ABSTRACT: Shipboard measurements of offshore oil and gas facilities were conducted in the Gulf of Mexico in February 2018. Species measured at 1 s include methane, ethane, carbon-13 (13C) and deuterium (D) isotopes of methane, and several combustion tracers. Significant variability in the emission composition is observed between individual sites, with typical ethane/methane ratios around 5.3% and 13C and D methane isotopic compositions around −40 and −240‰, respectively. Offshore plumes were spatially narrower than expectations of the plume width based on terrestrial atmospheric stability classes; a modified Gaussian dispersion methodology using empirically measured horizontal plume widths was used to estimate the emission rates. A total of 103 sites were studied, including shallow and deepwater offshore platforms and drillships. Methane emission rates range from 0 to 190 kg/h with 95% confidence limits estimated at a factor of 10. The observed distribution is skewed with the top two emitters accounting for 20% of the total methane emissions of all sampled sites. Despite the greater throughput of the deepwater facilities, they had moderate emission rates compared to shallow-water sites. Analysis of background ethane enhancements also suggests a source region in shallow waters. A complete 1 s measurement database is published for use in future studies of offshore dispersion.

INTRODUCTION

Offshore oil and gas methane emissions have not received the same attention from the measurement community as on-shore assets. The U.S. Energy Information Administration has projected that oil production in the Gulf of Mexico (federal areas) would account for approximately 16% of the total U.S. production in 2018 and 2019.1 Globally, offshore oil production accounted for around 30% of the overall production in 2015 and is increasing.2

Offshore production platforms are structures used to drill and service wells on the ocean floor. They may have compressors and some treatment equipment like separators, and often have equipment for use in workovers. A large variety of platform types are in operation,3 and equipment is also placed underwater.4 This includes wells marked by valve manifolds and flowlines (pipelines) connecting multiple wells to gathering manifolds. Umbilicals from surface platforms are needed to power, monitor, and control subsea equipment, and can include fluid lines for chemical injections. Underwater gathering flowlines ultimately converge at a riser, a section of pipeline that brings the produced fluids up to a surface facility. Offshore platforms are one example of such a surface facility, but extracted hydrocarbons (or “product”) can also be piped directly to the shore if wells are close enough, or up a riser to a floating production storage and offloading vessel (FPSO), which acts as a portable processing and storage plant. The resulting separated streams of product are then reinjected into subsea transmission pipelines or transported to the shore via a tanker.

Offshore platforms are thus not analogous to well pads on land. Their purpose and function are extremely varied, and they potentially occupy multiple spots in the offshore oil and gas supply chain. Historically, shallow-water reserves were easier to exploit, and these areas tend to have numerous fixed platforms and less equipment on the seabed. Deep-water plays are much more difficult and expensive to develop. They will leverage modern equipment and techniques, maximize the use of subsea equipment, and minimize the number of floating and semisubmersible platforms required. In 2015, deepwater production, at depths ≥125 m, accounted for 36% of the total US offshore production.5

A limited number of measurement campaigns have focused on the offshore sector. Two recent ship-based campaigns investigated North Sea platforms. Hensen et al. visited over 50
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platforms and included tracer release experiments at a subset of sites. Riddick et al. performed a dispersion analysis of eight platforms. Measurements along shipping routes in the offshore regions of Southeast Asia yielded methane emission rates for 14 methane plumes. Aircraft measurements in the Norwegian Sea have quantified emissions of NOx and aerosols, and flights over the North Sea observed a broad methane plume, partially attributed to offshore activity. Other emission estimates have used component-based measurements or inventory analysis. A large number of studies have examined hydrocarbon emissions from offshore emergency events: the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 and the Elgin platform gas leak in the UK North Sea in 2012. The Deepwater Horizon spill did not release significant amounts of methane into the atmosphere due to dissolution in the ocean. The Elgin gas leak, on the other hand, occurred at the platform itself, with substantial methane emission rates.

This paper presents shipboard measurements downwind of offshore oil and gas platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. Measurements were conducted off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana between February 12, 2018 and February 22, 2018. In situ measurements of methane, ethane, the isotopes of methane ($\delta^{13}C$ and $\delta^{18}O$), and several other combustion tracers were made. Gaussian inversion methods were used to estimate the methane emission rates at 103 offshore sites.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Equipment

A suite of meteorological and analytical equipment was installed aboard the Research Vessel Trident (RV Trident), owned and operated by the Texas A&M University at Galveston. Shipboard measurements were conducted during a two-week period between February 12, 2018 and February 22, 2018. The RV Trident was staffed 24 h a day by captains, deckhands, and scientists, and was capable of outings lasting as long as 36 h. The vessel was harbored in Galveston, Texas, and in Grand Isle, Louisiana, during the campaign. Measurements were conducted when weather conditions were forecast to be favorable for both sampling (winds >2 m/s) and sailing (<6 feet seas, at the captain’s discretion). All told, approximately 120 h were spent at sea during the 11-day and night measurement period, a duty cycle close to 50%.

Three tunable infrared laser direct absorption spectroscopy (TILDAS) trace-gas monitors from Aerodyne Research, Inc. were used for performing gas phase measurements of ambient air. A dual-laser TILDAS instrument equipped with a custom 400 m multipass absorption cell measured methane ($CH_4$) and its carbon and deuterium isotopes. Two single-laser mini-TILDAS instruments measured: (1) nitrous oxide, carbon monoxide, and water ($N_2O$, CO, and $H_2O$) and (2) ethane ($C_2H_6$) and redundant $CH_4$ and $H_2O$. The TILDAS instruments were operated with cell pressures between 30 and 50 Torr. A LI-COR 7000 analyzer was used to measure carbon dioxide ($CO_2$) and an Aerodyne cavity-attenuated phase-shift spectrometer (CAPS-NO2) for measuring nitrogen dioxide ($NO_2$).

A 10-m-long 1/2” Teflon inlet line was connected to the gas phase instrumentation in the vessel’s laboratory room and mounted partway up the vessel’s mast. The final height of the inlet tip was 10 m above the water. 7.8 standard liters per minute of air was drawn down the inlet through a particle filter and through the instruments with a scroll pump (Agilent TriScroll TM 600) for continuous sampling of outdoor air at ambient humidity levels. Every 15 min, clean air (ultra-zero air, hydrocarbon-free) was delivered in excess of the intake flow. These gas additions served to spectroscopically background the TILDAS instruments and to check zero values for the other instruments.

### Meteorological Conditions

Meteorological conditions and global positioning system (GPS)-based positions were measured near the base of the mast. A Hemisphere (V103) GPS Compass provided the GPS position, vessel heading, bearing, pitch, yaw, and roll. An RM Young 3D Anemometer (model 81000RE) was used to measure the wind at a 10 Hz data rate. The raw measured wind was corrected for vessel speed and orientation (including pitch, roll, and yaw) in near-real time using data from the GPS compass. The vessel itself was also equipped with navigational equipment, including access to NOAA navigational maps and radar. An ARISense monitor was mounted onto a railing near the base of the mast, which measured particulate matter size; insolation; and CO, NO, NO2, and ozone mixing ratios every 10 s.

Real-time data were logged and displayed on an analysis computer in the RV Trident’s laboratory space, and could be accessed remotely on a laptop from the vessel’s bridge. This live data access from the bridge was crucial in allowing collaboration between scientists and the ship’s captain on the downwind sampling strategy and on decisions to measure sites opportunistically along a pre-planned route. Notes were recorded on this same analysis computer, with particular effort taken to note the GPS coordinates of the measured sites and to flag periods of data showing enhancements above background (plumes). The research vessel exhaust was identified based on the wind direction and high concentrations of combustion species ($CO_2$, CO, and $NO_2$).

A 1 s measurement dataset is available for download. Data are presented in a comma-separated format, and are accompanied by a readme file (see Section S1 of the Supporting Information and 1 s Dataset supplemental file).

Calibrations for the mixing ratios of $CH_4$, $C_2H_6$, $N_2O$, and $CO$ were accomplished by precision blending ppm-level standards with a diluent, ultra-zero air. These calibrations were repeated two to three times over the course of the campaign (see Section S11). The instrument performance was assessed for $CO_2$ and $NO_2$ before and after the campaign. The methane isotope instrument was operated on an automated calibration schedule (7 min every 3 h) using dynamic dilutions of four high-concentration isotope standards mixed with ambient air. Details of this isotope calibration strategy are presented in Section S12. Keeling analysis was used to separate the signature of the source from that of the ambient background (see Section S13).

### Campaign Design

Offshore production data from well locations were analyzed prior to the measurement campaign in an effort to select sites representative of the offshore sector in the Gulf of Mexico (Section S3). Wellbore production data between July and November 2017 was used. Examination of these data shows a boundary between relatively low-producing sites closer to the shore and high-producing sites in deepwaters (Figure 1, dotted line): 19% of wells are south of the divide, but account for 67% of gas and 88% of liquid production (Table S2). Platform location data available from the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM, see Figure S2) reveal that only 3% of platforms are south of the divide.
A set of waypoints were chosen (Figure S3) to optimize the spatial coverage across the Gulf and across the two shallow/deep zones (dashed line in Figure 1). The locations of offshore platforms differ from the well locations (Figure 1, circle markers), and the density of platforms can be much lower, particularly in deeper waters. Platforms sampled were chosen based on their proximity to the waypoints and are shown in green in Figure 1. Additional fortuitous sites (blue) were added during the voyage based on their proximity to the transit route. A handful more sites were identified during the post-campaign analysis (red, generally along transit routes). The decision to add a site did not depend on whether or not emissions were observed.

Logistical considerations dictated deviations from the original sampling plan. Inclement weather (high seas, storms) prevented certain sorties and required that the return trip from Grand Isle to Galveston be close to shore for safety. Rarely, mechanical problems or insufficient wind speeds for sampling cut a sortie short.

The preferred sampling strategy (Section S4) at planned sites was to navigate a zig-zag path downwind of the chosen site, intercepting the emission plume at a range of distances (typically 1–10 km). In cases where potential interfering sites were present on maps and/or radar, an upwind pass of the selected site was also done. Congested areas with many nearby platforms, the presence of other nearby vessels, and large closest point of approach restrictions for deepwater drillships required simplified sampling schemes. Most of the fortuitous sites and all of the post-analysis sites were measured with a single pass, and occasionally repeated on different days (sites 114, 127, and 128; 2 days each).

**Emission Estimates.** Methane emissions from offshore sites were estimated as in previous studies using the standard Gaussian dispersion equation (Section S5). Horizontal ($\sigma_x$) and vertical ($\sigma_y$) dispersion parameters describe the extent of spread a plume undergoes as it is transported downwind. These parameters are typically looked up based on the Pasquill–Gifford stability classes. Traditionally, meteorological conditions such as wind speed, cloud cover, ceiling height, and insolation are used to define the stability class; the corresponding $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_y$ are then determined. The standard deviation of the wind can also be used to look up the stability class, as in the OTM-33A dispersion method. In the dataset shown here, both of these methodologies yield stability classes that are far too unstable (A–D) to match the width of the measured plumes. Indeed, studies of offshore dispersion find that very stable conditions are common. Hanna et al. supplemented the standard set of Pasquill–Gifford stability classes (A–F) with an additional extra-stable class, G, in their published offshore model. However, Hanna’s calculation of this extra-stable stability class requires knowledge of meteorological conditions that are not known for this campaign, such as the vertical air temperature gradient in the lowest 100 m. The published model itself was also designed with stationary hourly shore-based measurements in mind.

In order to account for the stable conditions encountered at sea, an empirical approach to estimate the stability class and dispersion parameters was developed. The research vessel transects the emission plume, directly measuring the degree of horizontal dispersion, $\sigma_x$. The inlet is at a fixed vertical height, and so the vertical dispersion $\sigma_y$ is not measured. However, with a known source location, the downwind distance $y$ is known. This allows for a reverse lookup of the stability class that comes closest to reproducing the observed horizontal $\sigma_x$ width. This empirical best-guess stability class is then used to determine the vertical dispersion, $\sigma_y$. In the final simulated result, a combination of the best-guess $\sigma_y$ and the measured $\sigma_x$ is used. Section S6 demonstrates Gaussian simulations using this methodology. Previous aircraft campaigns have also used the measured dispersion parameters for offshore dispersion calculations, though with the ability to measure both $\sigma_x$ and $\sigma_y$.

The average wind bearing measurement during a transect did not always accurately describe the observed direction of transport of the plume. This discrepancy is likely due to the breakdown of the constant wind direction assumption: plume meandering results in a difference between the average wind direction measured during the 2–3 min transect compared to the true transport direction in the 2–20 min timeframe between the period when emissions leave the platform and are intercepted by the vessel. In these cases, the wind bearing is allowed to float in order to reproduce the observed direction of plume transport.

Gaussian dispersion calculations were run on 290 individual time periods or “plumes” in order to produce the emission results presented here. The analysis strategy relies on quality metrics like the plume width and the $R^2$ between the simulated and measured time traces, as well as secondary tracers like ethane, CO, and CO$_2$. It is outlined in the flow chart in Section S7. Uncertainties in site assignment are discussed in the Results and Discussion section.

There is a high degree of uncertainty in these simulated emission magnitudes, stemming from a variety of factors. Land-based tracer-release studies of the Gaussian dispersion methodology (without using a measured $\sigma_y$) applied to mobile data found that the method itself has 95% confidence intervals of [0.33x, 3.34x] for an emission of magnitude $x$. This factor of 3.17 errors does not include any uncertainty in either the release height or the release location, both of which are present in this dataset. Furthermore, no field testing of the measured $\sigma_y$
methodology used here has been done at sea or otherwise. Clearly, field studies aimed at collecting tracer-release data for method validation are warranted. For this reason, factor-of-10 errors at 95% confidence (i.e., [0.1x, 10x]) are asserted on all dispersion results. For those sites with multiple downwind transects, the standard deviation of Gaussian quantifications is also reported (Section S2 and Site Averages supplemental file), as a means to assess any changes in site activity. The small standard deviations typically found in this study mean that uncertainty from plume-to-plume variability is unimportant when compared to the potentially large errors/biases stemming from the methodology itself.

In cases where no downwind methane enhancements were observed, the site was assigned a nominal emission magnitude of 0 kg/h and marked as "null" in the dataset. Since factor-of-10 errors on 0 are still zero, the error on these null sites is determined by running a Gaussian dispersion simulation on the baseline methane trace. The stability class is manually selected based on the results from previous or subsequent sites (usually, class F or E). The error in these cases is a function of the variability of the methane baseline downwind of the facility.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Offshore Platforms.** During this two-week campaign, 103 sites were measured. All except for 5 sites consist of a single platform structure or, rarely, a drillship. Five sites included multiple platform structures. The 103 sites include 62 sites that were targeted based on the original measurement plan and 41 fortuitous or opportunistic sites, when platforms were located on the way to the next waypoint. Thirty-seven sites had three or more replicate plume measurements and 46 had only one. Of the 103 sites, 75 had observed CH4 enhancements above background accompanied by C2H6; the remaining 28 had no such observed enhancements, and are termed "null" in the dataset. One of these "null" sites had observed C2H6 enhancements with no associated CH4.

There is a varying degree of uncertainty in the assignment of CH4 emissions (or lack thereof) to a given site location. The dataset flags 41 sites with location uncertainty. Location uncertainty is discussed in greater detail in subsequent paragraphs.

A dataset of site-average-estimated CH4 emission rates; site locations; and plume characteristics like C2H6/CH4 ratios, CO2/CO ratios, and isotopic signatures for δ13C-CH4 and δD-CH4 is available (Section S2 and Site Averages supplemental file). Ethane/methane ratios in these measurements span 0.16−17%, with the distribution peaking around 3.8% (Figure S2). The measured δ13C-CH4 isotope signatures span −72 to −15% and the distribution peaks around −40% (see Figure S18), as expected for fossil fuel sources with a typical composition of −56 to −26%. Only sparse data for δD-CH4 are available due to the difficulty in measuring this isotope and the sparsity of plumes with sufficient enhancements (>600 ppb CH4) to yield good results; δD data in this study span −314 to −186‰ with an average of −238‰. Typical fossil fuel sources are in the −250 to −150‰ range for δD.

Several interesting sites pop out when examining these plume characteristics. One site, ID 32, has a curiously low ethane/methane ratio of 0.16 (0.01)% (the value in parentheses corresponds to a 1σ error); a typical value for transmission-grade natural gas with low ethane content would be 1.5−2%. The associated isotope signatures are suggestive of microbial sources: δ13C = −71 (16)% and δD = −186 (115)%e. This site was in relatively shallow waters, off the coast of Louisiana, and had a large number of plume encounters (n = 20). The observed isotopic signatures are puzzling, since nearby sites had C2H6/CH4 ratios greater than 5% [ID 43 at 5.3 (0.5)%; ID 33 at 5.2 (0.2)%] and less negative isotope signatures. We also observed CO and CO2 concomitant with methane enhancements. Analysis of correlated CO and CO2 allows an estimate of the modified combustion efficiency (0.95). If we assume the combustion is due to flaring, the CO/CO2 data suggest that the flare was operating ~4.5 times less efficiently than the typical specification (0.99). One hypothesis is that emissions from this site are dominated by flaring emissions, and that ethane is selectively depleted through combustion. Another hypothesis is that this platform is accessing gas from a different geologic source than its neighbors with an unusual chemical signature, as is seen in certain unconventional reserves.

On the other hand, several sites had ethane/methane ratios that skewed higher: up to 17%. Such ethane/methane ratios are not unusual, and have been observed on land in regions producing larger amounts of oil and natural gas liquids, resulting in emissions richer in higher hydrocarbons. In general, ethane/methane ratios are higher in deeper waters.
and toward the east (Figure S22), though still with a fair degree of variation.

Though the precision in isotopic measurements is not as good as for laboratory mass-based methods typically used with extractive canister or bag samples, the spectroscopic measurements reported here have several unique advantages. First, isotopic quantification is done on the 1 s data stream, eliminating the need to collect and properly time the canister samples; all the collected data are candidates for isotopic analysis. Second, canister samples yield only a single data point, so that numerous samples are required to perform a Keeling analysis. Keeling plots (δ vs 1/CH₄, see Section S13, for several examples) are used to separate the signature of the source from that of the ambient background.²¹,²² Shipboard measurements also provide more time in the plume than analogous aircraft measurements would, which is fully leveraged in the Keeling analysis. Practically, canister sampling studies often lump together samples from many sites in order to accumulate enough data to identify an isotopic signature for a given source type. Here, each individual plume encounter yields a true Keeling plot, and assuming a sufficient dynamic range of CH₄ concentrations, an isotopic signature unique to that specific plume. As a result, variations in the isotopic signatures from site to site are resolved.

Figure 2 plots C₂H₆/CH₄ (top) and δD (bottom) versus δ¹³C-CH₄ for offshore sites. These figures show data that largely fall within the expected regions for thermogenic sources.³³,³⁶ The δ¹³C, δD, and C₂H₆/CH₄ source signatures are often used to interrogate the geologic formations at the source of emissions. For example, the C₂H₆/CH₄ ratio of natural gas tends to decrease and the δ¹³C isotopic signature becomes less negative (¹³C-enriched) with increasing thermal maturity of the reservoir.³⁶ Furthermore, no ethane will be present in bacterially formed methane,³⁵,³⁷ and the δD isotopic signatures provide an additional way to distinguish bacterial from thermogenic methane and to separate specific methanogenic pathways (carbonate reduction vs methyl-type fermentation). Though the measurements here span regions with rocks of varying geologic ages (generally younger closer to the shore and older further asea),³₈,³⁹ correlations are not readily visible in Figure 2 plots. However, when comparing this dataset to published gas compositions³³ in this region, we find good agreement for δ¹³C and C₂H₆/CH₄ in both range and variability. Discrepancies arise primarily due to differences in sampled areas, with this dataset measuring more sites in deep offshore waters south of Louisiana, and fewer sites far from shore south of the Texas/Louisiana border (Figures S19 and S22). Previously published data in this region are lacking for δD.³³

The uncertainty in the source isotopic signatures shown in Figure 2 is determined from propagating the error in the standard deviation of the Keeling intercept for each replicate plume measurement. This Keeling intercept uncertainty (typical value of 8‰ for δ¹³C, for example) decreases with the CH₄ dynamic range during a plume, and in this dataset, it is usually much greater than the instrumental performance on the 1 s data stream (typical 1 s 1σ value for δ¹³C of 0.5‰ stationary or 2‰ while in motion, see Figure S12). δD measurements are more challenging than δ¹³C measurements due to the spectroscopy and abundance of CH₃D in the sampled air (typical Keeling intercept uncertainty of 50‰; 1 s 1σ performance of 18‰ stationary and 62‰ in motion, see Figure S12). For this reason, higher plume concentration enhancements were required for δD quantification (see Sections S12 and S13), and fewer data points are reported.

The estimated CH₄ emission magnitudes, in kg/h, are shown in Figure 3. Null sites are assigned a nominal emission magnitude of 0, and are shown in pale pink or blue. The median emission magnitude is 5.3 kg/h with an average of 17
kg/h and a maximum of 185 kg/h. This distribution is highly skewed: the top 2% of sites account for 20% of the total emissions. Plotting the distribution of emitters on a logarithmic scale better shows the variability in emission magnitudes (Figure 3, bottom). This distribution spans over three orders of magnitude, peaking at 13 kg/h. The distribution is similar if restricted to only sites with three or more replicates (Section S8).

Two recent measurement campaigns, both in the North Sea, have significantly expanded the available emission data for offshore platforms. Riddick et al. reported median emissions of 24.5 kg/h from five platforms in the UK, with a maximum emission of 80 kg/h.\(^5\) Hensen et al. reported emissions from 37 platforms on the Netherlands side, with median emissions of 6.12 kg/h and a maximum value of 151 kg/h.\(^7\) Hensen et al. also performed tracer-release experiments on a subset of sites for validation purposes. Both of these datasets fall within the range of emissions reported here (median: 5.3 kg/h and maximum: 185 kg/h). In the study by Hensen et al., there were enough sites to construct a distribution of emitters. Their distribution was slightly broader, and peaks were observed at lower emission rates (3 kg/h vs 17 kg/h here, see Figure S23). They measured just one site with emissions <0.1 kg/h, whereas we found more than 25 such sites.

One other study looks at methane emissions from platforms in the Gulf of Mexico. Bylin et al. reported methane emissions of 224 kg/h per platform, as calculated from equipment counts and activity data.\(^3\) This is substantially higher than the median emission magnitude estimated in this study (median: 5.3 kg/h) and exceeds the maximum emission of 185 kg/h. However, there are potential differences in the platform populations investigated. Bylin et al. measured 15 operational platforms chosen to represent the size of platforms producing in deepwater areas of the Gulf. Ten of these had wet seal centrifugal compressors, the largest of the sources of emissions tabulated. In contrast, our study measured 103 sites, only 75 of which had detected methane enhancements downwind. Our sample contains numerous shallow-water sites, and included sites that were no longer producing. While we have no tabulated list of equipment, anecdotal there was a large diversity in the platform size and associated equipment.

In order to put emission magnitudes into context, it would be useful to know the amount of product handled by a given offshore platform. Offshore operators are responsible for reporting production data to BOEM (Section S17). However, at the time of writing, production data were reported only for wells, and the databases did not provide any generalized way to associate a given well to a platform. Adding to the complexity of this issue, platforms may serve a great variety of functions in the offshore landscape, and it is possible that some of the throughput they manage is associated with gases or liquids that never come to the surface. We note that a dataset hosted on the website of the department of the interior was found via a web search, and lists gas and oil production data associated with individual platforms;\(^40\) however, this database is not accessible via any website link, and has no associated description or metadata. Collaboration and data sharing with database managers and industry stakeholders will thus be beneficial to future studies.

Other types of assets in the offshore industry are not considered here and warrant future study. Notably, no FPSOs were measured. These vessels act as portable processing and storage plants, and can even perform some subsea main-tenance. They can be used as an alternative to a permanent platform in some areas. Tankers and coastal transfer stations also warrant study, particularly the transfer locations where product finally enters the land supply chain.

Uncertainties in Emission Estimates. Source height is a particularly uncertain parameter in this dataset—and of critical importance for Gaussian dispersion methodology. At only 26% of sites were we able to find site lease planning documents showing a platform height above the water for use in simulations (main deck heights are between 7 and 30 m, with the average of 15.24 m used for all other sites). Furthermore, the true height of an emission is likely different from the platform height, depending on its exact source vector. Underestimating heights of the simulated sources will lead to underestimation of their emissions. For representative meteorological conditions, assuming a 15 m source height, emissions could be overestimated by 9% if the source was actually at 7 m, or underestimated by 37% if the source was actually at 30 m (Section S9 and Figure S9). In comparison, the underestimation in emissions due to plume rise would be 7% if the source were a normally operating flare (see Figure S9).

The simple Gaussian model does not include the impact of emissions being reflected beneath a low marine boundary layer. For this dataset, we estimate boundary layer heights around 500–800 m based on an examination of vertical structure data from the 2006 TexAQS campaign.\(^41\) At these boundary layer heights, the impact of including the reflection terms is negligible (Figure S10). Those terms become important only for extremely low boundary layer heights: emissions will be overestimated by a factor of 2.5 for a 20 m boundary layer at a typical site measured at a 10 km distance. Another important factor to consider is the possibility of emissions being emitted above a very low marine boundary layer. If emissions are released above this layer, they are unlikely to mix down and be observed by the measurement vessel; these sites will have undetected or underestimated emissions. Measurements were aborted when winds ceased, and so this is unlikely to be a significant problem in this dataset.

Another compounding source of error in this dataset is the uncertainty in the distance between the vessel and the site (i.e., the exact site location because the vessel’s position is continuously logged). This location uncertainty includes inaccuracies or data gaps in the reported positions of sites in the BOEM platform database\(^34\) or NOAA navigational charts. More importantly though, it includes errors in identifying which site of multiple candidates was responsible for a given plume. Measurements at most planned sites (Figure 1) were assigned without much ambiguity. Ambiguities or uncertainties in site assignment were more common in congested areas, where the vessel’s sampling path was restricted, and for fortuitous or post-analysis sites (Figure 1). In all cases, the analysis (Section S7) leveraged information like other trace gases, plume widths, and wind data to identify reasonable site locations, discounting data that were too ambiguous. The dataset of site-average results (Section S2 and GulfSite Averages file) includes a “location uncertainty” column, indicating whether site assignment was certain or ambiguous.

Ultimately, the factor-of-10 error bars asserted here for Gaussian dispersion results are meant to encompass the uncertainties in input parameters like height (factor-of-0.5 for the above example) and location, as well as more fundamental uncertainties related to Gaussian dispersion (factor-of-3.17, see
the Materials and Methods section) and to the empirical methodology used to account for the extra stable conditions encountered in this study. In many cases, replicate downwind transects were done for a site. These replicate measurements showed variability in the Gaussian plume emission determination smaller or much smaller than a factor of 10 or even 3. This further highlights the fact that the error in these estimates is dominated by systematic or methodological errors, and not variability in the underlying measured data.

**Background Concentrations.** While previous sections have focused on plume enhancements originating from offshore facilities, significant variations in offshore ethane background values were also observed. From a typical background level of 2 ppb, background ethane mixing ratios varied by factors ranging from a half to a seven-fold increase. In order to understand whether these observed enhancements in ethane were due to either a continental outflow, or a flow from shallow or deepwater offshore regions, surface-level sampling footprints were calculated using Hysplit.42–45 The details of the calculation parameters used are reported in Section S16. The model was used to create a sampling contour arriving at the research vessel for each 10 min period. The background signals of ethane and methane (all plumes removed) were apportioned onto the sampling footprint, and geographically averaged for the whole measurement campaign.

Figure 4 depicts the result of this footprint analysis. The average campaign footprint (white/cyan contour lines, Figure 4) indicates that the project overwhelmingly sampled air that, in the prior 12 h, was present in the marine boundary layer of the Gulf waters. The background ethane signal mapped onto this footprint (pink color map, Figure 4) reveals several periods of elevated concentrations. An analogous figure showing methane background footprints is shown in Figure S25. High mixing ratios of ethane were measured during the brief period when the RV Trident sampled continental air from the Texas/Louisiana border. This is not surprising, as this part of the country is home to the Haynesville oil and gas play.

More interestingly, the waters south-west of Grand Isle also exhibit elevated mixing ratios of ethane, suggesting a distributed source in the shallow Gulf waters. Offshore natural seeps could be one such distributed source. Hu et al. sailed to deepwater areas in the Gulf of Mexico, and suggested that the impact of such emissions on atmospheric methane is not significant.46 Still, their light hydrocarbon measurements in the atmosphere and water column suggest at least some contribution from deepwater hydrocarbon seeps. Pioso et al. reported aircraft measurements west of Svalbard, an area with known methane clathrates.47 They found that these areas did not significantly influence atmospheric methane concentrations, and calculated an upper limit on methane fluxes from the region. Bacterial sources of methane in shallow shelf areas have been shown to have an impact on atmospheric methane.48

However, neither clathrates nor bacterial sources would be associated with ethane. Thus, while it is possible that a natural seep is present in the shallow region with higher levels of ethane, it is also possible that the numerous offshore oil and gas facilities in shallow waters are effectively acting as a distributed source through their emissions.
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