Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on "Megacity emission plume characteristics in summer and winter investigated by mobile aerosol and trace gas measurements: the Paris metropolitan area" *by* S.-L. von der Weiden-Reinmüller et al.

S.-L. von der Weiden-Reinmüller et al.

sl.vonderweiden@mpic.de

Received and published: 16 September 2014

The authors would like to thank the referee for the valuable comments. We have responded to all comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. Details of our responses to each comment are shown below.

Anonymous Referee #3

The manuscript shows a study analyzing the measurements done using a mobile Lab

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

during two deployments (winter, summer) on the Paris metropolitan area. It shows a very thorough explanation on how the measurements were performed and how they were post processed. The measurements were classified as background or affected by the Paris plume, with the methodology of classification also thoroughly described.

The classification was used to contrast plume and background conditions, analyze the dilution characteristics of the plume and to explore transformation processes within the plume. The manuscript is well written, the contents are in the scope of the Journal and I believe it is a contribution to the field. This is why I recommend publication after minor revisions.

My main comment is that I think there is a problem in the methodology used. The main method of air mass classification used in the paper is through enhancements of fresh pollution markers. Afterwards, one of the main results reported is the increase in fresh pollutants from background to megacity air masses. So it's expected that you are going to find these results if you are using the same criteria for classification. I would like to see the methodology validated by using an independent identification of plume emissions, such as backtrajectory analysis, which the authors used but on a very limited part of the study. The authors mention they use meteorological observations and air pollution reanalysis but these are not shown. Some of these examples could be added to the supplemental material.

Reply by the authors: We understand that the reader might see such a problem in the methodology used in our work. This is mainly due to the presentation of the work and not due the work itself. Actually, the identification of the plume in the data was performed in several steps. The first step was to determine the direction of air mass transport from meteorological forecasts and from Prev'Air pollution forecasts. Based on this information the measurement route was selected. This was described in detail in von der Weiden-Reinmüller et al., 2014 (AMT 7, p279-299). After the data were validated and cleaned for local pollution influence, all data sets from all measured variables were searched for fingerprints from the emission plume in the region where approxi-

mately – according to the pollution forecasts – the plume was expected. This step was made without any preference for certain types of variables like concentrations of fresh pollution markers. However, in this process it turned out that the plume was mainly visible in the data sets of the fresh pollution markers. Therefore these data were used to determine the location of the plume and of the background without plume influence. Only after this determination average plume and background concentrations were calculated for all variables. In the manuscript the point of view was from the results side: Only for those variables where a clear plume was visible the distribution of concentrations was shown. These were of course those markers where the largest contribution from the plume was found. In order to avoid the impression of this apparent problem in the methodology we revised section 3.1 (Emission plume identification) accordingly. In the revised text the actual process of how the plumes were identified is now better reflected. This, we hope, now shows better that there was no preference for fresh pollution markers to identify the plume but that these markers turned out to be the best markers for the plume, simply because their concentrations are those that are most strongly enhanced in the area where, according to the Prev'Air calculations, the plume was expected.

Other comments:

Page 11265, Lines 14-20. I disagree with the statement " ... while air masses further away from Paris show nearly constant background values". On Fig 1b, CO2 shows a clear decreasing trend as you move away from the city. The trend is not so clear in the other chemical species, but the values further away from the city seem to be the lowest. The values you are flagging as Background air masses could be City emission plume diluted after axial transport, or could be that the mobile sampler moved from the center of the plume (higher concentrations) to the side of it (more diluted) as it got away from the city.

Reply by the authors: Indeed, CO2 shows a clear decreasing trend in the distance range that was identified as "background". We agree with the reviewer that this might

be confusing to the reader. We also agree with the statement that the measurements further away from the plume might have missed the plume center. The definition of plume and background ranges was the result of intense studies of the values of the various variables as a function of distance (or direction) from Paris. Since it is not likely that different components of the plume are unmixed and show different distributions we assume that the combination of information from different pollutants gives us the best information on the extension of the plume. The definition of plume and background boundaries is therefore based on this combination of information. Variability in the concentration levels with distance to the city has different reasons. Since only for CO2 a clear decrease with increasing distance to the city is observed and not for the other variables, we assume a different reason for this behavior. As described in the text such quasi Lagrangian measurements lasted for many hours. Since in any cases the measurements started in the morning near Paris and the most distant point was reached in the early afternoon we assume that this decrease observed for CO2 is – at least to a certain degree – an artefact due to typical diurnal variations of this trace gas. In order to make all this clearer we reworded the paragraph that describes the plume and background definition. In this location in the text we included a statement about potential influences by diurnal variations (which was already made later in the text) and about potential influences by missing the plume (which was also already in the text) on measured pollution levels. In addition we made clearer that the definition of plume and background ranges is based on a combination of information from various pollutants.

Page 11267, Lines 22-24. You could use statistical testing to backup this claim.

Reply by the authors: As shown in Table 1 (last row, after revision now Table 2) the uncertainties of the average plume and background values of the O/C ratio are so low that within the given precision they do not differ from zero. With a decrease of 0.05 and 0.08 for summer and winter, respectively, the differences between plume and background O/C ratios are much larger than the uncertainty of these values. We added this information to the text: "The average O/C ratios in organic aerosol confirm

that during both seasons the oxidation level of the organic aerosol in emission plume air masses is significantly lower (much more than the uncertainty of the values) than that in background air masses."

Fig 5b. How confident are you that the measurement actually stayed in the direction where the plume was moving? As seen in Fig 5a, city plumes could tend to be narrower than predicted, so maybe that low background value you are finding is because the sampler went quickly out of the plume. Backtrajectory analysis could be helpful here.

Reply by the authors: As described in the text we compared the experimentally determined plume directions, extensions and shapes with those determined from Prev'Air forecasts and re-analyses, which is a more detailed model compared to the backtrajectory calculations we used. Since we found some discrepancies between the modelled and measured plume distributions and directions which were not systematic, we know that differences in modelled plume directions and measurement routes do not necessarily have to mean that the measurements were performed outside the plume. Therefore we just stated in the text (p11277 line 10-12) that such effects cannot be excluded. Unfortunately we cannot give any better information on the probability whether such effects actually happened during our measurements.

Section 3.4, "Quasi-Lagrangian axial measurements:" The results of this sub-section are not showed in tables or figures. You could show them in the supplementary material.

Reply by the authors: As stated on p11278 line 28 – p11279 line 2 (first version of the manuscript) with this analysis approach we were not able to detect any significant chemical transformation processes beyond the expected dilution of the plume. The reasons for this are presented in the following lines (p11279 lines 3-15). Since on the one hand there was mainly noise left over after this analysis and no transformation above noise level could be observed, and on the other hand many calculations and therefore many data have been involved in this analysis, we think that it does not make

sense to add this information to the supplementary material. In the case that an individual reader is interested in this analysis we would prefer to have a chance to discuss this directly.

The Summary states "The cross sectional profile of the plume is typically Gaussian-like while the axial decrease of fresh pollution concentrations shows an exponential shape." However, the authors present only 1 case for each. More cases need to be added (maybe just in the supplement) to backup these conclusions. Also include model results to see how representative is the case shown in the main manuscript.

Reply by the authors: We added five more measurement examples, including the corresponding model data, to the supplement (Sect. S3, Figs. S5 – S9). Three examples show the Gaussian-like cross sectional profile of the emission plume, two examples show the exponential axial decrease of fresh pollution concentrations in the emission plume.

Technical corrections:

Change Beekman 2013 to 2014

Reply by the authors: We changed this citation to "Beekman et al., in preparation for ACPD, 2014".

Page 11261, Lines 3-4. This sentence is not clear; it contradicts the sentence in lines 7-8. Please rephrase.

Reply by the authors: We do not think there is a contradiction between these two sentences, though we agree that as written, it might be confusing to the reader. The sentence in line 3-4 claims that no data were removed when the measurements were potentially contaminated by local sources – independent on the concentrations measured during these times. The sentence in line 7-8 claims that individual data points with very high concentrations – independent on the source of these concentrations – have been removed. To make this clearer – and to include the next comment – we

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

changed the two sentences into: "Local pollution contamination, as defined above, was not removed from the AMS data before PMF application but afterwards from the resulting factor time series." and "Therefore, data points with intense peaks in the organic time series, independent of the cause of these peaks, were removed before PMF was applied."

Page 11261, Lines 7-8: Change to "Therefore, data points with intense peaks in the organic time series were removed before PMF was applied."

Reply by the authors: This was already covered by the response to the previous comment.

Page 11265, Line 1. Fig 1 does not show PAH, shows HOA.

Reply by the authors: Thank you for this hint. We changed the sentence accordingly.

Fig. 2. You could add the mean in the box and whisker plots as a symbol in the middle of the box/whisker. The mean is in Table 1 but I think it's better to repeat this information in the box and whisker plots. Page 11267 Line 5 and Fig 2 Caption says that this figure has the "mean" but it's not plotted. The box and whisker represent the data distribution, not the mean.

Reply by the authors: We added the mean values to the box and whisker plots as suggested. While doing this we realized that the values for LV-OOA in the winter measurements were not correct. We corrected these values in both, the table and the text.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 11249, 2014.