

Application of in situ CO2 and CH4 concentrations measurements on-board UAV to monitor surface emissions on a grazed grassland, against ground-based Eddy Covariance

Jean-Louis Bonne, Delphine Combaz, Sami Omrane, Nicolas Dumelié, Jérémie Burgalat, Florian Parent, C Fléchard, Pauline Buysse, Yannick Fauvel, Lilian

Joly

▶ To cite this version:

Jean-Louis Bonne, Delphine Combaz, Sami Omrane, Nicolas Dumelié, Jérémie Burgalat, et al.. Application of in situ CO2 and CH4 concentrations measurements on-board UAV to monitor surface emissions on a grazed grassland, against ground-based Eddy Covariance. ICOS Science Conference 2024, Sep 2024, Versailles, France. . hal-04906885

HAL Id: hal-04906885 https://hal.science/hal-04906885v1

Submitted on 22 Jan 2025 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Application of in situ CO_2 and CH_4 concentrations measurements on-board UAV to monitor surface emissions on a grazed grassland, against ground-based Eddy Covariance

<u>Jean-Louis Bonne</u>^{Γ}, Delphine Combaz^{Γ}, Sami Omrane^{Γ}, Nicolas Dumelié^{Γ}, Jérémie Burgalat^{Γ}, Florian Parent^{Γ}, Christophe Flechard^{\forall}, Pauline Buysse^{\forall}, Yannick Fauvel^{\forall}, Lilian Joly^{Γ}

^{*T}GSMA UMR 7331, Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne, CNRS, Reims, France* ^{*V*}*INRAE, UMR SAS 1069, Institut Agro, Rennes, France* <u>jean-louis.bonne@univ-reims.fr, lilian.joly@univ-reims.fr</u></sup>

MATERIAL & METHODS

Field campaign

April 10th to 12th, 2024 20 flights / 4 hours flight time / 18.5 km distance 13 vertical profiles / 14 horizontal transects flights (3 upwind, 11 downwind)

Site

INRAE-IEPL dairy experimental farm in Mejusseaume NW, France ICOS / FR-Mej ecosystem station (associated), situated on an intensively managed grazed grassland by dairy cows : 90 livestock units (LU) during campaign

Instrumentation

Eddy covariance (EC)

Gill HS50 3-D ultrasonic anemometer at 1.5m: Wind and turbulence
LICOR-7200: CO₂ / H₂O mixing ratios at 20 Hz
MIRO MGA quantum cascade laser analyser : CH₄ mixing ratios at 10 Hz





A methodological campaign to develop new applications of UAV-based flux monitoring methods on a grazed grassland with CO₂ & CH₄ emissions, validated against Eddy Covariance



• Fluxes derived using the Eddypro software at 30 min and 10 min

UAV platform

- Drone DJI M300, recording attitude and position (RTK GPS)
- AUSEA open-path laser absorption spectrometer: in situ CO_2 and CH_4 at 200 Hz
- Trisonica-mini 2D ultrasonic anemometer: wind speed and direction





Wind measurements





Mass balance model

Developed and validated for point-source industrial emissions down to 0.01 g.s⁻¹ (*Bonne et al., 2024*)

<u>Flight path for wind and concentration measurements</u>: Within vertical plane downwind of the source, orthogonal to wind direction. Multiple horizontal transects at different elevations, covering an entire plume crosssection, up to the top of the plume.



CO₂/CH₄ concentrations during flight #3



Friction velocity

Merged ascending profiles, averaged at 10m resolution



	Friction velocity u	city u_{*} (m.s ⁻¹)	
	UAV	EC	
Morning 8:05 to 8:16 UTC	0.17 ± 0.04	0.18	
Afternoon 15:17 to 15:23 UTC	0.24 ± 0.13	0.23	

Vertical gradients

Mean gradients of concentrations, 8h05 to 8h16 UTC





$$Q = \int_{plane} C \cdot U dy dz$$

Q: source emissions flux (g.s⁻¹); C: concentration above background; U: wind speed (m.s⁻¹)

Vertical gradients method (application of *Bolek et al. 2024*) <u>Friction velocity</u> u_*

Apply logarithmic fit to mean wind speed profile $U(z) = a \ln(z) + b$ and derive friction velocity u_* (m.s⁻¹) from the fit slope, following theoretical profile:

$$\overline{U(z)} = \frac{u_*}{\kappa} \ln \frac{z}{z_0}$$
, $\kappa = 0.4$ (von Karman constant)

Vertical fluxes

Flux F (g.m⁻².s⁻¹) approximated as the product of the vertical gradient of GHG mole fractions (difference of mass concentrations χ_1 and χ_2 between elevations z_1 and z_2) and the eddy diffusivity K_{ed} (*Baldocchi et al., 1988*)

$$F = -K_{ed} \frac{\chi_1 - \chi_2}{z_1 - z_2}, \quad \chi = \frac{\overline{PMC}}{R\overline{T}}, \quad K_{ed} = \kappa u_* z_g, \quad z_g = \sqrt{z_1 \cdot z_2}$$



CO₂/CH₄ enhancement during flight #3 (left) / along a transect (right)

Flight #	2	3	4	5	6	7
Time	09:06	09:27	10:19	12:27	12:57	13:22
Transects heights (m)	2, 3	2, 3, 4	3, 4	2	2, 3, 4, 5	2, 3, 4
z _{max} (m)	5	5	5	15	15	15
$Q_{CH_4,UAV}$ (g.s ⁻¹)	0.34	0.26	0.17	0.10	0.16	0.38
$Q_{CO_2,UAV}(g.s^{-1})$	10.6	8.75	3.5	3.9	5.9	14.2

Plumes upper limits z_{max} manually defined from Gaussian hypotheses and distances to the source

Eddy Covariance: At 12:30, $F_{CH_4,EC} = 10.7 \ \mu \text{gCH}_4 \ \text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ For a density of 90 LU/23500 m² \rightarrow 2.8 e3 $\mu \text{gCH}_4 \ \text{LU}^{-1} \ \text{s}^{-1}$ \rightarrow Total herd emission $Q_{CH_4,EC} = 0.25 \ \text{g.s}^{-1}$



 \rightarrow Multiple plumes at 5 and 15 m elevations

→ Strong temporal variations of concentrations between profiles

- Fluxes from CO_2/CH_4 gradients between 2 and 4 m (z_g = 2.8 m)
- The dominant source of uncertainties for fluxes is the temporal variability of concentrations

		Period		
	Source	Morning 8:05 to 8:16 UTC	Afternoon 15:17 to 15:23 UTC	
F _{co2} (μgCO ₂ .m ⁻² .s ⁻¹)	UAV	-71 ± 535	-16 ± 160	
	EC (30 min)	167	-547	
- (UAV	1 ± 5	0.1 ± 3	
F _{CH4} (μgCH ₄ .m ⁻² .s ⁻¹)	EC (30 min)	0.04	4.4	
	EC (10 min)	0.04	-	

CONCLUSIONS & PERSPECTIVES

UAV measurements

- CO_2/CH_4 measurements suitable for this type of source
- Wind measurements validated against ground anemometer

Vertical gradients fluxes

• Not comparable with Eddy Covariance : method not appropriate to this type of source (unmixed plumes)

April 11th flights



Flight number 0 Flight number 1 Flight number 2 Flight number 3 Flight number 4 Flight number 5 Flight number 6 Flight number 7	Flight #	Take-off (UTC)	Distance to source center (m)	Flight type
Flight number 8	0	08:02	120	5 vertical profiles (1-120 m)
a second	1	08:34	-	Background round trips transects
A state of the second s	2	09:06	25	Round trips transects in plume*
	3	09:27	25	Round trips transects in plume*
	4	10:19	25	Round trips transects in plume*
bull 1	5	12:27	80	Round trips transects in plume*
	6	12:58	80	Round trips transects in plume*
X In	7	13:22	80	Round trips transects in plume*
light vortical profile pocitions	8	15:16	150	3 vertical profiles (1-120 m)

* Plumes upper limits not monitored due to high voltage electric line over the field

EXPECTED FLUXES

Eddy covariance results CH_4 flux close to zero before grazing and fluctuating around 20 μ gCH₄.m⁻².s⁻¹ during campaign



Emissions factors in the literature Average western European dairy cow: $\rightarrow 117 \text{ kg}_{CH_4} \text{ LU}^{-1}\text{yr}^{-1}$ (*Gavrilova et al.* 2019), combining all breeds, all phases (heifer & lactating) and all stages of lactation (peak to dry-off) $\Rightarrow 0.28 \text{ g.s}^{-1}$ for 90 LU

Lactating Holstein cows: \rightarrow 350 to 400 g_{CH₄} LU⁻¹day⁻¹ (Nadège Edouard, personal communication) \Rightarrow 0.36 to 0.42 g.s⁻¹ for 90 LU Friction velocity

• Good estimate compared to EC, giving confidence in method

Mass balance

- Standard protocol not applied due to technical issues
 - \rightarrow hypotheses on plumes upper limits, influencing fluxes results
- Quantifications for 6 flights, coherent between flights, with expected theoretical emissions and with Eddy Covariance

Financial support

Perspectives

- Footprint analysis to compare Eddy Covariance surface fluxes to mass balance emissions
- Apply vertical gradient method to large homogeneous surface sources such as peatlands (on-going analysis of campaigns)
- Alternative quantification methods where mass balance protocol not applicable: inversion with Gaussian, Lagrangian or CFD models

This research was partly supported by the French National Program (ANR) "Investment for Future—Excellency Equipment" project TERRA FORMA (reference ANR-21-ESRE-0014), aiming at developing new generations of environment sensors, conceiving sensors networks, and engage collectives to design new methods of sharing and appropriation of data by citizens and decision-makers. It is linked to WP2 (Design, prototype and test innovative sensors).

References

- Baldocchi, D. D., Hincks, B. B., and Meyers, T. P.: Measuring biosphere-atmosphere exchanges of biologically related gases with micrometeorological methods, Ecology, 69, 1331–1340, 1988.
- Bonne, J.-L., Donnat, L., Albora, G., Burgalat, J., Chauvin, N., Combaz, D., Cousin, J., Decarpenterie, T., Duclaux, O., Dumelié, N., Galas, N., Juery, C., Parent, F., Pineau, F.,
 Maunoury, A., Ventre, O., Bénassy, M.-F., and Joly, L.: A measurement system for CO₂ and CH₄ emissions quantification of industrial sites using a new in situ concentration sensor operated on board uncrewed aircraft vehicles, Atmos. Meas. Tech., 17, 4471–4491, https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-17-4471-2024, 2024.
- Bolek, A., Heimann, M., and Goeckede, M.: UAV Based In situ Measurements of CO₂ and CH₄ Fluxes over Complex Natural Ecosystems, Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss. [preprint], https://doi.org/10.5194/amt-2024-74, in review, 2024.
- Gavrilova, O., Leip, A., Dong, H., Macdonald, J., Gomez, C., Amon, B., Barahona Rosales, R., Agustin, Del Prado, A., Lima, M., Oyhantcabal, W., Weerden, T., Widiawati, Y., Bannink, A., Beauchemin, K., Clark, H., Leytem, A., Kebreab, E., Ngwabie, N., and Vellinga, T.: Emissions from livestock and manure management, in: 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories — IPCC, vol. 4: Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use, 2019.