Dissolved Methane and Carbon Dioxide Fluxes in Subarctic and Arctic Regions: Assessing Measurement Techniques and Spatial Gradients

Fenix Garcia-Tigreros Kodovska^{1*}, Katy J. Sparrow¹, Shari A. Yvon-Lewis², Adina Paytan³, Natasha T. Dimova⁴, Alanna Lecher³, John D. Kessler¹

Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY 14627 USA¹; Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843 USA²; Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064 USA³, Department of Geological Sciences, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 USA⁴

*Corresponding author e-mail: fenix.garciatigreros@rochester.edu

Abstract

Here we use a portable method to obtain high spatial resolution measurements of concentrations and calculate diffusive water-to-air fluxes of CH₄ and CO₂ from two subarctic coastal regions (Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays) and an Arctic lake (Toolik Lake). The goals of this study are to determine distributions of these concentrations and fluxes to (1) critically evaluate the established protocols of collecting discrete water samples for these determinations, and to (2) provide a first-order extrapolation of the regional impacts of these diffusive atmospheric fluxes. Our measurements show that these environments are highly heterogeneous. Areas with the highest dissolved CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations were isolated, covering less than 21% of the total lake and bay areas, and significant errors can be introduced if the collection of discrete water samples does not adequately characterize these spatial distributions. A first order extrapolation of diffusive fluxes to all arctic regions with similar characteristics as Toolik Lake suggests that these lakes are likely supplying 0.21 and 15.77 Tg of CH₄ and CO₂ to the atmosphere annually, respectively. Similarly, we found that the Subarctic Coastal Ocean is likely supplying 0.027 Tg of CH₄ annually and is taking up roughly 524 Tg of CO₂ per year. Although diffusive fluxes at

Toolik Lake may not be as substantial when comparing against present seep ebullition and spring ice-out values, warming in the Arctic may result in the increase of methane discharge and methane emissions to the atmosphere. Thus further work is needed to understand this changing environment. This study suggests that high spatial resolution measurement protocols, similar to the one used here, should be incorporated into field campaigns to reduce regional uncertainty and refine global emission estimates.

Introduction

Numerous terrestrial and marine high latitude ecosystems harbor large reservoirs of carbon. Arctic permafrost soils, for example, are estimated to hold approximately 14% of the world's soil organic carbon (Zimov et al., 2006). The rise of surface air and seawater temperatures in response to both natural and anthropogenic climate change has been almost twice as large in high latitude regions (Arctic and subarctic) compared to the global average, a feature known as Arctic Amplification (Serreze and Francis, 2006). Temperature increases will enhance thawing, liberation, transport, and/or transformation of this carbon, thereby modulating global carbon cycles and the budgets of greenhouse gases, primarily carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) (e.g., (Christensen et al., 2004; Zimov et al., 2006)).

Several recent investigations have measured or modeled substantial CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes from Arctic and subarctic regions highlighting the diverse nature of the fluxes, carbon source, and biogeochemical processes governing the release (e.g., Damm et al. (2008); Kessler et al. (2008), Ruppel (2011); Schuur et al. (2013); Shakhova et al. (2010); Walter Anthony et al. (2012)). For example, ubiquitous fluxes of CO₂ and CH₄ could be found due to the decomposition of organic matter in marine and lake sediments or from permafrost thaw (e.g.,

Wickland et al. (2006); Zimov et al. (1997)). However, point sources have been associated with hydrocarbon seeps, methane clathrate decomposition, and groundwater discharge (e.g., Kling et al. (1991); (Paytan et al., 2015); Ruppel (2011); Shakhova et al. (2010); Walter Anthony et al. (2012)). While greenhouse gas fluxes associated with ebullition and spring thaw have been shown to be significant sources to the atmosphere (e.g., Walter Anthony et al. (2012); Phelps et al. (1998)), they likely represent smaller areas (point source emissions) or short-term fluxes. Diffusive fluxes of CO₂ and CH₄, while conventionally viewed as being a fraction of the ebullition and spring-thaw flux, cover a much larger area and occur over the entire ice-free season. However, due to technological limitations and the relatively inaccessible nature of most arctic and subarctic aquatic environments, fundamental uncertainties exist in the diffusive CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes to the atmosphere. For example, due to the relatively inaccessible nature of these environments, the standard protocol for sampling the dissolved concentrations of CO₂ and CH₄ in surface waters is to collect discrete samples (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2007). This practice assumes that either the region is homogeneous or that the sampling adequately captures the average and the distribution of concentrations found in that environment. However, recent discoveries of significant greenhouse gas fluxes associated with seepage (Walter Anthony et al., (2012)) and groundwater discharge (Kling et al. (1991); Paytan et al. (2015)) suggest a more heterogeneous distribution of surface water CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations and thus diffusive fluxes that may be irregularly distributed around an aquatic environment; groundwater inputs would display elevated concentrations around the perimeter while seepage would input high concentrations of these gases at the location of these features. Understanding the distribution and magnitude of these fluxes is vital to accurately extrapolate fluxes from local

to regional to global scales and improve estimates of atmospheric greenhouse gas budgets (Ciais et al., 2013).

In this article, we investigate the spatiotemporal distributions and diffusive fluxes of CO₂ and CH₄ in two diverse environments in Alaska: an Arctic lake (Toolik Lake) and a subarctic coastal region (Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays). Toolik Lake (68°37'36" N, 149°35'56" W) represents a terrestrial Arctic lake overtopping continuous permafrost with recognized groundwater inputs (Dimova et al., 2015; Kling et al., 1991; Paytan et al., 2015). Kasitsna Bay (59° 28'07"N, 151° 33'11"W) and Jakolof Bay (59° 26'49"N, 151° 30'37"W) represent a marine subarctic region with sporadic permafrost, where methane sources may originate from marine or terrestrial sources (Lecher et al., 2015). Collectively, these environments represent Arctic and subarctic regions with the potential for both ubiquitous and point source emissions of CO₂ and CH₄.

We used a new portable method to continuously measure CO₂ and CH₄ concentrations in surface waters as well as the atmosphere at a rate of approximately 1 Hz. This technique was recently used successfully on a research vessel (Du et al. 2014) and is applied here on jon boats (Toolik Lake) and small recreational fishing vessels (Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays). The goal of this research is to provide high-resolution spatial distributions of the water-to-air fluxes of CO₂ and CH₄ from two regionally contrasting sites so that that (1) future field measurement campaigns can be designed to adequately capture the true greenhouse dynamics of these systems, (2) to provide an estimate of the errors introduced in regional emissions of CO₂ and CH₄ if extrapolations are performed ignoring spatial gradients of diffusive fluxes, and (3) to obtain first order water to air fluxes from these systems. Nearly homogenous distributions of dissolved surface water concentrations of these greenhouse gases would imply that gas concentrations in

surface waters and fluxes to the atmosphere could be measured with a simple sampling strategy where discrete water samples are collected in vials at a limited number of sites; this simplified sampling strategy would be both welcomed and appreciated when working in these often inaccessible and logistically challenging environments. However, highly heterogeneous and irregular distributions would suggest that higher resolution and more experimentally complex measurement systems would be necessary, such as used here and elsewhere (e.g., Du et al. (2014); Gülzow et al. (2011)).

The emission of CO₂ and CH₄ from thawing permafrost may become significant in the 21st century under naturally and anthropogenically driven climate change. These regions may serve as gas conduits for the transport of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere and exert a positive feedback on climate (Kling et al., 1991; Paytan et al., 2015; Shakhova et al., 2010; Walter et al., 2006), however, the magnitude of these emissions is still uncertain (Ciais et al., 2013). More intense sampling of Arctic lakes and high-latitude coastal areas is essential to accurately capture the distributions of the CO₂ and CH₄ dissolved in surface waters as well as to accurately determine fluxes, constrain global influences on atmospheric budgets, and predict climate changes.

Study Areas

Methane and CO₂ emissions from an Arctic lake (Toolik Lake) and from two subarctic coastal environments (Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays) in Alaska were investigated (Figure 1). Toolik Lake was surveyed two consecutive summers (16 August 2011 and 24 - 25 July 2012), while Jakolof Bay was surveyed on 23 August 2011, and Kasitsna Bay on 19 - 20 July 2012. These two regions were selected for this study because of their contrasting sources of CH₄ and CO₂. Toolik

Lake (68°38'00" N, 149°36'15" W) is a multiple basin kettle lake located on the North Slope of Alaska with continuous permafrost underlining the entire lake's watershed. Toolik Lake has a surface area of 1.32 km², an average depth of 7 m, and a maximum depth of 25 m (O'Brien et al., 1997). The main inlet to the lake enters from the south and provides 71% of the total water flow to the lake (O'Brien et al. 1997). A secondary inlet provides 9% of the water, and the remainder of the flow is accounted by ephemeral streams (O'Brien et al., 1997). Toolik Lake is oligotrophic (Whalen and Alexander, 1986) and characterized by CO₂ and CH₄ supersaturation (Kling et al., 1991). The excess of CO₂ and CH₄ has been linked to groundwater transport of dissolved carbon from the tundra (Kling et al., 1991; Paytan et al., 2015).

Kasitsna Bay (59°28'34" N, 151°33'31" W) and Jakolof Bay (59° 26'49"N, 151° 30'37"W) are located in the Kenai Peninsula in southern Alaska. Unlike Toolik Lake, watersheds around Kasitsna and Jakolof Bay are generally free of permafrost (Miller and Whitehead, 1999). These bays receive freshwater inputs from rivers draining a large portion of the Kenai Peninsula watershed and from glacial melting (Griffiths et al., 1982). An additional source of methane to these bays could be methane produced from the coal bearing deposits known to exist in the Kenai Peninsula (Flores and Strieker, 1993). This methane could be transported to coastal waters through groundwater (Dimova et al., 2015; Lecher et al., 2015). Large seasonal fluctuations in primary productivity and respiration have been observed for this region (Griffiths et al., 1982). Primary productivity and respiration are low in January and start to increase at the end of April, reaching a maximum in June and July. No previous studies on the CH₄ and CO₂ dynamics of this region have been published. Altogether, Toolik Lake, Kasitsna Bay, and Jakolof Bay represent Arctic and subarctic environments with different geology and hydrology characteristics and possibly distinct sources of CH₄ and CO₂.

Methods

Equipment

The partial pressures of dissolved and atmospheric CH₄ and CO₂ were continuously measured using a portable pCH₄-pCO₂ system similar to that described previously (Du et al. (2014) and references therein) however with a few slight modifications. A schematic of the system is shown in the supplemental material (Figure S1). Surface water is drawn from an intake at approximately 0.5 m depth and distributed through a manifold to both a sonde measuring water temperature and salinity (YSI 600R-series sonde) and two Weiss-type equilibrators (Johnson, 1999). Under normal operation, the equilibrator has a sample stream flow rate of 4 to 6 L min⁻¹ and a headspace volume of 0.54 L. Surface water flows continuously into the equilibrators through hollow cone nozzles producing a fine spray of water and expediting the rate of equilibration between the dissolved and gaseous phases of CH₄ and CO₂. The headspace inside the primary equilibrator is maintained at ambient pressure by a vent connected to a secondary equilibrator. The role of the secondary equilibrator is to prevent any gas exchange with ambient air; while the rate of gas loss from the main equilibrator was measured and determined to be minimal, the secondary equilibrator serves to supply pre-equilibrated headspace gas to the main equilibrator in the event of any gas loss. Atmospheric air is continuously pumped through a 0.63-cm ID SynFlex tube mounted to the front of the boat to avoid contamination by exhaust gases. Atmospheric air and gas from the equilibrator headspace are pumped through water vapor condensers and Nafion dryers to remove water moisture, and then are alternately analyzed using a Cavity Ring-Down Spectrometer (CRDS) (Picarro Inc, G1301). The analysis routine used here was ~120 min continuous measurement of the equilibrator headspace followed by 10 min continuous measurement of bow air samples. The CRDS was calibrated daily in the

field using four different reference gas standards obtained from Scott Specialty and Air Liquide (1.27, 2.06, 242, and 995 ppm for CH₄ and 382, 490, 1485, and 2219 ppm for CO₂).

Calculating Diffusive Fluxes

The net water-to-air fluxes (F) were calculated as:

$$F = k \cdot \alpha \cdot (p_{\text{sw}} - p_{\text{atm}}) \quad (1)$$

where k (m d⁻¹) is the gas transfer velocity, and α is the solubility of CH₄ or CO₂ in water calculated from surface water temperature and salinity (Weiss, 1974; Wiesenburg and Guinasso, 1979). p_{sw} is the equilibrium partial pressure of the gas in the surface water determined in the equilibrator headspace, and p_{atm} is the partial pressure of the gas in the atmosphere measured from the bow air.

The gas transfer velocity for the coastal ocean was calculated using the parameterization from Sweeney et al. (2007) since it is an improvement over the typical Wanninkhof (1992) equation:

$$K_w = 0.27 (U_{10}^2) (Sc/660)^{-0.5} \quad (2)$$

k is estimated as a function of the Schmidt number (Sc) and wind speed (U) at a reference height of 10 m. The Schmidt number is a dimensionless number and is calculated using third-order polynomial fits as described by Wanninkhof (1992). The gas transfer velocity for Toolik Lake was calculated according to Cole et al. (2010) which used four methods for estimating k in a series of small lakes. With the exception of Toolik Lake 2011, wind speeds were continuously measured during the survey at ~3 m above the water surface using an Airmar[®] weather station mounted to the ship. Wind speeds for Toolik Lake 2011 were taken from the weather monitoring station at Toolik Field Station. Wind speed was corrected to 10 m to match the reference height as describe by Erickson (1993).

182 *Equilibrator concentration correction*

183 Even though the CRDS collects data at a rate of about 1 Hz, the time needed for a gas in
 184 the headspace of the equilibrator to reach equilibrium with the incoming water is different for
 185 gases with different solubility. To describe the gaseous exchange process between the headspace
 186 and incoming water, the measured headspace gas concentration, C_e , at time, t , is expressed
 187 following the equation published by Johnson (1999):

$$C_e = \left(C_i - \frac{C_w}{\alpha} \right) e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\tau}\right)} + \frac{C_w}{\alpha} \quad (3)$$

188 where C_i is the initial gas concentration that is not at equilibrium, C_w is the gas concentration of
 189 the trace gas in the incoming water at equilibrium, and τ is the equilibrator response time which
 190 describes the time interval in which the gas phase in the equilibrator declines or increases
 191 exponentially to $1/e$ (36.8%) with respect to its starting value. τ was experimentally evaluated in
 192 the lab following the procedures used by Johnson (1999). This experiment involved two steps. In
 193 the first step, the equilibrator was thrown into disequilibrium by rapidly flushing (5 L min^{-1}) into
 194 the headspace of the equilibrator a gas containing known concentrations of CH_4 and CO_2 . In the
 195 second step, the flushing was terminated and the headspace was allowed to return to equilibrium.
 196 The response time was calculated by fitting the measured response to an exponential function
 197 and by rearranging equation (3):

$$\tau = - \frac{t}{\ln \left[\frac{\left(C_e - \frac{C_w}{\alpha} \right)}{\left(C_i - \frac{C_w}{\alpha} \right)} \right]} \quad (4)$$

198 This experiment was repeated six times using water with different temperatures to assess
 199 the effect of solubility on τ (16, 31, and 45 °C) and by using gas standards from a range of

concentrations (0, 1.7, 249, and 999 ppm of CH₄ and 0, 365, 1513 and 2248 ppm of CO₂). The response times when going from both high to low concentration waters and vice versa were simulated.

The mean equilibrator response time for methane was determined to be $\tau = 4.53$ min for the exponential decay process (when simulating movement from high concentration waters to low concentration waters), and $\tau = 2.51$ min in the scenario of increasing concentration (simulating movement from low concentration waters to high concentration waters; refer to Figure S2). Previous studies have reported τ values between 11 and 12 min for CH₄ (Gülzow et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2012). The faster equilibrator response time in this study may be associated with the headspace volume, headspace analysis technique, water flow rate, or the type of spray nozzle that was used. Instead of using a nozzle, Gülzow et al. (2011) flowed seawater at 0.5 L min⁻¹ into a 0.07 L headspace and then circulated the headspace air through a glass frit in the water to produce bubbles and decrease the equilibration time. The τ values provided by Hu et al. (2012) are theoretically and are for an equilibrator with a 19 L headspace volume that was fitted with a showerhead and flow rates of 13-20 L min⁻¹.

Equation (3) is only applicable when the equilibrator vent flow is zero, i.e. when no ambient air is entering the equilibrator. Venting rates of ambient air into the equilibrator headspace were measured to be zero, indicating that no air was removed from the headspace. Furthermore, the use of a secondary equilibrator further ensures that no ambient air was entering the equilibrator. After τ was determined, equation (3) was rearranged and solved for C_w :

$$C_w = \frac{\alpha \left(C_e - C_i e^{-\left(\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}\right)} \right)}{1 - e^{-\left(\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}\right)}} \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta t (t_{C_i} - t_{C_e})$ is the time difference between measurements assuming the dissolved gas concentration (C_w) is constant during Δt . This is a reasonable assumption since our boat speed did not exceed 1.5 m s^{-1} . τ is the measured equilibrator response time calculated using equation (4), C_i is the initial gas concentration that is not at equilibrium averaged over 1 minute, and C_e is the next headspace gas concentration measured at time t_{C_e} averaged over 1 minute. Equation (5) was used to translate the measured headspace concentrations (C_e and C_i) into the true dissolved gas concentration (C_w). This conversion was applied to the measured headspace from controlled laboratory calibrations and the data was averaged over 20, 60, and 100 second intervals. The 60 second average yielded the lowest errors and for this reason all the parameters were averaged over 1 minute (Fig. S2).

The equilibrator response to changing CO_2 concentrations in seawater is known to be quick (approximately 2 min for the exponential decay process (Pierrot et al., 2009)). The equilibrator's response time for CO_2 from Pierrot et al. (2009) is about 2.3 times faster than those determined for CH_4 in this study and 6 times faster than the time reported for CH_4 in previous studies (Gülzow et al., 2011; Hu et al., 2012). Because of the faster equilibrator response time of CO_2 , no concentration correction was applied to the CO_2 data.

The uncertainty associated with the CRDS was calculated to be less than 1.6% ($\pm 0.84 \text{ ppm}$) based on least squares analyses with the standard gases. The uncertainty in calculating C_w was determined using data collected from the laboratory experiment measuring response times. The data corrected using equation (5) was compared to the true known value after the system was allowed to reach steady-state:

$$\text{Percent error} = \frac{|\text{corrected data} - \text{true value}|}{\text{true value}} \cdot 100 \quad (6)$$

The true value was defined as the point where the equilibrator headspace had reached equilibrium (i.e., where concentration plateaus). As depicted in Figure S2, the largest errors occur when gas concentration in the water changes and the decaying/increasing trend begins. However, within 9 minutes this error is reduced to less than 30% for the exponential decay process and to less than 2% within 3 minutes when the concentration is increasing. When comparing to uncorrected data, it takes 14 minutes for the error to be reduced to less than 30% for the exponential decay process and 16 minutes must elapse for the error to be reduced to less than 2% when the concentration is increasing. These results show that the data is significantly improved when using equation (5) to the correct data; however the remaining uncertainty is not negligible (Figure S2).

Despite the high sampling resolution of this experimental design (ca. 1 Hz.), full-lake/bay coverage can only be achieved with interpolation. Several different interpolation methods were evaluated for accuracy and precision in terms of the mean error:

$$\text{ME} = \text{mean}(\text{true value} - \text{interpolated value}) \quad (7)$$

and the root-mean square error:

$$\text{RMSE} = \sqrt[2]{\text{mean}[(\text{true value} - \text{interpolated value})^2]} \quad (8)$$

A boot-strapping assessment was performed using random sub-sampling validation. Roughly 2/3 of the measured data points were randomly selected and used for the actual interpolation while the remaining 1/3 were used for the error estimation. The procedure was repeated 1000 times with a new set of random samples selected each time to cross-validate the results. The obtained errors for 5 different interpolation techniques are shown in Table S1. While all five

interpolation techniques were precise, the natural neighbor interpolation method yielded the most accurate values and thus was selected. The cubic interpolation technique showed to be inappropriate due to its high sensitivity to outliers.

Results

The results presented here are from detailed surveys and continuous measurements at each studied area. Since groundwater discharge has been shown to be a substantial point source of dissolved CO₂ and CH₄ to Toolik Lake (Kling et al., 1991; Paytan et al., 2015), the surface surveys focused on the littoral areas to quantify the spatial distribution of these hot spots as well as the center of the lake. In Toolik Lake, dissolved CH₄ concentrations ranged from 5 to 362 nM with mean water concentrations of 165.72 nM in 2011 and 128.27 nM in 2012 (Table 1). The mean atmospheric mixing ratios ranged from 2.15 to 2.49 ppm. Dissolved CO₂ partial pressure ranged from 304.53 to 588.24 ppm with mean values of 379.96 ppm in 2011 and 399.95 ppm in 2012 (Table 1). The mean atmospheric mixing ratio of CO₂ ranged from 315.97 to 357.73 ppm.

Dissolved CH₄ concentrations in Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays were up to two orders of magnitude lower than in Toolik Lake. The mean CH₄ concentration in Kasitsna Bay was 5.32 nM with values ranging from 2.03 to 7.23 nM (Table 1). The atmospheric mixing ratio of CH₄ ranged from 1.80 to 2.24 ppm. The mean surface dissolved CO₂ partial pressure in Kasitsna Bay was 206.75 ppm with values ranging from 157.84 to 361.34 ppm. The mean CH₄ concentration in Jakolof Bay was 5.86 nM with values ranging from 4.3 to 7.7 nM (Table 1). The atmospheric mixing ratio of CH₄ ranged from 2.20 to 2.24 ppm.

In Toolik Lake, mean water-to-air fluxes of CH₄ were 116.35 ± 61.86 (range: -0.03 to 334.67) $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ in 2011 and 126.88 ± 97.35 (range: -0.77 to 544.25) $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ in 2012

(Table 2). Wind speeds were slightly higher in 2012 than in 2011 (2.71 ± 0.69 m/s in 2011 compare to 3.31 ± 2.17 m/s in 2012) and may explain the wider range of fluxes in 2012 (Figure S3). Mean water-to-air fluxes of CO_2 were 1.50 ± 1.49 (range: -1.10 to 4.33) mmol m^{-2} and 3.70 ± 4.02 (range: -0.19 to 26.19) $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ in 2012 (Table 2; Figure 2 and Figure 3). Extrapolating over the entire 1.3 km^2 lake surface, these estimates yield positive mean flux values, indicating that Toolik Lake is a net source of CH_4 and CO_2 to the atmosphere. This is consistent with previous studies which have reported greenhouse gas emissions from Arctic Lakes in Alaska (Kling et al., 1991; O'Brien et al., 1997; Walter Anthony et al., 2012). The survey in Toolik Lake 2011 did not include the interior of the lake; therefore the extrapolations for this year should be looked at as a first order approximation.

Mean fluxes of CH_4 and CO_2 at Kasitsna Bay were 0.5 ± 0.42 (range: 0.002 to 3.68) $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ and -1.69 ± 1.26 (range: -6.45 to 0.22) $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$, respectively (Table 1). Mean fluxes of CH_4 and CO_2 at Jakolof Bay were 0.80 ± 0.77 (range: 0.07 to 3.07) $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$ and -0.82 ± 0.78 (range: -2.79 to -0.1) $\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$, respectively (Table 1). Small, positive CH_4 fluxes indicate that Kasitsna and Jakolof are weak sources of CH_4 to the atmosphere. This is consistent with what is known about coastal oceans (see Table 2) (Rhee et al., 2009; Scranton and Brewer, 1977). The highest efflux of CH_4 coincide with the highest winds speeds indicating that winds speeds may be governing the flux (Figure S4). Negative fluxes of CO_2 indicate that this region is a sink of atmospheric CO_2 . Coastal oceans receive major inputs of organic matter and nutrients from land which enhance primary productivity and atmospheric CO_2 uptake (Borges et al., 2005; Wollast, 1998).

Discussion

The goal of this research was to provide high-resolution spatial distributions of the diffusive water-to-air fluxes of CH₄ and CO₂ from two regionally distinct sites so that (1) future field measurement campaigns can be designed to adequately capture the true greenhouse dynamics of these systems, (2) to provide an estimate of the errors introduced in regional emissions of CO₂ and CH₄ if extrapolations are performed ignoring spatial gradients of diffusive fluxes, and (3) to obtain first order water to air fluxes from these systems.

Designing Sampling Strategies for Future Field Campaigns

The distributions we measured were used to assess the uncertainty that might arise from the more common and logistically simple discrete sampling techniques. Traditional field sampling protocols for U.S. lakes suggests collecting 10 discrete samples (by filling and preserving vials of surface water): one near the center of the lake and nine equally spaced from the center and around the lake (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2007). To evaluate the percent error from following this protocol, we calculated the flux at the center of the lake and randomly selected nine measurements from around the perimeter of the lake. As one example, percent errors of 18% for CH₄ and 27% for CO₂ were calculated if the standard protocol was followed (see Table S2). It is worth noting that these are example calculations and very different percent errors will be determined if concentration hot spots are not selected among the nine samples.

The distribution profiles of surface water concentrations and diffusive fluxes varied between regions and gases. The bimodal distribution of dissolved CH₄ and CO₂ in Toolik 2011 and Kasitsna 2012 suggests that there are multiple sources of dissolved CH₄ and CO₂. Potential inputs of CH₄ and CO₂ to Toolik Lake could include groundwater discharge and in-lake

respiration of terrestrial derived organic carbon (Kling et al., 1991; Kling et al., 1992). Other potential inputs of CH₄ in Arctic Lakes comprise anaerobic methanogenesis in sediments or bottom waters, aerobic methanogenesis, and fossil (radiocarbon-free) sources. Anaerobic methanogenesis in sediments is an unlikely source as Toolik Lake is characterized by very low organic matter sedimentation rates and low dissolved oxygen consumption rates (Cornwell and Kipphut (1992)). Toolik Lake is also extremely oligotrophic, with primary production being co-limited by dissolved inorganic nitrogen and phosphorous (Whalen and Alexander, 1986) thus anaerobic methanogenesis of autochthonous material is also unlikely. This suggests that the CH₄ emitted from Toolik Lake may be from a different origin. The highest dissolved concentrations of CH₄ and CO₂ were observed in the southern and the northern areas of the lake in proximity to the stream inlets of the lake (Figure 2 and Figure 3) and coincident with areas of highest groundwater discharge (Dimova et al., 2015; Paytan et al., 2015). Thus, as suggested by previous studies, groundwater is likely an important source of CH₄ and CO₂ in Toolik Lake (Kling et al., 1991; Paytan et al., 2015).

Sources of CH₄ to the coastal ocean include: horizontal and vertical transport from seafloor sources (Sansone et al., 2001), river inputs (Abril and Borges, 2005), in situ methane production, zooplankton, and fecal pellets (Damm et al., 2008; Karl et al., 2008). Likewise, submarine groundwater discharge has been observed to be significant in coastal regions and could also contribute to the release of carbon into this coastal ocean (Bugna et al., 1996; Lecher et al., 2015; Moore, 2010). A study by Lecher et al. (2015) found that submarine groundwater discharge is a source of CH₄ in Katisna Bay.

The data presented here shows that the concentration and flux of CH₄ and CO₂ in Toolik Lake, Kasitsna and Jakolof Bay are highly heterogeneous most likely due to local sources. The

highest dissolved CH₄ and CO₂ concentration values were localized to areas where streams enter the lake and bays (Figure 2 and Figure 3). Similarly, areas of high CH₄ and CO₂ flux were not uniform but were instead constrained to smaller and irregular zones (Figure 6 and Figure 7). A further indication of significant variability is the standard deviation of our data which is of a similar order of magnitude as the mean (Table 2).

To assess the effect of such non-uniform fluxes on the overall estimates in these two study areas, we calculated the percent error if 1) hot spot areas were omitted and if 2) only the highest flux value was measured and compared these values to the mean flux using all the data. Hot spot areas were defined as areas with the highest concentrations of CH₄ and CO₂. Gas concentrations in Toolik Lake were higher in 2012 than in 2011, thus to be consistent between years we chose the 2011 data to define our hot spot areas (concentrations higher than 180 nM for CH₄ and 425 for CO₂). For the costal ocean, we defined hot spots areas as areas with CH₄ concentration higher than 8 nM. Since the coastal ocean was undersaturated with respect to CO₂, no hotspots errors were calculated. These calculations suggest that errors of 18% for CH₄ and 23% for CO₂ are obtained if hot spots are ignored (see Table S2). Errors of over 346% for CH₄ and 1000% for CO₂ are obtained if only the highest flux value is assumed to be representative (Table 3).

Likewise, we can calculate the percentage of the Toolik Lake or bay area covered by hot spots (as defined above). Our estimates indicate that hotspots of dissolved CH₄ concentrations were isolated covering 16% (in 2012) to 21% (in 2011) of the total lake area and less than 15% of the bay areas (Figure 4). It should be pointed out that the hot spot area for Toolik Lake 2011 may be overestimated as no data for the center of the lake is available. For dissolved CO₂, hotspot areas were constrained to less than 16% of the total lake (Figure 5).

To determine the significance of temporal variability between the surveys in 2011 and 2012, we selected those points with similar location within a 15 m radius. We calculated a temporal error of up 0.5% for diffusive fluxes of CH₄ and 2.8% for diffusive fluxes of CO₂. At least to first order, this suggests that spatial heterogeneity provides more variance than year-to-year differences.

Methane and CO₂ fluxes measured in this study for Toolik Lake were about an order of magnitude lower than the fluxes published by Kling et al. (1991) and Kling et al. (1992) (Table 1 and Table 2) who calculated diffusive fluxes from discrete surface water concentrations of CH₄ and CO₂ (n = 4 to 11). While the source of the discrepancy could be due to under sampling, it could also be manifested in the different choice of gas exchange coefficients and atmospheric concentration measurements (Kling et al. (1991) and Kling et al. (1992) used globally averaged atmospheric concentrations, whereas the results presented here were recorded locally. Likewise flux variability could arise from natural variations. As observed by Kling et al. (1992), CO₂ fluxes at Toolik Lake showed significant inter-annual variations (fluxes ranged from 10.6 to 66.7 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ over 14 years). To determine the potential cause of the discrepancy between our data and those published by Kling et al. (1992), we used the mean concentration values for CH₄ and CO₂ given in Kling et al (1992) and our gas exchange coefficient to calculate diffusive fluxes. We obtained similar fluxes as those reported by Kling et al (1.2 and 71 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ of CH₄ and CO₂, respectively) suggesting that the different choice of gas exchange coefficients is not the source of difference. Since water concentrations were orders of magnitudes higher than atmospheric concentrations, varying atmospheric concentrations of CH₄ and CO₂ did not drastically change the calculated diffusive fluxes suggesting that changing atmospheric concentrations was also not the source of the difference. However, if our sampling was restricted

to only the regions of highest flux, the values presented here would be closer to those published by Kling et al. (1992) (20 to 30 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹). Thus, the difference in fluxes between those presented here and Kling et al. (1992) may be due to the irregular spatial distribution in this environment, which is difficult to constrain with discrete samples (Figures 4 – 7). Finally, no predictive distribution profiles were determined for the surface water concentrations (Figures 4 – 5). Even though this technique may be more difficult to utilize in remote locations than collecting discrete water samples, it is our recommendation that high resolution sampling techniques be employed when possible to minimize uncertainties.

First-Order Assessment of Arctic and Subarctic Diffusive Fluxes

To assess the regional contribution of Arctic and Subarctic diffusive fluxes, we conducted a first-order extrapolation to coastal waters north of 60° N and to lakes north of 54° N (Table 3). The area for the coastal ocean was taken from Borges (2005), whereas the area for lakes was taken from Bastviken et al. (2011). For the Subarctic coastal ocean, if we assume 120 days of open water annually and that our average measured diffusive fluxes (Ave. CH₄ = 0.65 μmol m⁻² d⁻¹ and Ave. CO₂ = -1.3 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹) are constant over this time period, we estimated that the subarctic coastal ocean is supplying 0.027 Tg of CH₄ to the atmosphere. This is 4% of subarctic coastal CH₄ emissions and 2.6% of the global CH₄ emissions. We also estimated that the coastal ocean is taking up approximately 40 Tg of C from the atmosphere annually as CO₂. This is 24% of subarctic coastal CO₂ uptake and 2% of the global uptake (Table 3).

We conduct a similar extrapolation for northern high latitude lakes where we assume 120 days of open water annually and that our average measured diffusive fluxes (Ave CH₄ = 122 μmol m⁻² d⁻¹ and Ave. CO₂ = 3 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹) are constant over this time period. This first-order

extrapolation indicates that diffusive fluxes from lakes north of 54° N are likely supplying 0.4 CH₄ and 8 Tg C as CO₂ to the atmosphere annually. These estimates suggest that Arctic lakes such as Toolik Lake contribute between 2.2% and 5% of the regional freshwater CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively, or between 0.5% and 0.7% of the global freshwater CH₄ and CO₂ emissions, respectively (Table 3). These are small percentages when compared to other freshwater sources. However, if we used the flux values from Kling et al. (1992), which are of similar magnitude as the fluxes from hotspot areas in this study, northern hemispheric lakes could be contributing 2 Tg of CH₄ and 55 Tg of C as CO₂ to the atmosphere annually (39% higher emissions for CH₄ and 60% higher emission for CO₂). This translates to about an order of magnitude higher emissions and emphasizes the discrepancy that can be obtained if such lakes are not well characterized. While lakes such as Toolik Lake may be a small source of CH₄ and CO₂ to the atmosphere presently, warming in the Arctic may result in the expansion of the active layer which may increase methane discharge and methane emissions to the atmosphere (Paytan et al., 2015). Further investigations and continued monitoring is needed to better understand and predict changes in this dynamic environment.

Conclusion

Here we determined high-resolution spatial distributions of dissolved concentrations and water-to-air fluxes of CO₂ and CH₄ from two different Alaskan field sites, Kasitsna and Jakolof Bays and Toolik Lake. The investigation presented here shows that these environments are highly heterogeneous and that the errors introduced from inappropriately sampling are higher than temporal variability. Errors of up to 60% can be introduced in regional emission models if the spatial distributions of CH₄ and CO₂ in northern hemisphere lakes are not well characterized. This suggests that in order to produce more accurate regional models and capture the true

dynamics of these systems, higher spatial resolution determinations requiring more experientially complex measurements are needed to account for the heterogeneity of the sources.

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the National Science Foundation through grants OCE-1139203 to S.A. Yvon-Lewis and J.D. Kessler, PLR-1417149 to J.D. Kessler, and ARC-1114485 to A. Paytan. This work was also supported by a Sloan Research Fellowship in Ocean Sciences to J.D. Kessler. Technical and scientific support was provided by the NOAA and UAF Kasitsna Bay Laboratory, Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, and NSF Polar Field Services. We are thankful for the enthusiasm and support of the staff at the Toolik Lake field station and Kasitsna Bay Laboratory.

Figures and Tables:

Table 1. Mean surface CH₄ and CO₂ concentrations with their respective standard deviation and standard deviation of the mean.

Study Area	Mean Surface Concentration Water (nmol L ⁻¹)	Mean Interpolated Surface Water Concentration (nmol L ⁻¹)	Area (km ²)	Reference
CH₄				
Toolik Lake 2011	165.72 ± 92.62, 4.97	189.54 ± 100.31, 12.08	1.32	This study
Toolik Lake 2012	128.27 ± 51.02, 2.36	172.32 ± 98.87, 11.99	1.32	This study
Toolik Lake 1990	1,100	n/a		Kling et al. (1992)
Kasitsna Bay 2012	5.32 ± 0.52, 0.03	8.16 ± 2.45, 0.48	4.70	This study
Jakolof Bay 2011	5.86 ± 0.74, 0.05	7.96 ± 0.99, 0.01	1.36	This Study
CO₂				
	(ppm)	(ppm)		
Toolik Lake 2011	379.96 ± 40.54, 2.17	377.03 ± 44.02, 8.04	1.32	This study
Toolik Lake 2012	399.95 ± 50.44, 2.34	399.95 ± 50.44, 2.34	1.32	This study
Toolik Lake 75 - 89	1,847 ± 239	n/a	1.32	Kling et al. (1991)
Kasitsna Bay 2012	206.75 ± 39.56, 2.03	257.84 ± 59.89, 9.35	4.70	This study
Jakolof Bay 2011	230.61 ± 4.01, 0.28	231.82 ± 2.95, 0.03	1.36	This study
Bering Sea Shelf	156 - 475	n/a	n/a	Borges (2005)

Table 2. Mean CH₄ and CO₂ water-to-air fluxes with their respective standard deviation and standard deviation of the mean.

Study Area	Mean Flux ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)	Total Mean Flux (mol d^{-1})	Mean Interpolated Flux ($\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)	Mean Interpolated Emission (mol d^{-1})	Reference
<i>Flux CH₄</i>					
Toolik Lake 2011	116.36 $\pm$ 61.86, 3.32	153.60	112.80 $\pm$ 37.40, 0.36	148.90	This study
Toolik Lake 2012	126.87 $\pm$ 97.32, 4.53	167.6	126.04 $\pm$ 82.73, 0.80	166.37	This study
Toolik Lake 1990	550 (80 - 1,020)	1,342	n/a	n/a	Kling et al. (1992)
Kasitsna Bay 2012	0.5 $\pm$ 0.42, 0.02	2.37	0.58 $\pm$ 0.35, 0.42	2.72	This study
Jakolof Bay 2011	0.80 $\pm$ 0.77, 0.05	1.07	0.95 $\pm$ 0.65, 0.01	1.25	This Study
Coastal Ocean	1.5 (1 – 20)	n/a	n/a	n/a	Rhee et al. (2009)
<i>Flux CO₂</i>					
	($\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)		($\text{mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$)		
Toolik Lake 2011	1.50 $\pm$ 1.49, 0.08	1,980	1.37 $\pm$ 1.11, 0.01	1,808	This study
Toolik Lake 2012	3.70 $\pm$ 4.02, 0.19	4,884	3.13 $\pm$ 2.66, 0.03	4,132	This study
Toolik Lake 1990	21 (-7 – 60)	46,048	n/a	n/a	Kling et al. (1992)
Kasitsna Bay 2012	-1.69 $\pm$ 1.26, 0.06	-7,979	-1.94 $\pm$ 0.97, 0.01	-10,614	This study
Jakolof Bay 2011	-0.82 $\pm$ 0.78, 0.06	-1,375	-0.95 $\pm$ 0.63, .01	-1,245	This study
Coastal Ocean	-11.75	n/a	n/a	n/a	Borges (2005)

Table 3. Comparing regional emissions of CH₄ and CO₂ from freshwater sources and the coastal ocean. All fluxes are diffusive unless otherwise stated.

Region	Permafrost coverage	Area (10 ³ km ²)	Time of Emission (d)	CH ₄ Flux (μmol m ⁻² d ⁻¹)	CH ₄ Emission* (Tg yr ⁻¹)	CO ₂ Flux (mmol m ⁻² d ⁻¹)	CO ₂ Emission* (Tg C yr ⁻¹)
<i>This study</i>							
Lakes - no hotspot	all types	1821 ^a	120	100	0.3	1.2	3
Lakes - mean	all types	1821 ^a	120	122	0.4	3	8
Lakes – only hotspot	all types	1821 ^a	120	544	1.9	39	102
<i>Other studies</i>							
NH Lakes	all types	1821 ^a	120	550 ^b	1.9	21 ^b	55
Lake Ebullition	all types	1821 ^a	120	11,794	15.5 ^c	n/a	n/a
Lake Spring Thaw	sporadic	135 ^a	10	83,126	1.8 ^d	n/a	n/a
Freshwater Sources	all types	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.3 ^e	n/a	151 ^g
<i>This study</i>							
Kasitsna Bay	discontinuous	7190 ^h	365	0.5	0.02	-2	-53
Jakolof Bay	discontinuous	7190 ^h	365	0.8	0.03	-0.8	-26
<i>Other studies</i>							
Coastal Ocean	n/a	7190 ^h	365	1.5 (1 – 2) ⁱ	0.7 (0.3 – 1) ⁱ	-5.2 ^h	-162 ^h
Global Ocean	n/a		365		1 (0.6 – 1.5) ⁱ	-1.21 ^h	-1930 ^h

* Total CH₄ and CO₂ emissions were calculated for the time period of active flux (time of emission/yr). ^aLake area was taken from Bastviken et al. (2011) for lakes north of 54° N. ^bThese are averaged values from Kling et al. (1992), ^cBastviken et al. (2011), ^dPhelps et al. (1998). Freshwater sources are defined as lakes, rivers and streams. ^eFreshwater CH₄ emissions were taken from Bastviken et al. (2011) and include ebullition and diffusive fluxes. ^g Emission of CO₂ from freshwater sources north of 50° N was taken from Aufdenkampe et al. (2011). ^hThe costal ocean area and flux were taken from Borges (2005) and were defined as the coastal region between 60° – 90°. ⁱThe averaged coastal flux of CH₄ was taken from Rhee et al. (2009).

Figure 1. Areas of study.

Figure 2. Dissolved CH_4 concentrations in Toolik Lake in (a) 2011, (b) 2012, and in Jakolof and Kasitsna Bays 2012, 2011 (c). Water-to-air fluxes of CH_4 in Toolik Lake in (d) 2011, (e) 2012, and in Jakolof and Kasitsna Bays 2012 and 2011 (f). The black dots denote the location where measurements were taken on 16 August 2011 (a and b) and on 24 July 2012 (b and e). The crosses denote samples measured on 25 July 2012. Stream inlets are shown by the black arrows.

Figure 3. Dissolved CO_2 concentrations in Toolik Lake (a) 2011, (b) 2012, and in Jakolof and Kasitsna Bays 2012, 2011 (c). Water-to-air fluxes of CO_2 in Toolik Lake in b) 2011, d) 2012, and f) Jakolof Bay and Kasitsna Bay 2012 and 2011. The black dots denote the location where measurements were taken on 16 August 2011 (a and b) and on 24 July 2012 (b and e). The crosses denote samples measured on 25 July 2012. Stream inlets are shown by the black arrows.

Figure 4. Histograms for dissolved CH_4 for a) Toolik 2011, b) Toolik 2012, c) Jakolof 2011, and d) Kasitsna 2012.

Figure 5 Histograms of dissolved CO₂ for a) Toolik 2011, b) Toolik 2012, c) Jakolof 2011, and d) Kasitsna 2012.

Figure 6 Histograms for water-to-air fluxes of CH_4 for a) Toolik 2011, b) Toolik 2012, c) Jakolof 2011, and d) Kasitsna 2012. Please note the difference in y-axis for panels c) and d).

Figure 7. Histograms for water-to-air fluxes of CO₂ for a) Toolik 2011, b) Toolik 2012, c) Jakolof 2011, and d) Kasitsna 2012.

References

- Abril, G., Borges, A.V., 2005. Carbon dioxide and methane emissions from estuaries, Greenhouse Gas Emissions—Fluxes and Processes. Springer, pp. 187-207.
- Aufdenkampe, A.K., Mayorga, E., Raymond, P.A., Melack, J.M., Doney, S.C., Alin, S.R., Aalto, R.E., Yoo, K., 2011. Riverine coupling of biogeochemical cycles between land, oceans, and atmosphere. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 9, 53-60, doi: 10.1890/100014.
- Bastviken, D., Tranvik, L.J., Downing, J.A., Crill, P.M., Enrich-Prast, A., 2011. Freshwater methane emissions offset the continental carbon sink. *Science* 331, 50-50, doi:10.1126/science.1196808.
- Borges, A., Delille, B., Frankignoulle, M., 2005. Budgeting sinks and sources of CO₂ in the coastal ocean: Diversity of ecosystems counts. *Geophysical Research Letters* 32, L14601, doi: 10.1029/2005GL023053.
- Borges, A.V., 2005. Do we have enough pieces of the jigsaw to integrate CO₂ fluxes in the coastal ocean? *Estuaries* 28, 3-27, doi: 10.1007/BF02732750.
- Bugna, G.C., Chanton, J.P., Cable, J.E., Burnett, W.C., Cable, P.H., 1996. The importance of groundwater discharge to the methane budgets of nearshore and continental shelf waters of the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 60, 4735-4746, doi: 10.1016/S0016-7037(96)00290-6.
- Christensen, T.R., Johansson, T., Åkerman, H.J., Mastepanov, M., Malmer, N., Friborg, T., Crill, P., Svensson, B.H., 2004. Thawing sub-arctic permafrost: Effects on vegetation and methane emissions. *Geophysical Research Letters* 31, L04501, doi: 10.1029/2003GL018680.
- Ciais, P., C. Sabine, G. Bala, L. Bopp, V. Brovkin, J. Canadell, A. Chhabra, R. DeFries, J. Galloway, M. Heimann, C. Jones, C. Le Quéré, R.B. Myneni, S. Piao., P. Thornton, 2013. Carbon and Other Biogeochemical Cycles, in: Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (Ed.), *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

- Cole, J.J., Bade, D.L., Bastviken, D., Pace, M.L., Van de Bogert, M., 2010. Multiple approaches to estimating air-water gas exchange in small lakes. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* 8, 285-293, doi: 10.4319/lo.2000.45.8.1718.
- Cornwell, J.C., Kipphut, G.W., 1992. Biogeochemistry of manganese-and iron-rich sediments in Toolik Lake, Alaska. *Hydrobiologia* 240, 45-59, doi: 10.4319/lo.2000.45.8.1718.
- Damm, E., Kiene, R., Schwarz, J., Falck, E., Dieckmann, G., 2008. Methane cycling in Arctic shelf water and its relationship with phytoplankton biomass and DMSP. *Marine Chemistry* 109, 45-59, doi: 10.1016/j.marchem.2007.12.003.
- Dimova, N.T., Paytan, A., Kessler, J.D., Sparrow, K.J., Garcia-Tigreros Kodovska, F., Lecher, A.L., Murray, J., Tulaczyk, S.M., 2015. Current Magnitude and Mechanisms of Groundwater Discharge in the Arctic: Case Study from Alaska. *Environmental Science & Technology* 49, 12036-12043, doi: 10.1021/acs.est.5b02215.
- Du, M., Yvon-Lewis, S., Garcia-Tigreros, F., Valentine, D.L., Mendes, S.D., Kessler, J.D., 2014. High Resolution Measurements of Methane and Carbon Dioxide in Surface Waters over a Natural Seep Reveal Dynamics of Dissolved Phase Air–Sea Flux. *Environmental Science & Technology* 48, pp 10165–10173, doi: 10.1021/es5017813.
- Erickson, D.J., 1993. A stability dependent theory for air-sea gas exchange. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* (1978–2012) 98, 8471-8488, doi: 10.1029/93JC00039.
- Flores, R.M., Stricker, G.D., 1993. Reservoir framework architecture in the Clamgulchian type section (Pliocene) of the Sterling Formation, Kenai Peninsula, Alaska. *Geologic Studies in Alaska by the US Geological Survey*. 118.
- Griffiths, R., Caldwell, B., Morita, R., 1982. Seasonal changes in microbial heterotrophic activity in subarctic marine waters as related to phytoplankton primary productivity. *Marine Biology* 71, 121-127, doi: 10.1007/BF00394619.
- Gülzow, W., Rehder, G., Schneider, B., Schneider von Deimling, J., Sadkowiak, B., 2011. A new method for continuous measurement of methane and carbon dioxide in surface waters using off-axis integrated cavity output spectroscopy (ICOS): An example from the Baltic Sea. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods* 9, 176-184, doi: 10.4319/lom.2011.9.176.

- Hu, L., Yvon-Lewis, S.A., Kessler, J.D., MacDonald, I.R., 2012. Methane fluxes to the atmosphere from deepwater hydrocarbon seeps in the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* (1978–2012) 117, doi: 10.1029/2011JC007208.
- Johnson, J.E., 1999. Evaluation of a seawater equilibrators for shipboard analysis of dissolved oceanic trace gases. *Analytica Chimica Acta* 395, 119-132, doi: 10.1016/S0003-2670(99)00361-X.
- Karl, D.M., Beversdorf, L., Björkman, K.M., Church, M.J., Martinez, A., Delong, E.F., 2008. Aerobic production of methane in the sea. *Nature Geoscience* 1, 473-478, doi: 10.1038/ngeo234.
- Kessler, J.D., Reeburgh, W.S., Valentine, D.L., Kinnaman, F.S., Peltzer, E.T., Brewer, P.G., Southon, J., Tyler, S.C., 2008. A survey of methane isotope abundance (C-14, C-13, H-2) from five nearshore marine basins that reveals unusual radiocarbon levels in subsurface waters. *J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans* 113, doi: 10.1029/2008JC004822.
- Kling, G.W., Kipphut, G.W., Miller, M.C., 1991. Arctic Lakes and Streams as Gas Conduits to the Atmosphere: Implications for Tundra Carbon Budgets. *Science* 251, 298-301, doi: 10.1126/science.251.4991.298.
- Kling, G.W., Kipphut, G.W., Miller, M.C., 1992. The flux of CO₂ and CH₄ from lakes and rivers in arctic Alaska. *Hydrobiologia* 240, 23-36, doi: 10.1007/BF00013449.
- Lecher, A.L., Kessler, J.D., Sparrow, K.J., Garcia-Tigreros Kodovska, F., Dimova, N., Murray, J., Tulaczyk, S., Paytan, A., 2015. Methane transport through submarine groundwater discharge to the North Pacific and Arctic Ocean at two Alaskan sites. *Limnology and Oceanography*, doi: 10.1002/lno.10118.
- Miller, J.A., Whitehead, R.L., 1999. Ground Water Atlas of the United States: Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the US Virgin Islands. Segment 13. US Geological Survey.
- Moore, W.S., 2010. The effect of submarine groundwater discharge on the ocean. *Annual Review of Marine Science* 2, 59-88, doi: 10.1146/annurev-marine-120308-081019.
- O'Brien, W.J., Bahr, M., Hershey, A., Hobbie, J., Kipphut, G., Kling, G., Kling, H., McDonald, M., Miller, M., Rublee, P., Vestal, J.R., 1997. The Limnology of Toolik Lake, in: Milner, A., Oswood, M. (Eds.), *Freshwaters of Alaska*. Springer New York, pp. 61-106.
- Paytan, A., Lecher, A.L., Dimova, N., Sparrow, K.J., Garcia-Tigreros Kodovska, F., Murray, J., Tulaczyk, S., Kessler, J.D., 2015. Methane transport from the active layer to lakes in the

- Arctic using Toolik Lake, Alaska, as a case study. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, 3636-3640, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1417392112.
- 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* (1984–2012) 103, 29029-29036, doi: 10.1029/98JD00044.
- Pierrot, D., Neill, C., Sullivan, K., Castle, R., Wanninkhof, R., Lüger, H., Johannessen, T., Olsen, A., Feely, R.A., Cosca, C.E., 2009. Recommendations for autonomous underway pCO₂ measuring systems and data-reduction routines. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography* 56, 512-522, doi: 10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.12.005.
- Rhee, T.S., Kettle, A.J., Andreae, M.O., 2009. Methane and nitrous oxide emissions from the ocean: A reassessment using basin-wide observations in the Atlantic. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 114, D12304, doi: 10.1029/2008JD011662.
- Ruppel, C.D., 2011. Methane Hydrates and Contemporary Climate Change. *Nature Education Knowledge* 3(10).
- Sansone, F.J., Popp, B.N., Gasc, A., Graham, A.W., Rust, T.M., 2001. Highly elevated methane in the eastern tropical North Pacific and associated isotopically enriched fluxes to the atmosphere. *Geophysical research letters* 28, 4567-4570, doi: 10.1029/2001GL013460.
- Schuur, E.A.G., Abbott, B.W., Bowden, W.B., Brovkin, V., Camill, P., Canadell, J.G., Chanton, J.P., Chapin, F.S., Christensen, T.R., Ciais, P., Crosby, B.T., Czimczik, C.I., Grosse, G., Harden, J., Hayes, D.J., Hugelius, G., Jastrow, J.D., Jones, J.B., Kleinen, T., Koven, C.D., Krinner, G., Kuhry, P., Lawrence, D.M., McGuire, A.D., Natali, S.M., O'Donnell, J.A., Ping, C.L., Riley, W.J., Rinke, A., Romanovsky, V.E., Sannel, A.B.K., Schadel, C., Schaefer, K., Sky, J., Subin, Z.M., Tarnocai, C., Turetsky, M.R., Waldrop, M.P., Anthony, K.M.W., Wickland, K.P., Wilson, C.J., Zimov, S.A., 2013. Expert assessment of vulnerability of permafrost carbon to climate change. *Climatic Change* 119, 359-374.
- Scranton, M.I., Brewer, P.G., 1977. Occurrence of methane in the near-surface waters of the western subtropical North-Atlantic. *Deep Sea Research* 24, 127-138, doi: 10.1016/0146-6291(77)90548-3.
- Serreze, M.C., Francis, J.A., 2006. The Arctic amplification debate. *Climatic Change* 76, 241-264, doi: 10.1007/s10584-005-9017-y.

- Shakhova, N., Semiletov, I., Salyuk, A., Yusupov, V., Kosmach, D., Gustafsson, O., 2010. Extensive Methane Venting to the Atmosphere from Sediments of the East Siberian Arctic Shelf. *Science* 327, 1246-1250, doi: 10.1126/science.1182221.
- Sweeney, C., Gloor, E., Jacobson, A.R., Key, R.M., McKinley, G., Sarmiento, J.L., Wanninkhof, R., 2007. Constraining global air-sea gas exchange for CO₂ with recent bomb 14C measurements. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 21, doi: 10.1029/2006GB002784.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2007. Survey of the Nation's Lakes. Field Operations Manual. EPA 841-B-07-004., p. 50, Washington, DC.
- Walter Anthony, K.M., Anthony, P., Grosse, G., Chanton, J., 2012. Geologic methane seeps along boundaries of Arctic permafrost thaw and melting glaciers. *Nature Geoscience* 5, 419-426, doi: 10.1038/ngeo1480.
- 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, 71-75, doi: 10.1038/nature05040.
- Wanninkhof, R., 1992. Relationship between wind speed and gas exchange over the ocean. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans* (1978–2012) 97, 7373-7382, doi: 10.1029/92JC00188.
- Weiss, R.F., 1974. Carbon dioxide in water and seawater: the solubility of a non-ideal gas. *Marine Chemistry* 2, 203-215, doi: 10.1016/0304-4203(74)90015-2.
- Whalen, S., Alexander, V., 1986. Seasonal inorganic carbon and nitrogen transport by phytoplankton in an arctic lake. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 43, 1177-1186, doi: 10.1139/f86-147.
- Wickland, K.P., Striegl, R.G., Neff, J.C., Sachs, T., 2006. Effects of permafrost melting on CO₂ and CH₄ exchange of a poorly drained black spruce lowland. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences* 111, G02011, doi: 10.1029/2005JG000099.
- 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, 356-360, doi: 10.1021/jc60083a006.
- Wollast, R., 1998. Evaluation and comparison of the global carbon cycle in the coastal zone and in the open ocean, in: Brink, K.H., Robinson, A.R. (Eds.), *The Global Coastal Ocean*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, pp. 213-252.

- Zimov, S.A., Schuur, E.A., Chapin III, F.S., 2006. Permafrost and the global carbon budget. *Science(Washington)* 312, 1612-1613, doi: 10.1126/science.1128908.
- Zimov, S.A., Voropaev, Y.V., Semiletov, I.P., Davidov, S.P., Prosiannikov, S.F., Chapin, F.S., Chapin, M.C., Trumbore, S., Tyler, S., 1997. North Siberian lakes: A methane source fueled by Pleistocene carbon. *Science* 277, 800-802, doi: 10.1126/science.277.5327.800.