



#### High Affinity Methanotrophs Are an Important Overlooked Methane Sink in the Arctic and Global Methane Budgets

<u>Youmi Oh</u>, Qianlai Zhuang, Licheng Liu, Lisa R. Welp Maggie C.Y. Lau, Tulli C. Onstott, David Medvigy, Gustaf Hugelius, Ludovica D'imperio, Bo Elberling, Stefan Schwietzke, Xin Lan, Sourish Basu, Lori Bruhwiler, and Edward Dlugokencky

NOAA ESRL Global Monitoring Annual Conference 2019

## Uncertainties in natural arctic methane budget

#### Net Methane Emissions Simulated by CLM 4.5







Tarnocai et al. 2009; McGuire et al., 2012; Hinzman et al., 2013; Bruhwiler et al., 2014; Lau et al., 2015; Tan et al., 2015; Saunois et al. 2016

# **Biogeographic differences in methanotrophs**



Le Mer and Roger, 2001; Christiansen et al., 2015

# I added microbial and permafrost dynamics into TEM

a. Wetland b. Upland CH₄ CH₄  $[CH_4]_{air}$  $[CH_4]_{air}$ ε ε m<sub>F</sub> m<sub>E</sub> MG HAM LAM Methanogen t=1,2,3... t=1,2,3... CH<sub>4</sub> LAM ε Low affinity methanotroph m<sub>E</sub> ε MG SOC HAM t=1,2,3... High affinity methanotroph Permafrost ε: Growth efficiency SOC m<sub>F</sub>: Maintenance energy

Method

Zhuang et al., 2004; Zhuang et al., 2006; Zhuang et al., 2013; Oh et al., 2016

## Three model setups for factorial analysis

 Simulation was conducted at a spatial resolution of 0.5°×0.5° from north of 50°N for contemporary period (2000-2016) and future projection (2016-2100)

| Model Setup                 | XPTEM-XHAM | PTEM-HAM | TEM |
|-----------------------------|------------|----------|-----|
| Permafrost Dynamics         | ON         | ON       | OFF |
| High Affinity Methanotrophs | ON         | ON       | OFF |
| Microbial Dynamics          | ON         | OFF      | OFF |

# New models show lower CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in 2000-2016



6

Bruhwiler et al., 2014;Lau et al., 2015; Tan et al., 2015; Saunois et al. 2016

## New models project smaller future CH<sub>4</sub> emissions



Schaefer et al., 2011; Koven et al., 2011; Schuur et al., 2013; Lawrence et al., 2015

# HAM shows a better adaption strategy in the future



8

Von Stockar and Liu, 1999; Wieder et al., 2013; Trimmer et al., 2015



Oh et al., 2016

# Models overestimated global natural methane emissions

 The current estimation of global methane soil sink is 30 TgCH<sub>4</sub>yr<sup>-1</sup>, but with a huge uncertainty (7 to >100 TgCH<sub>4</sub>yr<sup>-1</sup>)



Smith et al., 2000; Curry et al., 2007; Dutaur and Verchot, 2007; Saunois et al. 2016

# The Global methane soil sink can be up to 3 times larger

| Criteria 1 (Tg <sub>CH4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) | HAM only |
|--|----------|
| - max. SOC threshold                             | 90       |
| Criteria 2 (Tg <sub>CH4</sub> yr <sup>-1</sup> ) | HAM only |
| – max. pH threshold                              | 90       |



# Inversion simulation using CarbonTracker-CH<sub>4</sub>

NOAA in-situ data Observational CECMWF Constraints CarbonTracker-In-situ and AIRS Satellite data CH₄ TM5 GOSAT Simulation Current Evaluation **NOAA** Aircraft **HIPPO** Airborne **XPTEM-XHAM** BARCA measurement CARIBIC ARCTAS CARVE

12

#### Take Home Message

- We simulated less current and future net methane emissions in the Arctic by considering microbial dynamics of HAM and MG and permafrost dynamics
- The preliminary results show that the global methane soil sink can be up to 3 times larger than the current estimation
- Limitation and future research
  - Validation of the model and hypothesis using atmospheric inversions
  - Validation of the model for sites with a broader range of pH, SOC, and vegetation types using both high and low affinity methanotrophs using meta-data







#### Acknowledgement NASA Earth and Space Science Fellowship

14