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Abstract

Volcanic gas emissions are an important key component for monitoring volcanic activity and magmatic input of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere as well as the assessment of geothermal potential in volcanic regions. Diffuse soil degassing of CO$_2$ at Rincón de la Vieja and Miravalles volcanoes, assessed with the commonly accepted accumulation chamber method, showed the concentration of gas emissions in evident hydrothermal surface features in secondary gas emission zones of the volcanoes. Analyses of fumarolic gases were conducted to investigate similarities and differences between the volcanoes and the possibility of continued magma injection into their source(s). An output of 135 t/day over two degassing areas of together roughly 2 km$^2$ was calculated at Miravalles and one area of 0.129 km$^2$ at Rincón de la Vieja with 3.3 t/day. Comparatively low flux values and the particular soil flux distribution at the active Rincón de la Vieja volcano, suggests a different degassing behavior and stronger concentration of gas emissions at the active vent areas, compared to the dormant Miravalles volcano in case of a common hydrothermal reservoir. Similar chemical signatures of discharged fluids by the volcanoes of the Guanacaste region suggest a common hydrothermal reservoir fed by one or more magmatic source(s) with relatively primitive composition at Tenorio and Miravalles compared to Rincón de la Vieja.

Key words: carbon dioxide; degassing; Miravalles; Rincón de la Vieja; fluid chemistry; Costa Rica
1. Introduction

Carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere have recently been of interest due to the debate on natural vs. anthropogenic sources in the process of global warming. This has led to extensive research in a variety of fields to improve the accuracy of these estimates. Consequently, The Deep Carbon Observatory (DCO), a large international collaboration was established, in order to evaluate natural input of CO₂ into the atmosphere. Active and dormant volcanoes are considered to be one of the major contributors to the global CO₂ gas emissions.

The characterization of volcanic degassing is an important step to assess any volcano’s state of activity and, therefore, its hazard potential. In general, a change in physical and chemical degassing behavior can indicate a change in the magmatic system and, therefore, the onset of a possible period of unrest or magma movement in the subsurface (Giggenbach, 1987).

Carbon dioxide emissions serve as a reliable tracer of magmatic activity due to its high abundance in magmatic gases (second most abundant species after H₂O) and its early escape from the magma due to its low and pressure-dependent solubility in the magma compared to other magmatic gas species (Gerlach and Graeber, 1985). Previous studies (e.g. Arpa et al., 2013; Brusca et al., 2004; Melián et al., 2014; Vaselli et al., 2010; Williams et al., 1986) have shown short-term changes in CO₂ degassing of volcanoes during the onset of a period of unrest related to magma movement and injection into the shallow storage system, which also correlates with seismic activity.

Gas emissions of volcanic systems have been shown to be concentrated in vents and fumaroles, but a significant portion also escapes through diffuse soil degassing (Allard et al., 1991; Baubron et al., 1990). The same has been found for hydrothermal/geothermal systems (in many cases due to past magmatic activity) and reservoirs created by thermal decomposition of sediments (Lewicki et al., 2007). These areas of diffuse soil degassing [Diffuse Degassing Structures (DDS)], firstly described by Chiodini et al. (2001) are often linked to volcano-tectonic structures and fracture zones of the emitting volcanic or hydrothermal systems. Their main characteristic is high soil permeability, where the majority of the gas emissions can escape diffusely through the soil rather than being focused through a fumarole.
Studies on the relationship between plume activity and secondary diffuse degassing have been summarized by Notsu et al. (2006) and suggested an increased diffuse soil degassing associated with lower plume activity and, inversely, lower soil degassing in a state of increased plume activity for different volcanoes.

The analysis of the chemical composition of volcanic emissions from the soil and surface degassing features (fumaroles, hot pools, etc.) is an important part of volcano monitoring and hazard assessment. Compositional changes and gas flux rates in fumaroles and bubbling pools can indicate magma movement, injection into the reservoir(s) and the onset of periods of unrest. Long-term chemical monitoring is used to study the evolution of volcanic systems. Furthermore, a possible link between adjacent volcanoes can be investigated by the comparison of the chemical compositions of their gas emissions. The study of linked volcanic systems could give information about their influence on each other and the possibility to detect regional magma movement in the subsurface and therefore potential volcanic activity. Finally, certain gas species emitted by volcanoes can provide insight into temperature conditions in hydrothermal systems (e.g. Giggenbach and Soto, 1992; Giggenbach, 1995; Tassi et al., 2005).

It has been shown that elevated diffuse soil emissions of CO$_2$ are frequently correlated with elevated soil temperature, and, therefore heat flow in volcanic and geothermal soil (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Chiodini et al., 2005; Werner and Cardellini, 2006; Werner et al., 2008). In recent years, workers have used diffuse CO$_2$ emissions as a tool for the calculation of heat flow in active geothermal regions of interest for exploiting the energy resource (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Fridriksson et al., 2006). Studying diffuse degassing in geothermally exploited areas reveals the potential of the geothermal reservoirs and the possibility to increase exploitation. In addition, diffuse degassing studies, when combined with the assessment of $\delta^{13}$C$_{CO_2}$ values of the uprising gas, can be useful for identifying 'blind' geothermal areas (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Werner and Cardellini, 2006).
Study motivation and objectives

This study focuses on the Guanacaste region in Costa Rica, which has been investigated by the Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad (ICE) since the early 1970’s and is thought to have vast geothermal potential. Two of the three volcanoes (Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja) in the region are currently used for geothermal electricity production, while the potential for using the third volcano (Tenorio) is being explored. In addition, these volcanoes are surrounded by several communities and cities that could possibly be directly or indirectly affected by their activity.

No studies of diffuse soil flux of CO₂ have been conducted in the Guanacaste region with the exception of one large-scale study on Miravalles volcano by Melián et al. (2004). They investigated the flux over the entire volcano, although with few irregularly spaced measurement locations, which lead to large errors in flux estimates and, possibly, an overestimation of the total CO₂ output for the volcano. Therefore, a more detailed study of gas emissions from DDSs in the Guanacaste region is necessary to develop a foundation for a more reliable and thorough assessment of CO₂ emissions.

Furthermore, only a few studies on the geochemistry of volcanic fluids have been conducted in the Guanacaste region, mainly on Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja (Gherardi et al., 2002; Marini et al., 2003; Tassi et al., 2005). At Tenorio, only preliminary results (Vaselli et al., 2003) on fluid discharges are available since Giggenbach & Soto’s comparative study in 1992 on the whole Guanacaste volcanic region. They suggested that the three central volcanoes of the Guanacaste region, namely Rincón de la Vieja, Miravalles, and Tenorio, have a common hydrothermal reservoir feeding their hydrothermal surface features. Rincón de la Vieja is the most active center and Tenorio lies more in the periphery of this activity. Since 1992, sampling techniques for volcanic fluids have significantly improved (Montegrossi et al., 2001; Vaselli et al., 2006), facilitating more detailed analyses and more reliable values for volcanic gas species today. Consequently, additional data has been added to the previous database of volcanic fluid compositions to investigate their chemical composition.
The following is a list of scientific questions that were used to guide this study:

- What is the total CO$_2$ flux emitted into the atmosphere by these volcanoes?
- Do all three volcanoes share the same geothermal reservoir? Or does each operate independently?
- Does the diffuse degassing behavior correlate with the differences in volcanic activity recorded for each volcano?
- Is there more geothermal potential in the Miravalles geothermal field, currently unused by Costa Rica’s electricity company? And, is this method for heat flow calculations derived from CO$_2$ emissions applicable in this region?
- What is the background emission of CO$_2$ by these volcanoes while in a state of quiescence?
2. Geological Setting of the Guanacaste Volcanic Region

The Guanacaste volcanic region forms together with the Cordillera Central the Costa Rican part of the Central American Volcanic Belt. This volcanic arc formed due to the subduction of the Cocos plate under the Caribbean Plate.

Most of Costa Rica lies on the Panama block, a microplate between the Cocos, Caribbean, Nazca and South American Plates, creating a complex setting of subducting plates and a center for volcanic activity [Fig. 1, after Kellogg and Vega (1995)]. The Guanacaste region is situated in the NW of Costa Rica, trending NW-SE, including five stratovolcanic complexes: 1) Orosí, 2) Rincón de la Vieja, 3) Miravalles, 4) Tenorio and 5) Arenal (Fig. 2). These volcanic complexes sit on top of a Tertiary basement divided into two complexes: the Guanacaste-Ignimbrite Plateau, formed between 8 and 1.6 Ma in a sequence of large explosive events alternating with repose periods, and the Arenal-Tilarán Plateau, produced by a long period of effusive volcanism between 2 and 1 Ma (Gillot et al., 1994).
This study focuses on the three volcanic complexes in the center of the Guanacaste region, namely Rincón de la Vieja, Miravalles and Tenorio, suggested to have a common magmatic source due to petrologic (Chiesa et al., 1994) and fluid compositional similarities (Giggenbach and Soto, 1992). However, regional heterogeneities among the volcanoes are required to explain the vast range in silica content (Chiesa et al., 1994).

2.1 Miravalles

Miravalles is a stratovolcano and one of five cones of the Miravalles volcanic complex, lying inside the older Guayabo caldera. This caldera has a complex history of building the Guayabo volcano between 1.17 and 1 Ma and finally collapsing multiple times between 0.68 and 0.62 Ma with decreasing eruption energy towards the end (Alvarado and Gans, 2012; Chiesa et al., 1992). After the collapse of the caldera, intra-caldera activity built up a new stratovolcanic complex between 0.57 and 0.28 Ma, named Cabro Muco (Paleo-Miravalles). Finally, the volcanic complex
was completed by the creation of Zapote and Miravalles (Neo-Miravalles) volcanoes, the latter being the center of the last eruption ejecting juvenile material about 8000 years ago (Alvarado and Gans, 2012; Smithsonian, 2015a). The last and only historical eruption was a small steam explosion in 1946 (Smithsonian, 2015a). Today, the volcano is in a dormant state and shows only hydrothermal activity in various regions around its base, one of them being the fumarolic fields called “Las Hornillas” (Smithsonian, 2015a). This area around the surface expressions of the hydrothermal system has been found to be feasible for geothermal exploitation by the ICE and is now used for electricity production with three geothermal power plants, Miravalles I, II and III, with a total production design of 163 MWe (Moya and Yock, 2005).

2.2 Rincón de la Vieja

Rincón de la Vieja is a complex edifice of several volcanic structures. The paleo-volcanic Alcántaron formed between 2.16 and 1.78 Ma, when it finally collapsed, creating the associated Alcántaron-Guachepelín-Canas caldera after a series of minor collapses. Following this collapse, a series of dome growth and – collapse episodes took place before 1.6 Ma, when the complex of Proto-Rincón started growing. This volcano collapsed at 1.43 ± 0.09 Ma, forming the Canas Dulces caldera with a large eruption of 200 km³ of rhyolitic material (Molina et al., 2014). The youngest members of the volcanic complex, Paleo- and Neo-Rincón, also known as the Rincon de la Vieja-Santa Maria complex, were dated from 0.56 Ma to present (Alvarado and Gans, 2012).

Rincón de la Vieja is the only active volcano in the Guanacaste volcanic complex and its last major eruption was of Plinian style and occurred about 3500 BP. Explosive Plinian eruptions and voluminous lava flows were part of Rincón de la Vieja’s prehistoric activity (Kempter et al., 1996). After 3500 BP, the activity until today is characterized by mainly phreatic-phreatomagmatic eruptions with periodic pyroclastic flows and lahars, primarily on its NE side, towards the Caribbean Sea. Active periods have been found to last 5 – 7 years, reoccurring every 40 ±10 years (Soto, G. J., Alvarado, G. E., Goold, 2003). The lava is dominantly basaltic-andesitic in composition, but also including dacite and rhyolite. The Active Crater is the center of today’s activity, hosting a hyper-acidic crater lake (with values toward pH 0) (Kempter and Rowe, 2000; Tassi et al., 2005), where all historical eruptions originated from (Smithsonian, 2015b).
2.3 Tenorio

The history of Tenorio volcano is still not very well known due to the lack of outcrops and its heavily vegetated surface. Evidence has been found of an old volcanic edifice called Monteverde and its construction was dated between 2.17 and 1.92 Ma (Alvarado and Gans, 2012). After a period of quiescence the new Tenorio volcanic edifice with several cones and active centers was built up in three major effusive phases, the first 0.74 – 0.54 Ma, the second 0.37 – 0.26 Ma and the third starting at 0.09 Ma (Alvarado and Gans, 2012). The complex is comprised of three distinct volcanoes, namely Tenorio, Montezuma and Carmela with the first being the most recently active one (Kitchen, 2002). Eruptive material was identified as basaltic-andesite to andesite (Kitchen, 2003). There is no evidence of an eruption in the Holocene and the volcano is designated as dormant (Smithsonian, 2015c). The volcano shows slight hydrothermal activity on its flanks, mainly as hot gas bubbling through rivers (e.g. surface expression “Borbollones” and “Hervideros”) and bubbling hot pools (e.g. “Tierras Morenas”/“Alto Masis”). Seismic activity at Tenorio (and the Miravalles area) was recorded in October 1997 and 1998, which was thought to be related to tectonic activity of the NW-SE and NE-SW trending regional fault systems, rather than volcanic activity (Barquero and Taylor, 1998).
3. Description of the study areas and field work

3.1 Miravalles

At Miravalles, two study sites were investigated. The first, called the “Las Hornillas” (LH) area is part of the area actively used for geothermal exploitation (Fig. 3). It is the biggest investigated area at the base of Miravalles volcano, situated around visible surface expressions of the volcanoes hydrothermal system. Several clusters of non-vegetated, altered ground (1 – 1400 m²) with fumaroles, boiling (mud) pools, frying pans and elevated soil temperature can be found in the LH study area, where high diffuse soil flux of CO₂ was expected. Geothermal power plant facilities are distributed over the whole area and outside of the obvious hydrothermal surface expressions. The volcano’s flanks and base are covered in dense vegetation and tropical dry forests, having created a thick layer of soil with a significant amount of biogenic material; possibly creating diffuse CO₂ emissions from the soil with their decay. Clearings are either artificial or of hydrothermal nature, where elevated soil temperature and exhalation of significant amounts of CO₂ causes the death of vegetation. This LH area with strong hydrothermal activity coincides with a regional fault trending NE-SW through the volcanic complex (Fig. 3).

A second area investigated for diffuse soil flux of CO₂ was the “Injection Well 4” (IW4), named after the present injection well of the geothermal power plant. ICE communicated problems with the injection, as well as escaping gases on the site and in the creek next to it. The investigated area lies next to the community of La Fortuna and is on the edge of the geothermal power plant area, about 3 km to the SSW from the LH area. It is surrounded partly by dense forest and mainly by farm land. Escaping gas has been observed in the creek and altered ground on the injection well site, but none outside.

3.2 Rincón de la Vieja

At Rincón de la Vieja, a series of interconnected fumarolic fields (1 - 100 m²) called “Las Pailas” (LP) on the south flank of the volcano, near its base, were investigated. It includes altered grounds, fumaroles, mud pools, hot pools and frying pans, surrounded by dense tropical dry forest, similar to the LH area at Miravalles. At Rincón de la Vieja these altered areas could also be related to the regional fault system (Fig. 3).
3.3 Tenorio

Tenorio volcano is mainly covered by dense rainforest, creating soil of several meters thickness. Surface expressions of the hydrothermal systems are less obvious to find and often not connected to trails. Gas sampling was conducted in hot pools on its south flank and from gas bubbling through river water on its north side.

Field work

In January 2015 three weeks of field work were conducted in the Guanacaste volcanic region. Weather conditions in January are in general difficult and unpredictable in this part of Costa Rica, which lead to the complete abandonment of diffuse soil gas survey on Tenorio. High amounts of rainfall year round characterize the climatic circumstances around this volcano, saturating the soil with water and preventing diffuse transport of gas through the soil. For the same reason, the diffuse soil gas measurements were conducted at Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja on dry days and avoiding days after heavy rainfalls, in order to analyze ideally undisturbed
gas flux from the deep reservoir and shallow biogenic input. A total number of 500 measurements were carried out at Miravales and 134 at Rincón de la Vieja. The summit areas of both volcanoes were not accessible in this period, and therefore, no measurements could be taken from these areas and the degassing studies were focused on secondary gas emissions at the base of the volcanoes. Soil temperature maps were only created in the Las Hornillas and Las Pailas areas, where temperatures above ambient values were measured, while at the Injection Well 4 site, very uniform values were measured around ambient temperatures.

In addition to the diffuse degassing studies, gas samples from hydrothermal gas emissions were sampled over the course of several days. Most sampling locations were relatively easily accessible, while some required hours of driving and hiking through dense vegetation in strenuous conditions.

4. Methods

Various methods for the investigation of gas emissions in the Guanacaste region have been applied. In the LH area of Miravales, all methods were used successfully, while in the other areas – due to weather conditions, material availability or lack of data – only some methods could be applied. The methods applied in each field survey location are summarized in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of study</th>
<th>Miravales</th>
<th>Rincón de la</th>
<th>Tenorio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study areas</td>
<td>Las Hornillas</td>
<td>Injection Well 4</td>
<td>Las Pailas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse degassing maps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil temperature maps</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat output estimate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon isotopes from soil gas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumarole sampling</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Diffuse soil gas flux

4.1.1 The principle of the accumulation chamber

The accumulation chamber technique has been widely used to quantify diffuse soil degassing of carbon dioxide and other gas species and confirmed as a valid technique to be applied in volcanic areas (Cardellini et al. 2003; Chiodini et al. 1998, 2001; Frondini et al. 2008; Lewicki et al. 2005; Notsu et al. 2006; Padrón et al. 2008).

The portable diffuse flux meter designed by West Systems S.r.l. used in this study, consists of: (1) handheld accumulation chamber with an integrated mixing device, (2) LICOR 820 infrared CO$_2$ gas analyzer and a TOX-05 electrochemical H$_2$S gas analyzer and (3) palmtop computer to operate the instrument (schema and details on the instrument in Fig. 4 and Table 2).

![Fig. 4, a) Application of the accumulation chamber in the field, b) schematic configuration of the instrument and c) curve of concentration increase on the handheld computer](image-url)
Table 2, Specifications for the West Systems accumulation chamber instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ analyzer</td>
<td>LI-COR 820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S analyzer</td>
<td>TOX-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber type</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber volume</td>
<td>0.006186 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamber footprint</td>
<td>0.0314 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump strength</td>
<td>1000 SCCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each measurement, the accumulation chamber is placed on the soil and the measurement is started through the handheld computer after activating the integrated mixing device in the chamber. At each measurement point, a secure seal around the rim of the accumulation chamber on the soil has to be ensured in order to avoid the interference of atmospheric gases. The measurement lasts between 90 and 180 seconds or more if the curve was not stable enough in this time, in which the concentration of CO₂ in the chamber will increase. The fan in the chamber ensures the constant mixing of the captured gases and their even distribution. The pump transports the gas to the gas analyzers to measure the increase in concentration of CO₂ every second. This increase in concentration is reproduced as a curve on the handheld computer and the slope of this increase (ideally steady) is used to calculate the flux in ppm/s (Fig. 4c).

The barometric pressure and air temperature have been proven to influence the soil gas flux significantly (Hinkle, 1994) and, therefore, they have to be included into the calculation of the real gas flux. Laboratory experiments by Chiodini et al. (1998) showed that by injecting a constant known gas flux through a soil sample under different barometric pressure conditions, a negative correlation exists between barometric pressure and CO₂ flux. The barometric pressures are recorded by the instrument at each measurement and air temperature measurements were conducted manually for later corrections of the flux values.
4.1.2 The application of the accumulation chamber in the field

Carbon dioxide flux measurements were conducted at three different geothermal environments on the Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja volcanoes. Due to heavy vegetation, the distribution of the measurement points is irregular; the spacing at the “Las Hornillas” area varied between 5 and 200 m, at the “Injection Well 4” site between 30 and 70 m and at the “Las Pailas” area between 10 and 80 m. The spacing was kept closer in areas of high soil flux and visible ground alteration, in order to maintain a high level of detail in the regions of significant CO₂ output from the volcanic hydrothermal systems. The lack of vegetation in high alteration zones favored the more detailed investigation. Greater spacing was applied in the areas distant from the high flux zones, fracture and fault zones, where “background” flux was measured and in very strongly vegetated areas. Thick vegetation was one of the main causes of an irregular measurement grid and can also be a possible reason for enhanced CO₂ production in the soil, contributing to the total measured flux.

Soil temperatures were measured at 10-15 cm depth with a thermocouple and a digital thermometer within a 0.2 m radius from the accumulation chamber footprint. Air temperature, humidity and wind speed were determined at each flux measurement location. Wind speeds varied significantly between 0 and 20 km/h and occasionally up to 46 km/h, creating a possible source of variation in the measured soil fluxes, as well as the variation of the relative humidity at different sampling sites. Quantification of the influence of these factors was not possible in this study.

4.1.3 Data analysis

The gas flux measurements were converted from ppm/s to g/m²/day, taking into account the volume and footprint of the accumulation chamber and including the air temperature and barometric pressure taken at each measurement. The conversion factor $K$ is calculated with the following formula:

$$K = \frac{86400 \cdot P}{10^6 \cdot R \cdot T_k} \cdot \frac{V}{A}$$

(1)

where $P$ is the barometric pressure in mbar, $R$ the ideal gas constant (0.08314510 bar*L/K/mol), $T_k$ the air temperature in Kelvin degree, $V$ the chamber volume in m³ and $A$ its footprint area in m². The flux in ppm/s is multiplied by the conversion
factor $K$ to obtain a flux in moles/m$^2$/day, which is again multiplied by the molecular weight of CO$_2$ (44.01 g/mol) to obtain g/m$^2$/day.

The carbon dioxide flux and soil temperatures were then statistically analyzed for their distribution and correlations. Values of CO$_2$ flux under the limit of detection (LOD, 0.44 g/m$^2$/day, D. Continanza, West Systems®, personal communication) were substituted with a value of 0.311 g/m$^2$/day. This value corresponds to the LOD/$\sqrt{2}$, which is, according to Croghan and Egeghy (2003) and Verbovsek (2011), the best-fitting substitution method to include values under the LOD.

The distributions of the individual data sets were evaluated as a first step of exploratory data analysis. In case of a bimodal or polymodal distribution of the data, it is important to distinguish among the different populations in the gas flux or soil temperature data sets. The most reliable tool for this is the cumulative probability plot (CDP) technique, according to A.J. Sinclair (1974) and Harding (1949). With this technique, data populations are separated at inflection point(s), where the curvature of the CDP curve changes its sign (concavity), based on the assumption that the data set is either normally or log-normally distributed, which has to be confirmed with a histogram and/or QQ plot before the procedure. This CDP technique allowed for background and peak flux/temperature populations and in some cases an intermediate population (e.g. the “Las Hornillas” area in this study, see “Results” section) to be identified.

For the calculation of the total output of CO$_2$ for the study areas, non-sampled points in the areas were simulated by using the sequential Gaussian simulation (sGs) method. This method has been shown by Lewicki et al. (2005) and Cardellini et al. (2003) among others to be an effective and precise method for the interpolation of diffuse soil degassing, providing not only a highly detailed map of fluxes, but also facilitating the calculation of the range of total flux over all the conducted simulations. The sGs takes the spatial auto-correlation of the data into account and models each unknown point in the grid using the surrounding measured neighbor points and the previously modeled cell. Therefore, a semi-variogram model, based on the empirical semi-variogram of the dataset, is used as an input model for the simulations. Detailed descriptions of the processing in the GSLIB software are provided by Deutsch and Journel (1998). The total CO$_2$ flux of the study areas was
calculated by multiplying the value of each simulated CO₂ flux cell with the area it represents and summing the simulated flux across the grid.

The same method of interpolation was applied to the soil temperature measurements to produce maps of the soil temperature over the whole study areas. Input parameters for the different simulations are specified in Table 3.

Table 3, SGs input parameters for the interpolation of CO₂ and soil temperature at the different study areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study area + measurement type</th>
<th>Empirical variogram</th>
<th>Variogram model</th>
<th>sGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH CO₂</td>
<td>lag distance [m]</td>
<td>lags tolerance</td>
<td>nugget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>70-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH soil T</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IW4 CO₂</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP CO₂</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP soil T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.4 Calculation of mass and heat flow from CO₂ flux

Steam, and subsequently heat flow, can be estimated by using the [H₂O]:[CO₂] ratio from fluids derived from the deep hydrothermal system and multiplying it by the total CO₂ output of the system (e.g. Bloomberg et al., 2014; Fridriksson et al., 2006)

\[ F_{\text{stm (CO₂)}} = F_{\text{CO₂ tot}} \times \frac{[\text{H₂O}]}{[\text{CO₂}]} \]  

(2)

where \( F_{\text{stm (CO₂)}} \) is the steam mass flow in g/s, \( F_{\text{CO₂ tot}} \) is the total CO₂ output of the investigated area (converted from t/day to g/s) and \( \frac{[\text{H₂O}]}{[\text{CO₂}]} \) is the mass ratio. Selected high-CO₂-flux areas of the LH area were used to calculate the \( F_{\text{CO₂ tot}} \). A \( F_{\text{CO₂ tot}} \) of 30.64 t/day was calculated for these selected high flux areas by summing up significant portions (“hotspots” in the CO₂ flux results map, Fig. 8) of the simulated CO₂ map, which could possibly depict areas where magmatic CO₂ reaches the surface and could, therefore, be representative of the uprising magmatic-hydrothermal gas in the subsurface. \( \frac{[\text{H₂O}]}{[\text{CO₂}]} \) mass ratios of two different wells (Pozo 11 = 24.16 and Pozo 63 = 83.47) were used to calculate a range of possible steam flow rates.

Subsequently, the heat output of the selected high flux areas was calculated in the following way:

\[ H_s = F_{\text{stm (CO₂)}} \times h_{97.5^\circ C} \]  

(3)

where \( H_s \) is the heat output in kJ/s or W and \( h_{97.5^\circ C} \) is the enthalpy of H₂O at 97.5°C (2671.6 kJ/kg), which corresponds to its boiling point at 700 m a.s.l. (average elevation of the LH area). The heat output of the high flux zones was then extrapolated over the whole power plant area to evaluate the heat flow in the subsurface derived from the CO₂ flux at the hotspots and in order to draw a comparison to the power plant production capacity. This was only possible in the Las Hornilllas area on Miravalles, due to the availability of previously collected unpublished data for \( \frac{[\text{H₂O}]}{[\text{CO₂}]} \) ratios in gas emissions of wells in this area.
4.2 Gas geochemistry

4.2.1 Geochemical sampling of fumaroles/hot pools

4.2.1.1 Sampling method for major gas constituents

Gas samples were taken from surface expressions of the different hydrothermal systems of the three volcanoes, e.g. fumaroles and bubbling hot pools at Tenorio, Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja volcanic complexes. In order to analyze the major and minor constituents of gases escaping from fumaroles and hot pools, a method of sampling has to be applied which ensures the least amount of air-contamination and post-reaction of the gas to preserve its original composition. This is accomplished with the method of Montegrossi et al. (2001) using a pre-weighted and pre-evacuated 50 mL thorion-tapped glass tube, filled with 20 mL of purified 0.15M Cd(OH)$_2$ in 4 M NaOH, as a refinement of the method of Giggenbach (1975).

Since only low temperature emissions (T < 100 °C) were sampled, a plastic funnel could be used to focus the emission, which was placed upside-down and secured over the gas emission (fumarole or bubbles rising in a hot pool), fully covering it, in order to capture the full emission and to avoid as much air contamination as possible. The vial with the cadmium-soda solution was placed on the rubber tube connection on the funnel and opened after securing it to slowly let the volcanic gases accumulate (Fig. 5).

![Fig. 5, Sampling apparatus with flask for major gas constituents](image)
The solution in the flask absorbs CO₂, HF, HCl and SO₂ (as SO₃²⁻ and SO₄²⁻) while H₂S precipitates as CdS by reacting with the Cd(OH)₂, slowly turning the solution yellow. This precipitation prevents the reaction of SO₂ and H₂S \((2 \text{H}_2\text{S} + \text{SO}_2 = 3/x \text{S}_x + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O})\) during and after sampling, in order to analyze their original abundances. Incondensable gases (e.g. O₂, H₂, CO, COS, CH₄), noble gases (e.g. Ar, He, Ne) and other hydrocarbons move through the solution and accumulate in the flask’s headspace. Sampling lasts until the pressure in the headspace of the vial is equal to the pressure of the sampled gas emission.

**4.2.1.2 Sampling for CO₂ isotope analyses and volatile organic components (VOCs)**

In order to sample volcanic gas for carbon isotope and VOCs analyses, separate flasks have to be used to capture the gas. VOCs would immediately react with the alkaline solution in the flask for major constituents and new organic compounds, previously not present in the fumarolic gases, would form or previously present species would break up into other compounds. At each fumarole/steam heated pool, one flask was used for carbon isotopes and one for VOCs, by extracting gas from the funnel (same set up as with sampling for main constituents) with a syringe of 60 mL volume and injection into an evacuated vial (Exetainer®) of 10 mL volume, by piercing its semipermeable membrane in the cap with the syringe needle.

In addition to fumarolic gases, six samples of soil gas were taken directly from the accumulation chamber at Miravalles volcano, in order to investigate a possible correlation between CO₂ soil flux and the isotopic signature. This survey was aimed at distinguishing between magmatic and biogenic carbon dioxide sources in combination with the statistical method. Samples were collected from the top of the accumulation chamber by extraction with a syringe and transferred into the same type of vial (Exetainer®) at the end of each measurement of different flux rates, when enough CO₂ had accumulated in the chamber. Due to the limited number of flasks available in the field, not more than six samples could be taken at Miravalles and this survey could not be reproduced at Rincón de la Vieja.
4.2.2 Laboratory analyses of fumarolic gases and data treatment

Major and minor constituents of the collected gas samples, were measured over one week in the Laboratory of Fluid and Rock Geochemistry and the Laboratory of Stable Isotopes at the Department of Earth Sciences (University of Florence).

4.2.2.1 **Main constituents and light hydrocarbons**

The first part of the analysis of the gas captured by the flasks, containing the soda-cadmium solution, was the measurement of incondensable gases accumulated in the flask’s headspace. Two different gas chromatographs are available in the laboratory of the Department of Earth Sciences (University of Florence) for this purpose. The Shimadzu 14A is used for the measurement of CO through methanization and hydrocarbons after the methods of Vaselli et al. (2006). Heavier hydrocarbon gases (C > 10) have to be analyzed through gas mass spectrometry (Capecchiacci, 2012).

Vaselli et al. (2006) furthermore provide a detailed description of the analysis of H₂ (> and < 5000 ppmv), Ar, He, Ne, O₂, N₂, CH₄ (>1000 ppmv) and CO (> 350 ppmv) through the Shimadzu 15A chromatograph (Fig. 6), containing a Flame Ionization Detector, with He, Ne or Ar as a gas carrier, depending on the analyzed species.

![Gas chromatograph Shimadzu 15A](image)

*Fig. 6, Gas chromatograph Shimadzu 15A for the analysis of H₂, Ar, He, Ne, O₂, N₂, and CO content*
The chromatography methods are all based on the fact that different chemical constituents react in a different manner with the stationary phase of the chromatograph. This causes the different constituents to arrive at the detector at different times and, therefore, to be distinguished from one another by their arrival times. Integrating the area under the different peaks can then be used for the calculation of the concentration of each species.

The precipitated and dissolved species in the solution can then be analyzed after the methods of Montegrossi et al. (2001). The solid and liquid phases were removed from the flask, transferred into Teflon centrifugation tubes by a water pump and centrifuged to separate the solid and the liquid phases. In the liquid phase the following species can be analyzed:

- Carbonatic species, from the dissolution of CO₂, determined by titration with acidimetric volumetry,
- Cl⁻, originally from HCl in the gas, analyzed by ion chromatography, and
- SO₄²⁻ (from dissolution of SO₂), also with ion chromatography.

The solid phase CdS is dissolved and re-centrifuged to eliminate Cd and total sulfur. The resulting SO₄²⁻ is used to analyze the H₂S concentration by ion chromatography. The final solid phase Cd(OH)₂ and elementary sulfur are separated and the elementary sulfur concentration is measured by ion chromatography with the SO₄²⁻ formed by its oxidation (Vaselli et al., 2006).
4.2.2.2 **Carbon isotopes**

To evaluate the origin of the CO₂ in the discharges of the hydrothermal system, the stable isotopic composition of the CO₂ in the sampled gas was analyzed (δ¹³C₀₂). To achieve this, the proportion of ¹³C to ¹²C in the CO₂ of the sampled gas is used. Therefore, the CO₂ has to be separated from the other constituents using a two-stage cryogenic trap.

Before this trap can be applied, it has to be determined by the gas chromatography method if H₂S is present in the sampled gas. The cryogenic trap cannot separate CO₂ from H₂S, because both of their boiling points are below the temperature of the second stage of the cryogenic trap, causing both of them to remain as a solid; therefore, if H₂S is present, H₂S has to be eliminated from the gas phase beforehand.

After the determination of the absence or the elimination of H₂S, the first stage of the cryogenic trap can be initiated. The vial containing the sampled gas is connected to one of the tubes of the trap transferred into its evacuated tube system. A container with liquid nitrogen (-190 °C) is installed to surround the “elbow” part of the tube. This causes H₂O and CO₂ to condensate and to gather in the lower part of the tube, while the other phases, still in gaseous state, are evacuated through the valve on the uppermost end of the system (Fig. 7).

After this first separation, the trap with liquid nitrogen is removed and the second cryogenic trap is applied. It contains a mixture of liquid nitrogen and trichloroethylene and is applied the same way as in the first trap. The now higher temperature causes the CO₂ to transform back into the vapor phase, while H₂O remains solid. This procedure ensures a concentration of 99.999 % CO₂ in the remaining gaseous phase, which is captured in a separate container for the following stable isotopic ratio analysis.

---

*Fig. 7, Apparatus for separation of CO₂ from the sampled volcanic gas*
The analysis of the stable isotopic composition of the CO₂ was conducted with a mass spectrometer in the CNR (National Council of Research) – IGG (Institute of Geosciences and Earth Resources) of Pisa/Italy, where the ratio of mass over charge of the carbon in the CO₂ molecules was determined. Due to the higher weight of ¹³C compared to ¹²C, the ratio of these two isotopes can be calculated and is expressed in δ¹³C_CO₂, by normalizing it to the Pee Dee Belemnite standard with the following formula:

\[
δ^{13}C_{\text{Sample}} = \left( \frac{^{13}C/^{12}C_{\text{Sample}}}{^{13}C/^{12}C_{\text{PDB}}} - 1 \right) \cdot 1000
\] (4)

Several different sources of the soil CO₂ are possible, each having a unique signature of δ¹³C_CO₂. These include mantle derived magmatic CO₂ [δ¹³C_CO₂ = -8 to -3‰ (Hoefs, 1987)], CO₂ from organic soil respiration [δ¹³C_CO₂ between -13 and -30‰ (Cerling et al., 1991; Keeling, 1961)], as well as from input of carbonate sedimentary rocks into the magmatic source [δ¹³C_CO₂ = -1 to +4‰, (Faure and Mensing, 2005)] and contamination of the soil gas by atmospheric CO₂ [δ¹³C_CO₂ = -6 to -8‰, (Cerling et al., 1991)]. Carbon isotopic values have been determined for all samples from fumaroles and steam heated pools and four of six samples from the accumulation chamber contained enough CO₂ for the analysis of δ¹³C_CO₂ values.

Table 4. Summary of methods conducted for gas analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyzed component</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incondensable gases</td>
<td>Gas chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(H₂, Ar, He, Ne, O₂, N₂, CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>Acidimetric volumetry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCl, SO₂</td>
<td>Ion chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂S, S₈</td>
<td>Ion chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light hydrocarbons</td>
<td>Gas chromatography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CH₄, C₂H₆, C₃H₈, C₃H₆, i-C₄H₁₀, n-C₄H₁₀, i-C₄H₈, C₆H₆)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O</td>
<td>subtraction of analyzed species from sampled gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ¹³C_CO₂</td>
<td>Gas mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/Ra</td>
<td>Gas mass spectrometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Results

5.1 Diffuse soil gas flux

5.1.1 “Las Hornillas” area, Miravalles power plant

The investigated area around the “Las Hornillas” fumarolic fields lies completely within the power plant’s area of production and has an areal extent of 1.99 km². The measured CO₂ flux of 436 measurements in this area varied between below detection limit (0.311 g/m²/day) and 11004 g/m²/day, with an average of 253 g/m²/day and a standard deviation of 808 g/m²/day (Fig. 8). Fumarolic fields with high flux can be identified by “warm” colors in the map. Two areas of particular flux patterns have been identified. Zone A between the fumarolic fields and Zone B, inside an old quarry (Fig. 8).

Fig. 8, Map of sGs results for CO₂ flux (logarithmic scale with the population break points of 25 and 225 g/m²/day and significant high values) for the investigated LH area (1.99 km²). The thin red outline shows the area used for the calculation of the total CO₂ output, black dots indicate the measurement locations, pink circles production wells of the geothermal power plant, and Zone A and B in orange, which are areas of interest.
A representation of the CO\textsubscript{2} flux data in a cumulative distribution plot (CDP) (Fig. 9) shows the existence of three different populations of flux values, with population I (“background”) ranging from the LOD to 25 g/m\textsuperscript{2}/day with a mean of 13 g/m\textsuperscript{2}/day, population II (“mixed”) between 25 and 225 g/m\textsuperscript{2}/day with a mean of 64 g/m\textsuperscript{2}/day and population III (“peak”) from 225 to the maximum value measured with a mean of 1044 g/m\textsuperscript{2}/day. The three populations make up 43.3 %, 35.1 % and 21.6 % of the data, respectively.

A total mean CO\textsubscript{2} output of 133 t/day was calculated, with a minimum of 118 and a maximum of 151 t/day in 1000 realizations (95 % confidence interval), which corresponds to a maximum error of 13.5 % of the total mean flux estimate. The zones with relatively high efflux (peak and/or mixed populations) of CO\textsubscript{2} through the soil are concentrated around the obvious surface expressions of the hydrothermal area, such as fumaroles and hot pools. These are surrounded by patches of altered grounds of varying size, estimated from 1 m\textsuperscript{2} up to 200 m\textsuperscript{2}. They are characterized by the lack of vegetation and alteration of the soil minerals, causing a noticeable difference in soil color, ranging from light brown, to orange, to white. Outside of these non-vegetated areas, the CO\textsubscript{2} flux drops rapidly to background values (flux population I) or to slightly higher values in the range of the mixed flux population. A
very low flux area was observed in the very east of the study area (orange circle, Fig. 8), which is an old quarry and almost completely stripped of vegetation.

The best-fit semi-variogram, used to build a model for spatial correlation for the sequential Gaussian simulation of the CO₂ efflux and the soil temperature in the “Las Hornillas” area, are presented in Fig. 10. It can be observed that a spatial auto-correlation exists in the data (red points) until about 150 m distance for the CO₂ flux and until about 150 – 200 m for the soil temperature, where the variogram plateaus out, with points fluctuating around a variance value of 1. The models used (blue lines) for both the CO₂ flux and soil temperature are of the exponential variogram type, which was observed to be the best fit for this particular data set.

![Semi-variograms for sGs of a) CO₂ flux and b) soil temperature of the LH area.](image)

Fig. 10, Semi-variograms for sGs of a) CO₂ flux and b) soil temperature of the LH area, with horizontal distance of measurement points on the x-axis and Υ for the variance on the y-axis, where a value of 1 corresponds to the total absence of spatial auto-correlation. Red dots represent the empirical semi-variograms and the blue lines the semi-variogram models.

A positive logarithmic correlation of CO₂ efflux and soil temperature has been found in the area of the Miravalles power plant (Fig. 11), which is coherent with other soil flux studies in volcanic areas (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Werner et al., 2008). The simulated map for soil temperatures in the “Las Hornillas” area is presented in Fig. 12. Visual comparison of the CO₂ efflux and the soil temperature map shows a similar spatial variation of high values. The same similarity of the two data sets can be observed comparing the variograms showing a comparable spatial auto-correlation of the measurements. The soil temperatures in this area range from 19.4 to 97.7 °C with a mean of 32.0 °C and a standard deviation of 16.4 °C.
Carbon isotopic values of soil CO$_2$ have been determined at four different flux rates in the Las Hornillas area of the Miravalles geothermal field (Fig. 13). There is no apparent correlation between carbon isotopes and the CO$_2$ flux rate. In previous studies (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Chiodini et al., 2008; Werner and Cardellini, 2006), positive correlations of $\delta^{13}$C$_{CO2}$ and CO$_2$ flux were determined in volcanic/hydrothermal areas, which could not be found in this study.
Steam mass and heat flow of the Miravalles power plant area

Discharges from two production wells (Pozo 11 and Pozo 63) were used to estimate the ratio of H$_2$O to CO$_2$ in the uprising fluids from the underlying geothermal reservoir at Miravalles volcano. This was only calculated in the LH study area, due to the availability of data of deep geothermal wells, showing a ratio of presumed deep origin. Chemical compositions of gases in fumaroles and steam heated pools show low abundances of H$_2$O due to condensation in shallow depths. Therefore, it was only possible to conduct this heat flow estimate at the LH area, where discharge data from wells was available.

Both wells that were used as an estimate of upflowing CO$_2$ are situated between the fumarolic fields of the LH area (visible in “warm” colors in Fig. 8). The distance from Pozo 11, which has a [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] ratio of 24.16, to the nearest high flux field is about 400 m and the Pozo 63 lies about 270 m away from the next high-flux zone and has a ratio of 83.47, suggesting a higher [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] ratio with decreasing distance to the main fluid upflow zones. The heat flow calculations, using equation 2 and 3, give a value of 22,896 W for the Pozo 11 ratio and 79,079 W for the Pozo 63 ratio for selected high-flux zones (total extent 95364 m$^2$). Extrapolation of these values to the whole geothermally used power plant area (16 km$^2$) yields heat flow values of 3.8 MW and 13.3 MW, for the two ratios, respectively. Compared to the production design of the power plant, which is around 163 MW, these values are significantly lower.
5.1.2 Injection well 4 site, Miravalles power plant

Carbon dioxide flux in the Injection Well 4 site varies between below the LOD and 385 g/m²/day with a mean of 22 g/m²/day and a standard deviation of 49 g/m²/day among 64 measurements on an area of 0.172 km². The existence of two distinct populations is shown by the CDP in Fig. 14 with the inflection point at 14 g/m²/day. The background population below this value represents 54.7 % of the data with a mean of 6 g/m²/day, while the peak (above the inflexion point) represents 45.3 % with a mean of 39 g/m²/day.

![Fig. 14, CDP and histogram of the CO₂ flux measurements on the IW site with a break point at 14 g/m²/day, separating background (population I) and peak (population II) flux](image)

The empirical variogram and the variogram model used for the sGs show a clear spatial auto-correlation until about 300 m (Fig. 15b). A total mean CO₂ output of 2.2 t/day was calculated for the whole area around the injection well of 0.172 km² (Fig. 15a), with a minimum flux of 2.1 t/day and a maximum flux of 2.6 t/day in 700 realizations (95 % confidence interval). This corresponds to a maximum error of 15.8 % of the total mean flux estimate.
The highest value measured is not on the injection well site but in the middle of the adjacent meadow accommodating several wells observed during fieldwork. The efflux value of 27 g/m²/day, measured on the injection well site, lies above the background, but far from the highest measurements. Escaping gas from the soil through the water of the creek was observed next to the injection well site, where the second largest CO₂ soil flux was measured. Some m² of altered ground was observed and a strong odor of H₂S was present on and around the injection well site. Soil temperature on this site was slightly elevated with 33°C (maximum value in this area), while all other measurements were around ambient temperatures.

Fig. 15, a) CO₂ flux map of the IW 4 site with measurement locations represented by black dots, logarithmic color scale with significant flux values and b) empirical semi-variogram (red dots) and semi-variogram model (blue line) used for computing CO₂ flux with sGs, horizontal distance of measurement points on the x-axis and γ for the variance on the y-axis, where a value of 1 corresponds to a total absence of spatial auto-correlation.
5.1.3 “Las Pailas“ fumarole area, Rincón de la Vieja

Carbon dioxide efflux at the “Las Pailas“ fumarolic area (134 measurements) varied between below the detection limit and 569 g/m²/day (mean: 33 g/m²/day, standard deviation: 59 g/m²/day) where high efflux values were typically measured on altered ground. Inversely, altered grounds frequently did not show high CO₂ efflux, possibly due to sintering of the ground by the hydrothermal activity. The CDP of the LP data set (Fig. 16) shows the presence of two populations of CO₂ efflux, divided at a value of 18 g/m²/day. The background population represents 64.2 % with a mean of 13 g/m²/day and the peak population represents 35.8 % of the data with a mean of 70 g/m²/day.

Fig. 16, CDP am of the CO₂ measurements in the LP area with a break point at 18 g/m²/day, separating background (population I) and peak (population II) flux
A total CO₂ output of 3.3 t/day was calculated for the "Las Pailas" study area using the simulated flux map in Fig. 18a. The total flux ranges from 3.2 to 3.6 t/day (95 % confidence interval) over the area of 0.129 km² in 1000 sequential Gaussian simulations, corresponding to a maximum deviation of 7.8 % from the total mean output value. The variogram used for this simulation are presented in Fig. 17a. The empirical variogram shows poor spatial correlation and, therefore, a high nugget effect, causing a strong variability in the model and a less smooth surface of CO₂ flux.

Fig. 17, Empirical (red dots) and modeled (blue line) semi-variograms used for the computation of sGs for a) CO₂ flux and b) soil temperature in the LP area; horizontal distance of measurement points on the x-axis and γ for the variance on the y-axis, where a value of 1 corresponds to the total absence of spatial auto-correlation
Soil temperatures in the LP area varied between 23.5 and 98 °C with a mean of 41.3 °C. The empirical variogram of the soil temperature measurements has less variability compared to the variogram of the CO₂ flux from the same area (Fig. 17b), consequently a more detailed map of the soil temperature could be produced for the soil temperature (Fig. 18b). Visual comparison of the soil temperature and CO₂ flux in this area suggests a weak correlation between the two variables (Fig. 19).
The LP area shows a positive correlation of CO$_2$ flux and soil temperature, when visually comparing the two maps and plotted against each other (Fig. 19). The correlation is of rather linear shape and very flat, showing this phenomenon of very low flux in hot altered soil.

In the field it is obvious that high flux is concentrated in surface features (altered soil visible as white patches) and even there this is not always the case. Elevated soil CO$_2$ flux does not deviate from clusters of altered grounds and even very low flux can be observed around them.

Table 5, Results of soil gas surveys of the three study areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Las Hornillas</th>
<th>Injection Well 4</th>
<th>Las Pailas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (km$^2$)</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max soil temperature (°C)</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max CO$_2$ flux (g/m$^2$/day)</td>
<td>11004</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean CO$_2$ flux (g/m$^2$/day)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CO$_2$ flux (t/day)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat output (MW)</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Gas geochemistry

Twelve gas samples in total have been taken from boiling pools and bubbling emissions in the Guanacaste volcanic region in January 2015. Five on the south flank of Rincón de la Vieja, four on the SW side of Miravalles and three at Tenorio (one from the north side and two from the south side of the volcano). 34 samples from older studies (Gherardi et al., 2002; Giggenbach and Soto, 1992; Tassi, unpublished data 1999-2005) were included into the database of gas samples of the Guanacaste region for comparative purposes. These older samples were collected from fumaroles, steam heated pools and wells between 1984 and 2005.

Major and minor constituents of recent and previously analyzed gas samples are reported in Tables 6, 7 and 8 in mmol/mol, with a measurement error of 5%. In gas discharges on all three volcanoes no HF, HCl or SO₂ concentration has been detected above the detection limit of 0.01 µmol/mol. Sampled gases are mainly composed by CO₂ (up to 996 mmol/mol), closely followed by H₂O (up to 995.07 mmol/mol) and the less abundant main species H₂S, N₂, and H₂ (maxima of 35.2, 41.93, 6.33 mmol/mol, respectively). CH₄, Ar and O₂ range up to 1.775, 0.753 and 5.62 mmol/mol, respectively, where Ar and O₂ are more abundant than CH₄ at Rincón, which in turn is more abundant at Miravalles and Tenorio. O₂ concentration varies strongly between different surface features and the volcanoes. Ne, He and CO are present as trace compounds with a maximum concentration of 0.000631, 0.013 and 0.058 mmol/mol, respectively.

Seven different light hydrocarbons (VOCs) were analyzed in the samples, with benzene as the most abundant (max. 78.46 mmol/mol), then ethane, propene, n-butane, propane, butene in descending order and iso-butene with the lowest maximum concentration of 1.9 mmol/mol.

δ¹³C CO₂ values range from -0.63 to -5.44, relative to the PDB standard and He-isotopic values R/Ra vary between 3.24 at Miravalles and 7.1 at Tenorio.
Rincón de la Vieja differs in several ways from the other two volcanoes of the Guanacaste region:

Fairly high and variable H₂ contents are typical (Fig. 20a and Fig. 21b), which are three orders of magnitude more than at Tenorio and an order of magnitude more than at Miravalles. Furthermore, Rincón shows comparatively low CH₄ (Fig. 21a and b) and low C₂H₆ contents (Fig. 20a), compared to Miravalles, while Tenorio shows almost no C₂H₆. Higher δ¹³C CO₂ values and less uniform CO₂ values (Fig. 20b) distinguish Rincón from Miravalles and Tenorio.
Table 6. Chemical composition (in mmol/mol) and helium (expressed as R/Ra) and carbon (expressed as $\delta^{13}$C$_{CO_2}$) isotopic ratios of sampled gases in the Guanacaste volcanic region in January 2015 (red = Rincón, blue = Miravalles, green = Tenorio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>T°C</th>
<th>CO$_2$</th>
<th>H$_2$S</th>
<th>H$_2$O</th>
<th>N$_2$</th>
<th>CH$_4$</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>O$_2$</th>
<th>Ne</th>
<th>H$_2$</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Rincon</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>983.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>156.00</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>0.003900</td>
<td>0.000910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Barro</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>983.37</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>221.00</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.0012</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>0.003700</td>
<td>0.001100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Agua</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>983.57</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>117.00</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
<td>5.110</td>
<td>0.004500</td>
<td>0.001600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>983.47</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>154.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>0.002100</td>
<td>0.001200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon fuminco</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>492.77</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>2.780</td>
<td>0.003900</td>
<td>0.000900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 1 2015</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>867.80</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.000350</td>
<td>0.051000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 2 2015</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>859.33</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.000260</td>
<td>0.058000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 3 2015</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>847.24</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>0.000490</td>
<td>0.035000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guayacan</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>213.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.000390</td>
<td>0.011000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borbollones</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>837.00</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>156.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.660</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000230</td>
<td>0.000550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto masís 1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>891.00</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.000510</td>
<td>0.002800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto masís 2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>875.00</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>115.00</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.000470</td>
<td>0.003600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$d^{13}$C</th>
<th>R/Ra</th>
<th>C$_3$H$_6$</th>
<th>i-C$<em>4$H$</em>{10}$</th>
<th>n-C$<em>4$H$</em>{10}$</th>
<th>i-C$_4$H$_8$</th>
<th>C$_6$H$_6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Rincon</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Barro</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Agua</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>1.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon fuminco</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 1 2015</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>11.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 2 2015</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>15.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 3 2015</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>9.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guayacan</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>1.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borbollones</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto masís 1</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>7.100</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alto masís 2</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7, Major and minor constituents (in mmol/mol) and helium (expressed as R/Ra) and carbon (expressed as δ\(^{13}\)C\(_{CO_2}\)) isotopic ratios of the Guanacaste volcanoes (red = Rincón, blue = Miravalles, green = Tenorio) sampled prior to 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>T°C</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>H₂S</th>
<th>H₂O</th>
<th>N₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>Ar</th>
<th>O₂</th>
<th>Ne</th>
<th>H₂</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>δ(^{13})C</th>
<th>R/Ra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen BQ*</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00056</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.003000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas LM*</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>0.00035</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>0.001300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas vent LV*</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>0.003300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de agua 1***</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>983.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.00013</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>0.001428</td>
<td>0.000550</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago Caliente 1*</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>983.5</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.00014</td>
<td>2.560</td>
<td>0.001805</td>
<td>0.00776</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Agua 2***</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>760.8</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>225.7</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td>2.205</td>
<td>0.001417</td>
<td>0.001598</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen 1***</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>979.9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.00014</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>0.001376</td>
<td>0.001166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Barro 1***</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>492.7</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>450.5</td>
<td>41.94</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>0.00063</td>
<td>6.328</td>
<td>0.002118</td>
<td>0.001766</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Barro 2***</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>979.9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.00014</td>
<td>3.526</td>
<td>0.001376</td>
<td>0.001166</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen Barro 1***</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>629.8</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>336.1</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.00012</td>
<td>5.136</td>
<td>0.001792</td>
<td>0.008458</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen Barro 2***</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>736.8</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>245.2</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.00014</td>
<td>3.646</td>
<td>0.000199</td>
<td>0.010852</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * Samples from (Giggenbach and Soto, 1992), ** Samples from (Gherardi et al., 2002), *** Samples from (Tassi et al., 2005), unmarked samples are unpublished data collected by F. Tassi.
Table 8, Light hydrocarbon concentrations (in mmol/mol) of the Guanacaste volcanoes (red = Rincón, blue = Miravalles, green = Tenorio) sampled prior to 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>C$_2$H$_6$</th>
<th>C$_3$H$_8$</th>
<th>C$_4$H$_8$</th>
<th>i-C$_4$H$_10$</th>
<th>n-C$_4$H$_10$</th>
<th>i-C$_6$H$_10$</th>
<th>C$_6$H$_6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen BQ*</td>
<td>14.600</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas LM*</td>
<td>18.300</td>
<td>4.100</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas vent LV*</td>
<td>15.400</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de agua 1***</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>2.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Agua 2***</td>
<td>7.953</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>2.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago Caliente 1***</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>1.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lago Caliente 2***</td>
<td>4.574</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas de Barro ***</td>
<td>21.099</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>4.851</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>4.617</td>
<td>22.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pailas do Volc***</td>
<td>5.292</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>4.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen 1 ***</td>
<td>11.042</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>5.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen 2***</td>
<td>5.123</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>2.499</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen 3***</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen Barro 1***</td>
<td>18.527</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>17.668</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>16.093</td>
<td>8.725</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen Barro 2***</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>8.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen 1 2005***</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borinquen Barro 2 2005***</td>
<td>3.707</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN1 Las Hornillas**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN2 Las Hornillas**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN3 Las Hornillas**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN4 Las Hornillas**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HN5 Las Hornillas**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornillas pequeñas HM*</td>
<td>1.100</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 1</td>
<td>60.638</td>
<td>11.384</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 2</td>
<td>15.399</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>4.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Hornillas 3</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>2.156</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzo 11</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pozzo 63</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierras Morenas TM*</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hervideros</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poza Celeste</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termal Caliente</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.613</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termal Fria</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambú</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termal Rio Celeste</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>2.481</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Samples from (Giggenbach and Soto, 1992), ** Samples from (Gherardi et al., 2002), *** Samples from (Tassi et al., 2005), unmarked samples are unpublished data collected by F. Tassi (Università degli Studi di Firenze)
6. Discussion

6.1 Diffuse soil gas flux

6.1.1 “Las Hornillas” area, Miravalles power plant

*Distribution of soil flux and soil temperatures and structural control*

Peak CO₂ flux is obviously concentrated in areas of ground alteration and fumarolic fields. Outside these visible surface expressions of the hydrothermal system, CO₂ flux drops rapidly to background or “mixed” flux values. Mixed flux values are apparently not enough for stressing vegetation, since only stressed vegetation was observed, where high CO₂ soil flux and elevated soil temperatures were measured. Very low flux (around the LOD or below) was observed in the very NE of the LH study area, which is an abandoned quarry (Fig. 8, Zone B). Since a minimum of about 75% of the quarry is vegetation and soil free, there is almost no CO₂ flux (no biogenic CO₂ input) and the existing measured CO₂ is possibly due to air contamination. The bed rock is hard and massive basalt/basaltic andesite with little porosity and no visible fractures in this area, leaving no space for diffuse soil gas flux. This shows the contrast between vegetated and non-vegetated areas outside the DDSs, indicating that the background CO₂ flux is obviously derived from the decomposition of biogenic material.

The Zone A in Fig. 8, between the two fumarolic fields, is a large zone of low to mixed flux with a very wide spacing of measurement locations. This wide spacing is suspected to cause incorrect interpolation of higher flux values than the actual measurements around (dark blue patches). Close to these low flux measurements, the program simulates the flux correctly as low, but after 30 - 50 m distance, suddenly higher flux is simulated. This is probably due to the shape of the variogram model, where the strongest spatial auto-correlation is until about 50 m distance. After this strong decrease of spatial auto-correlation, the model takes the low-flux neighbors with a similar weight into account than the higher-flux points further away. Therefore the flux is simulated higher than logically expected. This error leads presumably to an over-estimation of the local CO₂ flux and, therefore, to an over-estimation of the total CO₂ output of this study area.
Miravalles volcano is influenced by several regional lineaments and faults. The Las Hornillas study area and its surface expressions of the deep hydrothermal system lie along such a fault (RL 5 in Fig. 3, section 2/Geological Setting; and Melián et al. 2004, Fig. 2), typical for DDSs. The fault is NE-SW orientated and crosses the whole volcanic complex, including the old Guayabo caldera. Faults create a zone of higher permeability, enabling deep fluids to rise to the surface, creating altered zones in some cases. Therefore, it is assumed that there is a direct link between tectonic and degassing structures.

Diffuse carbon dioxide flux in volcanic regions is often correlated with elevated soil temperatures (e.g. Bloomberg et al. 2014; Werner et al. 2008). In the LH area a positive logarithmic relationship between CO₂ flux and soil temperature was observed (Fig. 11). This indicates that hot steam from the deep hydrothermal reservoir and CO₂ travel along the same pathways to the surface. It also gives additional support for the assumptions that the flux in the previously mentioned Zone A, between the two fumarolic fields, is over-estimated, since no elevated soil temperatures were observed in this area. The concentration of CO₂ flux and elevated soil temperature in and around surface features of the hydrothermal systems could indicate that the transport of heat and gas is dominated by advective processes rather than diffusion, which is possibly the main transport process for CO₂ from biogenic sources (Chiodini et al., 2001).

**Comparison to previous study at Miravalles**

The calculation of CO₂ output in the selected LH and IW 4 areas is an attempt for more detailed knowledge about diffuse degassing distribution and behavior at Miravalles. The only previous study of diffuse degassing at Miravalles by Melián et al. (2004) was focused on the calculation of a total CO₂ output by the Miravalles volcano with significantly less detail. They conducted 244 measurements over an area of 65 km², whereas in this study the calculations for the two study areas are based on 500 measurement points in roughly 2 km². Here, only areas of anomalous flux and surface expressions of hydrothermal fluids were investigated, since it can be assumed that magmatic CO₂ emissions of quiescent volcanoes are mainly focused in DDSs, shown by previous studies (Chiodini et al., 2001, 1998; Gerlach et al., 2001; Hernández et al., 1998). These are located above fracture zones which act as pathways for hydrothermal fluids. It is likely that the edifice of Miravalles volcano is
strongly impermeable for diffuse transport from the deep reservoir, suggested by the very low flux values in the quarry region (Fig. 8, Zone B). In this part of the LH study area, vegetation is stripped away, only leaving the impermeable bedrock consisting of lava flows and lahar deposits, where the transport of magmatic CO$_2$ is dominated by fracture zones.

This study provides a clearly more detailed estimation of diffuse carbon dioxide flux from the soil with a more systematic sampling approach and likely smaller error, compared to the work of Melián et al. (2004), who probably strongly overestimated the total output of magmatic CO$_2$ by Miravalles volcano. The interpolation of a small amount of data in combination with unequal spacing and the lack of detail in high-flux zones can lead to an inaccurate estimate of the total CO$_2$ output. Biogenic CO$_2$ represents a large part of diffuse soil degassing at Miravalles, which interferes with the estimate of magmatic CO$_2$ output. The combination of this study with further detailed studies of the summit area and other high flux areas indicated by Melián et al. (2004) in the N and SE of the volcanic complex can lead to a more detailed estimation of the volcano’s output in carbon dioxide. Detailed measurements of the LH area can be used for chemical monitoring of the volcano, since it is an easily accessible area and, therefore, changes in its degassing behavior can be easily detected. This is also of benefit for the geothermal power plant, where its use and safety issues rely directly on the volcano’s activity.

**Heat flow estimation**

Heat flow was estimated in the LH area using [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] mass ratios of gas discharges in two different wells (Pozo 11 and 63) of the geothermal power plant. The estimation of heat flow, extrapolated over the whole geothermally exploited area of 3.8 MW and 13.3 MW is comparatively low to the production design of the power plant, which is about 163 MW. This large discrepancy suggests that the ratio of [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] is not a suitable proxy for heat flow estimations in this area due to several possible reasons: 1) Gas emissions at the deep geothermal wells might not have the same composition as in the high upflow zones, where escaping gases are concentrated and, therefore, it is difficult to compare thei with the gas data of the wells with diffuse degassing in the DDSs. 2) Interaction of uprising gases with the rock and shallow ground water, can reduce the diffuse soil degassing, as well as the CO$_2$ concentrations in fumaroles and bubbling pools. The shallow water table can be
assumed to be far more extensive due to the large amounts of rainfall in this area, compared to volcanic areas with dryer climate, where this method of heat flow estimation was used. 3) If most of the CO$_2$ is emitted by surface features (e.g. bubbling hot pools and fumaroles), it would not be included into the calculations, because only diffusely degassed CO$_2$ was used for the estimation and, therefore, a large part of heat flow would have been missed, explaining the present discrepancy. 4) Additionally, the fact that well 63 has stopped producing in 2003, after one year of use, suggests that higher gas and heat flow can be expected in other areas and that this well is not a suitable location for a representative [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] ratio. It is assumed that the decrease of natural permeability and the formation of sinter around the well, due to lower flashing because of geothermal extraction, could be reasons for this well to have stopped producing (Moya and Yock, 2005). Therefore, it is likely that this well does not represent the original [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] ratio derived from fluids from the deep hydrothermal reservoir. To further investigate the use of this method of heat flow estimation further data on gas compositions from geothermal wells in the power plant area would be needed.

6.1.2 Injection Well 4 site, Miravalles power plant

Carbon dioxide flux around the Injection Well 4 shows generally slightly elevated values compared to background values and anomalous amounts of flux are present. Although, they are not comparable to the fumarolic fields at the LH site. Interestingly, the highest values of CO$_2$ flux are not directly next to the well or on the well site, but outside, near other groundwater wells. ICE reported problems with the re-injection of waste-fluid produced by the power plant. Therefore, it is most likely that elevated carbon dioxide flux in the soil is artificially induced by the re-injection, rather than due to a natural surface emanation of the deep hydrothermal system. Ground alteration on the injection well site is probably due to escaping gases from the Cl-rich brine or percolation of the waste water itself in shallow levels of the soil.

Anomalous flux was also observed next to the creek along the well site, which additionally showed rising gases in the water. This could indicate that gas is escaping from the injection and is transported through fractures back to the surface. Carbon dioxide emissions at the surface are probably due to short-circuit circulation of the
injected gas, and are, therefore, showing a leak of this injection well site. Topography and the location of the creek suggest that this depression could be such a fracture zone, explaining problems with the injection at this site and not others, where there is no fracture zone in direct surroundings. Visual evidence of this lateral escape is only observed on and around the well site, where some m² of altered ground can be found and a strong H₂S smell is present. Dead animals and bones were found along the creek located in the depression, suggesting that CO₂ is escaping and gathering close to the surface, suffocating creatures near the ground.

6.1.3 “Las Pailas” area, Rincón de la Vieja

**Distribution of soil flux**

The “Las Pailas” area is composed of several fumarolic fields with hot pools, mud pools, frying pans and fumaroles, generally showing elevated soil flux of CO₂. High flux values were observed around and near these features as expected. Surprisingly, most of the altered ground shows very low flux values (close the background values), unlike in the LH area. This is either due to natural strong concentration of gas flux in the surface features and/or the shift of degassing from the soil to these features due to the self-sealing effect of ground alteration by gradual sinter-precipitation (Facca and Tonani, 1967). Chiodini et al. (2001) suggested that the transporting mechanism for deeply derived hydrothermal CO₂ is rather advection with the rising magmatic gas body, in contrast with biogenically derived CO₂, which rises dominantly by diffusion mechanics. The effect of these two mechanisms could be the reason for this particular distribution of CO₂ flux, which has a strong effect on their spatial auto-correlation. It creates a high variability in the CO₂ flux variogram and thus in the sequential Gaussian simulations. Therefore, high flux zones are more isolated dots rather than distinguished zones, visible in Fig. 18. Simulated values are therefore less reliable, due to the weakness of the variogram model.

The correlation of CO₂ flux and soil temperature (Fig. 19) is a rather flat curve compared to curve for LH, which means rather low CO₂ flux at high temperature. This again supports the idea of self-sealing ground-alteration where only heat is transported by conduction and no diffuse transport of gases is possible.
Comparison of diffuse degassing behavior of Rincón de la Vieja and Miravalles

In comparison to the Las Hornillas zone, the Las Pailas study area has about 65% less of CO₂ discharge from diffuse soil degassing, if both areas were of similar extent; even though the LH area mainly consists of unaltered ground with low background values far from the fumarolic fields. Less diffuse degassing on the flanks/base of the active volcano Rincón de la Vieja compared to the dormant Miravalles could indicate a different degassing behavior if the hypothesis of a common hydrothermal reservoir (Giggenbach and Soto, 1992) applies. Although they both show secondary degassing features on the flanks/bases, generally lower flux values were observed at Rincón de la Vieja, even in strongly altered soils. This could be either due to stronger concentration in the surface features (fumaroles and steam heated pools) than through the soil on this volcano or generally more focused degassing around the Active Crater area. Weaker soil degassing has been attributed to activity states with stronger plume-degassing (Notsu et al., 2006). Since Rincón de la Vieja was historically and recently very active, it is possible that the active magma plumbing system towards its Active Crater facilitates the transport of gas to the surface, compared to the degassing paths towards the flanks. Miravalles on the other hand has not recently been active and does not show evident emissions of CO₂ on the summit (summit crater is fully vegetated, which indicates no lethal amounts of CO₂ for plants), which indicates that at this dormant volcano, gas escapes mainly through the flanks. Since it is unclear if these two volcanoes have a common hydrothermal reservoir or not, these differences in degassing behavior could also be attributed to the possible existence of two separate hydrothermal systems with completely different physical and chemical conditions.

Possibilities for monitoring

Similarly to Miravalles, this study of diffuse degassing in the LP zone can be utilized for geochemical monitoring purposes at Rincón de la Vieja volcano. Certainly, the summit region is the center of activity and therefore the most accurate location for geochemical monitoring and, like Tassi et al. (2005) indicated, an important part of the magmatic gases escaping from the volcano outside the summit crater region is strongly interacting with shallow groundwaters. Nevertheless, degassing behavior and intensity can be monitored by repeated measurements of diffuse soil CO₂ and a
long-term evolution of the system can be investigated in a more easily accessible area, since the summit region of Rincón de la Vieja is very sparsely accessibly throughout the year.

6.2 Gas geochemistry

Rincón de la Vieja, Miravalles and Tenorio are spatially very close, aligned on the Central Volcanic Belt and belong to a one of Costa Rica’s active volcanic regions. General similarities in magmatic compositions (Chiesa et al., 1994) have been determined and relatively uniform water discharges were found by Giggenbach & Soto in 1992, who suggested a common geothermal reservoir beneath the Guanacaste volcanic region.

Abundances of several species, like H₂O, CO₂, H₂S, CO and the general absence of SO₂, HF or HCl are common to all three volcanoes in the region and do not allow a distinction among them. Nevertheless, certain elements show more or less distinct trends that allow a distinction of the different volcanoes.

**Origin of volcanic gases**

A remarkably high R/Ra ratio of 7.1 was measured in this study at Tenorio. Previous measurements by Giggenbach and Soto (1992) also showed R/Ra ratios up to 7.2 in sampled gases at Miravalles, which suggests a more primitive source and therefore stronger mantle signature (Sigurdsson et al., 1999) at these two volcanoes, which are both dormant. On the other hand, at Rincón de la Vieja ratios vary between 3.78 and 4.12. This suggests that Tenorio and Miravalles are not in the periphery of major upflow zones of magmatic fluids as was suggested for Tenorio by Giggenbach and Soto (1992), but are still fed by fluids derived from relatively primitive magma.

The He-N₂-Ar ternary diagram (Fig. 22a) is widely used for the derivation of origin and the determination of atmospheric influence of volcanic gases (Garofalo et al., 2007; Giggenbach and Soto, 1992; Sigurdsson et al., 1999; Tassi et al., 2005). For the Guanacaste region a strong influence by air and air saturated water is visible, a hint for strong hydrothermal activity. Nevertheless, there is a trend towards the convergent plate boundary endmember to observe, which is in accordance with the tectonic setting.
Fig. 22, a) He-N₂-Ar ternary plot showing input from andesite, crust, basalt, air and air saturated water on the gas emissions b) Ne-N₂-Ar ternary plot indicating crustal or magmatic input in Miravalles and Tenorio samples (asw = air saturated water) and c) ternary diagram of light hydrocarbons and their origin
A slightly higher abundance of N2 is observed at Miravalles and Tenorio in Fig. 22b compared to Rincón de la Vieja. This suggests either magmatic or crustal input into the hydrothermal system. For the distinction of these two components, further nitrogen and helium isotopic analysis would be beneficial. Abundance of N2 in hydrothermal gases is typical for gases from an andesitic system as indicated in Fig. 22a.

Carbon isotopic compositions between -5.44 and -0.63 are typical for subduction related volcanic gas emissions (Sigurdsson et al., 1999), showing mantle-derived carbon, contaminated by carbon-bearing sediments. These sediments vary around the PDB-standard (defined by the Pee Dee Belemnite, representing typical carbon-bearing sediments), influencing the $\delta^{13}C_{CO_2}$ values towards less negative values. $\delta^{13}C_{CO_2}$ values of samples taken from the accumulation chamber have typical values for a volcanic environment with magmatic as well as sedimentary input. Due to the scarcity of data, the usual positive correlation between the two variables could not be observed.

It is noticeable that air-derived species, such as O2, Ne and Ar are more abundant in gases sampled at Rincón de la Vieja, suggesting air entrainment into the shallow ground interacting with rising fluids, where different amounts of O2 could indicate different amounts of air contamination at the three volcanoes.

**Hydrothermal processes**

In general, no HF, HCl or SO2 were measured in the gas sampled on the flanks/bases of the volcanoes. These acid species are typical for active volcanic systems dominated by high temperatures derived from possible magmatic sources (Vaselli et al., 2006). The absence of these species suggests that the possible inflow of magmatic fluid is efficiently buffered by hydrothermal reservoirs present in the subsurface of the three volcanoes of the Guanacaste region (Giggenbach and Soto, 1992; Tassi et al., 2005). Interaction with liquid water causes their dissolution, preventing them from reaching the surface (Tassi et al., 2005). This process masks the magmatic input, which would usually be traceable in high-temperature fumarolic emissions. Only at Rincón de la Vieja in the summit crater could these species be detected in the emitted gas (Tassi et al., 2005). In addition, the low contents of H2S
suggest either the removal of these species through reaction with O₂ in shallow groundwater (Tassi et al., 2005), or the precipitation of sulfides due to gas-rock interaction in depth and around the surface features (Gherardi et al., 2002), the latter being observed in the field.

**VOCs**

Proportions of light hydrocarbons can be used to distinguish the physical conditions of the source of the sampled gas. Alkenes are produced at high temperatures close to magmatic conditions and most of them are not stable at low temperatures (<300 °C), while alkanes are typical for low-temperature regimes, derived from biogenic degradation and disintegrating alkenes when submitted to lower temperatures. Finally, aromatics such as benzene are usually produced in hydrothermal environments by the interaction of a hot magmatic fluid with CH₄-rich fluids from sediments, present in subduction zones (Capaccioni et al., 2004; Capecchiacci, 2012). In the Guanacaste region concentrations of light hydrocarbons (Fig. 22c) vary between the alkane and benzene end members, indicating the hydrothermal overprint of magmatic gases and a strong influence by low-temperature controlled biogenic degradation, typically expected in tropical regions with heavily vegetated surfaces.
7. Conclusions

Diffuse soil flux of CO$_2$ at Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja is concentrated in and around surface expressions of their hydrothermal systems, including zones of altered soil and fumarolic fields. The total output of 135 t/day of CO$_2$ of the investigated part (~2 km$^2$) of the geothermal power plant at Miravalles is slightly lower, although comparable, to emissions at other volcanogenic geothermal areas (Bloomberg et al., 2014; Werner and Cardellini, 2006). The measurement of CO$_2$ flux at Rincón de la Vieja’s secondary emissions, Las Pailas (0.129 km$^2$), resulted in a value of 3.3 t/day, which is low in comparison to similar volcanic areas.

Due to the concentration of CO$_2$ degassing along surface features and low flux values at a distance to them, it can be assumed that the transport of volcanic gases at Miravalles and Rincón de la Vieja is dominated by the process of advection, while diffusion processes mainly transport biogenic CO$_2$. Due to the lack of correlation of CO$_2$ flux and carbon isotopic values, this could not be verified, although a statistical separation of flux populations was successful. Furthermore, the concentrated distribution of CO$_2$ flux at Miravalles shows the difficulty of detecting the extent of the hydrothermal reservoir at depth, tapped by the geothermal power plant, with the accumulation chamber method. This should be combined with measurements of CO$_2$ emissions through fumaroles and hot pools, as well as the amount of CO$_2$ diluted in rivers and streams to obtain a complete estimate of CO$_2$ emissions by the hydrothermal system(s).

Comparatively low CO$_2$ flux (maximum of 569 g/m$^2$/day) in DDSs at Rincón de la Vieja, with similar properties compared to the ones at Miravalles (maximum 11,004 g/m$^2$/day), indicates even stronger concentration of gas output through surface features and possibly the active summit region. This shows different degassing behavior of the active Rincón de la Vieja and the dormant Miravalles volcano, if the hypothesis of a common hydrothermal system applies. If this is not the case, these variations could be due to the existence of separate hydrothermal systems for each volcano with completely different chemical and physical conditions.

The application of the fairly new method for the calculation of heat flow, by using diffuse degassing output and the [H$_2$O]:[CO$_2$] mass ratio of fumaroles or wells, showed that this method is not applicable on Miravalles and no valid assessment of
geothermal potential could be calculated. As mentioned before, a more comprehensive calculation of CO$_2$ degassing is needed.

This study provides further information to the understanding of the compositional variations of gas emission among the three volcanoes, with the analysis of fumarolic gases. Evidence for strong hydrothermal activity could be detected and several compositional similarities and differences among the volcanoes can be observed. Even though acid species were captured by their hydrothermal system(s) and did not reach the surface, significant concentrations of N$_2$, H$_2$ and R/Ra values were determined that suggest general andesitic input into the volcanic systems of the Guanacaste region and the presence of fairly primitive magmatic fluids at Tenorio and Miravalles. This could indicate the possibility of continuing magma recharge, not only for the historically active Rincón de la Vieja, but also for the dormant volcanoes Tenorio and Miravalles, which were previously suggested to lie outside major upflow zones of magmatic fluids.

**Future work**

This study resulted in the first calculation of CO$_2$ soil degassing at Rincón de la Vieja and adds further detail to the previous study at Miravalles by Melián et al. (2004). In order to obtain a complete mass balance of CO$_2$ for the Guanacaste volcanoes, studies of pre-eruptive CO$_2$ contents in the magma, by the use of melt inclusions in juvenile eruptive materials, should be combined with further investigations of degassing at DDSs, vents and fumaroles, as well as the determination of the amount of diluted CO$_2$ in rivers and streams, leading to a calculation of total CO$_2$ output into the atmosphere for the studied volcanoes.

Furthermore, a similarly detailed study of all DDSs at Miravalles should lead to a very detailed calculation of CO$_2$ output at Miravalles and a comparison to the previous study can be made. This could give information about the necessary level of detail for diffuse degassing studies to improve future measurement strategies.

Finally, this work could serve as a foundation for a geochemical long-term monitoring of the Guanacaste volcanoes. By continuous repetition of soil degassing studies and gas chemistry analyses, especially during volcanic and tectonic periods of unrest, the evolution of these volcanic complexes can be studied, as well as a possible influence of geothermal exploration on volcanic hydrothermal systems.
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