



DISTRIBUTION AND FATE OF METHANE RELEASED FROM SUBMARINE SOURCES

CHALLENGES AND RESULTS OF MEASUREMENTS BY USING AN IMPROVED IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER



Dr. Torben Gentz

AZTI



Torben.Gentz@awi.de

Heincke 362

Submarine gas seeps

WORLDWIDE DISTRIBUTION OF SUBMARINE METHANE RELEASE



Free gas (Fleischer et al. 2001) Pockmarks (Hovland et al. 2002)

Mud volcanoes (Milkov 2000) Gas hydrates (Kvenvolden et al. 2001)



according to IPCC (2007)



The average atmospheric concentration of methane has increased by 151 % since year 1750 (Houghton 2001).

according to IPCC (2007)



The average atmospheric concentration of methane has increased by 151 % since year 1750 (Houghton 2001).

 CH_4 acts beside CO_2 and water vapour as a greenhouse gas (Houghton 2001).

according to IPCC (2007)



The average atmospheric concentration of methane has increased by 151 % since year 1750 (Houghton 2001).

CH₄ acts beside CO₂ and water vapour as a greenhouse gas (Houghton 2001).

On a 100 year timescale the global warming potential (GWP) of CH_4 is 20 – 40 times higher than of CO_2 (Shindell 2009).

according to IPCC (2007)



according to IPCC (2007)

The average atmospheric concentration of methane has increased by 151 % since year 1750 (Houghton 2001).

CH₄ acts beside CO₂ and water vapour as a greenhouse gas (Houghton 2001).

On a 100 year timescale the global warming potential (GWP) of CH_4 is 20 – 40 times higher than of CO_2 (Shindell 2009).

CH₄ represents the second largest contribution (about 15 %) to historical warming after CO₂ (Shindell et.al. 2009).

GLOBAL RELEVANCE OF SUBMARINE SOURCES

Present estimations: 8 - 65 Tg CH_4 yr⁻¹ are released into the ocean and 0.4 – 48 Tg CH_4 yr⁻¹ reach the atmosphere which is up to 9 % of the total methane emission (Hovland et al.

1993; Judd and Hovland 2007; Judd 2004; Judd et al. 2002; Kvenvolden and Rogers 2005).

Future Scenarios induced by global warming:

Thawing of permafrost (e.g. Shakhova et al. 2010) Destabilization of gas hydrates (e.g. Jung and Vogt 2004; Mienert et al. 2005; Ruppel 2011)

> Free gas (Fleischer et al. 2001) Pockmarks (Hovland et al. 2002)

Mud volcanoes (Milkov 2000) Gas hydrates (Kvenvolden et al. 2001)

WHAT ARE SUBMARINE GAS SEEPS?



WHAT ARE SUBMARINE GAS SEEPS?



Formation of methane by degradation of organic matter

Aerobic respiration Nitrate reduction Manganese oxide reduction Iron oxide reduction

Microbial formation of methane

Thermocatalytic formation of methane



Storage and migration of methane



Utilization of methane in the sediment



Schematic view of the formation (modified after Froelich et al. 1979) and the subsequent pathways of methane in the sediment (modified after Judd 2004).

Utilization of methane in the sediment





Schematic view of the formation (modified after Froelich et al. 1979) and the subsequent pathways of methane in the sediment (modified after Judd 2004).

Pathways of methane in the water column



Air/Sea exchange

Vertical or horizontal transport of dissolved methane

Dilution

Microbial oxidation

Dissolution of methane from gas bubbles (Epstein and Plesset 1950; Leifer and Patro 2002; McGinnis et al. 2006)



Schematic concentration profils

Schematic view of the formation (modified after Froelich et al. 1979) and the subsequent pathways of methane in the sediment (modified after Judd 2004).

MOTIVATION, SCIENTIFIC FRAMEWORK

- 1. Quantification of the dissolved methane above gas seeps in high temporal and spatial resolution.
- 2. Which are the main pathways of methane in the water column?
- 3. How much of the submarine released methane in the studied areas contribute to the global atmospheric budget?

Conclusions



Hydroacoustic "image" of gas bubble plumes in the water column by Simrad EK60.



Gas release in the North Sea via video observation

GAS ANALYSIS: STATE OF THE ART



REQUIREMENTS FOR IN SITU SENSORS:

- Robustness for the use in harsh environment
- The energy consumption needs to be low to allow long term measurements
- Sampling rates should be high and respond times correspondingly short for high temporal and spatial resolution
- Maintenance of the analyzer should be easy and short in time
- A low detection limit for trace gases.
- Calibration of all gases of interest

INSPECTR200-200 FOR IN SITU, ONLINE, REAL TIME AND SIMULTANEOUS MEASUREMENTS:



IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER MODE OF OPERATION



IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER MODE OF OPERATION



70 times magnification



320 times magnification

Water vapor

is the main gas that permeates through this membrane?

- •Downgrades the detection limit
- •Affects on the ionization effency
- •Could cause condensation in the analytical line
- •Downgrades the life time of the filament

For several applications including investigations of natural as well as manmade gas seepages there is a strong demand for:

- 1. Lower detection limit
- 2. "Security System" in case of membrane rupture

IMPLEMENTATION OF A CRYOTRAP





Cooling of the capillary between sample inlet and sensor unit up to -90 °C

- Water vapour is reduced up to 98 % of initial
- Reduce the internal pressure significantly
- A higher ionization effency is observed

 \rightarrow Results in an obtimized detection limit

- Expand the lifetime of the analyser
- Secure the analyser for inflowing water

OPTIMIZED AND REDESIGNED INSPECTR200-200



Study Areas



Calibration of the optimized Inspectr200-200

New detection limit of the optimized Inspectr200-200:

~16 nmol L⁻¹

OPTIMIZED AND REDESIGNED INSPECTR200-200



Study Areas



Calibration of the optimized Inspectr200-200

New detection limit of the optimized Inspectr200-200:

~16 nmol L⁻¹

Low enough???

IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER FOR FIELD APPLICATIONS

Gas seep in the North Sea



Concentration	Area
[nmol L ⁻¹]	[%]
< 16	3.6
16 - 100	48.3
> 100	48.1

(Gentz and Schlüter 2012)

IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER FOR FIELD APPLICATIONS





Concentration	Area
[nmol L ⁻¹]	[%]
< 16	3.6
16 - 100	48.3
> 100	48.1

(Gentz and Schlüter 2012)

IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER FOR FIELD APPLICATIONS

Gas seep in the North Sea



Concentration [nmol L ⁻¹]	Area [%]
< 16	3.6
16 - 100	48.3
> 100	48.1

APPLICATION OF THE IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER IN HARSH ENVIRONMENTS



Ex situ

In situ in a frame including benthic chamber

In situ at sedimentwater-transition-zone

Laboratory measurements

APPLICATION OF THE IN SITU MASS SPECTROMETER IN HARSH ENVIRONMENTS



STUDY AREA SPITSBERGEN



STUDY AREA SPITSBERGEN



(Westbrook et al. 2009)

5°E

15°E

10°E

HYDROACOUSTIC:

Ten gas flares lined up in S – N direction and max. rise height of up to 200 m were found.



DISSOLVED METHANE AND HYDROGRAPHY



(Gentz et al. in review)

Graphic created by Ocean Data View (R.Schlitzer, Ocean Data View, 2011, http://odv.awi.de)

DISSOLVED METHANE AND HYDROGRAPHY



(Gentz et al. in review)

750E 94E 50
MAIN RESULTS SPITSBERGEN

The pycnocline is a strong limitation for the vertical transport of methane released at the Spitsbergen continental margin.

- → ~80 % of the methane will be dissolved and trapped below the pycnocline and horizontal transport in north direction to greater depth and subsequent oxidation occur.
- \rightarrow ~20 % could reach the water mass above the pycnocline.
- → Due to dilution of dissolved methane in the upper water mass the contribution of the released methane to the global atmospheric methane budget could not been determined.
- → Bubble transport can be excluded as direct pathway for methane to the atmosphere.
- → In winter the stratification breaks down which could lead to methane release into the atmosphere.



Google



Modified after Schroot et al. 2005



Under water gas analyser, sampler and observing system

- Inspectr200-200; 11900 samples
- GC; discrete 154 samples
- Video observation; 12 h
- Hydroacoustic; 12 h

- Multibeam; 140000 m²
- CTD 14; vertical profiles
- Bubble sampler; 5 samples
- Multiple sediment corer; 5 cores



⁽Gentz et al. unpublished data)



⁽Gentz et al. unpublished data)

VIDEO OBSERVATION OF THE SEAFLOOR



(Gentz et al. unpublished data)



Affected area: ~3800 m² Number of streams: 113 Bubble diameter: 4.5 to 16 mm (average 7 mm) Release frequency: 0.3 - 40 bubbles s⁻¹ (average 23 bubbles s⁻¹) Methane flux: 28.27 L min⁻¹ Methane release: 35.3 ± 17.65 t CH₄ yr⁻¹

DISSOLVED METHANE SAMPLING IN THE WATER COLUMN



11900 samples in various depth in between 24 hours

(Gentz et al. unpublished data)

DISSOLVED METHANE SAMPLING IN THE WATER COLUMN



- Discrete sampling: max 1.5 µmol L⁻¹
- In situ sampling: max 3.5 μmol L⁻¹
- A methane saturation of 23200 % was observed in 8 m water depth.
- The air sea exchange flux is calculated to ~210 <u>+</u> 63 μmol m⁻² d⁻¹.

DISSOLVED METHANE SAMPLING IN THE WATER COLUMN



- Discrete sampling: max 1.5 μmol L⁻¹
- In situ sampling: max 3.5 μmol L⁻¹
- A methane saturation of 23200 % was observed in 8 m water depth.
- The air sea exchange flux is calculated to ~210 <u>+</u> 63 μmol m⁻² d⁻¹.

Entire interpolated inventory of methane (6.410.000 m³):

~0.6 mol CH₄

- ~1.000.000 m³ (15.6 %) contain concentrations higher than 200 nmol L⁻¹
- 40 % of initial methane is dissolved above the pycnocline.

MAIN RESULTS NORTH SEA

- → Conservative estimation of methane release into the water column: $35.3 \pm 17.65 \text{ t CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ which is in the same order like the geogragraphically close Tommeliten area (Schneider von Deimling et al. 2011).
- \rightarrow The total inventory of dissolved methane is calculated to ~0.6 mol.
- → The pycnocline is a limitation for the vertical transport of methane like at the Spitsbergen continental margin but only 35 % of the methane will be dissolved below the pycnocline.
- → 40 % of the dissolved methane reaches the water mass above the pycnocline and could indirectly contribute to the atmospheric methane budget.
- \rightarrow 25 % of the released methane reaches the atmosphere via gas bubbles.
- → In total 65 % (23 <u>+</u> 11.5 t CH₄ y ⁻¹) of the released methane potentially reach the atmosphere, which is high compared to the Spitsbergen continental margin or the Tommeliten area.

CONCLUSIONS

Studies of methane above a gas seep in high resolution are now possible.

- After 7 years optimization (in full time) and more than 20 (test) expeditions, the UWMS fulfil the requirements of low detection limit for methane as well as calibration to 11 gases.
- Pycnoclines are limitations for vertical transport of methane.
- The fate of methane as well as the contribution to the global atmospheric methane budget of each source depends on bubble size, the water depth, the water current and the water stratification.
- The use of the improved in situ mass spectrometry is one step forward to understand the pathways and potential global relevance of these methane sources.







Thank you for your attention!



Torben.gentz@awi.de



Backup





Implementation in new device holder





Benthic chamber measurements

Combining ydroacoustic with in situ mass spectrometry





Sibson, R., "A Brief Description of Natural Neighbor Interpolation", Kapitel 2 in *Interpolating multivariate data*, S. 21-36. John Wiley & Söhne: New York, 1981.







GAS BUBBLE DISSOLUTION MODEL (SIBU GUI):

L P



2 mm to 12 mm (A) compared with the hydroacoustic image of the highest detected gas flare (B). Decrease of the initial CH_4 concentration in the bubbles during their rise in the water column (C). Data obtained by the model SiBu GUI (Greinert, J. and D. F. McGinnis 2009) personally optimized by Dan McGinnis



Personal communication Agnieszka Beszsynsky-Möller 28.26 km s-w direction







A) Inverse CH_4 concentration versus $d^{13}C_{CH4}$ values (Keeling plot). Layer III is presented by black dots and Layer II and I by red dots. (B) Distribution of $d^{13}C_{CH4}$ 2 m above the seafloor including the transect lines. The red circle indicates the crossing zone of the two transects



Calculation:

Bubble diameter: 7 mm by ImageJ

$$r_e = (a^2 b)^{\frac{1}{3}}$$
 (1)
 $V = \frac{4}{3}\pi r_e^3$ (2)

Leifer and Patro 2002

Release frequency: 23 bubbles s⁻¹

Methane flux: 28.27 L min⁻¹

PVA = nRTZ (3)

Modified after Römer et al. 2012

Seafloor methane release: $35.3 \pm 17.65 \text{ t CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$



Under water cryotrap



Gentz and Schlüter 2012

Gas analysis: New in situ sensors for high resolution mapping

- TRL 1 Basic principles of technology observed and reported TRL 2 Technology concept and/or application formulated
- TRL 3 Analytical and laboratory studies to validate analytical predictions

- TRL 5 Component and/or basic sub-system technology valid in relevant environment
- TRL 6 System/sub-system technology model or prototype demonstrated in relevant environment
- TRL 7 System technology prototype demonstrated in an operational environment

TRL 8 System technology qualified through test and demonstration TRL 4Component and/or basic sub-system technology valid in laboratory environment TRL 9 System technology qualified through successful mission operations

Sensor	Measurement/ environments	Technology	Membrane/ Sensitive layer	Concentration range	Limit of detection	Т 90	T°C	Depth range	Power supply	Manufacturer/ Research Institute/ Reference	TRL
METS- CAPSUM	Gas phase/water column	SnO ₂ semi- conductors	Silicon rubber (5–100 µm)	10 nM–150 mM	10 nM	1–30 min	2–40°C	0–3500 m	35–100 mA at 12 V	Capsum GmbH/ Franatech GmbH [26]	TRL 7
HydroC/CH ₄	Gas phase/water column	Direct IR absorption spectroscopy (3.4 µm)	Modified silicon rubber (2–100 µm)	30 nM-500 μM	<10 ppm (<6 nM)	17–30 s	0–50°C	0–6000 m	250 mA at 12 V	Contros GmbH http://www. contros.eu	TRL 7
Deep-sea methane sensor	Gas phase/water column	Laser absorption spectroscopy (3.3 µm)	Silicon-membrane tubes	40-320 ppm (25-200 nM)	40 ppm (25 nM)			0–2000 m		Hokkaido University (Japan) [15]	TRL 6/7
Deep-sea gas analyzer*	Gas phase/water column	NIR-off-axis integrated-cavity output spectroscopy	Silicon rubber			less than 1 min	0–45°C	0–2000 m	Internal battery	lginc (USA)	TRL 6/7*
Equilibrator	Gas phase/surface water	Photoacoustic spectroscopy	Glass marbles in tube	up to 400 µM	20 µM	12 min at 7 m depth				[33]	TRL 6
In situ mass spectrometer	Gas phase/water column	In situ mass spectrometer	Semi-permeable membrane inlet	no data	Sub-ppm (<1 nM)			0–30 m (200 m possible)	20 W	WHOI (USA) [36]	TRL 8
In situ mass spectrometer	Gas phase/water column	In situ mass spectrometer	PDMS membrane inlet	no data	1–5 ppb (<1 nM)			0-30 m (200 m possible)	20 W	University of South Florida (USA) [35]	TRL 8
Biosensor	Dissolved phase/sediments, pore water	Amperometry	Silicon membrane	up to 350 μM	5 µM			surface		University of Aarhus (Denmark) [19]	TRL 5/6
Biosensor	Dissolved phase/sediments, pore water	Dissolved oxygen sensor	"bacterial beads"	0.4–2 mM	100 µM	100 s		surface		[44]	TRL 5/6
FEWS	Dissolved phase/water column	Evanescent wave spectroscopy	Optical fiber/ sensitive laver					Possibly up to 6000 m		[50]	TRL 2/3
SERS	Dissolved phase/water column	Surface-enhanced Raman scattering	Silver–colloid SERS substrate		nM–µM			Possibly up to 6000 m		Technical University Berlin (Germany) [60]	TRL 4/5
SPR	Dissolved phase/water column	Surface-plasmon resonance	PDMS/crypto- phane-A	0–400 nM	0.2 nM	2–5 min	45°C	Surface	1 mW	[64] (Appendix 2)	TRL 4/5

Compilation of in situ methane sensors and technologies, modified after Boulart (2010) including the explanation of the TRL levels, modified from a UK Defence Procurement Agency version.



Introduction Novel Instruments Study Areas Results and Interpretation Conclusions Future Perspective

Formation of methane:



Schematic concentration profils

Degradation of organic matter by redox processes

 $(CH_2O)x(NH_3)y(H_3PO_4)z + xO_2 \rightarrow xCO_2 + xH_2O + yNH_3 + H_3PO_4$ Aerobic respiration Nitrate reduction $5CH_2O + 4NO_3 \rightarrow 4HCO_3 + CO_2 + 2N_2 + 3H_2O_3$ Manganese oxide reduction $CH_2O + 2MnO_2 + 3CO_2 + H_2O \rightarrow 2Mn^{2+} + 4HCO_3^{-1}$ Iron oxide reduction $CH_2O + 4Fe(OH)_3 + 7CO_2 \rightarrow 8HCO_3 + 3H_2O + 4Fe^{2+}$ sulfate/methane transition zone (SMTZ) Microbial formation of methane: Hydrogenotrophic CO_2 + 4 $H_2 \rightarrow CH_4$ + 2 H_2O $CH_3COO^- + H_2O \rightarrow CH_4 + HCO_3$ Acetotrophic $CH_3-A + H_2O \rightarrow CH_4 + CO_2 + A-H$ **Methylotrophic** Thermocatalytic formation of methane

Schematic view of the formation (modified after Froelich et al. 1979)

Introduction Novel Instruments Study Areas Results and Interpretation Conclusions Future Perspective

Working areas



Working areas

