

14.12.2004  
Tuija Ruoho-Airola  
Finland

Comments to the Draft Atmospheric Supply of Nitrogen, Lead, Cadmium, Mercury and Lindane to the Baltic Sea in 2002 by the EMEP Centres.

The report is a good summary of results concerning the air pollution load to the Baltic Sea in the year 2002. It follows decisions of the MONAS group about the scope and structure of an annual PLC Air report. The nitrogen emissions from the HELCOM countries are split in different emission sectors, which give further information on the sources of the nitrogen deposition. Details of the measurement data and source allocation budgets are placed in Appendixes, which makes the large report clearer and easier to use. However, a careful checking of the report is needed in order to correct shortcomings and mistakes. Below are listed mistakes or unclarities noted. In addition some proposals for improvement of the annual reports are given.

- table 3.1. and figure 3.1. with station names and locations do not match
- why is GUF missing from figure 3.3. although there are several station measuring in the Gulf of Finland
- text of the concentration of the heavy metals in aerosols in 3.4. (p. 13) differ from values in Appendix A (p. 100). In the text the values are given in ng/m<sup>3</sup>, in Appendix the values are 1000 times larger. In addition, the largest Pb concentration of Pb on p. 13 is lower than the lowest.
- Figures 4.18 and 4.19 remained unclear, the values are high compared to deposition on the Baltic Sea, but low compared to emissions. In order to make them clearer, the text on p. 31 of the figures should include explanation on how the values have been calculated. Figure 4.19 is probably for the Baltic Sea basin not for the catchment.
- The scales in figures 4.20 and 4.21 are unreadable, a table of annual mean values as 5.6 could solve the problem
- The emission of the sea traffic is discussed only in connection to the nitrogen emissions/depositions. Could it have an effect on the heavy metal deposition on the Baltic Sea? The contribution of the reemission and natural sources are rather high, could part of it be sea traffic? Without an emission inventory calculation of the contribution of the sea traffic is not possible, but some discussion about sea traffic emission could be included e.g. in the explanation of the difference between measured and modelled values
- Figures 8.3 and 8.4, the captures need checking
- Appendix C and D need an explanation of the country abbreviations (a table?)