

We would like to thank the reviewers for their useful and constructive comments regarding the manuscript and have made changes where possible to satisfy their questions and concerns. The original comments from the reviewers are shown in red, with the authors response following in black.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 July 2020:

France et al. quantify CH<sub>4</sub> emissions from offshore oil platforms using combinations of instruments aboard a Twin Otter aircraft. They describe the lessons learned from two years of flying downwind of these platforms. They also discuss methods of distinguishing sources of CH<sub>4</sub> based on isotopic measurements and correlations with ethane. They find ethane:CH<sub>4</sub> emission ratios of 0.029 in both years of flying, in line with published estimates. Their estimates of CH<sub>4</sub> mass fluxes improved significantly when flying in 2019 in a well-mixed marine boundary layer. This paper provides a straightforward description of the project. As such, there is not much to critique. They lessons the authors learned during the two years were mostly to be expected, i.e., faster response instruments were able distinguish source locations better than slow response instruments; a well-mixed marine boundary layer was easier to measure a downwind plume than a layered, poorly-mixed marine boundary layer; etc. However, since the paper will stand as an overview of the project studying emissions from offshore platforms, and because it provides some guidelines for future projects, it is worthy of publication in this journal. I have mostly minor comments related below.

line 54, “pinpoint” seems redundant. Is there a difference between locating and pinpointing emission sources? Maybe the authors mean locate facilities that are emitting, then pinpoint where in the facility the emissions are? And I think this sentence would read better if it were presented in a hypothetical chronological order: first locate emissions, second quantify them, third validate inventories, fourth design effective mitigation.

Agree – this sentence / paragraph has been restructured in line with the suggestions here.

line 131, stating the precision of the ethane measurement in flight would be more appropriate than in the lab

It would indeed be a better metric to provide, however as the cylinders contained no discernible ethane, an in-flight precision measurement estimate is not possible.

line 315, when the authors say a “vertical run”, do they mean a vertically-stacked horizontal run?

We agree, this does read better too. “vertical run” has been changed to “stacked horizontal run” through the paper.

In Figure 7, please state how far downwind the aircraft was for each of these two flights.

The distances that the aircraft were for various flights is clarified in the text. The aircraft varied in distance from emitting sources from ~1 to 10km away downwind.

line 355, I don't think the word "ideally" is necessary. There must be some variability in the source strength compared to the background in order to fit a line through the data points.

We agree, this has been changed.

Other comments:

line 253, what does NAME stand for?

The expansion for NAME (Numerical Atmospheric-dispersion Modelling Environment) has been added to the text.

Grammar suggestions:

All subsequent grammar suggestions have been resolved. Thank you for spotting these.

line 23, add comma after (SLCP)

line 93, it looks like the superscript "-1" is a different font

line 103, it looks like the second end parenthesis of the O'Shea reference is a different size?

line 176, it is unclear what "fit" means here

line 181 and elsewhere, suggest changing "in O'Shea" to "by O'Shea"

line 188, suggest "canister sampling" instead of "canisters sampling"

line 199, need ending parenthesis after Lowry reference

line 245, suggest "by Stull" instead of "in Stull"

line 255, change "decision" to "decisions"

line 319, I found this sentence a little confusing to read. I suggest instead of "between

the maximal and minimal altitude transects that do not demonstrate CH<sub>4</sub> enhancements

so are outside of the plume", perhaps say "between the highest and lowest

transects without CH<sub>4</sub> enhancements, which are above and below the plume, respectively"

line 328, same strange small parenthesis in the Plant reference

line 346, suggest "by Peischl" instead of "in Peischl"

line 352, suggest "by Keeling" instead of "in Keeling"

line 384, “dramatically” is subjective. I suggest removing this word.

## References

- Floerchinger, C., McKain, K., Bonin, T., Peischl, J., Biraud, S. C., Miller, C., Ryerson, T. B., Wofsy, S. C. and Sweeney, C.: Methane emissions from oil and gas production on the North Slope of Alaska, *Atmos. Environ.*, 218, 116985, doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116985, 2019.
- Gvakharia, A., Kort, E. A., Smith, M. L. and Conley, S.: Testing and evaluation of a new airborne system for continuous N<sub>2</sub>O, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO, and H<sub>2</sub>O measurements: the Frequent Calibration High-performance Airborne Observation System (FCHAOS), *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 11, 6059–6074, doi:10.5194/amt-11-6059-2018, 2018.
- Kostinek, J., Roiger, A., Davis, K. J., Sweeney, C., DiGangi, J. P., Choi, Y., Baier, B., Hase, F., Groß, J., Eckl, M., Klausner, T. and Butz, A.: Adaptation and performance assessment of a quantum and interband cascade laser spectrometer for simultaneous airborne in situ observation of CH<sub>4</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>6</sub>, CO<sub>2</sub>, CO and N<sub>2</sub>O, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 12, 1767–1783, doi:10.5194/amt-12-1767-2019, 2019.
- Peischl, J., Eilerman, S. J., Neuman, J. A., Aikin, K. C., de Gouw, J., Gilman, J. B., Herndon, S. C., Nadkarni, R., Trainer, M., Warneke, C. and Ryerson, T. B.: Quantifying Methane and Ethane Emissions to the Atmosphere From Central and Western U.S. Oil and Natural Gas Production Regions, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 123, 7725–7740, doi:10.1029/2018JD028622, 2018.
- Pitt, J. R., Le Breton, M., Allen, G., Percival, C. J., Gallagher, M. W., Bauguitte, S. J.-B., O'Shea, S. J., Muller, J. B. A., Zahniser, M. S., Pyle, J. and Palmer, P. I.: The development and evaluation of airborne in situ N<sub>2</sub>O and CH<sub>4</sub> sampling using a quantum cascade laser absorption spectrometer (QCLAS), *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 9, 63–77, doi:10.5194/amt-9-63-2016, 2016.
- Santoni, G. W., Daube, B. C., Kort, E. A., Jiménez, R., Park, S., Pittman, J. V., Gottlieb, E., Xiang, B., Zahniser, M. S., Nelson, D. D., McManus, J. B., Peischl, J., Ryerson, T. B., Holloway, J. S., Andrews, A. E., Sweeney, C., Hall, B., Hints, E. J., Moore, F. L., Elkins, J. W., Hurst, D. F., Stephens, B. B., Bent, J. and Wofsy, S. C.: Evaluation of the airborne quantum cascade laser spectrometer (QCLS) measurements of the carbon and greenhouse gas suite – CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CO – during the CalNex and HIPPO campaigns, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 7, 1509–1526, doi:10.5194/amt-7-1509-2014, 2014.
- Smith, M. L., Kort, E. A., Karion, A., Sweeney, C., Herndon, S. C. and Yacovitch, T. I.: Airborne Ethane Observations in the Barnett Shale: Quantification of Ethane Flux and Attribution of Methane Emissions, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 49, 8158–8166, doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b00219, 2015.