



Natasha L. Miles¹, Douglas K. Martins^{1,2}, Scott J. Richardson¹, Christopher Rella³, Thomas Lauvaux¹, Kenneth J. Davis¹,

Zachary R. Barkley¹, Kathryn McKain⁴, Colm Sweeney⁴

¹Department of Meteorology and Atmospheric Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA

FLIR Systems, Inc, Lafayette, IN (current affiliation)

⁴National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration / University of Colorado, Boulder, CO

CHALLENGES FOR CALIBRATION OF ISOTOPIC METHANE

Four in-situ cavity ring-down (Picarro G2132-i) spectrometers measuring methane (CH₄), carbon dioside (CO₂) and the isotopic ratio of methane (δ¹³CH₄) were deployed at towers with heights between 46 and 61 m ACL. The study is focused on the Marcellus Shale natural gas extraction region of Pennsylvania. The leakage rate of CH₄ determines whether natural gas is useful as a bridge fuel, in terms of greenhouse effects, compared to coal. These tower data will be used in a top-down inversion to determine fluxers. Sources can be distinguished via the isotopic signature: heavy isotope ratios (e.g., -23.9%) are characteristic of thermogenic (e.g., oil and gas) CH₄ sources and light isotope ratios (e.g., -66.5%) are characteristic of biogenic (e.g., landfills, agriculture) sources. Here we describe the calibration of the instruments. Target compatibility (accuracy) is 2 ppb CH₄, 0.2 ppm CO₃, and 0.2% b³CH₄.

ABSTRACT



Figure 1. Map of Pennsylvania with permitted unconventional natural gas wells (r circles) and network of towers with methane and stable isotope analyzers (Picarro G2132-i). Towers East and South are also equipped with NOAA flask sampling systems. Two towers (East and Central) are predominantly downwind of the study region, whereas the South tower is predominantly upwind of the majority of the wells. The North tower is located in New York State, which does not allow horizontal fracking of natural gas.

CHALLENGES FOR CALIBRATION OF ISOTOPIC METHANE

3.28-3.31 ppm ¹²CH₄ 6.10-6.16 ppm 12 CH 7.25-7.32 ppm 12CH 2 4 6 8 10 12 Trise (hr)

Figure 2. Isotopic ratio error (prior to calibration) as a function of measurement time during the lab calibration. For this test, commercially-available isotopic standard bottles (Isometric Instruments, Inc.) were diluted with zero air to produce mixtures bottles (Isometric Instruments, Inc.) were diluted with zero air to produce mixtures with varying CH_4 mixing ratios and $\delta^{x_{12}}CH_4$. The dotted lines separate the four isotopic values tested. The colors indicate the CH_4 mole fraction. Challenge 1: The topic ratios exhibit both pe/intercept error and a mole fraction

slope/interce dependence.

Gas Species	Typical maximum value or range	Estimated error
Carbon monoxide	Range ^f : 107.5-200.7 ppb	<< 0.01‰
Water vapor	Rangel: 0.02 - 0.06%	< 0.02‰
Carbon dioxide	Range ¹ : 375 – 475 ppm	< 0.03‰
Propane	Max ^f 3.6 ppb	<< 0.01‰
Butane (i-Butane + n-Butane)	Max ^f 1788 ppt	<< 0.01‰
Ammonia	Typical ^t 90 ppt	<< 0.01‰
Hydrogen sulfide	Typical ¹ 30 ppt	<< 0.01‰
Methyl mercaptan	N/A*	N/A
Ethylene	13.0 ^f ppt	<< 0.01‰
Ethane	Max ^f 8.0 ppb (typical background ^t : 1.3	ppb) 0.23‰ (0.04‰ typical)

Table 1. Maximum error estimate attributable to cross-interference for typical levels for this Table 1. Maximum error estimate attroutable to cross-interreferee for typical levels for this particular application. Typical maximum values determined by flask⁷ (level at which 99% of flask measurements at Towers South and East are below), by in-situ measurements at Marcellus towers⁴, or by typical values⁶ (Warneck and Williams, 2012). ¹No known estimates (Barnes, 2015). CHALLENGE 2: There are interferences with the isotopic ratio that have not been corrected for via manufacturer software. Ethane is measured by the instrument, but it is not calibrated via manufacturer software.



Figure 3. Example of laboratory Figure 3. Example of laboratory data, cycling through various tanks for the round robin testing shown in Figure 5 (black: -10 ppm, -38.5% ref: 1-9 ppm, -47.3% magenta: 1-9 ppm, -46.8%, cyan: 1-9 ppm, -45.7%). Time scale of the testing is 7 hours, data frequency is every -2 seconds. CHALLENCE 3: While the negat-to-negat noise in ~2 seconds. CHALLENGE While the peak-to-peak noise While the peak-to-peak noise in the typical atmospheric range of CH_4 is 2 ppb CH_4 (-the com-patibility goal), the noise of $\delta^{13}CH_4$ is 20‰, 100 times the compatibility goal.



CALIBRATION DETAILS

Prior to deployment, the instruments were calibrated for $\delta^{13}CH_4$ (both a slope calibration and a mole fraction correction) using four Isometric Instruments standar ndards (-23.9 calibration and a mole fraction correction) using four isometric instruments summands (2000) 38.3/-54.5/-66.5‰) diluted to varying degrees with zero air to obtain mole fractions ranging between 1.8 and 10 ppm. Field calibration tanks at each tower location

- High tank (~10 ppm, -38.9‰); filled by Scott-Marrin using Isometric Instrument standards to spike and calibrated at PSU • Low tank (~2 ppm, -23.6‰); filled by Scott-Marrin using Isometric Instruments standard
- to spike and calibrated at PSU
- Target tank calibrated by NOAA/INSTAAR (~1900 ppb, -47‰) Ethane was calibrated using the two Scott-Marrin tanks (containing no ethane) and th NOAA/INSTAAR tank (atmospheric levels of ethane) and a correction was then applie

o the isotopic ratio **OPTIMIZED CALIBRATION SCHEME**



- Performance was not improved via multiple calibration cycles within one day (i.e., insignificant drift during that time period).
- average multiple calibration cycles throughout the day, in order to not miss 60 inuous minutes of atmospheric data.
- Preferable to calibrate using tank within typically measured values

RESULTS – SIDE-BY-SIDE TESTING

Side-by-side testing of a G2301 analyzer and a G2132-i analyzer for June 2016 at the So Note of solution of the destination of the destina ppb CH





Figure 5. Errors compared to known values from a round-robin style lab test, using two tanks for each the mole fraction and isotope calibrations. Two tanks were treated as unknowns. Open circles are individual tests and filled circles are the means. The magnitude of the mean errors for round-robin tank tests are within 0.1 ppm CO₂, 0.8 ppb CH₄ and 0.3‰ δ^{13} CH₄.





Figure 6. Independent ("low") tank methane isotopic ratio differences from known value, Figure 6. Independent ("low") tank methane isotopic ratio differences from known value, for the individual calibration eycles, and for 1, 5, s. and 10-4m yeans, for the South tower for Sept - Dec 2016. The standard deviations of the low tank differences are a proxy for the noise in the calibrated ambient samples over those averaging intervals. The standard deviation of ~-13 calibration cycles per day over the period September 1 – December 2 is 0.53%. Using an averaging interval of one-day yields a standard deviation is 0.22%, and for 10-day means, 0.03%. For the period after the calibration tanks mapping scheme (primarly by sampling the target tank for 54 min/day instead of 6 min/day) was improved, December 3 – December 31, the standard deviation of min/day) was inproved, December 3 – December 31, the standard deviation of noise (application) and a sampling scheme (primarly by sampling the target tank for 54 min/day instead of 6 min/day) was improved, December 3 – December 31, the standard deviation of noise in the individual cycles is 0.25%, of one-day means 0.18% and 5-day means 0.09%.

RESULTS – FLASK TO IN-SITU COMPARISON



Figure 7. In-situ - flask differences for January - December 2016 for the East (red) and the Figure 7. In-situ – Hask differences for January – December 2016 for the East (red) and the South Towers (green) for A) CO₂, B) CH₂, and C) δ^{11} CH₄. Means and standard deviation of the afternoon values are indicated for each site. The magnitudes of the flask to in-situ differences are 0.2 ppm CO₂ and about 1 ppb CH₄ – within the WMO recommendation for those species. For δ^{12} CH₄, the differences are less than 0.1%, the target compatibility level.

FIELD RESULTS - AFTERNOON ENHANCEMENT ABOVE BACKGROUND





SUMMARY

We describe laboratory and field calibration of the analyzers for tower-based applications, and characterize their performance in the field for the period January – December 2016 as deployed on towers in the Marcellus Shale Gas region. Prior to deployment, each analyzer was calibrated using high mole fraction bottles with various isotopic ratios from biogenic to thermogenic source values, diluted in zero air. Furthermore, at each tower location, three field calibration tanks are employed, from ambient to high mole fractions, with various isotopic ratios. By calibration method. By testing various calibration schemes, we determine an optimized field

This work was funded by the Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory (DE-FOA-0000894).

Miles, N.L., D.K. Martins, S.J. Richardson, T. Lauvaux, K.J. Davis, B.J. Haupt, and C. Rella, Thirty, J. C. Brunns, J. N. Kommis, J. N. Kommis, F. Larburg, N. C. Burtis, Dirich and J. Stark, J. S. Karabar, and C. Karabar, and K. Karabar, and K. Karabar, K. Karabar,

CONTACT: Natasha Miles (nmiles@psu.edu)

