Quantifying Methane, Ethane, and VOC Emissions from the Denver-Julesburg Basin Using Aircraft Mass Balance in Fall of 2021.

Hannah M. Daley [1], Alan Fried[2], Xinrong Ren[3], Phillip Stratton[3], Benjamin Hmiel[4] and Russell R. Dickerson[1].

[1]Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Science, University of Maryland; [2]University of Colorado at Boulder, Institute or Arctic and Alpine Research, Boulder, United States; [3]Air Resources Laboratory, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; [4]Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Denver, United States.

Intro:

Methane, a potent greenhouse gas and primary component of natural gas, requires quantification of emission rates and their temporal changes to assess its climatic impact. In the Denver-Julesburg Basin (DJB), particularly the Wattenberg field area of Colorado, methane emissions predominantly originate from oil and natural gas (O&G) operations (>18,000 active wells in 2021), agricultural activities at concentrated animal feedlot operations (CAFOs), and landfills (Figure 2). During Fall 2021 (9/17–10/5), our research group conducted nine flights over this region in a fully instrumented Cessna aircraft (Figure 1), measuring CH_4, C_2H_6, acetic acid, and other trace gases, with four flights deemed sufficient for mass balance emission rate determination. Since CH_4 and C_2H_6 are co-emitted from O&G operations, and CH_4 and acetic acid (but not C_2H_6) from CAFOs (Figure 3), we determined methane emission rates, source apportionment, and emission intensity for each flight normalized by O&G production (Figure 4).

Aircraft-Based Mass Balance Method:



$$CH_4\,ER = \iint_{z_0=surface;y_0}^{z_1;y_1} \left([CH_4]_{plume} - [CH_4]_{bkg}\right) * WS_{\perp} * (GS * \Delta t) * N(P,T,Z)\, dy\, dz$$

$$WS_{\perp} = \mathrm{WS} * \cos(\mathrm{WD}\perp - \mathrm{TA}) * \mathrm{k}$$

Emission uncertainties were assessed through a propagation error analysis of 10 variables: adjusted PBLH, methane concentration ($[CH_4]_{plume}$), methane background ($[CH_4]_{plume}$), wind speed (WS), track angle (TA), wind speed correction factor (k), wind direction (WD), groundspeed (GS), temperature (T), and pressure (P).

Emission Intensity Determination:

$$Emission\ Intensity\ (EI) = (CH_4 \text{ fraction from O\&G})*(CH_4 \text{ mass balance kg/ hour})/(\text{BOEh})$$

Methane and Ethane Emission Results:

Date	C2H6 Emission Rate (tn/hr)	CH4 Emission Rate (tn/hr)	O&G%	Total BOE/hr	Methane Emission Intensity	Ethane Emission Intensity
9/24/2021	2.24 ± 0.49	17.7 ± 4.3	51.4	36925	0.26	0.06 ± 0.1
9/27/2021	1.83 ± 0.50	17.9 ± 2.9	63.2	27951	0.40	0.07 ± 0.02
10/1/2021	1.96 ± 0.52	19.5 ± 7.3	71.2	17949	0.77	0.11 ± 0.04
10/5/2021	3.71 ± 0.59	28.5± 3.1	67.1	29337	0.65	0.13 ± 0.02
Average	2.44 ± 0.80	20.9 ± 5.0	63.2 ± 8.7	28041 ± 7800	0.56 ± 0.19	0.09 ± 0.02

As **oil and gas production** in the D-J Basin **increases, methane emission intensity decreases.**

Poster number: A21K – 1917

Scan for a link to the poster, reference information, and more information about the presenter.

3 Take away points:

1. Methane and Ethane Emissions: From four flights conducted in Fall 2021 (9/24–10/5), the methane emission rate was quantified as **20.9 ± 5.9 tons CH_4/hr**, while the ethane emission rate was **2.44 ± 0.80 tons C_2H_6/hr**.

2. Source Apportionment Using Tracers: Acetic acid proved to be a valuable tracer for agricultural methane emissions. Combining acetic acid and ethane tracers, we attributed **63.2 ± 8.7%** of methane emissions to oil and gas (O&G) operations.

3. Emission Intensity Trends: By determining flight footprints, we achieved a more precise estimation of O&G production captured during each leg/flight. This enabled calculations of a methane emission intensity of **0.56 ± 0.19 kg thermogenic CH_4/BOE/hr** and an ethane emission intensity of **0.09 ± 0.02 kg C_2H_6/BOE/hr**. Methane emission intensity has declined linearly by **0.05 kg/BOE/hr per year** since 2012, while ethane emission intensity has significantly decreased > 70% since 2015 (Pieschl, 2018; Ngulat/Daley/Fried et al., in prep.).



Figure 1. (Top left) The 402B aircraft and reverse-facing gas inlet, along with pressure/temperature/humidity sensors. (Top middle) Interior view showing the UMD instrument rack and CAMS-2 ethane instrument. (Top right) The PTR-TOF spectrometer inside the aircraft. (Bottom) Schematic of instrument placements relative to the aircraft size.



Figure 2. Map of the Wattenberg Field portion of the DJB in Weld and Larimer Counties showing CH_4 sources, with O&G facilities sized by daily BOE production and CAFOs sized by animal units (AU).



Figure 3. Plot of 1s ΔMethane vs. ΔEthane, colored and sized by Δacetic acid concentrations. Background values represent 5% of values within the PBLH. The box region highlights Greeley, CO, a major CAFO area. The figure shows a ΔEthane/ΔMethane ratio of approximately 5.5% and a strong correlation between CAFOs and acetic acid.



Figure 4. Methane emission intensity (blue) and Barrels of Oil Equivalent (BOE, black) for six studies conducted in the Denver-Julesburg Basin from 2012–2021. BOE increased by 146% from 2012 to 2021 and 137% from 2015 to 2021. The trendline (r² = 0.78) indicates a decrease in emission intensity of approximately 0.05 EI/year, where EI is kg CH_4/BOE/hr.