

Errata and Clarifying Edits

Minor corrections and additions to be made in the figures and tables of the *Risk and Exposure Assessment to Support the Review of the SO₂ Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards: First Draft.*

Page 59, Figure 6-10, add to existing caption:

“The number of monitors used to generate the data presented in the top and bottom rows differs and is provided in Figure 6-11.”

Page 69, Figure 6-16, add to existing caption:

“The number of monitors used to generate the data presented in the top and bottom rows differs and is provided in Figure 6-17.”

Page 86, “Figure 26” should be changed to “Figure 6-26”

Page 130, 135, two unique tables are labeled “Table 7-7” (will be revised in the second draft of this document)

Page 136, Table 7-8, “the Missouri” should be changed to “in Missouri”

Page 147, Table 7-13,

Delete the column heading "Potential Health Effect Benchmark Level (ppb)"

Change the column heading "Actual" to "Potential Health Effect Benchmark Level (ppb)"

Change the column heading "Adjusted" to "Potential Health Effect Benchmark Level Adjusted for Current Standard Scenario (ppb).¹"

Add footnote “¹the adjusted levels should not be interpreted as actual potential health effect benchmark levels.”

Minor corrections and additions to be made in the text of the *Risk and Exposure Assessment to Support the Review of the SO₂ Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards: First Draft.*

Page 10, line 15, “is” should be deleted after “scheduled”

Page 14, line 15, “there” should be changed to “their”

Page 19, line 9, “Short-Term Respiratory Morbidity” should be deleted.

Page 20, line 11, “(draft ISA, 3.3.3.1)” should be changed to “(draft ISA section 3.1.3.1)”

Page 20, line 13, “(draft ISA section 3.3.3.1)” should be changed to “(draft ISA section 3.1.3.1)”

Page 21, line 25, after “(ATS 2000; draft ISA section 3.1.3)” insert:

“In addition, ATS concluded that a decrease in health-related quality of life, which refers to an individual’s perception of well being, should also be considered to represent an

adverse effect of air pollution. Therefore, whereas the conclusions in the 1994 Supplement were based on SO₂ exposure concentrations which resulted in large decrements in lung function along with moderate to severe respiratory symptoms, the current review of data from human clinical studies focuses on moderate to large SO₂-induced decrements in lung function combined with respiratory symptoms ranging from mild (perceptible wheeze or chest tightness) to severe (breathing distress requiring the use of a bronchodilator).”

Page 48, lines 20-25, the last two sentences of this paragraph should be replaced with: “The extent to which the air quality adjustment results in under- or overestimation of exceedances of specified potential health effect benchmarks is highly dependent on the distribution of air quality concentrations under the as is levels. We recognize that it is extremely unlikely that SO₂ concentrations in any of the selected areas where concentrations have been adjusted would rise to meet the current NAAQS. Therefore, we recognize that there is considerable uncertainty associated with the simulation of conditions that would just meet the current standards. Nevertheless, this procedure was necessary to assess the ability of the current standards, not current ambient levels, to protect public health.”

Page 84, line 14, replace the last sentence of paragraph to read: “The percentage of monitors containing at least one potential health effect benchmark exceedance averaged across all years was 98%.”

Page 94, line 6, “using” should be deleted.

Page 116, lines 22-26 should be replaced with the following:
If it is possible within the time and resource constraints to model additional locations, selection criteria would include the total number of emission facilities regardless of available ambient SO₂ monitoring data by state, while also considering locations that contain large urban areas. Other states with a large number of emission sources include in ranked order the following: Texas, Ohio, Illinois, and Indiana. The urban area of St. Louis, Mo. is currently being evaluated, while other large urban areas considered within these potentially modeled states would include, Philadelphia, Pa., Pittsburgh, Pa., Houston, Tx., Cleveland, Oh., and Chicago, Il.

Page 118, line 13, “Figure 8-1” should be changed to “Figure 7-1”

Page 132, line 19, “concentrations” should be added after “modeled”

Page 135, line 9, “(US EPA, 2007g)” should be changed to “(EPA, 2007d)”

Page 138, line 10, “(EPA, 2007g)” should be changed to “(EPA, 2007d)”

Page 143, lines 12,13, “NO₂” should be changed to “SO₂”

Page 156, line 14, “(2007g)” should be changed to “(2007d)”