

Interactive comment on “Characteristics of trace metals in traffic-derived particles in Hsuehshan Tunnel, Taiwan: size distribution, fingerprinting metal ratio, and emission factor” by Y.-C. Lin et al.

Dr. Ceburnis

darius.ceburnis@nuigalway.ie

Received and published: 30 May 2014

The paper by Lin et al. is a comprehensive study characterising size-segregated particulate matter and trace metal emissions in the tunnel. Tunnels are indeed excellent natural laboratories, but I wonder if the authors did a strategic mistake in the sampling set-up greatly diminishing the value of their study.

The Equation 2 of the paper can only be applied to a closed system, i.e. applying a box model which implies that an air parcel enters the tunnel at the inlet and exits at the outlet accumulating emissions along the length of the tunnel. The "box" should

C2944

be "airtight" - no exchange of air is allowed with the clean outside air inside the box. Based on the description of the experimental set-up there was automatically activated air exchange system (triggered by CO exceedances and/or randomly) in-between the inlet and outlet sampling points, thereby invariably diluting accumulated emissions in the air. Considering the dilution effect, Equation 2 can only be used in sections where no active air exchange has happened (not the 8.9 km length of the tunnel) and/or taking into account the dilution effect between those sections which complicates calculations significantly (and only if dilution was constant which was not probably the case).

Consequently, I conclude that the emission factors were greatly underestimated in this paper while comparison with other studies reporting similarly low values were only valid providing no mistakes were done in any of the studies. For example, Valiulis et al. (2002 Atmos. Environ.) reported emission factors for Zn, Ba, Mn, Cu and Pb an order of magnitude higher than in this study with similar traffic flow and composition albeit in a much shorter tunnel with only natural ventilation. In fact, Table 6 reports PM emission values in other studies also greatly higher than in this study pointing to the problem above. I argue against any advantage of long tunnels because of mandatory elaborate ventilation systems absent in short tunnels.

In addition, why only PM1 emission value in Hsuehshan tunnel is presented in Table 6 when comparative PM10 and PM1.8 could also be calculated from all three fractions and meaningfully compared to other studies?

I also wonder why the authors assume that emission factors should be same or similar among different size fractions taking 4.4 - inlet/outlet ratio of PM1 - as a reference? I would argue against the correction of PM1-1.8 emission factor supposedly taking into account dry deposition - a notoriously difficult parameter to estimate, particularly in the tunnel. Different processes (combustion (PM1) versus abrasive wear (PM1-1.8) versus re-suspension (PM1.8-10)) were contributing to different size fractions, so why expect similarity? Dry deposition cannot account for 43% losses of PM1-1.8 particles based on aerosol fundamentals - my estimate is at most 10-15%. However, I agree that the

C2945

larger the size fraction the larger the underestimation of the emission factors due to deposition. In summary, the experimental set-up clearly suffered from neglecting the dilution effect preventing any meaningful estimation of dry deposition which can be safely neglected by acknowledgement.

I believe that the authors will carefully revisit their experimental set-up and calculations of the emission factors and possibly find the way of correcting the emission factors. It is imperative to consider geometry of the tunnel finding unperturbed sections; air exchange rate at all stations estimating a dilution effect; and activation pattern of the ventilation system (and any differences in the pattern between weekdays and weekends) to see which data can be reliably used in Eq.2 (if any). If that is not possible, the sections reporting emission factors should be removed which would be pity because of the otherwise valuable dataset obtained.

The remainder of the paper - pollution patterns from air quality point of view, corresponding ratios of metals, size-distributions, etc. - is all fine.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 13963, 2014.