

**We thank both referees for their positive assessment of our paper and the useful comments.**

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

The paper presents measurements of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from a tunnel study in the Paris region. The results are reported as ratios to CO<sub>2</sub>, which can in principle be converted to emission factors per unit of fuel or per km driven; such measurements are important for verifying and / or updating emission inventories, like the Airparif in the present paper. Ratios of CO to CO<sub>2</sub> are also useful for estimating the fossil fuel burning contribution to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> variations. This paper very useful, and well suited for publication in ACP.

I find the paper very well written, concise enough and easy to follow. I recommend it for publication after minor revision. Please find my comments below.

#### General comments

1. The reported values for the measured species are mole fractions (or volume mixing ratios, if we consider all these gases ideal) – and not concentrations. I suggest replacing “concentration” with “mole fraction” through the paper.

**We will replace “concentration” by “mole fraction”.**

2. Introduction: I think some more information on VOCs would be useful: why are they important (only CO<sub>2</sub> tracers, or also pollution?), which are the most important species related to traffic, are they regulated by Euro standards, etc. Similarly, more background information on CO and NO<sub>x</sub> would be good.

**We will add information on VOCs, CO and NO<sub>x</sub> in the introduction.**

3. In my understanding, the night-time measurement results were averaged (for each species) and this average was then considered “background” and subtracted from individual measurements to get the  $\Delta$ s. If this is correct, then the choice of background should not affect the slope of the fit (which is the ratio), but only the intercept. It is shown in the supplement that the two considered background options give the same results, but using directly the measured mole fractions without subtracting the background should give exactly the same results.

**This interpretation is correct and we will make it more explicit in the revised version.**

**Our methodology was the following: we established the hypothesis that outside air could be brought in the tunnel, mixing different sources signals with the one of interest: traffic. To extract the traffic signal as accurately as possible, we therefore decided to remove a background signal. First, we computed the ratios using as the background signal outside ambient air concentrations (that show for CO<sub>2</sub> a typical diurnal cycle). However, there were only CO<sub>2</sub> and CO outside air data available whereas VOCs were measured together with CO<sub>2</sub> and CO inside the tunnel (the CO/CO<sub>2</sub> ratio is presented in the supplementary material).**

**Therefore, we decided to calculate the ratios removing an average (constant) background from nighttime measurements carried out inside the tunnel. Also note that the variability**

around the mean background level (characterized by the standard deviation) is accounted for in the standard deviation given for the ratios in the tables.

The variability of the ambient measurements (diurnal cycle amplitude) was found to be around 40 ppm whereas the mixing ratios in the traffic peaks reach 900 ppm, implying an uncertainty on this method of around 4%. We found an uncertainty of the same order of magnitude by calculating the ratios with the constant background (around 5%, please see the main paper and the supplementary material). Furthermore, only minor differences were found (0.2% of difference) between the ratios calculated by both methods, which motivated the use of an average value as background.

Still, we have chosen to use the generic  $\Delta$  notation in order to highlight the fact that a choice has been made about the background level definition.

4. In such a tunnel, water, gases and aerosols have higher concentrations than on open roads. How important is the chemistry in these conditions? Is it possible that some of the species measured are partly lost through chemical reactions or deposition? Or that some species are not (only) directly emitted, but formed afterwards through chemistry? In this regard, how representative would be the tunnel measurements for open air emissions?

The reviewer is right that some chemistry may occur. Concerning the VOCs, they usually react with OH radicals generated by photochemical processes that are non-significant in the tunnel conditions. In the same way the generation of secondary organic aerosols from the oxidation of VOCs involves photochemical reactions which should not be considered in this environment. Nevertheless, even the most reactive compounds measured during this campaign (xylenes, ethyl toluene) have a lifetime of several hours and therefore should not be significantly depleted within the tunnel. In addition, the good correlation of the VOCs compounds with CO and CO<sub>2</sub> suggests that they are of primary origin.

5. The result for fluent traffic conditions are now given as a secondary result, and only used for comparison with Popa et al., in Sect. 4.3. I see the point of the authors that these results are less well determined, and they want to report the most precise results. I think however the fluent traffic results are important and should get more attention in the paper. The emission inventories need measurement results for all traffic conditions, and imprecise results are better than no results.

We present in the following table the coefficients of determination and the ratios for fluent traffic conditions (vehicle speed > 50km.h<sup>-1</sup>).

Species	Observed ratios to $\Delta\text{CO}_2$	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ )
$\Delta\text{CO}$	5.68 ± 2.43	0.45
$\Delta\text{NO}$	2.98 ± 0.68	0.40
$\Delta\text{NO}_2$	0.54 ± 0.17	0.26
$\Delta\text{i-pentane}$	4.38 ± 11	0.0052
$\Delta\text{Toluene}$	7.29 ± 5.06	0.071
$\Delta\text{Acetylene}$	9.50 ± 5.95	0.077
$\Delta\text{Ethylene}$	71.50 ± 44.2	0.10
$\Delta\text{Propene}$	6.72 ± 11.70	0.011

$\Delta n$ -pentane	$6.79 \pm 11.2$	0.012
$\Delta$ Benzene	$2.04 \pm 1.33$	0.080
$\Delta m$ & $p$ -xylenes	$3.50 \pm 1.27$	0.22
$\Delta o$ -xylene	$1.58 \pm 0.83$	0.12
$\Delta$ Ethylbenzene	$0.64 \pm 1.08$	0.013
$\Delta n$ -propylbenzene	$0.73 \pm 0.51$	0.070
$\Delta m$ & $p$ -ethyltoluene	$0.46 \pm 0.21$	0.15

Except for CO and NO, the correlations between  $\Delta$ species and  $\Delta$ CO<sub>2</sub> are very poor. The use of a linear regression in this case seems to be irrelevant because we cannot be sure that the sources of emissions are similar for all the species. As the aim of our study was to characterize emissions from the traffic source, we chose not to present these results.

Moreover, some of the spread of these results could be due to real variability in emissions, thus it also contains information. For CO, it is known that low speed emissions can be higher than average, even with a hot engine (e.g. Kean et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2011). Here the comparison is made between Airparif, which I think includes average traffic conditions, and measurement results biased towards congested, low speed traffic. If all traffic conditions were considered, it could be that the authors will observe an overestimation of CO:CO<sub>2</sub> ratios in Airparif, related to a decrease in CO emissions over time. The CO:CO<sub>2</sub> ratios for fluent traffic could maybe be better estimated using the available measurements outside tunnel.

Ratios calculated for the whole campaign account for all periods of the days and the week, periods of heavy traffic (rush hours) with little or no traffic (e.g., some periods of nights or weekends), when emissions from other sources (e.g., biogenic) are brought and mixed in the tunnel. They are therefore difficult to interpret. Furthermore, the definition of the background we used might be in this case debatable.

As a complement, we present in the following table the coefficients of determination and the ratios for the whole campaign.

Species	Observed ratios to $\Delta$ CO <sub>2</sub>	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ )
$\Delta$ CO	$7.44 \pm 0.15$	0.86
$\Delta$ NO	$3.99 \pm 0.08$	0.88
$\Delta$ NO <sub>2</sub>	$1.06 \pm 0.02$	0.83
$\Delta i$ -pentane	$27.84 \pm 1.01$	0.67
$\Delta$ Toluene	$21.99 \pm 0.70$	0.71
$\Delta$ Acetylene	$14.65 \pm 0.56$	0.64
$\Delta$ Ethylene	-	-
$\Delta$ Propene	$10.37 \pm 0.62$	0.42
$\Delta n$ -pentane	$9.49 \pm 1.59$	0.085
$\Delta$ Benzene	$7.54 \pm 0.19$	0.80
$\Delta m$ & $p$ -xylenes	$4.84 \pm 0.14$	0.74
$\Delta o$ -xylene	$3.46 \pm 0.10$	0.74

$\Delta$ Ethylbenzene	$2.68 \pm 0.08$	0.71
$\Delta$ n-propylbenzene	$2.60 \pm 0.10$	0.71
$\Delta$ m&p-ethyltoluene	$1.35 \pm 0.05$	0.64

According to this table, the correlations between the co-emitted species and CO<sub>2</sub>, considering all the data of the campaign, are good (except for n-pentane). However, we notice that these ratios are lower than the ones evaluated in the traffic peaks. The differences with the ratios provided by the Airparif inventory are even more important.

Abstract, line 12: I suggest to replace “and rush hour periods” with “and on rush hour periods”

Abstract, line 13: I think “To those ...” should be “From those ...”

Abstract, line 16: “ $\Delta$ species” – later in the paper is “ $\Delta$ Species”, with capital S – check consistency

page 20199, line 25: I think “characterized” should be “characterize”

page 20199, line 26: the word “well” should be moved at the end of the phrase, or after “represent”

page 20200, line 1: “Megaparis” is spelled sometimes “MegaParis” – please check consistency

page 20200, line 5: “and of its carbon isotopes” – I would remove “of”

page 20200, lines 8 – 9: “to originate for 30% from traffic and for 70% from gas heating” – I think the two “for” should be removed

page 20203, line 8: “analysed continuous CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and H<sub>2</sub>O measurements” – I suggest to replace with “performed continuous CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and H<sub>2</sub>O measurements” or “analysed/measured CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and H<sub>2</sub>O continuously”

page 20203, line 11: “Gas Chromatograph” does not need capitals

**All these corrections will be done.**

page 20203, line 11: please check the calibration scales: by my knowledge NOAA-X2007 scale is only for CO<sub>2</sub>, and the most recent calibration scale for CO is X2004.

**We checked the calibration scale and agree with this comment. We will correct the text.**

page 20203, line 22: it would be good to mention here which NMHC species were measured

**The list of NMHC species we measured will be added.**

page 20204, lines 3 – 4: “The total uncertainty on the data was estimated better than 15%” – please consider reformulating, e.g. “The total uncertainty of the data was better than 15%”

**This will be corrected.**

page 20208, lines 20 – 25: Are the species emitted from fuel evaporation not correlated to the number of vehicles, the same as CO<sub>2</sub>? If yes, shouldn't there be a better correlation between these species and CO<sub>2</sub>? Also, did these species exhibit higher than background

mole fractions in the tunnel? – if yes, and if there are not many such measurements published, it may be useful to report them, at least as a time series plot in the supplement.

**We studied the correlations between the species and the number of vehicles. We found very poor coefficient of determination ( $r^2 < 0.1$ ), especially as regards species emitted from fuel evaporation ( $r^2 < 0.01$ ). We finally decided not to present the results about these species.**

page 20209, lines 13 – 15: Did Gros et al., 2014 use the same data? If yes, then it's not surprising that the results are similar.

**The same data are used for this study. We will rephrase the sentence.**

page 20216, line 25: "Volatile" typo

**This will be corrected.**

page 20219, lines 29 – 31: Is Roustan et al. still in press?

**The updated reference is : Roustan, Y., Pausader, M., and Seigneur, C.: Estimating the effect of on-road vehicle 30 emission controls on future air quality in Paris, France, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 6828-6836, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.10.010, 2011.**

page 20222, Table 1 caption: there is no  $\Delta\text{NO}_x$  in table, but  $\Delta\text{NO}$  and  $\Delta\text{NO}_2$

**This will be corrected.**

page 20223, Table 2: I would also include here on a separate line the results of this study for fluent traffic. See also the general comments.

**Please see the answer to the general comments.**

## **Reviewer #2 : Jocelyn Turnbull**

This paper describes a tunnel study measuring a suite of anthropogenic trace gases. They use the ratio of each gas to CO<sub>2</sub> to evaluate the emission rates of these gases and compare with bottom-up inventory data. The authors compare their results with other studies in other urban areas, and provide some explanations for the similarities and differences. Of particular interest is the detailed analysis of the CO/CO<sub>2</sub> ratios, which highlights the variability in this ratio, and as the authors point out, makes using CO measurements as a proxy for fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> a real challenge

This paper was really a pleasure to read. The topic is clear, the experiment well designed, the analysis is well explained, and the discussion nicely covered all my initial questions. The subject material is entirely appropriate for ACP. I have a few very minor comments on points of clarity, but the paper could be published as is without problems.


Pg 20199 Line 20. What is meant by “tertiary sector”?

**According to the Airparif report (Airparif, 2013), the tertiary sector groups together several types of activities such as hotels, restaurants, bars, offices of companies, health and social care institutions, community and sports centers, schools, ... The emissions taken into account for this sector are energy consumption linked to these activities. In order to be clearer, we will replace “tertiary sector” by “service sector”.**

Pg 20211. Lines 1-4. Are the emission ratios also temperature dependent (more VOC and CO emissions when air temperature and/or engine temperature is lower)? If so, do September and October approximate the annual average temperature for Paris, or might we expect that the observations could be biased relative to the annual average Airparif inventory?

**Emissions ratio may be slightly influenced by temperature but this effect could not be investigated in this study. Nevertheless, we do not think this effect could bias our comparison with the emission inventory. According to the Airparif inventory, there is indeed a small seasonal variation in the VOCs emitted by traffic. Nevertheless, September and October contributions to the whole year are close to the yearly average and therefore can be considered as representative. This point is shown on the following figure, which represents average emissions of VOCs per month considering the whole traffic sector (exhaust and evaporation).**

## WHOLE SNAP 07 (ROAD-TRAFFIC)



*(Airparif 2010 inventory. We thank Alexia Baudic for this figure).*

Pg 20211 line 28. Table 3, not table 6.

**This will be corrected.**

Pg 20213 line 25-27. This last sentence of the paragraph is unclear.

**We will rephrase the sentence.**

Pg 20214 lines 7-16. The most likely explanation is the first one given – at higher speeds, the CO:CO<sub>2</sub> ratio is lower. The further explanation regarding tunnel ventilation seems less likely, but the phrasing of the paragraph seems to overly emphasize this second possibility. I would rephrase the second explanation to something like “we cannot rule out the possibility that. . .”

**We will follow this suggestion.**

Figure 1. It would be nice to see a larger version of this key figure, as it is difficult to examine hour-by-hour at this resolution. Although not the main intent of the paper, the observed diurnal cycles in the mixing ratios will likely be of interest to many readers.

We will put an improved version of the figure in the revised paper and add comments on the mean diurnal cycles in the mixing ratios and their variability.



## List of changes

### Changes in the text:

In the whole text, “concentration” was replaced by “mole fraction”.

P20198 L12: “and rush hour periods” replaced by “and on rush hour periods”

P20198 L13: “To those ...” replaced by “From those ...”

P20198 L26: “36%” replaced by “34%”

P20198 L28: “39%” replaced by “30%”

P20199 L20: “tertiary sectors” replaced by “service sectors”

P20199 L25: “characterized” replaced by “characterize”

P20199 L26: “well” moved after “represent”

P20200 L1: “CO<sub>2</sub>-Megapolis” replaced by “CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS”

P20200 L3: “the EU-FP7 Megapoli project” replaced by “the MEGAPOLI project”

P20200 L4: “CO<sub>2</sub>-MegaParis” replaced by “CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS”

P20200 L5: “of” removed from “and of its carbon isotopes”

P20200 L8–9: the two “for” removed from “to originate for 30% from traffic and for 70% from gas heating”

P20200 L19: Several sentences on VOCs, CO and NO<sub>x</sub> were added at the end of this paragraph.

P20203 L8: “analysed” replaced by “performed”

P20203 L11: “Gas Chromatograph” replaced by “gas chromatograph”

P20203 L11: “for CO<sub>2</sub> and the NOAA-X2004 for CO” added after “scale”

P20203 L23: “Measurements” replaced by “Measurements of C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>6</sub> and C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>10</sub> hydrocarbons”

P20204 L3-4: “The total uncertainty on the data was estimated better than 15%” replaced by “The total uncertainty of the data was better than 15%”

P20206 L8: "Mole fractions vary significantly over the course of the day. The mean diurnal cycle ( $\pm 1-\sigma$  standard deviation) amplitudes are summarized in the supplementary material." was added at the beginning of this paragraph.

P20206 L21: "extracting the traffic signal as accurately as possible and" inserted after "we aim at".

P20206 L22; "in principle" inserted before "have to be corrected".

P20207 L17: "However, tests with option (ii) and even" replaced by "We define the background as the average measurement values per species in the tunnel between 23:00 and 4:00 on Monday-Thursday nights (i.e. four nights per week) and we characterize its uncertainty by the corresponding measurement standard deviation. For instance, for CO<sub>2</sub> our background is  $495.92 \pm 23.46$  ppm. Tests with option (ii) or".

P20208 L3: " $\Delta$ Species" replaced by " $\Delta$ species".

P20208 L6: " $\Delta$ Species" replaced by " $\Delta$ species".

P20209 L3: " $\Delta$ Species" replaced by " $\Delta$ species".

P20209 L6: "Note that our use of a constant background value per species in our main results implies that our calculated ratios do not depend on the actual value of these constants, but the uncertainty of the constants is accounted for in the confidence intervals of the ratios given in the tables (we evaluate the extreme linear regression fits for the data weighted with their uncertainties; the difference between the two extreme ratios is defined as the uncertainty on the ratio)." inserted after "(1- $\sigma$ )".

P20209 L6: "This" replaced by "Our".

P20209 L13-15: "This result is... (Gros et al., 2014)" replaced by "This result combined with the VOCs profile determined for the traffic sector from this tunnel campaign (Gros et al., 2014) is in good agreement with the vehicle exhaust source profile published in Gaimoz et al. (2011)."

P20211 L2: These two sentences were added "According to the Airparif inventory, there is a small seasonal variation in the traffic emissions. Nevertheless, September and October contributions to the whole year are close to the yearly average and therefore can be considered as representative."

P20211 L12: "36%" replaced by "34%".

P20211 L13: "320%" replaced by "318%".

P20211 L14: "39%" replaced by "30%".

P20211 L18: "7%" replaced by "5%"

P20211 L28: "Table 6" replaced by "Table 3".

P20212 L2: "NO<sub>x</sub>," added after "except for".

P20212 L3: "1200%" replaced by "960%".

P20213 L25-27: The last sentence was rephrased and replaced by "Looking backward at the analysis of section 4.1, the quality of the combustion could therefore not explain the difference with the previous studies (excepted Popa et al, 2014)."

P20214 L8-9: The sentence "However, ... also be considered" was replaced by "However, we cannot rule out the possibility of a dilution effect in the tunnel with ambient air outside".

P20215 L29: "a tool of choice" replaced by "still currently well-suited".

### **Changes in Acknowledgements:**

P20216 L10: "We also thank Felix Vogel and François-Marie Bréon for the thoughtful discussions in final analysis." was added.

P20216 L11: "CO<sub>2</sub>-MegaParis" replaced by "CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS".

P20216 L12: "and the region Île-de-France" was added after "CEA".

P20216 L13: "CO<sub>2</sub> tanks to the NOAA scale" replaced by "gas tanks to the CO<sub>2</sub> and CO NOAA scales."

### **Changes in References:**

P20216 L25: "Volatlle" replaced by "Volatile".

P20219 L23-25: Reference updated: Rayner, P. J., Utembe, S. R., and Crowell, S.: Constraining regional greenhouse gas emissions using geostationary concentration measurements: a theoretical study, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 3285-3293, doi:10.5194/amt-7-3285--2014, 2014.

P20219 L29-31: Reference updated: Roustan, Y., Pausader, M., and Seigneur, C.: Estimating the effect of on-road vehicle emission controls on future air quality in Paris, France, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 6828-6836, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.10.010, 2011.

P20221 L4: "CO<sub>2</sub>-Megaparis" replaced by "CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS".

### **Changes in Tables:**

P20222 Table 1: "ΔNO<sub>x</sub>" replaced by "ΔNO and ΔNO<sub>2</sub>" in the legend.

P20223 Table 2: Results of this study for fluent traffic were added.

P20224 Table 3: We noticed small mistakes in the conversion and corrected them. All the results in Table 3 and in the text were changed.

**Changes in Figures:**

P20227 Figure 1: This figure was changed for better readability. However, the content is still the same. The legend was also completed.

P20229 Figure 3: This figure was changed taking into account the corrections in the conversions.

**Changes in the Supplement:**

A description of mean diurnal cycles was added in the supplementary material (Table 1).

## Atmospheric measurements of ratios between CO<sub>2</sub> and co-emitted species from traffic: a tunnel study in the Paris megacity.

L. Ammoura<sup>1</sup>, I. Xueref-Remy<sup>1</sup>, V. Gros<sup>1</sup>, A. Baudic<sup>1</sup>, B. Bonsang<sup>1</sup>, J.-E. Petit<sup>1,2</sup>, O. Perrussel<sup>3</sup>, N. Bonnaire<sup>1</sup>, J. Sciare<sup>1</sup>, and F. Chevallier<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>LSCE, Unité mixte CEA-CNRS-UVSQ, UMR 8212, 91191 Gif-Sur-Yvette, France

<sup>2</sup>Ineris, Verneuil-en-Halatte, France

<sup>3</sup>Airparif, Association de Surveillance de la Qualité de l'Air en Île-de-France, Paris, France

*Correspondence to:* L. Ammoura (lamia.ammoura@lsce.ipsl.fr)

### Abstract

Measurements of CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and selected Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) **mole fractions** have been performed continuously during ten days in the Guy Môquet tunnel in Thiais, in a peri-urban area about 15 km south from the centre of Paris, between 28 September and 8 October 2012. This dataset is used here to identify the characteristics of traffic-emitted CO<sub>2</sub> by evaluating its ratios to co-emitted species, for the first time in the Paris region. High coefficients of determination ( $r^2 > 0.7$ ) are observed between CO<sub>2</sub> and some compounds which are characteristic of the traffic source (CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, benzene, xylenes and acetylene). Weak correlations ( $r^2 < 0.2$ ) are found with species such as propane, n-butane, i-butane, that are associated with fuel evaporation, an insignificant source for CO<sub>2</sub>. To better characterize the traffic signal, we focus only on species that are well correlated with CO<sub>2</sub> and **on** rush hour periods characterized by the highest traffic-related **mole fractions**. From those **mole fractions**, we remove the nighttime averaged weekday **mole fraction** obtained for each species that we infer to be the most appropriate background signal for our study. Then, we calculate observed  $\Delta\text{species}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios that we compare with the ones provided by the 2010 bottom-up high resolved regional emission inventory from Airparif, the association in charge of monitoring the air quality in Île-de-France, focusing on local emission data for the specific road of the tunnel. We find an excellent agreement (2%) between the local inventory emission CO/CO<sub>2</sub> ratio with our observed  $\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratio. Former tunnel experiments carried out elsewhere in the world provided observed  $\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios that differ from 49% to 592% to ours. This variability can be related to technological improvement of vehicles, differences in driving conditions and fleet compositions. We also find a satisfactory agreement with the Airparif inventory for n-propylbenzene, n-pentane and xylenes to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios. For most of the other species, the ratios obtained from the local emission inventory overestimate the observed ratios to CO<sub>2</sub>, by **34%** to more than 300%. However, the emission ratios of NO<sub>x</sub>, o-xylene and i-pentane are underestimated by **30%** to 79%. One main cause of such high differences between the inventory and our observations is likely the obsolete feature of the VOCs speciation matrix of the inventory that was not updated since 1998, although law regulations on

some VOCs occurred since that time. Our study bears important consequences for the characterisation of the urban CO<sub>2</sub> plume and for atmospheric inverse modelling of urban CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that are discussed in the conclusion.

## 30           1. Introduction

In 2011, more than half of the world population was living in urban areas and this proportion is expected to reach 67% in 2050 (United Nations, 2012). Cities are therefore strategic places to address impacts and mitigation of climate change and, in particular, the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Here we focus on the Paris metropolitan area. Paris is part of the Île-France region which is inhabited by about twelve million people. Out of these, Paris and its suburbs concentrate eleven million inhabitants and constitute the third largest megacity in Europe. The most detailed description of its emissions is provided by the regional inventory developed by Airparif, the association in charge of monitoring the air quality in Île-de-France. According to the Airparif 2010 emission inventory, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions of Île-de-France represent about 13 % of the total French anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, for a surface that extends only over 2% of the French territory (AIRPARIF, 2013). Most of the regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are concentrated in the Paris metropolitan area. They are attributed essentially to the residential and **service sectors** (43%) and to traffic (29%). As is quite common for emission inventories, there is no independent quantitative assessment of the Airparif database, and its uncertainties are poorly constrained. Moreover, Airparif emission estimates are based on activity proxies, calibrated from benchmark situations that may significantly differ from real ones. For instance, chassis dynamometer tests (Bosteels et al., 2006) **characterize** the vehicle emissions under controlled conditions and fuel composition, but cannot represent **well** the diversity of real driving conditions and fleet composition. Therefore independent evaluations of the inventory are needed and atmospheric measurement programs around the Paris megacity such as the CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS project that sample the actual emission plume (Xueref-Remy et al, paper in preparation, 2014) may provide new reference information to anchor the inventory. In the framework of the MEGAPOLI and CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS research projects, Lopez et al. (2013) measured the **mole fractions** of CO<sub>2</sub> and its carbon isotopes in winter 2010 in the centre of Paris and in the southwest peri-urban area. Using the <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and radiocarbon (<sup>14</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>) signatures, 77% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> was attributed to anthropogenic sources and 23% to biospheric sources. The anthropogenic emissions were identified to originate 30% from traffic and 70% from gas heating. Measured emission ratios were compared to the Airparif emissions inventory, and showed good consistency with it. First encouraging estimates of the total CO<sub>2</sub> anthropogenic emissions of the Paris megacity by atmospheric inverse modelling have been obtained by Bréon et al. (2014) who compared their results to the Airparif inventory. In urban areas, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) are also controlled by anthropogenic sources and thus represent potential tracers for inferring CO<sub>2</sub> urban emission sources. Gaimoz et al. (2011) set up such measurements in the centre of Paris in spring 2007 and identified major VOC sources. Traffic activities (exhaust and fuel evaporation) were found to be responsible for 65% of the total VOC emissions, industrial sources for 14%, natural gas and background for 8%, local sources for 4%, biogenic evaporation for 8% and wood burning for 1%. **The study of VOCs, and of tracers of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> like CO or NO<sub>x</sub>, is motivated by their impact on human health and by their production of photo-oxidants (such as ozone) in ambient air. As they are major pollutants emitted by traffic activities, they are regulated by European emission standards. As an example, the Euro 3 norm sets strong limits in emissions for gasoline vehicles (2.2 g.km<sup>-1</sup> for CO, 0.15 g.km<sup>-1</sup> for NO<sub>x</sub>). Euro 4 and 5 accentuated these limits (1.0 g.km<sup>-1</sup> for CO and 0.08 g.km<sup>-1</sup> for NO<sub>x</sub>). Euro 5 is the first norm in the series that also controls NMHC emissions (limited to 0.068 g.km<sup>-1</sup>).**

In this paper, we use new atmospheric **mole fraction** data acquired in real conditions in Paris to evaluate the emission ratios of CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs relatively to CO<sub>2</sub> for the traffic sector in the Airparif inventory. These ratios carry the signature of the traffic emission plume because, during the combustion processes of fossil fuels, CO<sub>2</sub> is co-emitted with other species in ratios that are characteristic of each emission sector and fuel type. In order to focus on the traffic sector and be representative of the vehicle fleet, we have performed our atmospheric measurements in a road tunnel. Such an approach has been used before in several tunnels of the world, to study emission factors of VOCs (Ho et al., 2009) and trace gases (Chirico et al., 2011). In Western Europe, Popa et al. (2014) and Vollmer et al. (2007) provided CO/CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O/CO<sub>2</sub>, and CH<sub>4</sub>/CO<sub>2</sub> ratios for vehicular emissions. In the Paris area, one study was conducted in a road tunnel in August 1996 (Touaty and Bonsang, 2000) to evaluate hydrocarbon vehicle emissions and to determine emission factors for non-methane hydrocarbons (NMHC) and CO.

Like the study of Touaty and Bonsang (2000), our experiment was carried out in the Guy Môquet tunnel in Thiais, located about 15 km south of Paris centre. The campaign took place during 10 days from 28 September 2012 to 8 October 2012. CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> **mole fractions** were measured inside the tunnel in order to determine their ratios to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> for traffic in the Paris megacity. Our measurements enable us to update the results from the year 2000's previous study. To our best knowledge, they also constitute the first study in a French tunnel involving CO<sub>2</sub>, VOCs and NO<sub>x</sub> altogether and hence quantifying the ratios of these co-emitted species to CO<sub>2</sub> in Paris for the traffic sector.

This paper is structured as follows. The instrumental methods are described in Section 2, together with the Airparif inventory. Section 3 starts with a general description of the data (Section 3.1) and a discussion about the definition of background level **mole fractions** (Section 3.2). In Section 3.3, we identify the co-emitted species due to road traffic by evaluating the correlations between these species and CO<sub>2</sub>. Then, in Section 3.4, we quantify the emission ratios between these species and CO<sub>2</sub> for the present vehicle fleet. Finally (Section 4.1), we compare these measured ratios with the ones provided by previous experiments and by the most recent regional emission inventory of Airparif (2010) (Section 4.2). Section 4.3 refines the comparison with the latest European tunnel study.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Site description

The Guy Môquet tunnel (48°77' N, 02°39' E) is located in Thiais, about 15 km south from the centre of Paris. This tunnel was built on a highway and has been used since 1990. It is 600 m long, with a rectangle cross-sectional area of 64 m<sup>2</sup>. It contains two separate tubes, one for each traffic direction. Each bore contains three lanes of traffic. The two tubes are not connected. The average traffic in each bore of the tunnel is about 60,000 vehicles per day. The speed limit is 90 km.h<sup>-1</sup>.

The tunnel is equipped with a longitudinal ventilation mode: a system of jet fans at two places on the tunnel ceiling. The aim of this ventilation system is to speed up the airflow towards the tunnel exit in case of fire emergency, pushing smoke outside. Under normal traffic conditions, the

115 tunnel is self-ventilated, as traffic through the tunnel induces the airflow direction. We cannot be  
sure that the ventilation system has never been activated during the whole measurement campaign.  
120 However, we will mainly focus on traffic peaks during which the traffic signal on the mole fraction  
ratios between species (which is the heart of this study) is strong enough not to undergo significant  
ventilation/dilution.

Vehicle speed and traffic counts were available every 6 minutes. All these data were  
120 provided by the Direction Régionale et Interdépartementale de l'Équipement et de l'Aménagement  
d'Île-de-France (DRIEA-IF). Vehicle speed and density are shown in Fig.1 (d,h). During working days  
(from 1 October 2012 to 5 October 2012), around 61,000 vehicles crossed the tunnel daily, 58,000 on  
Saturday (on 6 October 2012) and 55,000 on Sunday (on 7 October 2012). Traffic density during the  
125 night (between 23:00 and 4:00 local time) was low with around 500 vehicles per hour, unlike traffic  
density during rush hours which was around 3,100 vehicles per hour.

## 2.2 Air sampling and instruments

Air measurements were made at a single location within the tunnel, in the bore that leads to  
the city of Créteil, 550 m from the tunnel entrance and 50 m from its exit, from 28 September 2012  
130 to 8 October 2012. Time is given as local (Central European Summer) Time (UTC + 2 h).

Several instruments were operating during this study and the ones relevant to our study are  
presented here. A Cavity-Ring-Down Spectrometer (Picarro, model G2401) performed continuous  
CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and H<sub>2</sub>O measurements with a time resolution of 1 second. This instrument was calibrated at  
the beginning of the campaign, using three 40-Liter gas tanks. These cylinders were calibrated for  
135 CO<sub>2</sub> and CO dry air mole fraction using a gas chromatograph against the NOAA-X2007 scale for CO<sub>2</sub>  
and the NOAA-X2004 for CO, with a precision better than 0.1 ppm. During the campaign, a fourth gas  
cylinder was analysed during 30 minutes every 8h. It was used as a target to evaluate the  
repeatability of the data and the drift of the instrument. During the campaign, no significant drift was  
detected for CO<sub>2</sub> and CO measurements and the precision of the data (1 sigma) was estimated to be  
140 0.04 ppm for CO<sub>2</sub> data and 16 ppb for CO data on 1 minute averages. Thanks to the use of a  
sequencer, CO<sub>2</sub> and CO mole fractions in the ambient air (outside the tunnel) were also measured  
with this analyser during 30 minutes every 4 h. The sequence of CO and CO<sub>2</sub> measurements was:  
tunnel air for 4h, ambient air for 30 minutes, tunnel air for 3h30, target gas cylinder for 30 minutes,  
ambient air for 30 minutes.

145 Two gas chromatographs, equipped with a flame ionization detector (GC-FID), were installed  
to measure Non-Methane Hydrocarbons (NMHCs). Both instruments are described in details in Gros  
et al. (2011). Measurements of C<sub>2</sub>-C<sub>6</sub> and C<sub>6</sub>-C<sub>10</sub> hydrocarbons were provided with a time resolution  
of 30 minutes. Air was sampled during the first 10 minutes of each 30-minute segment and analysed  
during the next 20 minutes. Previous measurements and tests have shown a good stability of the  
150 detector over several weeks (Gros et al., 2011). Therefore only one calibration has been performed  
during the campaign (October 1) and consisted in the direct injection (repeated 3 times) of a 4 ppb  
calibration gas mixture (National Physics Laboratory, Teddington, UK). Mean response factors of  
these three injections were used to calibrate NMHC during the campaign. NMHC mole fractions in



155 ambient air were estimated on 2 October 2012 between 13:50 and 16:30 (local time). **The total uncertainty of the data was better than 15%.**

160 A chemiluminescent analyser (API TELEDYNE, model T200UP) continuously measured Nitrogen Oxides (NO and NO<sub>2</sub>) **mole fractions** with a time resolution of 1 minute. Calibration of the instrument is regularly checked at the laboratory by injecting 30 ppb from a 10 ppm NO calibration gas mixture (Air Liquide, France). In order to check the calibration parameters within the range of values expected in the tunnel, 500 ppb of NO from the Air Liquide standard were injected in the instrument prior to the campaign. The response of the instrument was found very good ( $506.5 \pm 4.5$  ppb, variability coefficient <1%, n=35) and therefore the instrument was operated with the same parameters during the campaign. NO<sub>x</sub> **mole fractions** in ambient air were also measured on 2 October 2012 between 13:51 and 16:39 (local time). For NO **mole fractions** over 2300 ppb, the instrument showed saturation and was no more quantitative.

### 2.3 Data processing

170 As the temporal sampling was different for each instrument, a common averaged time was defined a posteriori to get all datasets on a similar temporal resolution. The chosen time interval was the one imposed by GC-FID measurements. Data from GC-FID were acquired during 10 minutes every 30 minutes, the reported time corresponding to the beginning of the measurement. Thus for each compound measured by the other instruments, data were averaged on the same 10-minute interval. Doing so, all the final data have a time step of 30 minutes with a resolution of 10 minutes.

175 NO and NO<sub>2</sub> data were screened because of the characteristics of the analyser. Since the instrument saturated when NO **mole fractions** reach 2,300 ppb, a filter was applied to remove the NO and NO<sub>2</sub> data when the NO **mole fraction** exceeds 2,200 ppb.

### 2.4 Airparif inventory

180 Airparif (<http://www.airparif.asso.fr/en/index/index>) has been developing an inventory of emissions for greenhouse gases and air pollutants with a spatial resolution of 1 km x 1 km and a temporal resolution of one hour for Île-de-France. The emissions are quantified by sectors: energy, industry, road transport, agriculture, solvent uses, waste treatment, etc. Emissions (in tons) are assessed for five typical months (January, April, July, August and October) and three typical days (weekday, Saturday and Sunday) to account for seasonal and weekly cycles. A speciation matrix is used to extract emissions for each specific VOC from the total VOCs emissions in the inventory. This speciation matrix is provided by the Institute for Energy Economics and The Rational Use of Energy (IER). The extraction is possible for each specific COV and by SNAP (activity).

190 Thanks to in-situ vehicle counters, Airparif also provides emission estimates specific to some roads. Such information was available for this study in the Thiais tunnel.

The latest version of the inventory, whose results are used in this study, was made for the year 2010, but the speciation matrix for VOCs was established in 1998 and has not been updated yet.

### 3. Results

195

#### 3.1 Data overview

The temporal evolution of the **mole fractions** for the whole campaign and with a time step of 30 minutes is shown in Fig. 1. The average speed and density of vehicles in our tunnel section are also represented in this figure.

200

During working days, rush hours are easily identifiable for all studied species with one peak in the morning, between 6:00 and 9:00 (local time), and another one in the afternoon between 16:00 and 19:00 (local time). Almost 4050 vehicles cross the tunnel per hour at the beginning of the rush periods, but the vehicle density and speed then decrease along with the congestion in the tunnel. The average speed of vehicles during rush hours is lower than 20 km.h<sup>-1</sup>, whereas out of these periods it is faster than 60 km.h<sup>-1</sup>. These peaks are linked to the commutation of Paris active inhabitants going back and forth to their working place. For comparison purpose, the average vehicle speed in Paris city has been determined to be 15.9 km.h<sup>-1</sup> from a recent study performed the Paris city local administration.

205

210

**Mole fractions vary significantly over the course of the day. The mean diurnal cycle ( $\pm 1\text{-}\sigma$  standard deviation) amplitudes are summarized in the supplementary material. Mole fractions were significantly higher during traffic peaks than during nighttime or at other times of the day. Compared to traffic peaks, we notice a decrease in **mole fractions** during nighttime by 40% for CO<sub>2</sub> and propane, and by 80% to 94 % for the other compounds. For periods during daytime out of traffic peaks, the decrease, compared to traffic peaks periods, was about 15% for propane, 30% for CO<sub>2</sub> and between 65% and 90% for the others. Since the traffic signal in terms of gas **mole fractions** is so much stronger during rush hours, we will focus on these periods in the following. Indeed, in order to evaluate **mole fraction** ratios, enough **mole fraction** variability is required (differences to the background level can thus be robustly calculated) and these strong signals were encountered only during traffic peaks periods.**

215

220

#### 3.2 Background levels

The long lifetime of some of the studied species, like CO<sub>2</sub>, induces a large variety of emission origins and potentially elevated background levels in the measured **mole fractions**. Since we aim at **extracting the traffic signal as accurately as possible** and characterizing the ratios of the studied species relatively to CO<sub>2</sub> for tunnel traffic activity only, the **mole fractions in principle** have to be corrected from other influences, like the nearby biogenic contribution, or the baseline level.

225

In previous tunnel studies (Popa et al. 2014, Touaty and Bonsang 2000, Vollmer et al. 2007, Ho et al. 2009, Araizaga et al. 2013), two sampling sites were installed, one near the entrance of the

tunnel, representing the background **mole fractions**, and another one near the exit. The difference of **mole fractions** between these two samples represented vehicle emissions in the tunnel. The current configuration of the Thiais tunnel did not enable us to install two sampling sites, and background levels had to be defined differently. Apart from CO<sub>2</sub> and CO, it was not possible to use the few measurements made outside the tunnel (Section 2.2), because they do not include all species and are not performed on regular basis, while, according to previous measurements, ambient VOCs **mole fractions** vary significantly during the day and from one day to another (Gros et al. 2011).

Given the available information, background **mole fractions** can be approximated (i) by nighttime **mole fractions** (as performed by Chirico et al., 2001) or (ii) by daily **mole fractions** out of the traffic peaks. In our case, nighttime **mole fractions** were the lowest measured **mole fractions** of the whole campaign. Vehicle density was quite low, around 500 vehicles/h, and averaged vehicle speed was relatively high, more than 70 km.h<sup>-1</sup>. For (ii), the daytime **mole fractions** outside rush hours were higher than nighttime ones by 10% (CO<sub>2</sub>) to 60% (propene). Vehicle density during these periods was high as well, around 3500 vehicles/h. For our study, we choose option (i) because it corresponds to the lowest density of vehicles. We focused on four nights during weekdays and evaluated averaged mole fractions between 23:00 and 4:00. **We define the background as the average measurement values per species in the tunnel between 23:00 and 4:00 on Monday-Thursday nights (i.e. four nights per week) and we characterize its uncertainty by the corresponding measurement standard deviation. For instance, for CO<sub>2</sub> our background is 495.92 ± 23.46 ppm. Tests with option (ii) or** using the sparse measurements made outside the tunnel are presented in the supplementary material: they show that the definition of the background does not affect the estimated ratios to CO<sub>2</sub> showed in the following. This comes from the fact that the traffic signal during rush hours inside the tunnel is much larger than the **mole fractions** measured during all other periods of time, inside or outside of the tunnel (from twice to around ten times more).

### 3.3 Correlations between co-emitted species and CO<sub>2</sub>

Gros et al. (2011) and Gaimoz et al. (2011) characterized the VOC sources in Paris and identified the main traffic-related VOCs. Based on their results, we select benzene, toluene, xylenes, ethylbenzene, n-propylbenzene, m&p-ethyltoluene, propene, acetylene, ethylene, i-pentane, n-pentane, i-butane, n-butane and propane for the correlation study to CO<sub>2</sub>. We also consider CO, NO, NO<sub>2</sub> and NO<sub>x</sub>, as done by Chirico et al. (2011).

For background **mole fractions**, we use the averaged values during the night (cf. Section 3.2). We focus on working days (five days between Monday 1 October and Friday 5 October 2012) only. For each species, we calculate **Δspecies** as the differences between each **mole fraction** point measured in the tunnel during traffic peaks and the average **mole fraction** calculated for the nights of working days only. We compute the coefficient of determination  $r^2$  for all corrected **mole fractions** **Δspecies** and ΔCO<sub>2</sub> using the scatterplot between the two (Fig. 2). Generally, tight correlations are found between the selected compounds and CO<sub>2</sub> ( $r^2=0.58-0.89$ ). In all cases, a p-value value test was performed, resulting in each p-value lower than 0.001. However, correlations were poor for propane, i-butane and n-butane with respectively a coefficient of determination  $r^2= 0.15$ ,  $r^2=0.22$  and  $r^2= 0.031$ . All coefficients of determination are listed in Table 2.

270 Inside the Thiais tunnel, CO is exclusively emitted by traffic activities. The strong correlation  
between  $\Delta\text{CO}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$ ,  $r^2=0.89$ , supports that the emitted  $\text{CO}_2$  in the tunnel has the same origin as  
CO, i.e. traffic. Strong correlations are also found between  $\text{CO}_2$  and benzene, toluene, xylenes,  
275 ethylene, acetylene and propene ( $r^2=0.60-0.81$ ) because these compounds dominate in vehicle  
exhaust (e.g., Gaimoz et al. 2011 and Chirico et al. 2011). This is also consistent with the high  
coefficient of determination ( $r^2=0.85$ ) seen between  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{NO}_x$ , which are also traffic tracers.

Propane is one of the main compounds emitted by fuel evaporation. Fuel evaporation does  
not emit  $\text{CO}_2$  and this can explain the poor correlation between  $\Delta\text{propane}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ( $r^2=0.15$ ).  
Coefficients of determination for i-butane and n-butane, which also come from fuel evaporation,  
were also low (respectively  $r^2=0.22$  and  $r^2=0.031$ ). Therefore, these compounds (propane, i-butane  
280 and n-butane) will not be further considered in this study.

### 3.4 Ratios of co-emitted species to $\text{CO}_2$ in traffic peaks

In the following, we assess the ratios between co-emitted compounds and  $\text{CO}_2$  in the traffic  
285 peaks. We define the ratio as the slope of the scatterplot between  $\Delta\text{species}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$ , using a linear  
regression fit (Bradley et al. 2000, Popa et al. 2014). For each co-emitted species, the error on the  
ratio was computed using a confidence interval at 68 % (1 sigma). **Note that our use of a constant  
background value per species in our main results implies that our calculated ratios do not depend on  
the actual value of these constants, but the uncertainty of the constants is accounted for in the  
290 confidence intervals of the ratios given in the tables (we evaluate the extreme linear regression fits  
for the data weighted with their uncertainties; the difference between the two extreme ratios is  
defined as the uncertainty on the ratio).** Our method seems more robust than the calculation of  
instantaneous ratios. Indeed, it constrains the ratio to be unique. The uncertainty is thus lower  
(instantaneous ratios show a larger variability, which leads to large uncertainty). The ratios of the  
295 selected co-emitted species to  $\text{CO}_2$  are presented in Table 1. We notice that the outliers do not  
influence the linear regression within a  $1-\sigma$  uncertainty.

$\Delta\text{VOCs}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios are shown in decreasing order of magnitude. The higher the ratio is,  
the more the corresponding species is emitted. In the tunnel, i-pentane and toluene were the most  
emitted VOCs. **This result combined with the VOCs profile determined for the traffic sector from this  
300 tunnel campaign (Gros et al., 2014) is in good agreement with the vehicle exhaust source profile  
published in Gaimoz et al. (2011).**

## 4. Discussion

### 305 4.1 Comparison with previous campaigns

Of the studies that focused on traffic emissions, few have evaluated **mole fraction** ratios to  
 $\text{CO}_2$ . To our best knowledge, none of previous tunnel studies reported  $\Delta\text{VOC}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios. Table 2

lists  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios for vehicle emissions from previous studies. Generally, their ratios are higher than ours, except for the latest Swiss study (Popa et al. 2014). The comparison with the oldest studies shows indeed a significant difference in  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios: the ratio from the study of Bradley et al. (2000) is almost 500% higher than ours. For more recent studies, the ratios reported by Bishop and Stedman (2008) and Vollmer et al. (2007) were respectively 11 to 120% and 9% higher than ours. There were fifteen years between the campaign of Bradley et al. (2000) and ours, during which vehicles benefited from significant technological improvement, especially catalytic converters that reduce vehicle CO emissions. Furthermore, fuel use is not the same in France, in the USA and in Switzerland. American vehicles have been mostly using gasoline for decades (diesel vehicles only reached 3% in 2012) whereas in France and particularly in the Île-de-France region, diesel is the most used fuel (according to Airparif, 78% of vehicles use diesel). Switzerland is in between, with 22% of the fleet using diesel (2010). Furthermore, gasoline vehicles are known to emit much more CO than diesel vehicles. Thus, European emission policies set higher thresholds for CO emissions from gasoline consumption (about a factor 3 in 2000 and a factor 2 since 2005 compared to diesel) while their  $\text{CO}_2$  emissions are only of a few percents higher (ADEME, 2013). This results in a much higher  $\text{CO}/\text{CO}_2$  emission ratio for gasoline vehicles than for diesel ones. The large differences in the fuel partition of each national fleet is thus likely one main reason why the  $\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios measured in the United States are effectively higher than the ones observed in Switzerland - and even more in France. However, this point cannot be more detailed because we did not have further information on the fleet composition evolutions between 1997 and 2012.

Finally, the ratio from the latest study (Popa et al., 2014, in Switzerland) is half the value of the one measured during our campaign. Measurement years were almost the same (2011 for Popa et al. and 2012 for our study), and no significant evolution occurs in the fleet composition during this year. Furthermore, the mean age of the Swiss fleet and the French one is also nearly the same, around 8 years. The comparison with this study will be further analysed in Section 4.3.

#### 4.2 Comparison of the measured ratios with the Airparif inventory

In this section, we compare the emission ratios derived from our observations in the tunnel during our campaign with those given by the Airparif 2010 inventory.

As Airparif provides emission estimates in tons for each compound, we convert our measured **mole fractions** ratios (in ppb/ppm or ppt/ppm) into mass ratios (t/kt or kg/kt). Our measurements were made in September and October and we notice that these months were typical months as regards annual average traffic emissions. **According to the Airparif inventory, there is a small seasonal variation in the traffic emissions. Nevertheless, September and October contributions to the whole year are close to the yearly average and therefore can be considered as representative.** Thus, we use annual emissions from the Airparif inventory to evaluate the ratios. The comparison is summarized in Table 3 and Fig. 3.

The Airparif inventory is sufficiently detailed (Section 2.4) to provide emissions estimates related to the specific area of this tunnel road, where our experiment was conducted. These ratios are shown in the second column in Table 3 and in green bars in Fig. 4. We notice a good agreement for the  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratio: the difference between the ratio inferred from our observations and the

one from the Airparif inventory is less than 2%. The agreement is also satisfactory for the n-pentane to CO<sub>2</sub> and n-propylbenzene to CO<sub>2</sub> for which we notice a difference with the observed ratios lower than 15%. Airparif overestimates most of the other ratios by 34% or more (up to about 318% for ethylene). NO<sub>x</sub> to CO<sub>2</sub>, o-xylene to CO<sub>2</sub> and i-pentane to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios are underestimated by 30% to 79%. The case of xylenes can be distinguished. Indeed, if we consider the separation between m&p-xylenes on the one side and o-xylene on the other side, we note significant differences between the specific Airparif ratios and the observed ones. However, if we evaluate the ratio considering total xylenes, we obtain a better agreement with only 5% of difference between the two (observed Δxylenes to ΔCO<sub>2</sub>: 24.4 kg/kt, Airparif xylenes to CO<sub>2</sub>: 26.1 kg/kt). A problem in the speciation of xylenes may be responsible for this change.

Airparif accounts for the specific fleet composition in the tunnel which is different on this highway than in the Paris centre, for instance. Heavy goods vehicles do not run in the centre of Paris whereas the two-wheelers represent 16% of the total of vehicles. In the tunnel, heavy vehicles are allowed (5% of the fleet composition) whereas motorized scooters constitute less than 2% of the total vehicles. To assess the impact of this specificity on our study, we also compare our results to the traffic ratios obtained from the whole regional emission inventory. The Airparif regional ratios are given in the first column in Table 3 and in blue bars in Fig. 3. These results indicate a significant spatial variability in the whole Airparif inventory, which makes it important to select inventory data from the specific tunnel road for proper comparison. Doing otherwise systematically increases the misfits (except for NO<sub>x</sub>, i-pentane and o-xylene), that increase up to about 960%. The Thiais tunnel is a highway tunnel, where motorized scooters are not allowed while they constitute an important source of traffic emissions around Paris, particularly of CO emissions. Almost half of traffic-emitted CO is due to scooters and motorbikes: 57210 t/year on a total of 117170 t/year for the whole traffic sector (Airparif 2013). We can notice the same trend as regards total VOC emissions: 6990 t/year are emitted by two-wheeler vehicles over a total of 14850 t/year for traffic.

Even if we use the inventory data from the relevant geographical area, our calculated ratios mostly do not well agree with the ones from the inventory, especially for VOCs to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios. This may be caused by some out-dated features of the speciation matrix that was made in 1998 (see Section 2.4). For instance, the regulation of benzene in fuel became stricter in year 2000: benzene has been limited to 1% in the fuel composition since then instead of 5% before. The fuel composition was also regulated in aromatic compounds content, becoming limited to 35% since January 2005 instead of 42% before. The impact of these changes on the benzene and aromatics emissions is not yet taken into account in the speciation matrix of the inventory and may explain that the related ratios to CO<sub>2</sub> are overestimated for the emission inventory.

#### 4.3 Additional investigation in the comparison with the latest Swiss study

The comparison with the Airparif inventory in Section 4.2 suggests some refinement to our comparison in Section 4.1 to the recent tunnel measurements made in Switzerland by Popa et al. (2014). The Swiss fleet composition and the French one are very different, in particular in diesel use (Section 4.1). In order to assess the impact of this difference on the emission ratios, we separately compute CO to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios for gasoline and diesel fuel in Île-de-France and in Switzerland, based respectively on the emission inventories delivered by Airparif and by the Swiss Department of

Environment, transports and Energy (OFEV 2010). Using the distribution diesel vehicles/gasoline vehicles in each region, we can then get the total CO to CO<sub>2</sub> ratio. Results are compiled in Table 4.

395  $\left(\frac{CO}{CO_2}\right)_{\text{gasoline}}$  emission ratio is almost 3 times higher in France than in Switzerland and reflects the impact of two-wheelers emissions. Indeed, Motorcycles in Île-de-France, around 8% of the total fleet, only use gasoline fuel and as we said previously, they emit almost half of the CO emissions. In Switzerland, less than 4% of vehicles are motorcycles and they emit around 20% of the total traffic-emitted CO.

400  $\left(\frac{CO}{CO_2}\right)_{\text{diesel}}$  ratios are lower than  $\left(\frac{CO}{CO_2}\right)_{\text{gasoline}}$  ratios in both cases. The total ratios, which are the product of  $\left(\frac{CO}{CO_2}\right)$  and of the relative percentage of diesel and gasoline vehicles in each case, are almost the same in Switzerland and in the Paris region, even if Swiss and French fleet compositions are different. Therefore the difference in diesel and gasoline vehicles in the two fleet compositions does not seem to explain the difference between the  $\Delta CO$  to  $\Delta CO_2$  ratio from Popa et al. and ours.

405 Then, we note that the two campaigns have been made in different traffic conditions. On the one hand, Popa et al.'s ratio is representative of fluent highway traffic: driving conditions stayed constant while vehicles crossed the tunnel, and the averaged vehicle speed was higher than 80 km.h<sup>-1</sup>. On the other hand, in our study we have focused on traffic jam period, with some frequent stops and low speed (less than 20 km.h<sup>-1</sup>) during which the combustion and the catalytic converter are less efficient. According to SETRA (SETRA, 2009), a branch of the French Department of Energy and Environment, vehicles emit twice as much CO when they work at a temperature which is 40% of the optimal value whereas CO<sub>2</sub> emissions remain almost the same (CO emissions are multiplied by 3 if vehicles are completely cold). Based on these results,  $\Delta CO$  to  $\Delta CO_2$  ratios are therefore expected to be 2 or 3 times higher in the case of less effective combustion. **Looking backward at the analysis of section 4.1, the quality of the combustion could therefore not explain the difference with the previous studies (excepted Popa et al, 2014).**

415 To further assess the influence of the vehicle speed on  $\Delta CO$  to  $\Delta CO_2$  ratio, we evaluate this ratio in the tunnel when the speed was higher. We use daily data, between 12:00 and 16:00 (local time), for working days only, when the speed was higher than 50 km.h<sup>-1</sup> and vehicle density was still important (around 3,800 vehicles/h). We use the method presented in sections 3.3 and 3.4 to evaluate the ratio. The comparison between the two periods is shown in Table 5.

420 Vehicle speed appears to affect the  $\Delta CO$  to  $\Delta CO_2$  ratio: it decreases when the averaged speed is increasing but the standard deviation shows a larger variability. **However, we cannot rule out the possibility of a dilution effect in the tunnel with ambient air outside.** Indeed, in the Swiss study, air flow in the tunnel is well-known and the two sampling sites allow isolating vehicle emissions from the tunnel. In our study, it may be possible that, when average speed is high and the tunnel is not congested, some ambient air is brought in the tunnel and mixed with the tunnel air thanks to a piston effect, changing the ratios compared to rush hours. This dilution effect, combined with a random use of the ventilation may explain the weak correlations between co-emitted species and CO<sub>2</sub> found out of traffic peaks and justifies the focus on the rush periods.

430 **5. Summary and conclusion**

This study pioneered the measurement of CO to CO<sub>2</sub> and VOCs to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios for traffic emissions in the Paris area. Fifteen co-emitted species, characteristic of traffic emissions, were found to strongly correlate with CO<sub>2</sub>. VOCs to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios enabled to identify the most emitted species: here, i-pentane and toluene were the most emitted VOCs. We compared our results with other studies  
435 made in the United States and in Switzerland. Previous tunnel studies only reported CO to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios and differences from 9% to more than 500% were found with the ratio inferred from our observations. Such differences may be explained by the significant technological improvements of vehicles (such as the development of catalytic converters) but also by the large differences in fleet composition (diesel/gasoline use) and driving conditions (traffic jams/fluent traffic, high/low speed  
440 regimes). A comparison with the latest Paris regional inventory was done focusing on the specific road of the Thiais tunnel. In most cases, it indicated that the inventory overestimates the ratios to CO<sub>2</sub>, even though satisfactory agreement is found for the CO to CO<sub>2</sub>, n-pentane to CO<sub>2</sub>, n-propylbenzene to CO<sub>2</sub> and xylenes to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios. VOC emissions for the traffic sector are the most overestimated, suggesting that the VOCs speciation matrix should be updated in the inventory, in  
445 order to account for the latest regulations about fuel composition. The evaluation of the mean ratios for the whole regional inventory indicated significant spatial variability in the inventory data. The fact that the best fit to our measurements is seen when the inventory data for the tunnel road is isolated, suggests some skill in this inventory variability. The satisfactory agreement found for several ratios to CO<sub>2</sub> suggests that data from the inventory are representative of low speed regimes. Our data  
450 suggests a  $\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratio smaller by about one third in high-speed regime, but with much higher uncertainty. This point also confirms the limited representativeness of specific campaigns, like the previous ones or ours. In our case, more measurements are needed within the Paris megacity to draw a general picture of the emission ratios around Paris for the traffic sector, which is characterized by a large spatial (highways vs. small streets) and temporal (weekday vs. weekend)  
455 variability. The varying ratios of co-emitted species to CO<sub>2</sub> also imply that traffic does not have a unique imprint in the urban plume, but rather leaves various signatures. Depending on whether these signatures overlap with those of the other emission sectors like domestic heating, the ratios may or not allow identifying the emission composition of the urban plume. Finally, this variability of the ratios bears important consequences for atmospheric inverse modelling. Indeed it has been  
460 suggested that measurements of CO, and of possibly other co-emitted species, could help constraining the estimation of fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (Levin and Karstens, 2007, Kort et al. 2013, Lopez et al. 2013, Rayner et al. 2014). Our study shows that this is possible only through a good quantitative knowledge of the large variations of the emission ratios in space and time, which somehow moves the difficulty without necessarily reducing it. In this respect, isotopic measurements  
465 of CO<sub>2</sub> are **still currently the most well-suited** for bringing information about fossil fuel vs. natural CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that is easier to extract (e.g., Levin et al, 2003, Lopez et al. 2013), even though such measurements are expensive and much more difficult to make.

**Acknowledgements:**

470 We thank Tiphaine Le Priol and Jean-François Petit from the DRIEA-CETE-IF for the logistics and technical preparation of the Thiais tunnel experiment and for providing us data about vehicle density



and speed during our experiment. INERIS is gratefully thanked for its logistical help in the field. We thank Irena Jeseck and Grisa Mocnik for their help during the campaign and for the fruitful discussions. We also thank Felix Vogel and François-Marie Bréon for the thoughtful discussions in final analysis. We thank the PRIMEQUAL “PREQUALIF” and ANR-CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS projects for allowing us to carry out this measurement campaign. This work was supported partly by CNRS, CEA and the region Île-de-France. We thank the ICOS-France team for the calibration of the gas tanks to the CO<sub>2</sub> and CO NOAA scales.

480 **References**

ADEME, Evolution du marché, caractéristiques environnementales et techniques. Véhicules particuliers neufs vendus en France en 2013, ISBN 978-2-35838-382-0, Septembre 2013.

AIRPARIF, Bilan des émissions de polluants atmosphériques et de gaz à effet de serre en Île-de-France pour l'année 2010 et historique 2000/2005 : Méthodologie et résultats, Juillet 2013.

485 AtmoPACA, Les émissions dues aux transports routiers, 2007.

Araizaga, A. E., Mancila, Y., and Mendoza, A.: **Volatile** Organic Compound emissions from Light-Duty vehicles in Monterrey, Mexico: a tunnel study, *Int. J. Environ. Res.*, 7, 277-292, 2013.

Bishop, G.A. and Stedman, D.H.: A decade of on-road emissions measurements, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 42, 1651-1656, doi:10.1021/es702413b, 2008.

490 Bosteels, D., May, J., Karlsson, H., and de Serves, C.: 'Regulated' and 'non-regulated' emissions from modern European passenger cars, *SAE Technical Paper Series*, 2006-01-1516, pp. 1-9, 2006.

Borbon, A., Gilman, J. B., Kuster, W. C., Grand, N., Chevallier, S., Colomb, A., Dolgorouky, C., Gros, V., Lopez, M., Sarda-Esteve, R., Holloway, J., Stutz, J., Petetin, H., McKeen, S., Beekmann, M., Warneke, C., Parrish, D. D., and de Gouw, J. A.: Emission ratios of anthropogenic volatile organic compounds in northern mid-latitude megacities: Observations versus emission inventories in Los Angeles and Paris, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118, 2041–2057, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50059, 2013.

495 Bourdeau, B. : Evolution du parc automobile Français entre 1970 et 2020. INRETS. Thesis Report LEN N°9801, 1998.

Bradley, K. S., Brooks, K. B., Hubbard, L. K., Popp, P. J., and Stedman, D. H.: Motor vehicle fleet emissions by OP-FTIR, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 34, 897–899, doi:10.1021/es9909226, 2000.

500 Bréon, F. M., Broquet, G., Puygrenier, V., Chevallier, F., Xueref-Rémy, I., Ramonet, M., Dieudonné, E., Lopez, M., Schmidt, M., Perrussel, O., and Ciais, P.: An attempt at estimating Paris area CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from atmospheric concentration measurements, *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 14, 9647-9703, doi:10.5194/acpd-14-9647-2014, 2014.

505 Chirico, R., DeCarlo, P. F., Heringa, M. F., Tritscher, T., Richter, R., Prévôt, A. S. H., Dommen, J., Weingartner, E., Wehrle, G., Gysel, M., Laborde, M., and Baltensperger, U.: Impact of aftertreatment devices on primary emissions and secondary organic aerosol formation potential from in-use diesel vehicles: results from smog chamber experiments, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 11545–11563, doi:10.5194/acp-10-11545-2010, 2010.

510 CITEPA, Rapport national d'inventaire pour la France au titre de la convention cadre des Nations-Unies sur les changements climatiques et du protocole de Kyoto, 2013.

Duren, R. M. and Miller, C. E.: Measuring the carbon emissions of megacities, *Nature Climate Change*, 2, 560–562, 2012.

515 Gaimoz, C., Sauvage, S., Gros, V., Herrmann, F., Williams, J., Locoge, N., Perrussel, O., Bonsang, B., d'Argouges, O., Sarda-Esteve, R., and Sciare, J.: Volatile Organic Compounds sources in paris in spring

2007. Part II: Source apportionment using positive matrix factorisation, *Environ. Chem.*, 8, 91–103, doi:10.1071/en10067, 2011.
- Gros, V., Gaimoz, C., Herrmann, F., Custer, T., Williams, J., Bonsang, B., Sauvage, S., Locoge, N., d'Argouges, O., Sarda-Esteve, R., and Sciare, J.: Volatile Organic Compounds sources in Paris in spring  
520 2007. Part I: Qualitative analysis, *Environ. Chem.*, 8, 74–90, doi:10.1071/en10068, 2011.
- Gros, V., A. Baudic, R. Sarda-Esteve, H. Petetin, O. Sanchez, A. Rosso, O. Perrussel, T. le Priol, J. F. Petit, J., J.-E. Petit, O. Favez, C. Kalogridis, N. Bonnaire, B. Bonsang, I. Xueref-Rémy, L. Ammoura, and J. Sciare, Volatile organic compounds source apportionment in Paris: Focus on the traffic and wood  
525 burning sources, communication orale présentée à l'Urban Air Quality Conference, Garmish-Partenkirchen, Allemagne, Mars 2014., Proceedings of abstracts, 9<sup>th</sup> International conference on air quality, Garmish-Partenkirchen, p88, 2014.
- Ho, K. F., Lee, S. C., Ho, W. K., Blake, D. R., Cheng, Y., Li, Y. S., Ho S. S. H., Fung K., Louie P. K. K. Park, D.: Vehicular emission of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from a tunnel study in Hong Kong, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 9, 7491-7504, 2009.
- 530 Kirchstetter, T. W., Harley, R. A., Kreisberg, N. M., Stolzenburg, M. R., and Hering, S. V.: On-road measurement of fine particle and nitrogen oxide emissions from light- and heavy-duty motor vehicles, *Atmos. Environ.*, 33, 2955–2968, 1999
- Kort, E. A., W. M. Angevine, R. Duren, and C. E. Miller, Surface observations for monitoring urban fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: Minimum site location requirements for the Los Angeles megacity, J.  
535 *Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118, 1577–1584, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50135, 2013.
- Levin, I. and Karstens, U.: Inferring high-resolution fossil fuel CO<sub>2</sub> records at continental sites from combined <sup>14</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> and CO observations, *Tellus*, 59B, 245–250, 2007.
- Lopez, M., Schmidt, M., Delmotte, M., Colomb, A., Gros, V., Janssen, C., Lehman, S. J., Mondelain, D., Perrussel, O., Ramonet, M., Xueref-Remy, I., and Bousquet, P.: CO, NO<sub>x</sub> and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> as tracers for fossil  
540 fuel CO<sub>2</sub>: results from a pilot study in Paris during winter 2010, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 7343–7358, doi:10.5194/acp-13-7343-2013, 2013.
- Montero, L., Duane, M., Manfredi, U., Astorga, C., Martini, G., Carriero, M., Krasenbrink, A., and Larsen, B. R.: Hydrocarbon emission fingerprints from contemporary vehicle/engine technologies with conventional and new fuels, *Atmos. Environ.*, 44, 2167–2175,  
545 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.03.027, 2010.
- Na, K.: Determination of VOCs source signature of vehicle exhaust in a traffic tunnel, *Atmos. Environ.*, 81, 392-398, doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2005.11.004, 2006.
- Office fédéral de l'Environnement OFEV, Confédération suisse, Emissions polluantes du trafic routier de 1990 à 2035, 2010.
- 550 O'Gorman, S., Nuttall, R., and Purchase, A.: An investigation of longitudinal ventilation for short road tunnels with high fire HRR, Report, 6<sup>th</sup> International Conference "Tunnel Safety and Ventilation", Graz, 2012.

- 555 Parrish, D. D., Kuster, W. C., Shao, M., Yokouchi, Y., Kondo, Y., Goldan, P. D., de Gouw, J. A., Koike, M., and Shirai, T.: Comparison of air pollutant emissions among mega-cities, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43(40), 6435–6441, 2009.
- Passant, N.: Speciation of UK emissions of non-methane volatile organic compounds, Rep. AEAT/ENV/R/0545, issue 1. 'Available at [http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/reports/empire/AEAT\\_ENV\\_0545\\_final\\_v2.pdf](http://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/reports/empire/AEAT_ENV_0545_final_v2.pdf)', 2002.
- 560 Popa, M. E., Vollmer, M. K., Jordan, A., Brand, W. A., Pathirana, S. L., Rothe, M., and Röckmann, T.: Vehicle emissions of greenhouse gases and related tracers from a tunnel study: CO : CO<sub>2</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O : CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub> : CO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>2</sub> : CO<sub>2</sub> ratios, and the stable isotopes <sup>13</sup>C and <sup>18</sup>O in CO<sub>2</sub> and CO, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 14, 2105–2123, doi:10.5194/acp-14-2105-2014, 2014.
- 565 Rayner, P. J., Utembe, S. R., and Crowell, S.: Constraining regional greenhouse gas emissions using geostationary concentration measurements: a theoretical study, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 3285–3293, doi:10.5194/amt-7-3285--2014, 2014.
- Ropkins, K., Beebe, J., Li, H., Daham, B., Tate, J., Bell, M., and Andrews, G.: Real-World Vehicle Exhaust Emissions Monitoring: Review and Critical Discussion, *Crit. Rev. Env. Sci. Tec.*, 39, 79–152, doi:10.1080/10643380701413377, 2009.
- 570 Roustan, Y., Pausader, M., and Seigneur, C.: Estimating the effect of on-road vehicle emission controls on future air quality in Paris, France, *Atmos. Environ.*, 45, 6828–6836, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.10.010, 2011.
- 575 SETRA: Emissions routières de polluants atmosphériques : courbes et facteurs d'influence, Novembre 2009.
- Touaty, M., and Bonsang, B.: Hydrocarbon emissions in a highway tunnel in the Paris area, *Atmos. Environ.*, 34, 985–996, 2000.
- 580 Turnbull, J. C., Karion, A., Fischer, M. L., Faloona, I., Guilderson, T., Lehman, S. J., Miller, B. R., Miller, J. B., Montzka, S., Sherwood, T., Saripalli, S., Sweeney, C., and Tans, P. P.: Assessment of fossil fuel carbon dioxide and other anthropogenic trace gas emissions from airborne measurements over Sacramento, California in spring 2009, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 705–721, doi:10.5194/acp-11-705-2011, 2011.
- United Nations: World Urbanization Prospects : The 2011 Revision, United Nations publication, ESA/P/WP/224, March 2012.
- 585 Vardoulakis, S., Gonzalez-Flesca, N., and Fisher, B. E. A.: Assessment of traffic-related air pollution in two street canyons in paris: Implications for exposure studies, *Atmos. Environ.*, 36, 1025–1039, 2002.
- Vollmer, M. K., Walter, S., Bond, S. W., Soltic, P., and Röckmann, T.: Molecular hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) emissions and their isotopic signatures (H/D) from a motor vehicle: implications on atmospheric H<sub>2</sub>, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 10, 5707–5718, doi:10.5194/acp-10-5707-2010, 2010.

590 Vollmer, M. K., Juergens, N., Steinbacher, M., Reimann, S., Weilenmann, M., and Buchmann, B.: Road vehicle emissions of molecular hydrogen (H<sub>2</sub>) from a tunnel study, *Atmos. Environ.*, 41, 8355–8369, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2007.06.037, 2007.

von Schneidemesser, E., Monks, P. S., and Plass-Duelmer, C.: Global comparison of VOC and CO observations in urban areas, *Atmos. Environ.*, 44, 5053–5064, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2010.09.010, 595 2010.

Warneke, C., McKeen, S. A., de Gouw, J. A., Goldan, P. D., Kuster, W. C., Holloway, J. S., Williams, E. J., Lerner, B. M., Parrish, D. D., Trainer, M., Fehsenfeld, F. C., Kato, S., Atlas, E. L., Baker, A., and Blake, D. R.: Determination of urban volatile organic compound emission ratios and comparison with an emissions database, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D10S47, doi:10.1029/2006JD007930, 2007.

600 Weilenmann, M., Favez, J. Y., and Alvarez, R.: Cold-start emissions of modern passenger cars at different low ambient temperatures and their evolution over vehicle legislation categories, *Atmos. Environ.*, 43, 2419–2429, 2009.

Weingartner, E., Keller, C., Stahel, W. A., Burtscher, H., and Baltensperger, U.: Aerosol emission in a road tunnel, *Atmos. Environ.*, 31, 451–462, 1997.

605 Xueref-Remy, I., Dieudonne, E., Lopez, M., Vuillemin, C., Schmidt, M., and Ampe, C.: Assessing Paris megacity CO<sub>2</sub> urban dome: analysis of 1 year of data from the CO<sub>2</sub>-MEGAPARIS project (Aug.2010-Jul.2011), manuscript in preparation, 2014.

Zavala, M., Herndon, S. C., Slott, R. S., Dunlea, E. J., Marr, L. C., Shorter, J. H., Zahniser, M., Knighton, W. B., Rogers, T. M., Kolb, C. E., Molina, L. T., and Molina, M. J.: Characterization of on-road vehicle emissions in the Mexico City Metropolitan Area using a mobile laboratory in chase and fleet average measurement modes during the MCMA-2003 field campaign, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 6, 5129-5142, doi:10.5194/acp-6-5129-2006, 2006.

615

620

625 **Table 1.** Observed emission ratios to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  and coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ). Numbers after  $\pm$  signs correspond to 1 sigma. Mole fraction ratios for  $\Delta\text{CO}$ ,  $\Delta\text{NO}$  and  $\Delta\text{NO}_2$  are reported in ppb/ppm, all others are reported in ppt/ppm.

Species	Observed ratios to $\Delta\text{CO}_2$	Coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ )
$\Delta\text{CO}$	$8.44 \pm 0.45$	0.89
$\Delta\text{NO}$	$3.32 \pm 0.23$	0.85
$\Delta\text{NO}_2$	$1.10 \pm 0.09$	0.82
$\Delta i\text{-pentane}$	$35.22 \pm 4.43$	0.60
$\Delta\text{Toluene}$	$24.26 \pm 2.91$	0.63
$\Delta\text{Acetylene}$	$20.14 \pm 1.67$	0.79
$\Delta\text{Ethylene}$	$14.01 \pm 1.91$	0.60
$\Delta\text{Propene}$	$13.17 \pm 1.37$	0.69
$\Delta n\text{-pentane}$	$12.93 \pm 1.45$	0.66
$\Delta\text{Benzene}$	$8.84 \pm 0.67$	0.81
$\Delta m\&p\text{-xylenes}$	$6.06 \pm 0.63$	0.70
$\Delta o\text{-xylene}$	$4.38 \pm 0.43$	0.72
$\Delta\text{Ethylbenzene}$	$3.32 \pm 0.36$	0.67
$\Delta n\text{-propylbenzene}$	$3.12 \pm 0.41$	0.58
$\Delta m\&p\text{-ethyltoluene}$	$1.75 \pm 0.18$	0.69

630

635

640

**Table 2.**  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios for traffic emissions, comparison with previous studies (continued from Popa et al., 2014).

Reference	$\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$ (ppb/ppm)	Location	Measurement year
Bradley et al., 2000	$50 \pm 4$	Denver, CO, USA	1997
Vollmer et al., 2007	$9.19 \pm 3.74$	Gubrist tunnel, Switzerland	2004
Bishop and Stedman, 2008	9.3 ... 18.4	Chicago (IL), Denver (CO), Los Angeles (CA), Phoenix (AZ), USA	2005-2007
Popa et al., 2014	$4.15 \pm 0.34$	Islisberg tunnel, Switzerland	2011
<b>This study (congested traffic)</b>	<b><math>8.44 \pm 0.45</math></b>	<b>Paris, France</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>This study (fluent traffic)</b>	<b><math>5.68 \pm 2.43</math></b>	<b>Paris, France</b>	<b>2012</b>

645

650

655

660

665 **Table 3.** Comparison between mass observed ratios to CO<sub>2</sub> and mass emission ratios provided by the  
 2010 Airparif inventory, only for the traffic source. The first column shows ratios from the Airparif  
 inventory for the whole Île-de-France region, the second one shows the specific Airparif ratios for the  
 tunnel road. Observed ratios are in bold. The last column reports the relative differences between  
 the specific Airparif ratios for the tunnel road and observed mass ratios. Emission ratios for CO and  
 670 NOx are reported in t/kt, all others are reported in kg/kt.

	Airparif 2010 (mean in Île-de- France region)	Airparif 2010 in the tunnel road	<b>Observed mass ratios 2012</b>	Relative difference between inventory ratios in the tunnel area and observed mass ratios (in % of the observed mass ratio)
<i>Compound i</i>	<i>i/CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>i/CO<sub>2</sub></i>	<b><math>\Delta i/\Delta CO_2</math></b>	
CO	9.7	5.3	<b>5.4</b>	- 2
NOx	4.4	4.6	<b>6.5</b>	- 30
i-pentane	64.3	21.6	<b>57.7</b>	- 63
Toluene	176.9	68.3	<b>50.8</b>	+ 34
Acetylene	44.6	16.5	<b>11.9</b>	+ 39
Ethylene	94.2	37.2	<b>8.9</b>	+ 318
Propene	52.5	20.6	<b>12.6</b>	+ 63
n-pentane	34.9	18.0	<b>21.2</b>	- 15
Benzene	74.1	33.7	<b>15.7</b>	+ 115
m&p-xylenes	67.6	24.0	<b>14.6</b>	+ 64
o-xylene	2.6	2.1	<b>10.2</b>	- 79
Ethylbenzene	32.8	12.4	<b>8.0</b>	+ 55
n-propylbenzene	22.8	7.7	<b>8.5</b>	- 9

675

680



685 **Table 4.** CO to CO<sub>2</sub> ratios (ppb/ppm) for gasoline and diesel contribution in Switzerland and the Île-  
de-France region, using annual emission inventories.

	$\frac{CO}{CO_2}$ ) <sub>gasoline</sub>	$\frac{CO}{CO_2}$ ) <sub>diesel</sub>	$\frac{CO}{CO_2}$ ) <sub>total</sub>
Switzerland (2010)	13.52	1.32	10.84
Île-de-France (2010)	37.44	1.41	9.34

690

695

700

705

**Table 5.**  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  ratios in the Thiais tunnel depending on vehicle averaged speed.

Low speed period ( $< 20 \text{ km.h}^{-1}$ )		High speed period ( $> 50 \text{ km.h}^{-1}$ )	
$\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$ (ppb/ppm)	Coefficient of determination $r^2$	$\Delta\text{CO}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$ (ppb/ppm)	Coefficient of determination $r^2$
$8.44 \pm 0.45$	0.89	$5.68 \pm 2.43$	0.45


710

715

720


725

730




735 **Fig. 1.** (a)-(c) and (e)-(g) Temporal variation of the mole fraction of the selected compound during the whole tunnel campaign. (d) Averaged speed. (h) Vehicle density. Time is given in local (UTC + 2h). Minor ticks on the horizontal axis are distributed every four hours.

740



**Fig. 2.** Correlations between  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  and selected co-emitted species. The red line represents the linear regression fit between  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  and the considered species. The linear regression does not intercept the (0, 0) point because of the uncertainty on the background level.

745



755 **Fig. 3.** Comparison between observed ratios to CO<sub>2</sub> and emission ratios provided by the 2010 Airparif inventory, only for the traffic source. In blue, ratios from the Airparif inventory for the whole Île-de-France region, in green ratios from the Airparif inventory using emissions only in the tunnel area, in red, ratios from our study. Ratios for CO and NO<sub>x</sub> are reported in t/kt, all others are reported in kg/kt.

**Supplementary material:**

Mean diurnal cycles:

5 Mole fractions vary significantly over the course of the day. The mean diurnal cycle ( $\pm 1\text{-}\sigma$  standard deviation) amplitudes are summarized in Table 1.

	Amplitude minimum	Associated standard deviation	Amplitude maximum	Associated standard deviation
CO <sub>2</sub>	486.81	14.95	750.21	166.26
CO	429.30	144.27	2670.52	1595.44
NO	377.51	86.12	1284.46	732.97
NO <sub>2</sub>	82.32	16.09	319.82	208.02
Benzene	0.38	0.18	2.67	2.89
Toluene	1.07	0.58	7.53	6.36
m&p-xylenes	0.23	0.12	1.72	1.84
o-xylene	0.14	0.08	1.25	1.45
n-propylbenzene	0.06	0.05	0.84	1.15
m&p-ethyltoluene	0.08	0.07	0.53	0.52
Ethylbenzene	0.14	0.08	1.02	1.18
Acetylene	0.73	0.39	5.96	6.36
Propene	0.63	0.49	4.63	4.67
Ethylene	4.15	2.82	8.55	8.70
i-pentane	0.82	0.67	7.96	9.77
n-pentane	0.51	0.33	4.84	16.05

**Table 1.** Mean diurnal cycle amplitudes and associated standard deviations. Amplitudes for CO<sub>2</sub> are reported in ppm, all others are reported in ppb.

Background discussion:

10 Two options were considered to represent background levels: (i) nighttime concentrations or (ii) daily concentrations out of the traffic peaks. Table 2 shows the averaged background concentrations considering these two options. Associated standard deviations are also mentioned. According to this table, we notice that background concentrations in the option (ii) are more variable because the standard deviations are higher than the ones of the option (i). During daytime out of the traffic peaks, vehicle density is high but vehicle speed is also high. Vehicles may bring outside air in the tunnel, diluting the air in the tunnel.

15

	Option (i)		Option (ii)	
	Nighttime averaged concentrations	Associated standard deviation	Daytime averaged concentrations outside rush hours	Associated standard deviation
CO <sub>2</sub>	495.92	23.46	555.85	26.64
CO	516.24	213.80	776.11	232.61


NO	445.42	91.35	839.46	119.82
NO <sub>2</sub>	88.11	17.78	160.52	28.03
Benzene	0.48	0.24	0.67	0.21
Toluene	1.33	0.84	1.65	0.75
m&p-xylenes	0.25	0.15	0.38	0.19
o-xylene	0.16	0.10	0.25	0.12
n-propylbenzene	0.09	0.07	0.20	0.07
m&p-ethyltoluene	0.08	0.06	0.11	0.03
Ethylbenzene	0.15	0.09	0.22	0.09
Acetylene	0.97	0.75	1.32	0.90
Propene	0.74	0.49	1.79	1.61
Ethylene	6.1	3.91	7.79	4.55
Propane	1.71	0.19	3.00	2.98
i-pentane	0.94	0.77	1.59	1.51
n-pentane	0.57	0.33	1.13	1.56
n-butane	0.98	0.85	0.99	1.17
i-butane	0.82	0.92	1.22	1.85

**Table 2.** Averaged background concentrations and associated standard deviations considering the two options. Mole fractions for CO<sub>2</sub> are reported in ppm, all others are reported in ppb.

20 Nighttime concentrations may be less representative of daytime background levels because vehicle density is very low, but they are less affected by the traffic source that we want to isolate. Furthermore, they look more stable.

The ratios between co-emitted species and CO<sub>2</sub> are evaluated correcting compound concentrations with background concentrations of option (i) (in the main paper) and of option (ii). We obtained  
25 exactly the same results for coefficients of determination and ratios  $\Delta\text{Species}/\Delta\text{CO}_2$ .


The ambient air outside of the tunnel was also sampled during the campaign but is not regularly available for most of the species. These data is available every 4h for CO and CO<sub>2</sub>. We linearly interpolated this ambient data every 4h to obtain a 1 minute step ambient dataset. Fig. 1 displays this time series.



30

**Fig. 1.** (i) Temporal variation of the CO ambient concentration (outside of the tunnel). Blue points represent real measurements and red lines the linear interpolation. (ii) Temporal variation of the CO<sub>2</sub> ambient concentration (outside of the tunnel). Black points represent real measurements and red lines the linear interpolation.

35 Then, we corrected CO and CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations in the tunnel during traffic peaks using the ambient interpolated concentrations as background level. As in the main paper, we evaluate the correlation between  $\Delta\text{CO}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  and the ratio in this case. Fig. 2 shows this scatterplot. We notice that the coefficient of determination is the same than in the two other options and the ratio  $\Delta\text{CO}$  to  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  is nearly the same (0.2% of difference).



40

**Fig. 2.** Correlation between  $\Delta\text{CO}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$  using ambient concentrations as background levels. Red line represents the linear regression fit between  $\Delta\text{CO}$  and  $\Delta\text{CO}_2$ .