

Interactive comment on “Comparison of the predictions of two road dust emission models with the measurements of a mobile van” by M. Kauhaniemi et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 15 April 2014

General comments

The well written manuscript deals with a comparison of measurements and model results for non-exhaust road dust emissions. This is an interesting topic of increasing relevance since traffic PM emissions will be dominated by non-exhaust emissions in the near future. The authors give a detailed introduction to the topic covering lots of previous work and describe both the used measurements and models in great detail (maybe a bit too long).

However the attempted comparison of very different type of data has some serious

C1418

flaws and weaknesses.

There are simply too many unknown parameters and not fully justified underlying assumption involved when comparing 10 second resolution on-road mobile measurements over relatively short periods with modelled 1 hour time series over several years. The measurements are influenced by unaccounted and very local road conditions, variable driving speeds and data with great scatter are averaged to 20-25 hourly averages only. These type of mobile measurements seem to have their strength in studying the dependencies on single parameters as driving speed; type of tires or spatial variation of the road dust suspension, while less suited for long term measurements monitoring day to day variations.

The presented models are based on meteorological data from a central location and average road and meteorological conditions. The models were developed and validated for reproducing time variations of average fleet re-suspension emission factors on a very well defined location as done e.g. for Hornsgatan in Stockholm. In order to make modelled total fleet average fleet emissions comparable with the measured van emissions some assumptions about two additional parameters ($r_{pCar}=0.7$ and $r_{HDV}=10$) have to be made. These parameter taken from the literature might be very uncertain (missing sensitivity study) and could be dependent on road and weather condition and vehicle speed and therefor variable from day to day and in-between seasons.

A fixed permanent monitoring site in Helsinki is missing in the study to bridge the gap between both data sets. Such data are needed in order to calibrate the models to reproduce the temporal variation in emissions correctly under Helsinki conditions. In the moment both models rely on data from Stockholm without knowing if they are applicable in Helsinki; in FORE the reference emission factors; in NORTRIP the road wear rates and the suspension factor. Moreover the mobile SNIFFER results could be calibrated when passing the fixed monitoring site.

The uncertainty analysis is well done and states a lot of the reasons for the discrepan-

C1419

cies between the model and measurements. The conclusion of the authors that “road dust emission models can be directly compared with mobile measurements” is certainly overstating the results in the moment. The presented comparison between the measurements and the two models is very uncertain due to the very few data points. The bias are very high and the correlation partly non-existing. Just the very overall feature of the seasonal variation fits roughly even though there are very few SNIFFER data outside the road dust season. The above mentioned aspects should be reflected in a revised manuscript in case of further publication.

Specific comments

Several of the figures need revision. It is misleading to present the total emission factors graphical together with the measurements, both in the time series plots (Fig 3 + 6) and the scatter plots (Fig 4 + 7). Only EF (van) should be presented. Also it is impossible to relate the exact hourly timing of the measurements to timing in the models, i.e. several measurements appear at virtually the same time in the plot. Therefor consider to a) plot measurements together with both models in one graph in order to show the differences in-between the models as well and b) to show some shorter time periods zoomed around some measured data points. The plots of the modelled values are hard to read in the figures (especially in Fig. 5.+ 6.) due to the frequent and overlapping vertical lines. Consider other ways of plotting e.g. small symbols instead of connecting lines or expanding x- axis / zoom.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 14, 4263, 2014.