

Interactive comment on “Methane mapping, emission quantification and attribution in two European cities; Utrecht, NL and Hamburg, DE” by Hossein Maazallahi et al.

Luise Westphal

luise.westphal@gasnetz-hamburg.de

Received and published: 14 September 2020

Gasnetz Hamburg could not confirm 80 % of the LI as pipeline leaks. This issue requires further investigation. Therefore, we set up a joint project together with IMAU. The field test campaign in Hamburg is ongoing. The objective of the project is to compare leak rate estimates from mobile methods with ground measurements applying the suction method for a small sample of leaks in a real-life situation. For this reason, we request to give more explanation on that statement, e.g. by the conditional "[. . .] once the LIs were shared. Further, it must be considered that the leak detection of the gas utility and University of Utrecht did not take place at the same time (several weeks in

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



between). It might be possible that changing weather and soil conditions prevented finding leaks on different events. Furthermore, a "fossil leak" does not necessarily originate from a pipeline. It could also come from natural gas vehicles, thus, it is only presented for a very short time. We are highly confident, that regular LDAR (Leak Detection and Repair) is capable of finding the vast majority of leaks. Accordingly, we suggest rewording the sentence for example to "Gasnetz Hamburg could not confirm 80 % of the LI as pipeline leaks. This issue requires further Investigation."

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-657>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)