6 enhancements matched closely with observations, with a mean correlation coefficient of 0.82 for the six transects using the optimized solutions (Figure S6). From the results of the C2H6 optimization, total emissions from O&G are 2.6\(\pm\)0.6 larger than EPA inventory estimates. These values are on the high end/exceed the uncertainty range for O&G from the CH4 optimization and indicate that the overall increase in CH4 emissions observed compared to EPA inventory estimates are likely associated with O&G sources and not animal agriculture. The joint CH4-C2H6 optimization provides further evidence, producing mean and 2\(\sigma\) confidence intervals for O&G and animal agriculture emission multipliers of 1.8\(\pm\)0.7 and 0.9\(\pm\)0.7 respectively (Figure 3).

A different optimization was performed to provide an additional check on O&G emissions rates using the CH4 data, but treating animal agriculture as a potential source of uncertainty in the Monte Carlo rather than an unbounded parameter to be solved for in the optimization. In this experiment, animal agriculture is set to have an emission rate and uncertainty range equal to the values in the EPA’s gridded inventory estimate (\(\sigma = \pm 7.5\%\)) and is a variable drawn randomly from the Monte Carlo, with O&G emissions being the only variable optimized. The results of this test represent a solution range for O&G emissions that would be representative of the truth if one had high confidence in the EPA’s animal agriculture estimates. From
this optimization, we find a mean and 2σ confidence interval for the O&G emission multiplier to be 1.6x ± 0.5. The close match between the results from this test and the CH4-C2H6 joint optimization provides more confidence that the higher values of CH4 observed from these flights can likely be attributed to the O&G sector.

From these various optimization methods, one major discrepancy that arises is the difference between the O&G emission rate solution when optimized using only CH4 (1.5x ± 0.7 from two-source optimization or 1.6x ± 0.5 for O&G only optimization) versus optimizing using only the C2H6 data (2.6x ± 0.6). The difference between these two solutions is likely due to either a missing source of C2H6 in the simplified C2H6 inventory or a underestimation of the C2H6:CH4 ratios assumed in this study to create the C2H6 inventory. To explore the latter scenario, a simplified C2H6 optimization was rerun, applying the same C2H6:CH4 ratio to all basins uniformly and adjusting this ratio to observe its impact on the optimized O&G emission rate (see supporting information section S4). From this experiment, we find that applying a flat C2H6:CH4 ratio of 0.13 produces solutions for O&G emissions using the C2H6 optimization that are nearly identical to the solutions from the CH4 optimization both overall and flight-by-flight, with an absolute mean difference between the O&G rates per flight from these two solutions of only 0.15. The strong correlation between the results of these two optimizations after increasing the C2H6:CH4 ratio by 80% of its original value (0.13 vs 0.07) indicates that C2H6:CH4 emission ratios used in the simplified C2H6 inventory may be significantly lower than the true ratios, and could be related to an underestimation of emissions from oil-producing sectors of basins with a much lower percentage of CH4 content (Gherabati et al., 2016; Cardoso-Saldaña et al., 2019).

From the CH4-C2H6 joint optimization, we estimate O&G emissions from the South Central United States to be 1.8x ± 0.7 higher than 2012 EPA inventory estimates. This result is in agreement with national-scale aggregated estimates derived in Alvarez et al. (2018) (1.5–1.9x) and Omara et al. (2018) (1.5–3.3x, production sector only), as well as numerous top-down estimates of individual basins which have measured emissions higher than inventory estimates (Brandt et al., 2014). For top-down studies, there have been concerns that these estimates may contain bias due to their reliance of daytime measurements, unable to account for potential diurnal differences in O&G emissions that could exist due to different levels of onsite maintenance and activity (Vaughn et al., 2018). The flights from this study provide evidence to the contrary. For each flight, air traveled multiple days and nights across O&G basins before being measured by the aircraft. Their measurements represent emissions that are not only a mixture of the various basins in the South Central United States but are also mixture of daytime and nighttime emissions in the region (Figure S3). For this reason and given the large amount of O&G activity captured in these frontal plumes, it is unlikely that diurnal differences in O&G emission rates could explain the high emission rates observed in this study.

4. Conclusion

Using CH4 and C2H6 observations from six aircraft transects crossing frontal systems in the South Central and Midwestern United States, we conclude that regional CH4 emissions from the O&G sector are 1.8 ± 0.7 times higher than the 2012 EPA Gridded inventory (2σ confidence). Projected emissions from animal agriculture do not show significant differences from EPA inventory estimates (0.9x ± 0.7), and large C2H6 mole fractions within the observed frontal plumes indicate increases in CH4 emissions relative to inventory estimates are due to emissions from the O&G sector. Optimizing for O&G emissions using CH4 and C2H6 observations individually results in inventory multipliers of 1.6 ± 0.5 using CH4 and 2.6 ± 0.6 using C2H6. Discrepancies between the two solutions is likely due to an underestimation of the C2H6:CH4 ratios assumed to represent the O&G basins in the study.

This study demonstrates the potential of using frontal systems to quantify CH4 emissions from regional hot spots that span thousands of kilometers. The continuous, strong steady-state winds in the warm sector combined with the buildup of CH4 along the frontal boundary can lead to the development of large plumes that represent enhancements from a large portion of O&G and animal agriculture emissions and are easily tracked within the model. Using this targeted approach to emissions quantification based on frontal weather patterns can serve as an alternative approach to quantifying fluxes on a regional scale. Future studies examining the strengths and weaknesses of emission quantification under different synoptic-scale weather patterns could provide valuable information for flight design.
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