

River inflow dominates methane emissions in an Arctic coastal system

Cara C. Manning¹, Victoria L. Preston^{2,3}, Samantha F. Jones⁴, Anna P.M. Michel², David P. Nicholson⁵, Patrick J. Duke^{4,6}, Mohamed Ahmed⁴, Kevin Manganini², Brent G.T. Else⁴, and Philippe D. Tortell^{1,7}

1. Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada. 2. Department of Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering, Woods Hole, MA, USA. 3. Department of Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA. 4. Department of Geography, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada. 5. Department of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA, USA. 6. School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada. 7. Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Corresponding authors: Cara C. Manning (cmanning@alum.mit.edu), Anna Michel (amichel@whoi.edu), David Nicholson (dnicholson@whoi.edu)

Key Points:

- Methane concentrations in an Arctic estuary show strong seasonality; elevated concentrations are associated with early freshet river inflow
- Observations with a novel robotic kayak demonstrate that methane and carbon dioxide in the estuary are rapidly ventilated following ice melt
- River discharge is estimated to account for >95% of annual methane emissions from the estuary

Abstract

Measurements of greenhouse gases in Arctic waters are strongly biased toward low-ice summer conditions, with few observations during periods of seasonal ice retreat. We present a year-round time series of dissolved methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O), along with targeted observations during ice melt of CH_4 and carbon dioxide (CO_2) in a river and estuary adjacent to Cambridge Bay, Nunavut, Canada. CH_4 displayed dramatic seasonality, in contrast to limited seasonal changes in N_2O . During the river freshet, CH_4 concentrations in the river and ice-covered estuary were up to 240,000% saturation and 19,000% saturation, respectively, but quickly dropped by >100-fold following ice melt. Observations with a robotic kayak revealed that river-derived CH_4 and CO_2 were transported to the estuary and rapidly ventilated to the atmosphere once ice cover retreated. We estimate that river discharge accounts for >95% of annual CH_4 sea-to-air emissions from the estuary.

Plain Language Summary

The primary cause of recent global climate change is increasing concentrations of heat-trapping greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Ongoing rapid Arctic climate change is affecting the annual cycle of sea ice formation and retreat, however most published studies of greenhouse gases in Arctic waters have been conducted during ice-free, summertime conditions. In order to characterize seasonal variability in greenhouse gas distributions, we collected year-round measurements of the greenhouse gases methane (CH_4) and nitrous oxide (N_2O) in a coastal Arctic system near Cambridge Bay, Nunavut, Canada. We found that during the ice melt season, river water contains methane concentrations up to 2000 times higher than the wintertime methane concentrations in the coastal ocean. We utilized a novel robotic kayak to conduct high-resolution mapping of greenhouse gas distributions during ice melt. From these data, we demonstrate that the river water containing elevated levels of methane and carbon dioxide (CO_2) flowed into the coastal ocean, and when ice cover melted, these greenhouse gases were rapidly emitted into the atmosphere. We estimate that in this system more than 95% of all annual methane emissions from the coastal ocean are driven by river inflow.

1 Introduction

Methane (CH_4) emissions from Arctic waters and sediments may accelerate in the future as part of positive feedback from ongoing climate change (Biastoch et al., 2011; James et al., 2016; Shakhova et al., 2010). Landscapes that were once permanently frozen are now seasonally thawing, and the ice-free season is lengthening in freshwater and marine systems (Magnuson, 2000; Stroeve et al., 2012; Zona et al., 2016). Thawing can result in the mobilization of labile organic matter and emissions of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), and nitrous oxide (N_2O) (Karlsson et al., 2013; Kvenvolden et al., 1993; Lamarche-Gagnon et al., 2019; Voigt et al., 2017; Zona et al., 2016). Studies of terrestrial and freshwater Arctic systems have demonstrated strong temporal variability in greenhouse gas emissions in these environments (Denfeld et al., 2018; Karlsson et al., 2013; Lamarche-Gagnon et al., 2019; Phelps et al., 1998; Voigt et al., 2017; Zona et al., 2016), yet published measurements in Arctic marine and estuarine waters are strongly biased toward summertime, low-ice conditions (Fenwick et al., 2017; Shakhova et al., 2010).

Ice acts as a barrier to gas exchange, sustaining strong disequilibria in gas concentrations between the atmosphere and ice-covered waters (Butterworth & Miller, 2016; Denfeld et al., 2018; Karlsson et al., 2013; Wand et al., 2006). Rapid re-equilibration of the mixed layer can occur following ice melt. Quantifying the impacts of sea ice loss on Arctic greenhouse gas emissions requires seasonally-resolved measurements; yet few measurements of dissolved CH₄ or other greenhouse gases are available in ice-covered or recently ice-liberated Arctic Ocean waters and connected estuaries. Here we present new observations that address this critical observational gap, demonstrating that the vast majority of annual CH₄ release in an Arctic estuary occurs during the ice melt period.

2 Observations, Results, and Discussion

2.1 Field observations

To quantify the annual sea-air emissions of greenhouse gases in a coastal Arctic system, we collected measurements in a well-sheltered bay with two inlets (west arm and east arm, Figure 1a) adjacent to the town of Cambridge Bay (Iqaluktuuttiaq), Nunavut, Canada. Surface waters are seasonally ice covered, and the dominant freshwater source is Freshwater Creek, which discharges water into the east arm of Cambridge Bay from Greiner Lake and the associated watershed. Terrestrial snowmelt in this region typically begins in late May (Tedesco et al., 2009), and as a result, Freshwater Creek begins to flow before significant sea ice melt has occurred. This freshwater discharge causes the rapid melt of sea ice along the east arm, creating open water in June (Figure 1b), with the rest of the bay typically becoming ice-free 2–3 weeks later, in late June to early July. During 2017 and 2018, we collected a time-series of dissolved CH₄ and nitrous oxide (N₂O) measurements in the estuary and river (Figures 1 and S1). Additionally, in 2018, we used a remotely operated robotic kayak, the ChemYak (Kimball et al., 2014; Nicholson et al., 2018), to characterize fine-scale spatiotemporal changes in dissolved CH₄ and carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the estuary during peak river inflow (Figures 2–3), and collected water samples from Greiner Lake. Methodological details for bottle samples and the ChemYak are provided in the Supporting Information.

During winter and spring (January–May) in 2017 and 2018, CH₄ concentrations throughout the estuary water column (station B1 in Fig. 1b) were closely distributed around the atmospheric equilibrium of 4 nM (range 3–10 nM). In early June, river discharge from the spring thaw began to enter the estuary, and elevated CH₄ concentrations up to 860 nM (19,000% saturation) were measured in near-surface waters of Cambridge Bay (2 m below the surface of the ice). A water mass analysis using salinity and water isotope data from station B1 confirmed that the elevated CH₄ concentrations were associated with river runoff rather than ice melt (Figure S2 and Text S1). Ice-free summer surface waters sampled in July 2017 and 2018 had much lower CH₄ concentrations, ranging from 4–65 nM.

From 28 June to 2 July 2018, we used the ChemYak for high-resolution spatial mapping and vertical profiling of CH₄, CO₂, salinity, and temperature distributions in a ~1 km² open water area between the river mouth and the ice edge during the dynamic melt period (Figures 2, 3 and S3–S6). These ChemYak measurements confirmed elevated greenhouse gas concentrations in river-derived estuary water. The river-derived water occurred throughout the study area as a

shallow, fresh surface mixed layer (<2 m depth), separated from deeper waters by a sharp pycnocline (Figure 2 f-g). During the ChemYak measurement period, CH₄ concentrations in the surface water decreased as the water flowed from the river toward the coastal ocean, suggesting a rapid ventilation within the estuary. For example, the CH₄ concentration in Freshwater Creek decreased from 560±10 nM on 27 June to 290±20 nM by 3 July, whereas CH₄ at station B1 was 130±10 nM on 3 July (Figure 4b). In the ChemYak sampling area (between Freshwater Creek and station B1), on 28 June, CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations in the upper 1 m of the water column were up to 470 nM and 1470 µatm, respectively (mean 410±20 nM and 1340±40 µatm). Concentrations in the upper 1 m decreased over the campaign to 150±70 nM CH₄ and 600±150 µatm CO₂ by 2 July (Figures 3 and S6).




Figure 1. Map of study site and time-series data. **a** Map of eastern Canadian Arctic showing the location of Cambridge Bay. **b** Satellite image of study area on 21 June 2017 (obtained by Google, DigitalGlobe). Pink circles indicate the locations of the main sampling stations FWC (Freshwater Creek) and B1, as well as ONC (Ocean Networks Canada observatory with ice profiler). The approximate region where the ChemYak was deployed is shown with a green outline. Time-series of CH_4 concentrations in Cambridge Bay estuary and Freshwater Creek in **c** 2017 and **d** 2018. Surface samples in Cambridge Bay were collected at 2 m depth below the ice surface, or 0.75 m below the open water surface. The dashed horizontal line represents atmospheric equilibrium and the dashed vertical line indicates when sampling station B1 became ice-free. Error bars reflect the standard deviation of duplicate measurements.




Figure 2. Spatial observations made by the ChemYak vehicle. **a** The study site with ChemYak trajectories from each day overlaid. The mouth of Freshwater Creek (69.1257°N , 105.0042°W) is marked with a star, and concentric rings at increments of 500 m centered at the mouth are provided for scale. Northeast of the red dashed line lies Freshwater Creek (red arrow and box) and a small embayment (blue label and box) which receives input from a much smaller river. **b-g** Observations made by the ChemYak for two representative days, 29 June and 2 July, are plotted by depth versus distance from the Freshwater Creek mouth. Negative distances (to the right of the axis) represent points northeast of the mouth (a small embayment) and positive distance (to the left of the axis) represent points southwest of the mouth (downstream). As indicated by the salinity plots (**f-g**), the mixed layer depth is < 2 m throughout the study area, and the fresh surface layer was generally higher in both CH_4 and CO_2 concentration than layers deeper than 2 m. The gas concentrations decreased over the multi-day measurement campaign. Equivalent plots and temperature data for the other measurement days are shown in Figure S5.




Figure 3. Spatial and temporal trends observed by the ChemYak. **a-b** Each day of the measurement campaign is marked with a unique color, and samples collected are binned into 0.25 m increments from the surface to 6 m. Both CH_4 (**a**) and CO_2 (**b**) exhibit decreasing trends for each subsequent day, and there is strong stratification between the surface layer and water below 2 m. Error bars represent the standard deviation of measurements for each depth bin. **c-j** Temperature-salinity plots showing changes in CH_4 (**c-f**) and CO_2 (**g-j**) concentrations and water mass distributions over the time-series.

In the estuary, at depths below the mixed layer (>2 m depth), CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations decreased from 29 June to 2 July. Elevated wind speeds (up to 10 m s⁻¹) appear to have enhanced mixing across the sharp pycnocline on 30 June (Figures 3d, 3h, S5, and S6). On 30 June, the depth of the pycnocline shoaled and CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations below the mixed layer increased near the ice edge and the river mouth. Over the following days, lower wind speeds (3.7±1.1 m s⁻¹), coupled with decreasing river inflow concentrations and restratification of the water column, led to decreased gas concentrations throughout the water column by 2 July. Changes in the observed temperature-salinity properties of the water suggest that mixing reduced the vertical salinity gradient over the measurement period. The mixed layer near the river mouth showed significant warming between 28 June and 2 July (Figures 3c-j, S5, and S6).

To evaluate the importance of atmospheric ventilation to the CH₄ budget in the estuary, we performed sea-air flux calculations (Wanninkhof, 2014) using observed wind speeds. In the absence of lateral transport and river discharge, CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations in the estuary over our sampling period would be expected to decrease to ~70 nM and ~570 µatm, respectively. In actuality, we observed a mean surface CH₄ concentration of ~150 nM at the end of the sampling period, suggesting that the continued inflow of high-CH₄ river water into the ChemYak sampling region contributed to maintaining elevated CH₄ concentrations following ice melt (Figure 4a). Based on the observed river discharge of ~40 m³ s⁻¹, we estimate that the residence time of water in the ChemYak measurement region was ~0.6 d.

In addition to measuring the estuary downstream of the Freshwater Creek mouth, the ChemYak was also used to collect observations in a small embayment at the outlet of a much smaller river on 29 June, 1 July, and 2 July (Figures 2, 3, S4, and S5). This embayment generally exhibited higher temperatures and lower CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations relative to adjacent waters. For example, on 29 June, the mean CH₄ concentration in the upper 2 m was 242±41 nM in the embayment, in contrast to 417±31 nM within 100 m downstream of the river mouth. For CO₂, the mean concentration was 790±140 µatm in the embayment and 1400±110 µatm downstream of the river mouth. In late June to early July 2018, we collected bottle samples at the head of the embayment in this smaller river and found that CH₄ concentrations in Freshwater Creek were two times higher than in the smaller river. The CH₄ and CO₂ levels in the embayment may therefore reflect lower inflowing CH₄ and CO₂ from the smaller river, and/or a longer residence time for river-derived surface water to exchange with the atmosphere in the embayment.

Overall, we conclude that the declining CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations throughout the water column between 28 June and 2 July, and along the spatial gradient from Freshwater Creek to station B1, primarily reflect a combination of decreasing gas concentrations in the river water (Figure 1c), loss due to gas exchange within the ice-liberated area, and lateral/vertical mixing. Below, we present a more complex physical model for the estuarine mixed layer CH₄ budget, and discuss potential impacts of microbial processes on the CH₄ budget. The observed differences between the smaller river and embayment compared to Freshwater Creek and the rest of the estuary demonstrate the need to conduct studies in a diverse range of Arctic coastal systems to better understand the complex hydrological controls on the magnitude and location of greenhouse gas emissions.




Figure 4. Observations and model-derived output of CH_4 delivery to the estuary mixed layer. **a** Historical river discharge data from Freshwater Creek. **b** Modeled and measured CH_4 concentration in the river (Freshwater Creek) and the Cambridge Bay estuary mixed layer (Model Regions 1 and 2), based on data and the model. The range of modeled values across the estuary is shown with grey shading and the range of values measured with the ChemYak is shown with blue symbols (error bars represent the standard deviation of daily measurements). The red symbols represent bottle measurements at station B1, and the black outlined symbols represent measurements at Freshwater Creek. The grey dotted line shows the equilibrium concentration in the estuary. **c-d** Modeled daily (**c**) and cumulative (**d**) CH_4 delivery to the estuary, from river inflow, ice melt, and gas exchange (positive delivery represents an input to the mixed layer). The CH_4 delivery caused by ice melt is negligible relative to the other terms.

2.2 Mixed layer model

To quantify the fate of river-derived CH₄ over the entire river inflow season, we developed a mixed layer model for the Cambridge Bay estuary (Figures 4 and S7). The model was constrained with measured CH₄ concentrations in Freshwater Creek (bottle samples), river discharge and wind speed measurements, and ice thickness records from the Ocean Networks Canada (ONC) cabled observatory (Figure S8 and Text S1). The results of this analysis suggest that the annual CH₄ cycle in the estuary is driven by river inflow, with sea ice melt contributing a comparatively negligible amount of CH₄ to the mixed layer (Figure 4d). This conclusion is consistent with a water mass property (salinity/water isotope) analysis showing an insignificant impact of sea ice melt on the CH₄ budget (Figure S2 and Text S1). The model was able to simulate the observed changes in estuarine CH₄ concentrations (measured at station B1 and with the ChemYak) without including an additional sink for microbial oxidation of CH₄ within the bay.

Using the model, we estimate that ~800 kg CH₄ was released from Freshwater Creek into the estuary in 2018 (volume-weighted mean concentration in river water of 360 nM), with 20% (160 kg) ventilated to the atmosphere from the estuary following ice cover retreat (Figure 4d). The remaining 80% of the river-derived CH₄ was laterally transported across the estuary beneath sea ice to the coastal ocean, where it was likely ventilated to the atmosphere following ice melt in mid-late July. Indeed, a model run with a larger spatial footprint (including 60 km² of coastal ocean surrounding the Cambridge Bay estuary) yielded a cumulative annual sea-air emission of 640 kg CH₄ from the coastal ocean derived from river discharge, which occurs rapidly following ice melt (Figure 4d). To estimate the CH₄ emissions from the estuary in the absence of river inflow, we prescribe a fixed CH₄ concentration of 6 nM (~150% saturation), the typical surface concentration before and after the river inflow period. Under this scenario, with no river discharge, we derived annual estuarine CH₄ emissions of 7.4 kg, 22 times lower than the emissions derived from the full model including riverine CH₄ inputs. Given that our model predicts that 80% of the riverine CH₄ is ventilated beyond the estuary in the adjacent coastal ocean, small river systems such as Freshwater Creek may be of primary importance to annual methane budgets through much of the coastal Arctic Ocean. Accurate calculation of such short-lived, high magnitude CH₄ emissions following ice melt, requires a more extensive under-ice sampling program, including melt-season measurements in multiple river-influenced Arctic estuaries and coastal systems.

2.3 Comparison to other systems

The CH₄ concentrations we measured in Freshwater Creek (ranging from 10–11000 nM, volume-weighted mean 360 nM) are similar to other river systems in the Arctic and worldwide. For example, mean CH₄ concentrations observed in the Yukon River, Lena Delta, and Leverett Glacier runoff range from 70–750 nM (Bussmann, 2013; Lamarche-Gagnon et al., 2019; Striegl et al., 2012). Furthermore, a data compilation of over 900 rivers and streams worldwide reported a mean CH₄ concentration of 1400 ± 5200 nM and median of 250 nM (Stanley et al., 2016). The peak CH₄ concentrations observed in Cambridge Bay estuary (up to 900 nM during the freshet, prior to ice melt) are similar to maximum values measured in other Arctic coastal waters (Bussmann et al., 2017; Shakhova et al., 2010).

In contrast to CH₄, N₂O concentrations throughout 2017-2018 measured at station B1 and Freshwater Creek displayed limited seasonal variability (Figure S1). During open water conditions in Cambridge Bay, N₂O was typically undersaturated or close to equilibrium in near-surface waters. Anoxic conditions in the sediments and water column that promote CH₄ accumulation may simultaneously drive N₂O consumption via denitrification (Naqvi et al., 2010). These conditions contrast with the lower- and mid-latitudes where rivers and estuaries are typically considered significant N₂O sources (Seitzinger & Kroeze, 1998; Seitzinger S.P. et al., 2000).

2.4 Future work

This research motivates two directions for future work in Cambridge Bay: characterization of natural sinks of CH₄ (e.g., microbial oxidation) and identification of CH₄ sources. The extent of microbial CH₄ oxidation in river-derived water transported from Freshwater Creek to the coastal ocean is currently unknown. The early-season river discharge containing >1000 nM CH₄ may remain under the ice for ~1 month before being exposed to the atmosphere, during which time microbial oxidation could potentially decrease concentrations. Recent studies of CH₄ oxidation rates in Arctic estuarine and marine waters have found rates ≤ 2 nM CH₄ d⁻¹ (Bussmann et al., 2017; Gentz et al., 2014; Mau et al., 2013; Uhlig & Loose, 2017). Oxidation rates ≤ 2 nM CH₄ d⁻¹ would have a small impact on under-ice CH₄ levels in Cambridge Bay estuary (considering that we measured up to 860 nM CH₄ under ice in the estuary). However, some studies in ice-covered lakes have reported significantly higher oxidation rates (Bastviken et al., 2002; Ricão Canelhas et al., 2016). Additionally, our model reproduces the seasonally observed progression of CH₄ levels in the estuary without invoking CH₄ oxidation. To further investigate the extent and dynamics of under-ice CH₄ plumes, robotic underwater vehicles and moored sensors could be developed and deployed to enable high resolution under-ice measurements. Tracer-based incubation experiments could be performed to measure oxidation rates (Uhlig & Loose, 2017).

Another area of future research is determining CH₄ sources and characterizing the relative emissions of CH₄ and CO₂ from the lake versus the river and coastal ocean. Our preliminary measurements in Greiner Lake suggest that anoxic zones in the lake are a significant source of CH₄. However, the formation mechanism is not clear. For example, CH₄ could be generated in situ each winter within anoxic sediments and/or overlying anoxic waters, or, alternatively, could be liberated from existing pools in methane seeps or thawing permafrost. More extensive measurements of CH₄ concentration and isotopic composition in the watershed surrounding Freshwater Creek would assist in determining the source of the CH₄. Additionally, radiocarbon measurements would demonstrate whether ancient CH₄ sources such as thawing permafrost are significant (Sparrow et al., 2018).

This study demonstrates the importance of fully resolving seasonal processes in inter-connected marine and freshwater environments to accurately quantify CH₄ emissions from Arctic systems. The results motivate future coastal Arctic field campaigns at other sites with measurement technologies capable of high spatial and temporal resolution mapping immediately before and during ice melt. Such studies will provide critical information to characterize current and future Arctic greenhouse gas emission, improving quantitative estimates of changes in CH₄ and CO₂ emissions across the rapidly changing Arctic environment.

3 Conclusions and implications

Our results, derived from a year-round times series of CH₄ measurements and dense spatio-temporal observations from a remotely-operated robotic kayak, show that CH₄ discharge via Freshwater Creek drives intense CH₄ emissions immediately following ice melt in the Cambridge Bay estuary and surrounding waters. River discharge also acts as a significant seasonal source of CO₂ to the estuary, whereas N₂O shows limited seasonality. Samples collected exclusively during low-ice summer conditions would likely miss the primary driver of the annual CH₄ budget, and underestimate the sea-air fluxes. Similar seasonal variability in CH₄ emissions likely occurs in other river-influenced, seasonally ice-covered Arctic estuaries, which receive ~10% of global river discharge (Dai & Trenberth, 2002). Our results suggest that the ongoing and projected future increases in Arctic river discharge (Macdonald et al., 2015) could drive increased CH₄ and CO₂ emissions from Arctic estuaries. The low and stable CH₄ concentrations observed below the mixed layer in the estuary indicate that sedimentary CH₄ sources within the estuary are negligible relative to river-derived inputs, in contrast to published studies in some other Arctic coastal and shelf systems where significant sedimentary sources are observed (Gentz et al., 2014; Shakhova et al., 2010).

Acknowledgments, Samples, and Data

All data generated by the authors that were used in this article have been submitted to PANGAEA, where publication is pending, and a PANGAEA DOI will be included in the final published manuscript. Code for the biogeochemical model used to estimate CH₄ transport is available on GitHub (<https://github.com/caramanning/cambridge-bay-model>). We acknowledge the use of imagery from the NASA Worldview application (<https://worldview.earthdata.nasa.gov>), part of the NASA Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS), and data from Ocean Networks Canada, and Environment Canada. We thank everyone involved in the fieldwork including C. Amegainik, Y. Bernard, A. Cranch, F. Emingak, S. Marriott, and A. Pedersen. Laboratory analysis and experiments were performed by A. Cranch, R. McCulloch, A. Morrison, and Z. Zheng. We thank J. Brinckerhoff, the Arctic Research Foundation, and the staff of the Canadian High Arctic Research Station for support with field logistics. Funding for the work was provided by MEOPAR NCE funding to B. Else, a WHOI Interdisciplinary Award to A. Michel., D. Nicholson. and S. Wankel, and Canadian NSERC grants to P. Tortell. and B. Else. Authors received fellowships, scholarships and travel grants including an NSERC postdoctoral fellowship to C. Manning., an NDSEG fellowship to V. Preston., NSERC PGS-D and Izaak Walton Killam Pre-Doctoral scholarships to S. Jones, Northern Scientific Training Program funds (Polar Knowledge Canada) to S. Jones. and P. Duke.. We also thank Polar Knowledge Canada (POLAR) and Nunavut Arctic College for laboratory space and field logistics support.

References

Biastoch, A., Treude, T., Rüpke, L. H., Riebesell, U., Roth, C., Burwicz, E. B., et al. (2011). Rising Arctic Ocean temperatures cause gas hydrate destabilization and ocean acidification. *Geophysical Research Letters*,

- 38(8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011GL047222>
- Bliss, L. C. (1981). North American and Scandinavian tundras and polar deserts. In L. C. Bliss, O. W. Heal, & J. J. Moore (Eds.), *Tundra ecosystems: a comparative analysis* (pp. 8–24). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bussmann, I. (2013). Distribution of methane in the Lena Delta and Buor-Khaya Bay, Russia. *Biogeosciences*, *10*(7), 4641–4652. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-4641-2013>
- Bussmann, I., Hackbusch, S., Schaal, P., & Wichels, A. (2017). Methane distribution and oxidation around the Lena Delta in summer 2013. *Biogeosciences*, *14*(21), 4985–5002. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-14-4985-2017>
- Butterworth, B. J., & Miller, S. D. (2016). Air-sea exchange of carbon dioxide in the Southern Ocean and Antarctic marginal ice zone. *Geophysical Research Letters*, *43*(13), 7223–7230. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL069581>
- Cai, W.-J., Hu, X., Huang, W.-J., Jiang, L.-Q., Wang, Y., Peng, T.-H., & Zhang, X. (2010). Alkalinity distribution in the western North Atlantic Ocean margins. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C8). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JC005482>
- Capelle, D. W., Dacey, J. W., & Tortell, P. D. (2015). An automated, high through-put method for accurate and precise measurements of dissolved nitrous-oxide and methane concentrations in natural waters: Automated PT-GCMS for N₂O and CH₄. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, *13*(7), 345–355. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lom3.10029>
- Dai, A., & Trenberth, K. E. (2002). Estimates of Freshwater Discharge from Continents: Latitudinal and Seasonal Variations. *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, *3*(6), 660–687. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541\(2002\)003<0660:EOFDFC>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1525-7541(2002)003<0660:EOFDFC>2.0.CO;2)
- Denfeld, B. A., Baulch, H. M., Giorgio, P. A. del, Hampton, S. E., & Karlsson, J. (2018). A synthesis of carbon dioxide and methane dynamics during the ice-covered period of northern lakes. *Limnology and Oceanography Letters*, *3*(3), 117–131. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lol2.10079>
- Dickson, A. G. (1990). Thermodynamics of the dissociation of boric acid in synthetic seawater from 273.15 to 318.15 K. *Deep Sea Research Part A. Oceanographic Research Papers*, *37*(5), 755–766. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149\(90\)90004-F](https://doi.org/10.1016/0198-0149(90)90004-F)

- Environment and Climate Change Canada Historical Hydrometric Data website, River discharge data for station 10TF001, Freshwater Creek near Cambridge Bay
https://wateroffice.ec.gc.ca/mainmenu/historical_data_index_e.html. Water Survey of Canada, Environment and Climate Change Canada. Downloaded on January 10, 2019.
- Environment and Climate Change Canada Historical Database (2019) Hourly weather data for Cambridge Bay, Nunavut from Jan 1, 2018 to Jan 1, 2019. Station Climate ID: 2400602, WMO ID: 71288 TC ID: XCM
<http://climate.weather.gc.ca> . Downloaded on February 25, 2019.
- Fenwick, L., Capelle, D., Damm, E., Zimmermann, S., Williams, W. J., Vagle, S., & Tortell, P. D. (2017). Methane and nitrous oxide distributions across the North American Arctic Ocean during summer, 2015. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JC012493>
- Gentz, T., Damm, E., Schneider von Deimling, J., Mau, S., McGinnis, D. F., & Schlüter, M. (2014). A water column study of methane around gas flares located at the West Spitsbergen continental margin. *Continental Shelf Research*, 72, 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2013.07.013>
- Gran, G. (1952). Determination of the equivalence point in potentiometric titrations. Part II. *Analyst*, 77(920), 661–671. <https://doi.org/10.1039/AN9527700661>
- James, R. H., Bousquet, P., Bussmann, I., Haeckel, M., Kipfer, R., Leifer, I., et al. (2016). Effects of climate change on methane emissions from seafloor sediments in the Arctic Ocean: A review. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 61(S1), S283–S299. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10307>
- Karlsson, J., Giesler, R., Persson, J., & Lundin, E. (2013). High emission of carbon dioxide and methane during ice thaw in high latitude lakes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 40(6), 1123–1127.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/grl.50152>
- Kimball, P., Bailey, J., Das, S., Geyer, R., Harrison, T., Kunz, C., et al. (2014). The WHOI Jetyak: An autonomous surface vehicle for oceanographic research in shallow or dangerous waters. *2014 IEEE/OES Autonomous Underwater Vehicles (AUV)*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AUV.2014.7054430>
- Kvenvolden, K. A., Lilley, M. D., Lorenson, T. D., Barnes, P. W., & McLaughlin, E. (1993). The Beaufort Sea continental shelf as a seasonal source of atmospheric methane. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 20(22), 2459–2462. <https://doi.org/10.1029/93GL02727>
- Lamarche-Gagnon, G., Wadham, J. L., Sherwood Lollar, B., Arndt, S., Fietzek, P., Beaton, A. D., et al. (2019).

- Greenland melt drives continuous export of methane from the ice-sheet bed. *Nature*, 565(7737), 73–77.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-018-0800-0>
- Lee, K., Kim, T.-W., Byrne, R. H., Millero, F. J., Feely, R. A., & Liu, Y.-M. (2010). The universal ratio of boron to chlorinity for the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 74(6), 1801–1811. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2009.12.027>
- Macdonald, R. W., Kuzyk, Z. A., & Johannessen, S. C. (2015). It is not just about the ice: a geochemical perspective on the changing Arctic Ocean. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 5(3), 288–301.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13412-015-0302-4>
- Macdonald, R. W., Paton, D. W., Carmack, E. C., & Omstedt, A. (1995). The freshwater budget and under-ice spreading of Mackenzie River water in the Canadian Beaufort Sea based on salinity and $18\text{O}/16\text{O}$ measurements in water and ice. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 100(C1), 895–919.
<https://doi.org/10.1029/94JC02700>
- Magnuson, J. J. (2000). Historical Trends in Lake and River Ice Cover in the Northern Hemisphere. *Science*, 289(5485), 1743–1746. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.289.5485.1743>
- Millero, F. J. (2010). Carbonate constants for estuarine waters. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 61(2), 139–142.
<https://doi.org/10.1071/MF09254>
- Naqvi, S. W. A., Bange, H. W., Farías, L., Monteiro, P. M. S., Scranton, M. I., & Zhang, J. (2010). Marine hypoxia/anoxia as a source of CH_4 and N_2O . *Biogeosciences*, 7(7), 2159–2190. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-7-2159-2010>
- Nicholson, D. P., Michel, A. P. M., Wankel, S. D., Manganini, K., Sugrue, R. A., Sandwith, Z. O., & Monk, S. A. (2018). Rapid Mapping of Dissolved Methane and Carbon Dioxide in Coastal Ecosystems Using the ChemYak Autonomous Surface Vehicle. *Environmental Science & Technology*.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.8b04190>
- Ocean Networks Canada Data Archive (2019) Corrected ice draft data from Cambridge Bay, Nunavut, from Jan 1, 2018 to Jan 1, 2019. <http://www.oceannetworks.ca>, Ocean Networks Canada, University of Victoria, Canada. Downloaded on May 25, 2019.
- Phelps, A. R., Peterson, K. M., & Jeffries, M. O. (1998). Methane efflux from high-latitude lakes during spring ice melt. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 103(D22), 29029–29036.

- <https://doi.org/10.1029/98JD00044>
- Pierrot, D., Lewis, E., & Wallace, D. W. R. (2006). *MS Excel Program Developed for CO2 System Calculations* (Technical Report). Oak Ridge, Tenn: Carbon Dioxide Inf. Anal. Cent., Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., US DOE.
- Seitzinger, S. P., & Kroeze, C. (1998). Global Distribution of Nitrous Oxide Production and N Inputs in Freshwater and Coastal Marine Ecosystems, *12*(1), 93–113.
- Seitzinger S.P., Kroeze C., & Styles R.V. (2000). Global distribution of N₂O emissions from aquatic systems: natural emissions and anthropogenic effects. *Chemosphere: Global Change Science*, *2*, 267–279.
- [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1465-9972\(00\)00015-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1465-9972(00)00015-5)
- Shakhova, N., Semiletov, I., Salyuk, A., Yusupov, V., Kosmach, D., & Gustafsson, Ö. (2010). Extensive Methane Venting to the Atmosphere from Sediments of the East Siberian Arctic Shelf. *Science*, *327*(5970), 1246–1250. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1182221>
- Sparrow, K. J., Kessler, J. D., Southon, J. R., Garcia-Tigreros, F., Schreiner, K. M., Ruppel, C. D., et al. (2018). Limited contribution of ancient methane to surface waters of the U.S. Beaufort Sea shelf. *Science Advances*, *4*(1), eaao4842. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao4842>
- Stanley, E. H., Casson, N. J., Christel, S. T., Crawford, J. T., Loken, L. C., & Oliver, S. K. (2016). The ecology of methane in streams and rivers: Patterns, controls, and global significance. *Ecological Monographs*, *86*(2), 146–171. <https://doi.org/10.1890/15-1027.1>
- Striegl, R. G., Dornblaser, M. M., McDonald, C. P., Rover, J. R., & Stets, E. G. (2012). Carbon dioxide and methane emissions from the Yukon River system. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, *26*(4).
- <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012GB004306>
- Stroeve, J. C., Serreze, M. C., Holland, M. M., Kay, J. E., Malanik, J., & Barrett, A. P. (2012). The Arctic's rapidly shrinking sea ice cover: a research synthesis. *Climatic Change*, *110*(3–4), 1005–1027.
- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0101-1>
- Uhlig, C., & Loose, B. (2017). Using stable isotopes and gas concentrations for independent constraints on microbial methane oxidation at Arctic Ocean temperatures. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, *15*(8), 737–751. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lom3.10199>
- Voigt, C., Marushchak, M. E., Lamprecht, R. E., Jackowicz-Korczyński, M., Lindgren, A., Mastepanov, M., et al. (2017). Increased nitrous oxide emissions from Arctic peatlands after permafrost thaw. *Proceedings of the*

- National Academy of Sciences*, 114(24), 6238–6243. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702902114>
- Walter, K. M., Zimov, S. A., Chanton, J. P., Verbyla, D., & Chapin, F. S. (2006). Methane bubbling from Siberian thaw lakes as a positive feedback to climate warming. *Nature*, 443(7107), 71–75.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05040>
- Wand, U., Samarkin, V. A., Nitzsche, H.-M., & Hubberten, H.-W. (2006). Biogeochemistry of methane in the permanently ice-covered Lake Untersee, central Dronning Maud Land, East Antarctica. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 51(2), 1180–1194. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.2.1180>
- Wanninkhof, R. (2014). Relationship between wind speed and gas exchange over the ocean revisited. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 12(6), 351–362. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2014.12.351>
- Weiss, R. F., & Price, B. A. (1980). Nitrous oxide solubility in water and seawater. *Marine Chemistry*, 8(4), 347–359. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4203\(80\)90024-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4203(80)90024-9)
- Wiesenburg, D. A., & Guinasso, N. L. (1979). Equilibrium solubilities of methane, carbon monoxide, and hydrogen in water and sea water. *Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data*, 24(4), 356–360.
<https://doi.org/10.1021/je60083a006>
- Wilson, S. T., Bange, H. W., Arévalo-Martínez, D. L., Barnes, J., Borges, A. V., Brown, I., et al. (2018). An intercomparison of oceanic methane and nitrous oxide measurements. *Biogeosciences*, 15(19), 5891–5907.
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-15-5891-2018>
- Yamamoto, S., Alcauskas, J. B., & Crozier, T. E. (1976). Solubility of methane in distilled water and seawater. *Journal of Chemical & Engineering Data*, 21(1), 78–80. <https://doi.org/10.1021/je60068a029>
- Yamamoto-Kawai, M., McLaughlin, F. A., Carmack, E. C., Nishino, S., Shimada, K., & Kurita, N. (2009). Surface freshening of the Canada Basin, 2003–2007: River runoff versus sea ice meltwater. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 114(4), 2003–2007. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2008JC005000>
- Zhou, J., Delille, B., Eicken, H., Vancoppenolle, M., Brabant, F., Carnat, G., et al. (2013). Physical and biogeochemical properties in landfast sea ice (Barrow, Alaska): Insights on brine and gas dynamics across seasons. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 118(6), 3172–3189. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrc.20232>
- Zona, D., Gioli, B., Commane, R., Lindaas, J., Wofsy, S. C., Miller, C. E., et al. (2016). Cold season emissions dominate the Arctic tundra methane budget. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 113(1), 40–45. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1516017113>

Supporting information for

River inflow dominates methane emissions in an Arctic coastal system

Cara C. Manning^{1,*}, Victoria L. Preston^{2,3}, Samantha F. Jones⁴, Anna P.M. Michel^{2,*}, David P. Nicholson^{5,*}, Patrick J. Duke^{4,6}, Mohamed Ahmed⁴, Kevin Manganini², Brent G.T. Else⁴, and Philippe D. Tortell^{1,7}

1. Department of Earth, Ocean and Atmospheric Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada
2. Department of Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering, Woods Hole, MA, USA
3. Department of Aeronautical and Astronautical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA
4. Department of Geography, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada
5. Department of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA, USA
6. School of Earth and Ocean Sciences, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada
7. Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

Corresponding authors: Cara C. Manning (cmanning@alum.mit.edu), Anna Michel (amichel@whoi.edu), David Nicholson (dnicholson@whoi.edu)

Contents of this file

Text S1 to S2
Figures S1 to S8

Introduction

The Supporting Information contains the methods section (Text S1), a description of the model for calculating the CH₄ budget for the estuary (Text S2) and eight extended figures.

Text S1. Methods

Site description

Cambridge Bay (69°07'N, 105°03'W) is a small hamlet located along the south-eastern coast of Victoria Island in the Kitikmeot Region of Nunavut, Canada (Figure 1). The island is classified as part of the North American High Arctic with sedge-moss-meadow tundra and polar semi-desert (Bliss, 1981). Freshwater Creek is the most influential riverine source to Cambridge Bay, and receives discharge from Greiner Lake. A much smaller river also contributes to Cambridge Bay, and an embayment fed by this river is located northwest of the mouth of Freshwater Creek. The lake, river, and bay experience a yearly freeze-thaw cycle. The estuary freezes to ~1.5 m thick by late spring and river discharge begins in June (Figure 4 and Figure S8).

The study site is shown in Figure 1a. The ChemYak vehicle was primarily deployed in open (de-iced) regions of Cambridge Bay harbor and up to the mouth of Freshwater Creek where it became too shallow to drive the vehicle. Discrete sampling locations for the time series were located in the harbor, Freshwater Creek, and in Greiner Lake. Manual sampling locations during the course of ChemYak in situ work were in open waters and a GPS waypoint was used to flag locations.

Manual sample collection

At station B1 (69.107556 °N, 105.059667 °W), in the middle of Cambridge Bay, under-ice measurements were collected by augering a 10-inch diameter hole into the ice and open water measurements were collected by boat (~5 m long skiff). A RBR Concerto CTD was attached to a rope and lowered by hand to ~70 m, near the maximum depth. Subsequently, 1.2 L Niskin 1010 model water sampling bottles were lowered on a rope and closed at the desired sampling depths. Samples from Freshwater Creek (69.12975 °N, 104.99459 °W) were collected using a battery-powered submersible pump (Waterra Cyclone and Mini-Typhoon models were used). River temperature and salinity was measured using the RBR Concerto CTD in 2017 and a YSI ProDSS in 2018.

In ice-covered conditions, all water depths were determined relative to the top of the ice (the water surface after infilling the augered hole), rather than relative to the bottom of the ice, as the ice thickness was not measured.

Water samples for measurement of CH₄/N₂O concentration and dissolved inorganic carbon/total alkalinity (DIC/TA) were collected in 60 mL and 125 mL borosilicate serum vials, respectively. Both sample types were preserved with 0.1 mL of a saturated solution of mercuric chloride, and sealed with chlorobutyl-isoprene rubber stoppers and aluminum caps, taking care to not entrain bubbles. Samples were collected for water stable isotopic composition measurements in 2 mL glass vials with screw tops and septa. In Cambridge Bay estuary, all samples were unfiltered. At Freshwater Creek, samples for water isotopic measurement were filtered with an in-line 0.45 µm filter (Whatman Polycap 75 GW capsule with polyethersulfone membrane) to remove particulate material, whereas CH₄/N₂O samples were left unfiltered.

Manual sample analysis

CH₄ and N₂O concentrations were determined using an automated purge and trap system coupled to a gas chromatograph mass spectrometer (Shimadzu GCMS-QP2010) at the University of British Columbia following a published method (Capelle et al., 2015). Standard curves were calculated using certified gas standard mixtures ($\pm 5\%$ accuracy for CH₄ and N₂O), and air-equilibrated water samples were run daily to verify the accuracy of the system. The laboratory has been involved in international intercalibration exercises for oceanic CH₄ and N₂O measurements (Wilson et al., 2018). Duplicate samples were collected and sample pairs with poor precision and/or clear evidence of air contamination were eliminated from the data set.

Dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) concentrations were determined via acid extraction by quantifying the released CO₂ using an infrared gas analyzer (AIRICA and LiCOR-7000). Total alkalinity (TA) was measured by Gran titration (Gran, 1952) using a semi-automated open-cell titration system (AS-ALK2 Apollo SciTech) (Cai et al., 2010). All measurements were calibrated against certified reference materials (provided by A.G. Dickson from Scripps Institute of Oceanography) with a standard bottle precision of ± 2.2 µmol/kg. *p*CO₂ values were calculated in CO2SYS (Pierrot et al., 2006) from the measured DIC and TA at in situ temperature, salinity, and pressure using published inorganic carbon dissociation constants for estuarine waters (Millero, 2010), bisulfate ion acidity constant (Dickson, 1990) and boron to chlorinity ratio (Lee et al., 2010).

Water isotope concentrations were determined using an integrated off-axis cavity absorption spectrometer (LGR Triple Liquid Water Isotope Analyzer, model 912-0032) and calibrated with VSMOW2 and SLAP2 standards, with an estimated accuracy of 0.1 and 1 permil for $\delta^{18}\text{O-H}_2\text{O}$ and $\delta^2\text{H-H}_2\text{O}$, respectively.

Water mass analysis

Both river runoff and sea ice melt can contain elevated CH₄ (Kvenvolden et al., 1993; Stanley et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2013). The water mass composition of near-surface samples (0.75 m depth in open water and 2 m depth under ice) at station B1 was determined using a mixing analysis. We assumed each water sample was a mixture of three endmembers (seawater, sea ice melt, and river runoff) (Macdonald et al., 1995; Yamamoto-Kawai et al., 2009) and that each endmember had unique and constant salinity (in PSS) and water isotopic composition (in ‰ versus VSMOW2-SLAP2). The following endmembers were defined for Cambridge Bay estuary: local seawater salinity = 28.73 PSS, $\delta^{18}\text{O-H}_2\text{O} = -4.2$ ‰, and $\delta^2\text{H-H}_2\text{O} = -32.4$ ‰ (based on winter surface water measurements prior to ice melt and river discharge), local ice melt salinity

= 5.16 PSS, $\delta^{18}\text{O-H}_2\text{O} = -2.4 \text{ ‰}$, and $\delta^2\text{H-H}_2\text{O} = -18.3 \text{ ‰}$ (based on a melted sea ice core collected at station B1), and local river runoff 0.14 PSS, $\delta^{18}\text{O-H}_2\text{O} = -18.5 \text{ ‰}$, and $\delta^2\text{H-H}_2\text{O} = -147.9 \text{ ‰}$ (based on average river water measurements in June and August). Some samples with salinity >28.5 PSS were assumed to be 100% seawater and were not analyzed for water isotopic composition.

During the melt period in June-July, near-surface samples at station B1 contained variable fractions of river water (from 0 to 85%). On some under-ice sampling dates (e.g., 24 June 2017), the high-resolution CTD profile showed that the mixed layer depth was <2 m and therefore the near-surface sample collected in a Niskin bottle centered at 2 m depth likely did not solely reflect the mixed layer composition. Additionally, tidal and wind-driven current variations may have affected the distribution of the river plume. Nevertheless, the general pattern that we observed confirmed that elevated CH_4 measurements were associated with river discharge, as all measurements of elevated CH_4 at station B1 were associated with some fraction of river discharge. Furthermore, all under-ice samples containing at least 5% river runoff contained >100 nM CH_4 and two under-ice samples with >100 nM CH_4 contained 0% sea ice melt (Figure S2). These results confirm that river discharge is the source of the elevated CH_4 . All water samples collected deeper than 2 m contained <12 nM CH_4 and had salinity ≥ 28.5 PSS indicating they contained $>99\%$ seawater and confirming that the river inflow is constrained to a shallow surface layer, facilitating rapid ventilation once ice cover retreats.

ChemYak in situ measurements

The ChemYak is a remotely operated robotic kayak developed by Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI) for in situ greenhouse gas measurements. The vehicle's chassis is a Mokai gas-powered air-jet propulsion kayak with servo-driven controls. A PixHawk autopilot and wireless radio network was used to remotely operate the vehicle during the field campaign. The ChemYak carried a suite of instruments including: RBR Concerto CTD, Los Gatos Research (LGR) Dissolved Gas Extraction Unit (DGEU), LGR Greenhouse Gas Analyzer (GGA), and Air-Marine 200WX Weather Station. Every instrument was programmed to take and log measurements at a frequency of 1 Hz.

The DGEU equilibrates gases through a Liqui-Cel G420 2.5 X 8 membrane contactor with a total membrane surface of 1.4 m^2 and gas volume of 150 mL and pumps water at a rate of $420 \text{ std cc min}^{-1}$. The GGA is designed to be field portable (15 kg, 60 W) and has a measurement range of 1-20,000 ppm for CO_2 and 0-10% for CH_4 with precision at 1Hz of $< 300 \text{ ppb}$ and $< 2 \text{ ppb}$ for each gas, respectively. The DGEU draws water in and extracts an air sample which is subsequently pumped to the GGA for content analysis (the calibration of the GGA is discussed in the following section). The inlet to the DGEU, as well as the CTD, are connected to a 10m profiling winch attached to the back of the ChemYak in order to pull water samples from throughout the upper-layer of the water column.

The ChemYak traveled an average of 11 ± 2 km per day from 28 June through 2 July and collected $>75,000$ observations that are reported in this study. Observations were typically collected between 15:00-22:00 UTC.

ChemYak data analysis

Measurements collected by the ChemYak were first processed by hand to remove anomalous measurements which were typically seen at the beginning of logging and the end of logging during which the vehicle was taken in and out of the water, respectively. Data from the CTD, GGA, and Weather Station were logged on separate computers, which requires a time-based interpolation procedure in order to compare the instruments directly. The Weather Station provides the GPS coordinates for each sample, and this timestamp is used. The CTD data and GGA data are then linearly cast to the timestamp of the Weather Station to create a single dataset where each entry is considered a sample measurement and contains a time, geolocation, and set of instrument observations.

The DGEU does not perfectly extract all CH₄ and CO₂ from a water sample, and so we apply an extraction efficiency correction (Nicholson et al., 2018) by inspection of results from physical bottle samples collected contemporary to the field campaign with the ChemYak (Figure S3). The bottle samples are reported in molar and atmospheric quantities for CH₄ and CO₂ respectively. ChemYak observations, were converted from partial pressure units using CTD data and established temperature and salinity dependent gas solubilities (Wiesenburg & Guinasso, 1979; Yamamoto et al., 1976). For calibration of the CO₂ sensor, dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and total alkalinity (TA) were measured on bottle samples and the results were converted to *p*CO₂ (see *Manual sample analysis*). Uncertainty in the DIC, TA, salinity and temperature measurements, as well as uncertainty in the carbonate equilibrium constants for Arctic estuarine waters, all contribute uncertainty to the calculated *p*CO₂ values.

To compare with bottle samples, we filter ChemYak measurements by day the sample was taken, depth proximity (± 0.38 m), and geographic proximity (within 50 m radius). We then select an extraction efficiency that corresponds to a one-to-one mapping (with no offset) between bottle samples and the average of the matching ChemYak observations. As shown in Figure S3, we apply an empirical extraction efficiency of 5.09% for CH₄ ($r^2=0.842$) and of 50.5% ($r^2=0.717$) for CO₂. One bottle sample was eliminated from the calibration as the temperature/salinity profiles indicated the Niskin sampling bottle was closed in the middle of the pycnocline where there is a sharp gradient in gas concentrations, and this sample showed very poor agreement between the bottle sample and GGA. The difference in extraction efficiency occurs as a consequence of the differences in solubility characteristics between CH₄ and CO₂.

Text S2. Model for estimating CH₄ distributions and transport

Model mass balance

We developed a geochemical box model to quantify the CH₄ budget for Cambridge Bay. Model code is provided as a supplement to the paper (see Acknowledgments). The estuary model domain has a volume of 10×10^6 m³ (5×10^6 m² surface area and a 2 m deep mixed layer) and is shown in Figure S7. The model time-step is hourly and the domain is divided into 10 boxes (reducing the time step and box size further had a negligible impact on model output).

The model assumes conservation of water volume in each well-mixed box. In each box the volume balance at each time step is:

$$V_{riv} + V_{ice} + V_{out} = 0$$

where V_{riv} is the volume added from river discharge, V_{ice} is the volume added from ice melt, V_{out} is the lateral volume transferred to the adjacent box (moving toward the coastal ocean). Positive values add volume to the box. The model does not include the effects of vertical mixing and/or vertical advection, as the rate of vertical mixing coefficient is unconstrained for this system and likely inhibited by the strong vertical salinity stratification.

In the rest of the boxes, the mass balance at each time step is:

$$V_{ice} + V_{out} + V_{in} = 0$$

where V_{in} is the volume received laterally from the adjacent box (closer to the river) and V_{out} is the volume transferred laterally to the adjacent box (farther from the river).

For each box, at each time-step t the $[CH_4]$ is calculated as

$$[CH_4]_{t+1} = ([CH_4]_t V_{box} + F_{riv,t} + F_{ice,t} + F_{gase,t} + F_{in,t} + F_{out,t}) / V_{box}$$

where V_{box} is the box volume (m^3), $[CH_4]$ is the dissolved concentration in the box ($mol\ m^{-3}$) and F is the flux (in $mol\ m^{-3}\ timestep^{-1}$). Specifically, for box n , the flux from river discharge is:

$$F_{riv,t} = V_{riv,t} [CH_4]_{riv,n,t}$$

and $V_{riv} = 0$ for every box except for the first box adjacent to the river.

The flux from ice melt is

$$F_{ice,t} = V_{ice,t} [CH_4]_{ice,n,t}$$

The lateral flux in to box n from the adjacent box ($n-1$) is

$$F_{in,t} = (V_{riv,t} + V_{ice,t}) [CH_4]_{n-1,t-1}$$

and F_{in} is 0 for box $n=1$.

The lateral flux out from box n to the adjacent box ($n+1$) is

$$F_{out,t} = -(V_{riv,t} + V_{ice,t}) [CH_4]_{n,t}$$

The flux due to gas exchange is

$$F_{ge,t} = k_{CH_4,t} ([CH_4]_{eq,t} - [CH_4]_{n,t}) V_{box} dt$$

where k_{CH_4} is the gas transfer velocity for CH_4 ($m\ d^{-1}$) (Wanninkhof, 2014), $[CH_4]_{eq}$ is the equilibrium concentration (Wiesenburg & Guinasso, 1979) ($mol\ m^{-3}$) and dt is the timestep (d).

Calculation of flux due to gas exchange alone

To estimate the expected gas concentration decrease for an isolated box unaffected by river inflow, we used a simplified model where

$$[CH_4]_{t+1} = ([CH_4]_t V_{box} + F_{gase,t}) / V_{box}$$

Model data sources

To estimate V_{riv} , the river discharge volume flux, we used river discharge records in Freshwater Creek from 1970 to 2016 extracted from the Environment and Climate Change Canada Historical Hydrometric Data web site

(https://wateroffice.ec.gc.ca/mainmenu/historical_data_index_e.html) on 10 January 2019

(station 10TF001) as well as preliminary discharge data from 2018 provided by A. Pippy of

Environment Canada (Figure 4a). Peak discharge typically occurs in late June-early July and

mean annual discharge from 1970-2016 was $1.4 \pm 0.7 \times 10^8\ m^3$ (14 times the volume of the

model domain). Unfortunately, the river discharge meter malfunctioned in early 2018 and the

first discharge measurement for 2018 was made on 2 July 2018, slightly after the annual peak.

We used the average daily discharge from 1970 to 2016 in the model, which appeared very similar to the 2018 discharge data from 2 July onward (Figure 4a).

Calculation of the gas transfer velocity, k_{CH_4} requires estimates of wind speed and ice coverage. For wind speed, we used records from the Cambridge Bay airport for 2018 (station WMO71288, from Environment and Climate Change Canada data available at <http://climate.weather.gc.ca>).

To model the volume flux of ice and the fractional ice coverage, we used ice thickness records collected via an ice draft profiler (upward-facing sonar) installed on a cabled observatory at the Ocean Networks Canada (ONC) site in Cambridge Bay estuary (69.1133 °N, 105.060 °W, Figure 1a). Corrected ice draft data from 1 January to 31 December 2018 (sensor ID 21593, device ID 24049) was used (Figure S8). These records show that the ice above the ONC sensor was ~1.43 m thick on 10 June and following 10 June, the ice thickness steadily decreased until the water became ice-free between 7-10 July. Satellite true color (corrected reflectance) images collected with Terra MODIS and Aqua MODIS and accessed using the NASA Worldview application (<https://worldview.earthdata.nasa.gov/>) indicated that the majority of the estuary was ice-covered on 6 July that the estuary became entirely ice free between 7-9 July (Figure S7), and that the coastal ocean adjacent to the estuary became ice free around 25 July. We assumed that the model boxes closest to Freshwater Creek (Region 1, 1 km²) became ice free on 25 June (just prior to the beginning of the ChemYak measurement campaign), the remainder of the estuary (Region 2, 4 km²) became ice-free on 8 July, and the adjacent coastal ocean (Region 3, 60 km²) became ice-free on 20 July. Region 1 is approximately equivalent to the 1 km² region that was sampled with the ChemYak from 28 June-2 July. For Region 2, we used the modeled ice thickness record based on the ONC data. For Region 1 we shifted the modeled ice thickness record in time so the melt began 13 days earlier and the station became ice free 13 days earlier, and likewise the Region 3 modeled ice thickness record was shifted 12 days later.

At each time step, each box has either 100% ice cover or 0% ice cover. For 100% ice cover, we assume there is no gas exchange flux ($k_{CH_4} = 0$) (Butterworth & Miller, 2016), and for 0% ice cover, we use the gas exchange parameterization of Wanninkhof (2014) (Wanninkhof, 2014). The west arm is not included in the model domain because the sea ice melt pattern in the estuary suggests the dominant flowpath for river discharge is along the east arm and through the central estuary toward the coastal ocean (Figure 1). Increasing the Region 2 domain to include the west arm would increase the total CH₄ emissions from Cambridge Bay estuary.

The value of $[CH_4]_{riv}$ is modeled using a linear interpolation on the Freshwater Creek data to match the model time steps, and the initial $[CH_4]$ in each box in the estuary is assumed to be 6 nM (typical wintertime under-ice concentration). $[CH_4]_{eq}$ is calculated using the observed salinity and temperature at station B1 (interpolated to match the model time steps) and assuming an atmospheric CH₄ concentration of 1851 ppb (mean global value for June-July 2018). $[CH_4]_{ice}$ was not measured and is assumed to be 6 nM (the typical wintertime under-ice concentration). Because the total river discharge volume is 200 times greater than the ice melt volume ($V_{ice} = 7.1 \times 10^5 \text{ m}^3$ and $V_{riv} = 1.4 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^3$), the model results are relatively insensitive to the value of $[CH_4]_{ice}$. For example, using $[CH_4]_{ice} = 6 \text{ nM}$ the total annual CH₄ input from ice (cumulative F_{ice}) is 0.6 kg, and using $[CH_4]_{ice} = 100 \text{ nM}$ the cumulative F_{ice} is 10 kg, compared to the cumulative F_{riv} of 803 kg.

Microbial CH_4 oxidation is not included in the model, in order to determine whether a model driven by physical processes alone could simulate the observations. The potential impact of methane oxidation is discussed in the main manuscript.




Figure S1. N_2O time-series. N_2O concentration (a-b) and saturation (c-d) calculated using the in situ temperature and salinity and a dry atmospheric N_2O concentration of 329 ppb (Weiss & Price, 1980). Dashed line indicates atmospheric equilibrium. Samples were collected in Cambridge Bay harbour (station B1, blue and black lines) and Freshwater Creek (FWC, red line).




Figure S3. Calibration results for ChemYak greenhouse gas analyzer. Comparison of gas concentration measurements from discrete bottle samples and ChemYak observations. Raw measurements from the ChemYak greenhouse gas analyzer (GGA) are reported in ppm, and using simultaneous salinity and temperature measurements, we make a gas-unit conversion to molar and atmospheric quantities for comparison with bottle samples. To correct for incomplete gas extraction, we apply a gas extraction efficiency coefficient that is empirically determined by comparing ChemYak observations with paired bottle samples. In the plots above, ChemYak observations of CH₄ and CO₂ are calculated using an extraction efficiency of 5.09% ($r^2=0.842$) and 50.5% ($r^2 = 0.717$), respectively. ChemYak measurements are representative of the mean (location) and standard deviation (errorbar) of all data filtered by location (<50 m radius), depth (± 0.38 m), and day, as recorded for the bottle sample.




Figure S4. Depth versus value binned by distance from Freshwater Creek. To observe regional variation in CH₄, CO₂, salinity and temperature between the mouth of Freshwater Creek (0-500m) the embayment to the northeast, and the ice edge downstream to the southwest (>500 m), we bin the observations of the ChemYak by day (color), depth (0.25 m), and distance. Circles and lines represent the mean and standard deviation for each bin. The embayment water was generally warm and fresh, with uniformly low CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations in the three days it was observed (29 June, 1 July, and 2 July). Generally the stratification of the water column, as observed by salinity and temperature, became less pronounced as distance from the mouth of Freshwater Creek decreased, indicating more vertical mixing. Elevated CH₄ and CO₂ was evident below 2 m depth towards the ice edge on 30 June compared to other days, likely due to increased wind speeds.




Figure S5. Complete depth-distance plots. See Figure 2a for the map used to calculate distance from Freshwater Creek mouth. The data shown for 29 June and 2 July is equivalent to Figure 2 b-g.




Figure S6. ChemYak bar graphs. Bar graphs with error bars showing CH_4 , CO_2 , salinity, and temperature, colored by depth binned in 0.25 m intervals. Trend lines are added to show the average value of measurements in the surface layer (top 1 m), the pycnocline (1.5-2.5 m), and below the pycnocline (4-5 m). On 30 June, elevated wind briefly disturbed the pycnocline leading to vertical mixing, as evidenced by elevated CO_2 and CH_4 levels below the mixed layer, and elevated Salinity in the surface layer. Both CH_4 and CO_2 decreased substantially in the surface layer over the 5 day measurement period.




Figure S7. Model domain. Map showing model Model Regions 1, 2, and 3 (see Text S1). The satellite image was collected on 21 June 2017 and was obtained from Google, DigitalGlobe




Figure S8. Ice thickness and wind speed data. **a** Ocean Networks Canada ice thickness data (blue line) and modeled daily values (red circles) used to generate model shown in Figure 4. **b** Wind speed records from Cambridge Bay airport. The ChemYak sampling period is shown with a shaded gray bar.