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1. Abstract

Methane emissions from oil and gas sites are often characterized by mixed plumes from multiple sources in close proximity. This presents a challenge for screening methods that rely on emissions quantification to direct and prioritize follow-up inspections. Here, we present results from experiments evaluating mixed-source quantifications using the University of Calgary Portable Methane Leak Observatory (PoMELO) conducted at the Colorado State University Methane Emissions Technology Evaluation Center (CSU METEC). PoMELO is a vehicle-based screening system that is designed for operator-led surveys of methane emissions at upstream oil and gas sites, producing detections, localizations, and emissions quantifications while on site. Mock upstream pads were configured with 1-6 emissions points and the PoMELO system was used to quantify emissions rates at the equipment scale for each piece of equipment. Over 5 days of testing in a wide diversity of conditions, 88 individual experiment pads were surveyed at the equipment scale, with 1-6 emitting equipment per survey (total surveyed equipment = 209). The uncalibrated model was effective at measuring differences in rates: compared against real releases there was a linear calibration factor of 6.77 ($r^2 = 0.71$). Results were more accurate in conditions with stable flow. Experiments with measurements further downwind were more accurate, and results improved when considering pooled data on each pad (linear model fit $r^2 = 0.84$), reflecting errors in the model attributable to disambiguating methane in mixed plumes. Results suggest PoMELO has practical utility for understanding upstream methane emissions at the equipment and total pad scale.

2. Introduction

In the upstream oil and gas industry, hundreds of thousands of wellpads are distributed across different production areas. These pads typically contain one or several pieces of equipment such as wellheads, separators, tanks, risers, and other production equipment. Methane emissions occur from equipment either by design (e.g., vents and combustion emissions), or by accident (e.g., leaks) (see Alvarez et al., 2018).

Methane is a damaging greenhouse gas, and there is significant effort worldwide to decrease methane emissions from the oil and gas industry (Ocko et al., 2021). However, methane emissions from upstream sources are very poorly understood. Emissions from leaks are difficult to detect and can occur at any time as equipment ages and fails. Emissions from sources such as vents that emit by design often vary through time – or emit significantly more or less than the original design (e.g., Johnson et al., 2019; Zimmerle et al., 2022).

Oil and gas producers face a considerable challenge managing their emissions and operating cost-effective abatement programs without accurate emissions data. Collecting this data is costly as the scale of oil and gas infrastructure is immense, with equipment distributed across huge geographies, often in remote locations. This challenge has spurred considerable research and development. A wide diversity of approaches for collecting data from upstream sites are presently in use (Fox et al., 2019b; Ravikumar et al., 2019).

From a scientific perspective, measuring methane emissions is very difficult. Methane cannot be seen and has no odor. With qualitative methods such as optical gas imaging (ogi), intuition is often not reliable for estimating emissions rates (Zimmerle et al., 2022). Accurate rate measurement requires complex plume modeling, specialized instrumentation, and careful understanding of airflow on upstream sites (Fox et al., 2019a).
To help advance the science of emissions quantification, the University of Calgary has developed the PoMELO system, a field truck mounted methane detection and quantification system that serves as a testbed for research, development, and education (Figure 1, Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a). The system uses measurements of wind, position, and methane concentration to automatically detect, map, and quantify emissions on upstream sites. Data are resolved at the equipment scale (~ meters). PoMELO uses 3 instruments: (i) high performance open path methane sensor, (ii) GNSS, and (iii) anemometer. A computer fuses instrument data streams at 10 Hz and automatically maps the position of emissions sources on the pad, as well as providing triage grade source quantifications for emissions sources.

**Figure 1:** the University of Calgary Portable Methane Leak Observatory (PoMELO) system at the Colorado State University Methane Emissions Technology Evaluation Center (CSU METEC).

The most common work practice that is used with the PoMELO system is known as ‘OGI triage’, where rapid detection and quantification with the PoMELO system is used to guide further emissions source identification with an OGI camera (or similar close-range instrument) while on site. This work practice is normally more efficient than traditional OGI surveys as using the PoMELO system to triage the equipment that requires follow-up provides an opportunity for operators to immediately target surveys to certain parts of a pad, and in cases omit OGI surveys in regions with no emissions or those below a target rate (see further in Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a).

The detection skill of the PoMELO system has been tested in a robust single-blind experiment (see Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a, 2020b). Results indicate the system had a minimum detection limit emissions rate (90% probability of detection) below 0.0016 g/s (≈ 0.3 scfh, ≈ 0.2 m³/day). The METEC test facility could not meter rates low enough to produce a defensible probability of detection curve. This study was conducted in a way such that the University of Calgary team reported results to METEC personnel before University of Calgary were aware of release points, making the study blind.

Here, we focus on evaluating emissions quantification, using the same dataset as utilized in Barchyn and Hugenholtz (2020a, 2020b). In particular, complex multi-source emissions configurations with close-range
mixed plumes were tested (see Figure 2). Multi-source emissions situations are realistic for many upstream pads where leaks and vents are in close proximity. This differs from many controlled release experiments where only a single release stack is used (e.g., Singh et al., 2021).

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2:** This report focuses on situations with overlapping plumes, where the methane from multiple sources mix. Overlapping plumes are common on many upstream sites. In (a), the source (black dot) produces one plume that is easily measured in isolation; however, in (b) multiple sources (black dots) each have individual plumes that overlap, significantly increasing the complexity of plume modeling. The multiple source configuration (b) is realistic for many upstream sites.

This study focuses on a new quantification engine for the PoMELO system. This model has not been calibrated against empirical controlled release data and lacks a detailed assessment of system performance. We use the following analysis steps to report information on the skill of the system:

(i) First, we compare the theoretical quantification engine results against complex multi-source precision-controlled releases to understand the proportion of variance explained by the model as a metric of uncalibrated skill. This helps to metric the triage performance of the model, where the primary interest is finding the largest emissions sources.

(ii) Second, we use the release rates to develop a simple empirical correction. The dataset from METEC is realistic and large, providing excellent data for a calibration.

(iii) Third, we evaluate condition dependence of the quantification engine to explore any relationships between residuals and controlling conditions. This is useful to understand where the model performs well, providing vital practical guidance for PoMELO users.

We then bring the results into context, comparing the results against similar studies and outline the implications of these results for practical deployments of the PoMELO technology.

### 3. PoMELO overview

The PoMELO system is designed for producing data about emissions sources on upstream pads with one visit, where all information necessary for emissions management is collected at one time. Modeling and practical deployments have indicated this is an efficient approach to emissions management (Fox et al., 2021). The system is designed to be easy to use to reduce training requirements and allow operators to follow-up on detections and quantifications immediately, providing vital information while on the pad. The general work practice is as follows:
(i) **Rapid screen:** The PoMELO truck is driven around the site immediately upon arrival and a map of emissions locations is produced automatically as the system logs and integrates the data into a probability map of emissions locations. The operator takes note of emitting equipment, cross referencing the equipment types on the ground with detections and known emissions sources on the pad.

(ii) **Equipment inventory:** With an inventory of emitting equipment, in cases augmented by OGI surveys or other close-range inspections, pieces of equipment are entered into the PoMELO system in preparation for quantification.

(iii) **Quantification:** From this, the quantification engine automatically estimates the emissions rates associated with each piece of equipment onsite.

(iv) **Component-scale surveys and investigation:** Armed with emissions rates and an accurate picture of where emissions are coming from on the site, the operators can conduct further investigation with close range technique like OGI, to precisely understand the source of emissions and determine the next course of action (e.g., repair, retrofit, further process analysis). The goal is to leave the site with a complete inventory of emissions sources and as much information as possible on the source to help abatement efforts.

![Figure 3: The PoMELO system mounted on the roof of a standard field truck (after Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a).](image)

This study only evaluates the quantification performance of the system. We do not evaluate a full work practice with OGI follow-up. Metrics of OGI performance are documented elsewhere (see Zimmerle et al., 2020).
3.1. Quantification engine overview
The PoMELO system quantification engine is a close-range equipment-scale plume model. The model takes the following inputs:

Raw and assimilated measurement data: Data are measured automatically from the PoMELO system as it drives around a site. All sensor data are fused, corrected, and assembled in real-time and recorded as a timeseries. The system measures wind, methane concentration, temperature, pressure, vehicle orientation, velocity, and position. Additional diagnostic variables are included to help the system self-evaluate data quality.

Emitting equipment positions: In normal survey mode, emitting pieces of equipment are input by the user while on site. In this study we used the known emissions point locations provided by METEC staff.

From these input data, the algorithm produces individual emissions rates for each emitting piece of equipment. The model is specifically designed for close-range scenarios with many emissions points that create overlapped plumes. The quantification engine de-mixes the contributions from different sources and produces individual emissions rate estimates for each emitting piece of equipment.

4. Methods
4.1. METEC site overview
The METEC site was developed to examine the performance of technologies used to detect, localize, and quantify emissions. The site includes mock oil and gas pads with specially modified real oil and gas equipment that includes hidden leak locations (Figure 4, 5). There is no real oil and gas production on the site. Leak locations are a closely guarded secret. Further details about the site are discussed by Zimmerle et al. (2020).

Figure 4: Mock equipment at the METEC site. The facility uses real production equipment that has been modified to have hidden leak points throughout. Participants do not know where the leaks are located, providing a robust environment to assess technology performance (after Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a).

At METEC methane was sourced from high pressure natural gas (approximately 85% methane by mole fraction). The precise concentration mix was determined by gas chromatograph. While metered as a bulk flow, all emissions rates reported here are only reported in methane, in g/s.

At METEC methane was sourced from high pressure natural gas (approximately 85% methane by mole fraction). The precise concentration mix was determined by gas chromatograph. While metered as a bulk flow, all emissions rates reported here are only reported in methane, in g/s.

Metering at METEC involves several steps. First, the high pressure gas was cut to lower pressures before running into a thermal mass flow meter. Next, the gas was run through a combination of 0-3 orifice plates to bring release rate(s) close to target rate(s). In experiments where multiple release points were supplied from the same flow meter, each release point was run in isolation to develop a calibrated flow rate estimate before opening all release points for the experiment. Calibrations were performed immediately prior to each
experiment to minimize pressure and temperature effects on orifice plate flow. Full details are provided by Barchyn and Hugenholtz (2020a).

Figure 5: Overview of different pads at METEC and the facility. Each pad contains multiple equipment units, typically grouped in like equipment. Pads 1 and 2 have one equipment group only. Figure after Barchyn and Hugenholtz (2020a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pad</th>
<th>Equipment Group</th>
<th>Equipment Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (wellhead, separator, tank)</td>
<td>1T-1 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1S-1 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1W-1 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (wellhead, separator, tank)</td>
<td>2T-1 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2S-1 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2W-1 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3W (wellheads)</td>
<td>3W-1 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W-2 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3W-3 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3S (separators)</td>
<td>3S-1 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3S-2 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3T (tanks)</td>
<td>3T-1 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3T-2 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4W (wellheads)</td>
<td>4W-1 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4W-2 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4W-3 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4W-4 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4W-5 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4S (separators)</td>
<td>4S-1 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4S-2 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4S-3 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4S-4 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4T (tanks)</td>
<td>4T-1 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4T-2 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4T-3 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5W (wellheads)</td>
<td>5W-1 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5W-2 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5W-3 (wellhead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5S (separators)</td>
<td>5S-1 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5S-2 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5S-3 (separator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4T (tanks)</td>
<td>4T-1 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4T-2 (tank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4T-3 (tank)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Equipment hierarchy and listing. Each experiment was conducted on a given pad. Results are aggregated by equipment group and individual equipment units. Each equipment unit subsequently contains multiple emissions points that are aggregated here. Note that Pad 5 included the tank complex from Pad 4.*

Table 1 provides a full equipment listing used in this study (after Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a). The experiment pads used in this study differ in size and shape. Pads 1 and 2 were small and clustered, with only 1 equipment group each. The tanks on Pads 1 and 2 were smaller (~100 - 200 barrel). Pads 3, 4, and 5 contained 3 different equipment groups each and had much larger tanks (~300 - 400 barrel).
The characteristics of pads at METEC were quite realistic. All pads had driving access around all sides of all equipment groups. There was no road access in between individual pieces of equipment within a given equipment group. This noted, there was no ground-level or overhead piping between equipment groups that can reduce driving access on upstream oil and gas pads.

4.2. Experimental protocol

For each pad experiment, the METEC team created an emissions profile with 1-6 emissions points, releasing methane at constant flow rates. Some pad configurations were replicates of previous pads. Pads were tested in the order 1, 3, 5, 2, 4, then repeated. This protocol helped ensure the next pad was far from the present pad and helped ensure that each pad had an equal number of experiments. In cases where the upcoming pad was downwind of the target pad, calibrations were run without risk of interference. Interference from any non-target methane releases was actively monitored.

The quantification tests were designed to emulate a standard measurement work practice with approximately 3-4 downwind passes through the target plumes. Testing proceeded in all weather. We qualify results with weather data. Wind speed and direction data were recorded from the PoMELO system. No ancillary data were used or are reported.

4.3. Analyses

The goal of the analyses was to (i) evaluate the new quantification engine, (ii) understand the general bias of the model to create an empirical correction, and (iii) evaluate the pattern of variance and effect of controlling parameters on quantification results.

We first pre-processed the raw emissions data. Each experiment had 1-6 emissions points. In most cases these emissions points were spread among equipment on the mock pad (see Table 1 for equipment and pad listing). However, there were cases where there was more than one emissions point on a single piece of equipment. In these cases, we combined the emissions rates of those sources to produce a sum rate at the equipment scale. For these points, the position and heights of the emissions points were averaged so location metadata were as representative as possible.

To produce emissions quantifications, we used the PoMELO quantification engine with the real emissions point locations and measured PoMELO data from each pad. No additional data were used. The model produces raw, theoretical emissions estimates. We compare these emissions estimates against the real emissions rates to understand the fit and triage effectiveness as measured with proportion of explained variance ($r^2$ of a linear model fit). We then use the linear model fit to determine a calibration factor for subsequent residual analysis.

We elected to use all data in the dataset for testing and calibration as while this dataset is large ($n = 208$) compared to similar studies (see Ravikumar et al., 2019; Johnson et al., 2021; Sherwin et al., 2021), it is not large enough to split into test / train subsets without compromising the representativeness of test sets. Future work may better evaluate the system efficacy in a different configuration.

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Experiment conditions
Emissions quantification algorithms are often sensitive to environmental conditions (Fox et al., 2019a). Performance assessments are better when they cover a wide range in conditions that more closely mimic real deployment conditions.

**Figure 6:** Histogram of survey temperatures for each measured emissions point ($n = 209$).
The test envelope was reasonably broad (Figures 6, 7). However, we were unable to test the system in colder temperatures typical of Canadian winters (< -10 °C), extreme temperatures of Texas summers (> 35 °C), or in stronger winds (> 5 m/s). This noted, we were able to obtain a broad sample of atmospheric conditions.

The atmospheric turbulence characteristics of the experiments are representative of prairie conditions. Although METEC itself is an open field, the surrounding surface roughness and topography is diverse. METEC is approximately 2 km E of the front range foothills of the Rocky Mountains which rise steeply. To the S and E, the city of Fort Collins presents considerable surface roughness with reasonably flat topography. To the N, a natural area represents a smooth surface roughness representative of many prairie environments.

The equipment onsite affected airflow, but in a similar manner to real oil and gas infrastructure. Of note, all equipment was open (similar to most infrastructure in the United States or other warm climates). Separators were not in small, heated buildings, as is common in Canada or other colder climates. Tanks were clustered, bermed, and varied in size as is common on upstream oil and gas sites. For the PoMELO system, the presence of realistic airflow interference is important to metric the performance of the system as measurements are typically taken < 10 m from the equipment. Airflow effects materially affect nearly all plume models as eddies in the lee of large equipment confuse flow modeling algorithms.

5.2. PoMELO survey characteristics
The PoMELO system was driven in a normal survey manner for each experiment to emulate normal operations, with > 3 laps of each equipment group (Figure 8 shows survey times). We drove all pads at a normal driving pace for upstream pads in an effort to emulate real operations.
Figure 8: Survey time for each experiment. Note that survey time is recorded by the system and does not include time for reporting which is completed after turning off the system. Note that pads are not equal sized and longer survey times do generally correspond to the larger pads (Pad 3, 4, 5).

From theoretical consideration of close-range plume models, longer survey times are expected to increase accuracy and shorter survey times (< 200 s) are expected to reduce accuracy. As such, the survey times used here are important data to context all quantification results. This noted, the sites here are small and survey times should be expected to scale with site complexity and number of equipment present. For example, to achieve similar results in surveys of large gas plants, survey times will correspondingly need to scale.

5.3. Pad characteristics
Prior to reporting measured results, we context the pad characteristics (Figures 9, 10). These characteristics were designed to emulate similar experiments (Ravikumar et al., 2019), but also were designed to explore the limitations of the PoMELO system. We did not conceptually or practically separate vents from leaks – typically this is performed at the follow-up stage with close range survey methods and is outside of the scope of these experiments (Barchyn and Hugenholtz, 2020a).
Figure 9: Number of emitting equipment per survey (n = 88). Equipment listings for each pad are presented in Table 1.

Figure 10: Sum of emissions rates for each equipment in g/s CH₄ (n = 88).
The equipment emissions rates are generally similar to those of Ravikumar et al. (2019). These rates are much lower than empirically measured total pad emissions. For example, Zavala-Araiza et al. (2018) reported average total pad emissions of 1.52 g/s in Alberta, Canada, measured empirically from off-site. We used much lower rates as the PoMELO system is quite sensitive to small emissions rates and we sought to benchmark the skill of the system at these lower rates. Additionally, METEC was not well equipped for emitting large emissions rates.

5.4. PoMELO quantification results
To evaluate the PoMELO quantification engine, we first compared the raw uncalibrated results against the real emissions rates. A simple least-squares linear model was fit to the data (see Figure 11) to evaluate the proportion of explained variance and to create a calibration factor. The calibration factor from the simple linear regression is 6.77 (slope = 1.151), with a fit $r^2 = 0.71$, $n = 208$.

![Figure 11: Uncalibrated model data against released rates on the equipment scale. See Figures 9 and 10 for equipment characteristics.](image)

This suggests that the theoretical model underpredicts the real emissions rates by a factor of approximately 6.77. This is expected, the theory of the model systematically underpredicts emissions rates and requires calibration to produce meaningful emissions rates.

This dataset is the largest controlled release dataset among similar technologies to the authors knowledge (see similar studies from Ravikumar et al., 2019; Sherwin et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2021). Due to the size and representativeness of this dataset, this calibration factor should be relatively robust, but further tests could help better calibrate the model in the future. The proportion of explained variance ($r^2 = 0.71$) suggests that the model is capturing a reasonable proportion of the variance associated with emissions releases.
Figure 12: Calibrated model results (raw model results multiplied by empirical calibration of 6.77) against released rates. Red line has a slope of 1.0, intercept of 0.0, provided for reference.

5.5. Condition dependence
Evaluating condition dependence is vital for plume models for several reasons: (i) valuable information on where the theoretical model is failing can be explored, helping improve future versions of the model, and (ii) condition dependence provides important practical information on environmental conditions where poor quantification performance can be expected, helping PoMELO operators take this into account when working on pads.

We used scaled residuals to metric the performance of the model following

\[ Scaled\ residual = \frac{Q_{released} - 6.77 \cdot Q_{estimated}}{6.77 \cdot Q_{estimated}} \]  

where \( Q_{released} \) is the released emissions rate in g/s methane, \( Q_{estimated} \) is the estimated emissions rate in g/s methane. The 6.77 multiplied by estimated rates is the empirical calibration factor determined above. Our scaled residual has the properties where:

- -1.0 corresponds to situations where the model substantially overpredicted the emissions rate.
- 0.0 corresponds to situations where the model perfectly predicted the emissions rate.
- >1.0 corresponds to situations where the model substantially underpredicted the emissions rate.

The purpose of scaling the residual against estimated emissions rates is to consider the performance normalized to measured concentration, which scales approximately linearly to estimated emissions rate. The range of enhancements measured here are well resolved with the methane sensor, thus a large
proportion of the error in the plume model can be sourced directly to the plume model itself, independent of emissions rate.

![Figure 13: Scaled residuals against release rates. A simple loess fit is shown to help highlight any trends. Note: one data point is omitted from this plot to improve interpretability (scaled residual = 857.9).](image)

Comparing the scaled residuals against release rates (Figure 13) does not reveal considerable trends but does emphasize the skew of release rates to small emissions rates and variable data density. The lack of clear trend is expected from theory and from the calibration. The model should not be significantly affected by release rate as most measured concentrations are well above the inherent noise of the concentration measurements from the methane sensor, and the dominant source of error is related to the behaviour of the plume.
Figure 14: Scaled residuals against mean downwind measurement position. A simple loess fit is shown to help highlight any trends. Note: one data point is omitted from this plot to improve interpretability (scaled residual = 857.9).

Figure 14 shows the mean downwind position of the most important concentration measurements used in the plume model. Large downwind positions indicate the plumes were dominantly measured from further downwind, smaller positions relate to situations where equipment was only measured at a very close range. Most of the significant underpredictions occurred where measurements were < 15 m from the release source. This is somewhat expectable as plume behaviour at very close ranges is dominated by small scale turbulence in the lee of equipment. This is important and helps to justify the experimental setup at METEC, which uses real equipment similar to upstream sites. The airflow effects of the equipment at METEC are likely partially responsible for the increase in error seen in Figure 14. It is possible this effect may not be observed in controlled releases with isolated release stacks that do not significantly affect airflow (e.g., Johnson et al., 2021; Sherwin et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2021).
Figure 15: Scaled residuals against wind speed. A simple loess fit is shown to help highlight any trends. Note: one data point is omitted from this plot to improve interpretability (scaled residual = 857.9).

Figure 16: Scaled residuals against wind direction standard deviation. A simple loess fit is shown to help highlight any trends. Note: one data point is omitted from this plot to improve interpretability (scaled residual = 857.9).
Figures 15 and 16 show wind speed and direction variability metrics against error. Conditions with very low wind speeds (< 1 m/s) and high wind direction variability (> 15 degrees) relate with underpredictions and a large increase in error. From theory, this is expectable; plumes are significantly more difficult to model in conditions where the advection of air from source to sensor is less certain. The model does appear to be robust in conditions with consistent wind (> 1 m/s) across a range of wind speeds with little wind speed dependence.

5.6. Combined pad results

The PoMELO quantification engine is designed to de-mix contributions from multiple sources in close proximity. Many pads contained sources in very close proximity where plumes were mixed (Figure 5). This is a particularly complex and error-prone part of the plume model. In situations where there are multiple close emissions points, it is likely that while individual emissions rates for the contributing sources may have higher error, the sum of all emissions rates may be accurate.

Figure 17: Pad sum calibrated emissions rates against released emissions rates. The red line is a 1:1 line for reference (n = 88).

Figure 17 shows the sum of all emissions sources on each pad compared to the calibrated estimated sum of all sources. As expected, there is better fit, with a proportion of linear model explained variance ($r^2$) increasing to 0.84 (from 0.71 when considering each equipment emissions separately).

This suggests that the model can produce more accurate results for total pad emissions estimations when summing the constituent emissions points at the equipment scale. This has relevance for practical application in jurisdictions where a total site rate is of interest.
5.7. Comparison with other technologies

The PoMELO system is designed for on-pad measurements of equipment-scale emissions rates. Here we compare the proportion of explained variance of different systems with previously published controlled release data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology</th>
<th>Experiment characteristics</th>
<th>Prop. of explained variance (linear model $r^2$)</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PoMELO</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>This study</td>
<td>Totals of all equipment on a site improve on these results ($r^2 = 0.84$, see Figure 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek Ops Inc.</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeris Technologies</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Aerospace</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisian</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Hughes (GE)</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picarro</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABB / ULC Robotics</td>
<td>mixed plume</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ravikumar et al. (2019)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridger Photonics Gas Mapping LiDAR™</td>
<td>single plume</td>
<td>0.87-0.89</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bridger Photonics (2021)</td>
<td>Results vary with choice of modeled wind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kairos Aerospace</td>
<td>single plume</td>
<td>0.67-0.84</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Sherwin et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Results vary with choice of modeled wind. Slightly better results can be obtained with ground anemometers (see Sherwin et al., 2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence Photonics QL-320 QOGI</td>
<td>single plume</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Singh et al. (2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus Geomatics (now Geo Verra)</td>
<td>single plume</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Singh et al. (2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of equipment scale controlled release results for similar mobile emissions measurement technologies. Refer to references for full experimental context. Experiments with single plumes are separated from experiments with mixed plumes and closely situated equipment. Johnson et al. (2021) performed a blind assessment of Bridger Photonics Gas Mapping LiDAR™, but we excluded these results due to the small sample size of 11. Note that these results are only valid at the time of experiment, technology providers may have changed algorithms or technology.
Table 2 suggests that PoMELO compares favourably, and particularly so in the more realistic multi-source mixed plume configuration. We may conduct future experiments with single plume configurations, but these configurations are often not representative of upstream pads.

5.8. Expected sources of error and discussion of error reducibility

The PoMELO system produces quantifications with several minutes of truck collected data. This approach has a number of advantages and disadvantages with respect to expected sources of error. We discuss these sources of error and general potential for future error reducibility. From first principles, emissions quantification nominally relies upon accurate measurement of (i) the situation (sources, receptors, etc.), (ii) the wind speed, and (iii) the methane concentration.

The situational measurements in PoMELO are quite accurate as the vehicle is physically on the site and uses high quality location information from the GNSS (nominally < 1.2 m 1 standard deviation, depending on satellite view and correction service availability, normally < 0.3 m). Most situational errors in PoMELO surveys come from positioning the sources. In this study we include the real emissions point locations from METEC. While the system as deployed includes a number of built-in user interface aids and systems to locate emissions points as accurate as possible, picking the actual emissions point location requires care, and it is likely that error will be introduced from equipment positioning during real deployments. Other technologies face similar barriers and likely have similar sensitivities (Bridger Photonics, 2021; Sherwin et al., 2021; Singh et al., 2021).

Situational complexity has a large and expectable impact on quantification accuracy when considering mixed plumes (Figure 1). As shown in Figures 17 and 12, results improve when considering the sum of emissions points on a given pad. This is expectable as de-mixing the relative contributions of several close sources is difficult and error prone. METEC has the advantage of including relatively realistic equipment configurations with closely spaced equipment. Sherwin et al. (2021) describe how the Kairos Aerospace aircraft system they tested could not disambiguate plumes from multiple release points 15 m apart, suggesting that ground-based systems have advantages for practical emissions point measurement on upstream pads with closely situated equipment.

Methane concentration measurements are generally quite accurate with the PoMELO system because in-situ laser spectrometers are a very mature and a well-understood mode of instrumentation. The largest source of error for ground-based methods is not the instrumentation itself, but rather the ability to generalize the shape of the plume and understand the portions of the plume that are above the vehicle. This is likely manifest in the defined decrease in quantification accuracy for sources measured close to the vehicle (Figure 14). Airborne systems, in general, have a much higher minimum detection limit than PoMELO (Johnson et al., 2021; Sherwin et al., 2021), which suggests that airborne methods have more noise in measurements of concentration than vehicle systems. This noted, airborne systems can fully resolve the vertical distribution of the plume, which can translate to a more complete portrait of plumes.

Recent studies such as Cusworth et al. (2022) have found a considerable large number of large emissions sources across U.S. oil and gas production. The emissions rates released in this study were very small compared to the ‘super-emitters’ or ‘ultra-emitters’ documented by these high-profile missions. It is helpful to consider whether PoMELO could feasibly measure these large emissions sources from first principles.

In the case of unlit flares, PoMELO would likely be unable to produce accurate quantifications while on pads as the release points are normally too high and don’t advect to the surface. This could reduce the efficacy of PoMELO for quantifying emissions from unlit flares; however, from the perspective of detecting
and rectifying the issue, unlit flares can normally be visibly seen and investigated while on site, without the use of any technology. For other large emissions points, this depends on the concentration in the air. The methane sensor on PoMELO ranges out at approximately 70 ppmv and ceases to produce accurate data.

The structure of most plume models (PoMELO included) linearly relates concentration to emissions rate, so as long as the concentration does not exceed the measurement capacity of the sensor, the same accuracy of results can be expected. In situations where the methane sensor is ranging out – it is immediately clear to the PoMELO operator that serious quantities of hydrocarbons are in the atmosphere on the site. Thus, in many practical situations, this instrument response may be sufficient to trigger action.

Emissions flux is generally concentration multiplied by wind speed (mass x advection) – thus the ability for a given technology to resolve wind speed has important effect on quantification accuracy and in situations dominates the error budget. PoMELO uses high resolution mobile anemometry to resolve the flow field on the site at 10 Hz and considers the spatial configuration of flow measurements. Wind measurements from PoMELO are quite accurate in a relative sense, but there are errors associated with mobile anemometry – some of which are likely causing issues with quantification in extremely low wind speed situations (see Figure 15 and 16).

However, it is important to note that PoMELO measures wind on the site at the exact time when concentration measurements are collected. This contrasts with aircraft-based systems, which suffer from well documented errors associated with estimating ground wind speed (Johnson et al., 2021; Sherwin et al., 2021). For most aircraft deployments, ground wind speed is usually estimated from modeled wind forecast products. While these products can be accurate in regions with flat topography, well-established boundary layer flow, homogenous land cover, and proximity to weather stations (that feed into the wind modeling systems) - in many more remote regions or locations with topography errors are large (Johnson et al., 2021). Sherwin et al. (2021) demonstrate that different averaging and data extraction schemes for wind data from the US NOAA HRRR wind model could materially affect results, with $r^2$ fits ranging from 0.39 to 0.67 (see Figure S17, Sherwin et al., 2021). Further, the timescales of plume measurement for aircraft-based systems are on the order of seconds – well within the timescales associated with boundary layer turbulence. Error may be fundamentally irreducible with this approach – it is unlikely that any forecast wind model would ever be able to accurately predict boundary layer turbulence.

6. Conclusions

This study outlines quantification performance of the University of Calgary PoMELO vehicle-based measurement system. We tested the system against 209 individually metered emissions points at the CSU METEC facility. In particular, we tested situations with complex mixed plumes, similar to real upstream oil and gas production sites.

Results suggest the system can accurately triage individual emissions points ($r^2 = 0.71$), providing valuable information on emissions rates. Results improved when considering the sum of all emissions points on each pad ($r^2 = 0.84$). Conditions with stable, well-defined flow improved quantification performance. Similarly, situations where measurements were very close to equipment were generally less accurate than those further downwind.

Together, these results suggest the PoMELO system is likely to have practical utility for understanding and managing emissions from individual equipment on upstream pads, providing important clarity for oil and gas operators as they manage methane emissions.
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