

# **Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone:**

**Policy Assessment of Scientific and Technical Information** 

**Appendices to OAQPS Staff Paper – Second Draft** 

EPA-452/D-05-002 July 2006

## **Review of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone:**

**Policy Assessment of Scientific and Technical Information** 

### **Appendices to OAQPS Staff Paper – Second Draft**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards Research Triangle Park, North Carolina

#### DISCLAIMER

This document has been reviewed by the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and approved for publication. This second draft OAQPS Staff Paper contains the initial conclusions of the staff of the OAQPS and does not necessarily represent those of the EPA. Mention of trade names or commercial products is not intended to constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

1	APPENDIX 2A. PLOTS OF DIURNAL POLICY RELEVANT
2	<b>BACKGROUND OZONE PATTERNS FOR 12 URBAN AREAS</b>
3	BASED ON RUNS OF THE GEOS-CHEM MODEL FOR APRIL-
4	OCTOBER 2001



1 Figure 2A-1. Atlanta CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.







1 Figure 2A-3. Chicago CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.







Figure 2A-5. Detroit CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns. 1







1 Figure 2A-7. Los Angeles CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.

3 Figure 2A-8. New York CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.





1 Figure 2A-9. Philadelphia CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.

3 Figure 2A-10. Sacramento CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.





1 Figure 2A-11. St. Louis CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.

3 Figure 2A-12. Washington CSA: Diurnal Policy Relevant Background Ozone Patterns.



#### 1 APPENDIX 3A: MECHANISMS OF TOXICITY

This Appendix provides an overview of evidence covered in Chapters 5 and 6 of the CD
on possible mechanisms by which exposure to O<sub>3</sub> may result in acute and chronic health effects.

4 5

#### **Pulmonary Function Responses**

6 The direct pulmonary effects of O<sub>3</sub> include changes in breathing pattern, symptoms of 7 breathing discomfort, lung function changes, and airway hyperreactivity. Subjects who engage 8 in physical activity for several hours while exposed to  $O_3$  may experience respiratory tract 9 symptoms and acute physiological changes. Airway irritation is consistently the most typical 10 symptomatic response reported in studies and can be accompanied by several physiological 11 changes. These physiological changes include alteration in breathing pattern, airway 12 hyperresponsiveness, airway inflammation, immune system activation, and epithelial injury. 13 Severity of symptoms and magnitude of response depend on dose of inhaled O<sub>3</sub>, individual 14 sensitivity to  $O_3$ , and the extent of tolerance resulting from previous  $O_3$  exposures. Development 15 of effects is time-dependent with a substantial degree of overlap of increasing and receding 16 effects. Time sequences, magnitudes, and types of responses of this series of events, in terms of 17 development and recovery, indicate that several mechanisms, activated at different times, must 18 contribute to the overall lung function response. (CD, pp. 6-11) For the full discussion of the 19 mechanisms of pulmonary function responses, see section 6.2.5 of the CD. 20 21 **Breathing Pattern Changes** 

22 Human controlled-exposure studies have consistently found that inhalation of O<sub>3</sub> alters 23 the breathing pattern without significantly affecting minute ventilation (CD, pp. 6-12). A 24 progressive decrease in tidal volume and an increase in frequency of breathing to maintain steady 25 ventilation during exposure of human subjects indicates a direct impact on ventilation. These 26 changes are similar to responses in many animal species exposed to  $O_3$  and other respiratory 27 irritants. Bronchial C-fibers and rapidly adapting receptors appear to be the primary modulators 28 of O<sub>3</sub>-induced changes in ventilatory rate and O<sub>3</sub> penetration in both humans and animals (CD, 29 section 6.2.5.1).

- 30
- 31

#### Symptoms and Lung Function Changes

In addition to changes in ventilatory control, O<sub>3</sub> inhalation by humans induces a variety of symptoms (e.g., cough, pain on deep inspiration), reduces inspiratory capacity (IC) and vital capacity (VC) and related functional measures, and increases airway resistance (CD, pp. 6-13). 1 The reduction in VC caused by exposure to  $O_3$  is a reflex action and not a voluntary early

- 2 termination of inspiration resulting from discomfort. An inhaled topical anesthetic substantially
- 3 reduces O<sub>3</sub>-induced symptom responses (mediated in part by bronchial C-fibers) while having
- 4 only minor and irregular effect on pulmonary function decrements and rapid, shallow breathing.
- 5 Since respiratory symptom responses were largely abolished by anesthetic, these findings
- 6 support reflex inhibition of VC due to stimulation by both bronchial and pulmonary C-fibers.
- 7 Intersubject variability in FEV<sub>1</sub> responses is not explained by differences in O<sub>3</sub> doses between
- 8 similarly exposed individuals (CD, section 6.2.5.1).
- 9 10

#### Airway Hyperresponsiveness

11 Bronchial or airway hyperresponsiveness (AHR) refers to a condition in which the 12 propensity for the airways to bronchoconstrict, due to a variety of specific (e.g., allergens and 13 antigens) or nonspecific (e.g., histamine and cold air) stimuli, becomes increased (CD, p. 6-30). 14 Despite a common mechanism (CD, pp. 6-13 and 6-14), post- O<sub>3</sub> exposure pulmonary function 15 changes and AHR (either early or late phase) are poorly correlated either in time or magnitude. 16 Neither does post- $O_3$  exposure AHR seem to be related to baseline airway responsiveness. 17 These findings imply that the mechanisms are either not related or are activated independently in 18 time. Animal studies (with limited support from human studies) have suggested that stimulation 19 of C-fibers can lead to increased responsiveness of bronchial smooth muscle independently of 20 systemic and inflammatory changes which may be absent. A characteristic of  $O_3$ -induced 21 inflammatory airway neutrophilia, which at one time was considered a leading AHR mechanism, 22 has been found to be only coincidentally associated with AHR, i.e., there was no cause and effect 23 relationship. This observation does not rule out involvement of other cells in AHR modulation. 24 However, there is some evidence that release of inflammatory mediators can sustain AHR and 25 bronchoconstriction. Late AHR observed in some studies is plausibly due to sustained damage 26 of the airway epithelium and continual release of inflammatory mediators. In conclusion, O<sub>3</sub>-27 induced AHR appears to be a product of many mechanisms acting at different time periods and 28 levels of the bronchial smooth muscle signa ling pathways (CD, section 6.2.5.1).

29 30

#### Extrapulmonary Effects

Ozone reacts rapidly on contact with lipids and antioxidants in the epithelial lining fluid (ELF) and the epithelial cell layer and is not absorbed or transported to extrapulmonary sites to any significant degree (CD, p. 6-42). Laboratory animal studies suggest that reaction products formed by the interaction of  $O_3$  with respiratory system fluids or tissues may produce effects measured outside the respiratory tract. Studies of the effects on hematological parameters and blood chemistry in rats have shown that erythrocytes are a target of  $O_3$ . Exposures to 1.0 ppm  $O_3$ 

- 1 for 3 hr have been found to decrease heart rate (HR), mean arterial pressure (MAP), and core
- 2 temperature (Tco) and to induce arrhythmias with some exposures in rats. These effects are more
- 3 pronounced in adult and awake rats than in younger or sleeping animals. Exposures of 0.2 ppm
- 4 for 48 hr have been shown to cause bradycardia, while exposures of 0.1 ppm O<sub>3</sub> for 3 days have
- 5 been shown to cause bradyarrhythmia in these animals (CD, Section 5.3.3).
- 6 More recent studies of rats have consistently demonstrated effects on heart rate, T<sub>co</sub> and 7 activity levels. One study exposed rats to FA for 6 hr, followed 2 days later by a 5 hr exposure 8 to 0.1 ppm O<sub>3</sub>, 5 days later by a 5 hr exposure to 0.3 ppm O<sub>3</sub>, and 10 days later by a 5 hr 9 exposure to 0.5 ppm O<sub>3</sub> (Arito et al., 1997). Each of the O<sub>3</sub> exposures was preceded by a 1 hr 10 exposure to FA. Transient rapid, shallow breathing with slightly increased HR appeared 1 to 2
- 11 min after the start of  $O_3$  exposures and was attributed to an olfactory response. Persistent rapid,
- 12 shallow breathing with a progressive decrease in HR occurred with a latent period of 12 hr.
- 13 During the last 90-min of exposure, averaged values for relative VO<sub>E</sub> tended to decrease with the
- 14 increase in O<sub>3</sub> concentration for young (4 to 6 months) but not old (20 to 22 months) rats.
- 15 Studies by Watkinson et al. (1995, 2001) and Highfill and Watkinson (1996)
- 16 demonstrated that when HR was reduced during a 5-day, 0.5 ppm O<sub>3</sub> exposure, T<sub>co</sub> and activity
- 17 levels also decreased. The decreases in T<sub>co</sub> and BP reported in these studies and by Arito et al.
- 18 (1997) suggest that the changes in ventilation and HR are mediated through physiological and
- 19 behavioral defense mechanisms in an attempt to minimize the irritant effects of O<sub>3</sub> inhalation.
- Similar cardiovascular and thermoregulatory responses in rats to O<sub>3</sub> were reported by Iwasaki et al. (1998). Repeated exposure to 0.1, 0.3, and 0.5 ppm O<sub>3</sub> 8 hr/day for 4 consecutive days caused disruption of circadian rhythms of HR and T<sub>co</sub> on the first and second exposure days that was concentration-dependent. The decreased HR and T<sub>co</sub> recovered to control values on the third and fourth days of O<sub>3</sub> exposure.
- 25 The thermoregulatory response to O<sub>3</sub> was further characterized by Watkinson et al.
- 26 (2003). Rats were either exposed to 0.0 ppm for 24 hr/day (air), 0.5 ppm for 6 hr/day
- 27 (intermittent), or to 0.5 ppm for 23 hr/day (continuous) at 3 temperatures, 10 °C (cold), 22 °C
- 28 (room), or 34 °C (warm). Another protocol examined the effects of O<sub>3</sub> exposure (0.5 ppm) and
- 29 exercise (described as rest, moderate, or heavy) or CO<sub>2</sub>-stimulated ventilation. Both intermittent
- 30 and continuous  $O_3$  exposure caused decreases in HR and  $T_{CO}$  and increases in BALF
- 31 inflammatory markers. Exercise in FA caused increases in HR and Tco while exercise in O<sub>3</sub>
- 32 caused decreases in those parameters. Several factors were suggested that may modulate the
- 33 hypothermic response, including dose, animal mass, and environmental stress.
- One of the major postulated molecular mechanisms of action of O<sub>3</sub> is peroxidation of mono- and polyunsaturated fatty acids and unsaturated neutral lipids in the lung, resulting in lipid ozonation products (see Figure 5-1 in the CD). Ozone can penetrate only a short distance

1 into the ELF; and, therefore, it reacts with epithelial cell membranes only in regions of distal

2 lung where ELF is very thin or absent. The inflammatory cascade initiated by O<sub>3</sub> generates

3 a mix of secondary reactants which then are likely to oxidize lipids and proteins in cell

4 membranes. (CD Section 5.1.2.4).

5 Recent in vitro studies of O<sub>3</sub> reactions with cholesterol in lung surfactant found 6 consequent generation of highly reactive products such as oxysterols and  $\beta$ -epoxide in BALF 7 isolated from rats exposed to 2.0 ppm O<sub>3</sub> for 4 hr (Pulfer and Murphy, 2004). Additionally, both 8 5 $\beta$ ,6 $\beta$ - epoxycholesterol and its most abundant metabolite, cholestan-6-oxo-3 $\beta$ ,5 $\alpha$ -diol, were 9 shown to be cytotoxic to human lung epithelial (16-HBE) cells and to inhibit cholesterol 10 synthesis. Studies (Pulfer et al., 2005) of mice exposed to 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, or 3.0 ppm O<sub>3</sub> for 3 hr 11 also demonstrated that these oxysterols were produced in vivo. These results suggest that this 12 may be an additional mechanism of  $O_3$  toxicity, including a pathway by which  $O_3$  may play a 13 possible role in the development of atherosclerosis and other cardiovascular effects.

14 The presence of oxysterols in human atherosclerotic lesions implicates the oxidation of 15 cholesterol in the pathogenesis of atherosclerosis, a well-known contributor to development of 16 cardiovascular disease. Oxysterols may arise from different cholesterol oxidation mechanisms, 17 (including free radical-mediated oxidations), and their unabated accumulation in macrophages 18 and smooth muscle cells of arterial walls lead to formation of fatty streaks in advanced lesions. 19 The presence of one of the  $O_3$ -induced oxysterols, secosterol, in endogenously formed arterial 20 plaques (Wentworth et al., 2003) suggests that the oxysterols produced in the lung either due to 21 direct O<sub>3</sub> interaction with surfactant cholesterol or with oxidant radicals at the O<sub>3</sub>-induced 22 inflammation site may have potential involvement in the development of cardiovascular and 23 myocardial diseases. In addition, the recent in vitro observation (Sathishkumar et al. 2005) of 24 increased apoptosis (programmed cell death) induced by secosterol in H9c2 cardiomyocytes 25 (heart cells) supports possible involvement of such biologically active oxysterols in O<sub>3</sub>-induced 26 cardiovascular effects observed in the epidemiologic studies. Also, the detection of oxysterols in 27 the BALF of rats exposed to  $O_3$  suggests their potential to be used as biomarkers of  $O_3$  exposure. 28 Demonstration of relationships between oxysterols of the type generated in lung surfactant with 29 O<sub>3</sub> exposure and cardiovascular disease outcomes in clinical settings or epidemiologic studies 30 would add considerable value to the experimental observations thus for reported in the animal 31 toxicology studies. 32 Other potential mechanisms by which  $O_3$  exposure may be associated with cardiovascular

disease outcomes have been described. Laboratory animals exposed to relatively high  $O_3$ concentrations ( $\geq 0.5$  ppm) demonstrate tissue edema in the heart and lungs. This may be due to

35 increased circulating levels of atrial natriuretic factor (ANF), which is known to mediate

36 capillary permeability, vasodilation, and BP (Daly et al., 2002). Ozone-induced changes in heart

1 rate, edema of heart tissue, and increased tissue and serum levels of ANF found with 8-hr 0.5

- $2 ppm O_3$  exposure in animal toxicology studies (Vesely et al., 1994a,b,c) raise the possibility of
- 3 potential cardiovascular effects of acute O<sub>3</sub> exposures.
- 4 Earlier work demonstrated  $O_3$ -induced release of functionally active platelet activating 5 factor (PAF) from rodent epithelial cells and the presence of PAF receptors on AMs. New work 6 examining lipid metabolism (CD, Section 5.2.1.4) and mediators of inflammatory response and 7 injury (CD, Section 5.2.3.4) confirm earlier findings indicating that PAF (Kafoury et al., 1999) 8 and PAF receptors (Longphre et al., 1999) are involved in responses to O<sub>3</sub>. In addition to the role 9 of PAF in pulmonary inflammation and hyperpermeability, this potent inflammatory mediator 10 may have clotting and thrombolytic effects, though this has not been demonstrated 11 experimentally. This cardiovascular effect may help explain, in part, some limited epidemiologic 12 findings suggestive of possible association of heart attack and stroke with ambient O<sub>3</sub> exposure 13 described in section 3.3.1.4, below. As indicated by the studies described above, an emerging 14 body of animal toxicology evidence is beginning to suggest mechanisms by which O<sub>3</sub> can affect 15 the cardiovascular system. 16 In a controlled human exposure study described in the CD in Chapter 6, Gong et al. 17 (1998) exposed 10 hypertensive and 6 healthy adult males, 41 to 78 years of age, to 0.3 ppm O<sub>3</sub> 18 for 3 hr while at intermittent exercise, at 30 L/min. For all subjects combined (no significant 19 group differences), there was an  $O_3$ -induced decrement of 7% in FEV<sub>1</sub> and a statistically 20 significant increase (70%) in the alveolar-arterial oxygen tension gradient. The overall results did 21 not indicate any major acute cardiovascular effects of  $O_3$  in either the hypertensive or normal 22 subjects. Foster et al. (1993) demonstrated that even in relatively young healthy adults ( $26.7 \pm 7$ 23 yrs old), O<sub>3</sub> exposure can cause ventilation to shift away from the well perfused basal lung. This 24 effect of  $O_3$  on ventilation distribution (and, by association, the small airways) may persist
- 25 beyond 24-hr postexposure (Foster et al., 1997). Gong et al. (1998) suggested that by impairing
- 26 alveolar-arterial oxygen transfer, the O<sub>3</sub> exposure could potentially lead to adverse cardiac events
- 27 by decreasing oxygen supply to the myocardium. However, the subjects in their study apparently
- 28 had sufficient functional reserve so as to not experience significant ECG changes or myocardial
- 29 ischemia and/or injury. Information about the impact of O<sub>3</sub> exposure on the cardiovascular
- 30 system from epidemiologic studies is discussed in section 3.3.1.4.

Appendix 3B. Ozone Epidemiological Study Results: Summary of effect estimates and air quality data reported in studies, distribution statistics for 8-hr daily maximum ozone concentrations for the study period and location, and information about monitoring data used in study.

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f qu	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air **	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Respiratory Symptoms	:						
Mortimer et al., 2002 8 U.S. cities morning symptoms	1.35 (1.06, 1.71)	8h	48	64.3	66	28.8-66	6/1/93 - 8/31/93 AQS, all monitors in corresponding county, averaged for 10am to 6pm
Gent et al., 2003 New England cities chest tightness	1.19 (1.05, 1.34)	8h 1d	51.3	95.2	91.8	27.1-99.6	4/1/01 - 9/30/01 10 sites in CT and 4 in Springfield MA
Gent et al., 2003 New England cities shortness of breath	1.17 (1.03, 1.33)	8h 1d	51.3	95.2	91.8	27.1-99.6	4/1/01 - 9/30/01 10 sites in CT and 4 in Springfield MA
Ostro et al., 2001 2 S Cal counties Asthma med use	1.15 (1.12, 1.19)	1h	59.5/ 95.8 (57.2)	121	122	14-122	Aug-Nov 1993 2 sites - downtown LA and Pasadena, individuals matched to closest site
Ostro et al., 2001 2 S Cal counties shortness of breath	1.01 (0.92, 1.10)	1h 3d	59.5/ 95.8 (57.2)	121	122	14-122	Aug-Nov 1993 2 sites - downtown LA and Pasadena, individuals matched to closest site
Ostro et al., 2001 2 S Cal counties Wheeze	0.94 (0.88, 1.00)	1h 3d	59.5/ 95.8 (57.2)	121	122	14-122	Aug-Nov 1993 2 sites - downtown LA and Pasadena, individuals matched to closest site
Ostro et al., 2001 2 S Cal counties Cough	0.93 (0.87, 0.99)	1h 3d	59.5/ 95.8 (57.2)	121	122	14-122	Aug-Nov 1993 2 sites - downtown LA and Pasadena, individuals matched to closest site

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Neas et al., 1995 Uniontown PA pm cough	1.36 (0.86, 2.14)	12h 0d	37.2 (56.1)	85.3	98	15-98	6/10/90 - 8/23/90 1 site near Laurel Highlands HS
Delfino et al., 2003 San Diego, CA Symptom score>1	0.75 (0.24, 2.33)	8h Od	17.1	34.8	35.2	5.8-35.2	Nov 99 - Jan 00 Huntington Park central site
Delfino et al., 2003 San Diego, CA Symptom score>1	1.55 (0.52, 4.63)	8h 1d	17.1	34.8	35.2	5.8-35.2	Nov 99 - Jan 00 Huntington Park central site
Delfino et al., 2003 San Diego, CA Symptom score>2	6.67 (1.09, 40.88)	8h Od	17.1	34.8	35.2	5.8-35.2	Nov 99 - Jan 00 Huntington Park central site
Delfino et al., 2003 San Diego, CA Symptom score>2	1.15 (0.41, 3.17)	8h 1d	17.1	34.8	35.2	5.8-35.2	Nov 99 - Jan 00 Huntington Park central site
Delfino et al., 1998 San Diego, CA Asthma symptoms	1.26 (1.00, 1.58)	8h Od	73	107	109	43-109	8/1/95 - 10/30/95 SDAPCD site
Schwartz et al., 1994 6 US cities Cough	1.15 (0.99, 1.33)	24h 1d	36.9				Harvard 6 cities sites; school year period for each, from 1985/6 to 1987/8
Schwartz et al., 1994 6 U.S. cities lower respiratory symptoms	1.22 (1.00, 1.50)	24h 1d	36.9				Harvard 6 cities sites; school year period for each, from 1985/6 to 1987/8

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f qu	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air **	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Ross et al., 2002 East Moline, IL morning symptoms	1.12 (1.05, 1.20)	8h 3d ave	41.5	68.8	75	8.9-78.3	Apr-Oct 1994 AQS data - East Moline sites
Ross et al., 2002 East Moline, IL Evening symptoms	1.12 (1.06, 1.19)	8h 3d ave	41.5	68.8	75	8.9-78.3	Apr-Oct 1994 AQS data - East Moline sites
Ross et al., 2002 East Moline, IL Asthma med use	1.08 (0.99, 1.17)	8h 3d ave	41.5	68.8	75	8.9-78.3	Apr-Oct 1994 AQS data - East Moline sites
Thurston et al., 1997 Connecticut chest symptoms	1.21 (1.12, 1.31)	1h 0d	83.6	NA	NA	NA	last wk of June 1991-93 on-site monitor
Thurston 1997 Connecticut Asthma med use	1.19 (1.08, 1.32)	1h 0d	83.6	NA	NA	NA	last wk of June 1991-93 on-site monitor
Lung Function Change	s:						
Mortimer et al., 2002 8 U.S. cities am PEF (%)	-0.59% (-1.05, -0.13)	8h	48	64.3	66	28.8-66	6/1/93 - 8/31/93 AQS, all monitors in corresponding county, averaged for 10am to 6pm
Linn et al., 1996 Los Angeles FEV1 (ml)	-0.26 (SE 0.25) (am) -0.18 (SE 0.20) (pm)	24h 0d	23	150	164	2.5-192.5	Jan 91-Dec 92 SCAQMD sites in 3 communities Upland, Rubidoux, Torrance

Study period;	illy max air	Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Air Quality Stuc	Effect Estimate	Study;
Monitoring information	Range	99 <sup>th</sup> %	98 <sup>th</sup> %	Mean	Ave time; Lag	(lower CL, upper CL)	Location
9/1/00 - 10/31/00 OK DEQ site about 1 km from U Tulsa	17.3-104.7	104.7	92.7	30	24h 1d	-0.274 (p<0.05) (mean O <sub>3</sub> ) -0.289 (p<0.05) (max O <sub>3</sub> )	Newhouse et al., 2004 Tulsa, OK am PEF (L/min)
Apr-Oct 1994 AQS data - East Moline sites	8.9-78.3	75	68.8	41.5	8h 0-1d 1d	-2.29 (-4.26, -0.33) (am) -2.58 (-4.26, -0.89) (pm)	Ross et al., 2002 East Moline, IL PEF (L/min)
6/10/90 - 8/23/90 1 site near Laurel Highlands HS	15-98	98	85.3	37.2 (56.1)	12h 0d	-2.79 (-6.7, -1.1) (pm)	Neas et al., 1995 Uniontown PA PEF (L/min)
7/8/93 - 9/3/93 2 sites: Airport and Presbyterian Nursing Home (58th and Greenway)	17.7-104.5	104.5	96.9	56	12h 0d 1-5d ave	-1.38 (-2.81, 0.04) (am) -2.58 (-4.91, -0.35) (pm)	Neas et al., 1999 Philadelphia PA PEF (L/min)
summers 1991, 92 2 sites: Mt. Washington Observatory and mountain base at Auto Rd	24 – 91	89	87	40	1h 0d	-2.6 (-4.1, -0.4)	Korrick et al., 1998 Mt. Washington NH FEV1 (%)
last wk of June, 1991-1993 on-site monitor	NA	NA	NA	83.6	1h 0d	-0.096 (p<0.05)	Thurston et al., 1997 Connecticut summer camp PEF (L/min)
summers 1995-1996 1 site in Vinton VA	13-87	79	74	34.87	24h 1-5d ave	-7.65 (-13.0, -2.25) (pm)	Naeher et al., 1999 SW Virginia PEF (L/min)

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Brauer et al., 1996 Fraser Valley, BC FEV1 (mL)	-3.8 (SE 0.4) (end shift) -4.5 (SE 0.6) (next day)	1h 0d	40.3	55	55	3-55	June-August 1993 BC Ministry of Environment sites
Emergency Department	Visits: Respiratory Di	seases					
Peel et al., 2005 Atlanta	2.89 (1.03, 4.77)	8h 3d ave	55.6	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor
Delfino et al., 1997 Montreal (>64yo)	28.93 (11.98, 45.88)	8h 1d	34.7	57.5	64.9	7-64.9	May-Aug 1988 and 1989 AQS data, 5 sites
Delfino et al., 1997 Montreal (>64yo)	31.61 (12.91, 50.31)	1h 1d	34.7 (28.9)	57.5	64.9	7-64.9	May-Aug 1988 and 1989 AQS data, 5 sites
Jones et al., 1995 Baton Rouge, LA (1-17 yo)	-13.00 (-32.82, 12.66)	24h 0d	28.2 (56.4)	111.8	118	21-119	6/1/90 - 8/31/90 DEQ 3 sites
Jones et al., 1995 Baton Rouge, LA (18-60 yo)	20.00 (2.29, 40.78)	24h 0d	28.2 (56.4)	111.8	118	21-119	6/1/90 - 8/31/90 DEQ 3 sites
Jones et al., 1995 Baton Rouge, LA (>60 yo)	27.00 (-3.48, 67.10)	24h 0d	28.2 (56.4)	111.8	118	21-119	6/1/90 - 8/31/90 DEQ 3 sites
Wilson et al., 2005 Portland NH,	-3.00 (-8.49, 2.82)	8h 0d	43.1	108	121	15-142	Apr-Oct 1998-2000 AQS data, single monitor in each city
Wilson et al., 2005 Manchester NH	-3.00 (-8.53, 2.87)	8h 0d		85	93	5-121	Apr-Oct 1998-2000 AQS data, single monitor in each city

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Stud	Data from ly *	Statistics f	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air	Study period;	
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information	
Stieb et al., 1996 St. John, Canada	9.33 (-0.07, 18.74)	1h 2d	41.6 (36.1)	83	91	5-140.5	May-Sept 1984-1992 EC data averaged across sites	
Emergency Department	Visits: Asthma	1						
Peel et al., 2005 Atlanta, GA	2.65 (-0.50, 5.89)	8h 3d ave	55.6	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor	
Wilson et al., 2005 Manchester NH	-3.00 (-8.91, 3.29)	8h 0d	NA	108	121	15-142	Apr-Oct 1998-2000 AQS data, single monitor in each city	
Wilson et al., 2005 Portland NH	9.40 (10.26, 8.55)	8h 0d	NA	85	93	5-121	Apr-Oct 1998-2000 AQS data, single monitor in each city	
Friedman et al., 2001 Atlanta GA (1-16 yo)	30.89 (5.34, 62.64)	1h 0-1d	77.2 (60.7)	85.8	85.8	20-85.8	7/19/96 - 8/4/96 3 sites in Atlanta	
Tolbert et al., 2000 Atlanta, GA	6.37 (2.53, 10.34)	8h 1d	59.3 (60.7)	92.4	112.6	16.2-135.8	AQS, GA and Fulton Co., SOS, USGS; 7 sites in Atlanta MSA	
Zhu et al., 2003 Atlanta, GA (0-16 yo)	2.41 (-2.39, 7.44)	8h 0d						
Jaffe et al., 2003 3 Ohio cities	9.27 (0.13, 19.25)	8h 2-3d	(66.1)	104	108	24-124	7/1/91 to 6/30/96 all data from active monitors	
Jaffe et al., 2003 Cincinnati	15.76 (-1.01, 35.38)	8h 2d	60	106	116	24-124	7/1/91 to 6/30/96 all data from active monitors	
Jaffe et al., 2003 Cleveland	3.03 (-8.52, 16.04)	8h 2d	50	104	107	27-111	7/1/91 to 6/30/96 all data from active monitors	
Jaffe et al., 2003 Columbus	15.76 (-2.49, 37.44)	8h 3d	57	98	106	25-117	7/1/91 to 6/30/96 all data from active monitors	

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Stud	Data from dy *	Statistics f	or 8-hr da ality data	nily max air	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Cassino et al., 1999 NYC (in heavy smokers)	-5.42 (-8.38, -2.36)	24h 0d	17.5 (32.6)	83.3	88.8	3-114.6	1/1/89 - 12/31/93 data from sites throughout NYC
Cassino et al., 1999 NYC (in heavy smokers)	2.74 (-3.00, 8.83)	24h 1d	17.5 (32.6)	83.3	88.8	3-114.6	1/1/89 - 12/31/93 data from sites throughout NYC
Cassino et al., 1999 NYC (in heavy smokers)	9.69 (3.93, 15.76)	24h 2d	17.5 (32.6)	83.3	88.8	3-114.6	1/1/89 - 12/31/93 data from sites throughout NYCI
Cassino et al., 1999 NYC (in heavy smokers)	-1.62 (-7.01, 4.08)	24h 3d	17.5 (32.6)	83.3	88.8	3-114.6	1/1/89 - 12/31/93 data from sites throughout NYC
Emergency Department	Visits: Other respirate	ory diseases	5:				
Peel et al., 2005 Atlanta, GA Pneumonia	1.80 (-2.27, 6.04)	8h 3d ave	55.6	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor
Peel et al., 2005 Atlanta, GA COPD	3.49 (-2.77,10.15)	8h 3d ave	55.6	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor
Peel et al., 2005 Atlanta, GA upper respiratory infection	3.25 (1.10, 5.44)	8h 3d ave	55.6	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor
Cardiovascular outcom	es, biomarkers, and ph	ysiological	changes:				

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Stuc	Data from ly *	Statistics f	or 8-hr da ality data	aily max air	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Liao et al., 2004 3 US cities HRV (high frequency power)	-0.010 (SE 0.016)	8h 1d	41				1996-1998 AQS data
Liao et al., 2004 3 US cities SD of normal RR intervals	-0.336 (SE 0.290)	8h 1d	41				1996-1998 AQS data
Peters et al., 2000 Boston Defibrillator discharge	OR 0.96 (0.47, 1.98) (patients with 1+ event) OR 1.23 (0.53, 2.87) (patients with 10+ events)	24h 0d	18.6	75.2	78.1	15.7-102.7	Jan 95 - Dec 97 1 site
Peters et al., 2001 Boston Myocardial infarction	OR 1.31 (0.85, 2.03) (2h O <sub>3</sub> ) OR 0.94 (0.60, 1.49) (24h O <sub>3</sub> )	24h and 2h 1d and 1h	19.9	75.8	81.5	17.7-102.7	Jan 95 - May 96 1 site (case-crossover)
Park et al., 2004 Boston HRV (low frequency power)	-11.5% (-21.3, -0.4)	4h	23	81.8	92	10-122.6	Nov 2000- Oct 2003 Mass Dept. Environ. Protection sites
Gold et al., 2000 Boston HRV (r-MSSD) (ms)	-3.0 (SE 1.9) (first rest period) -5.8 (SE 2.4) (slow breathing period)	1h	34	77.3	92.5	21.8-100	June-Sept 1997 1 site, MA Dept. Environ. Protection

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f qu	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air **	Study period;					
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information					
Dockery et al., 2005 Boston Ventricular arrhythmia	OR 1.09 (0.93, 1.29) (all events)	48h	22.9	75	82.1	2–102.7	7/11/95 - 7/11/02 6 sites, Mass Dept. Envir. Protection					
Rich et al., 2005 Boston Ventricular arrhythmia	OR 1.21 (1.00, 1.45) (all events)	24h	22.6	74	81.5	2-102.7	Aug 1995 - June 2002 6 sites, Mass Dept. Envir. Protection					
Emergency Department Visits: Cardiovascular Diseases												
Metzger et al., 2004 Atlanta, GA all CV	0.96 (-1.59, 3.58)	8h 3dave	53.9	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor					
Metzger et al., 2004 Atlanta, GA Dysrrhythmia	0.96 (-3.96, 6.13)	8h 3dave	53.9	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor					
Metzger et al., 2004 Atlanta, GA CHF	-4.19 (-9.74, 1.71)	8h 3dave	53.9	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor					
Metzger et al., 2004 Atlanta, GA IHD	2.28 (-2.30, 7.09)	8h 3dave	53.9	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor					
Metzger et al., 2004 Atlanta, GA peripheral vascular	1.68 (-1.57, 5.05)	8h 3dave	53.9	127	140	3-152	1/1/93 to 12/21/02 AQS Confederate Ave monitor					
Hospital Admissions: (	Cardiovascular Disease	s										

Study; Location	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f qu	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air	Study period;
	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Linn et al., 2000 Los Angeles CA (summer)	2.02 (-16.14, 24.11)	24h 0d	32.9 (98.7)	175	180	188	Los Angeles basin - averaged from monitors across basin
Fung et al., 2003 Windsor CV <65 yo	-0.14 (-11.79, 13.06)	1h 0d	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0-106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor
Fung et al., 2003 Windsor CV <65 yo	5.84 (-10.50, 25.16)	1h 0-2d ave	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0-106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor
Fung et al., 2003 Windsor CV 65+ yo	-3.57 (-10.35, 3.72)	1h 0d	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0-106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor
Fung et al., 2003 Windsor CV 65+ yo	1.94 (-8.01, 12.95)	1h 0-2d ave	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0 -106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor
Burnett et al., 1997 Toronto CV	20.47 (9.32, 32.76)	1h 2-4d ave	41.2 (31.6)	62	64	0-79	summers 1992, 93, 94 7-9 sites in metro Toronto
Gwynn et al., 2000 Buffalo circulatory	0.23 (-1.27, 1.74)	24h 1d	26.2 (38.7)	92.5	104	4.5-123	1988-1990 AQS data from multiple sites in Buffalo/Rochester area
Hospital Admissions:	Specific Cardiovascular	Diseases					
Koken et al., 2003 Denver CO myocardial infarction	-32.91 (-47.16, -14.82)	24h 0d	25 (44.2)	64.5	65.5	11-76	July-August 1993-1997 AQS sites in Denver County (2 sites)

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics f qu	or 8-hr da ality data	ily max air **	Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Koken et al., 2003 Denver Coronary Atheroschlerosis	27.02 (8.30, 48.98)	24h 2d	25 (44.2)	64.5	65.5	11-76	July-August 1993-1997 AQS sites in Denver County (2 sites)
Koken et al., 2003 Denver Pulm Heart Disease	49.16 (8.35, 105.22)	24h 1d	25 (44.2)	64.5	65.5	11-76	July-August 1993-1997 AQS sites in Denver County (2 sites
lto, 2003 Detroit MI ischemic heart disease	0.52 (-2.27, 3.39)	24h 3d	25 (38.7)	80	85	4.3-101.3	1992-1994 AQS data, 4 ozone sites
lto, 2003 Detroit MI dysrrhythmia	-1.04 (-5.87, 4.04)	24h 3d	25 (38.7)	80	85	4.3-101.3	1992-1994 AQS data, 4 ozone sites
lto, 2003 Detroit MI heart failure	0.76 (-2.47, 4.09)	24h 3d	25 (38.7)	80	85	4.3-101.3	1992-1994 AQS data 4 ozone sites
lto, 2003 Detroit MI stroke	0.50 (-3.03, 4.15)	24h 3d	25 (38.7)	80	85	4.3-101.3	1992-1994 AQS data 4 ozone sites
Hospital Admissions: F	Respiratory Diseases						
Luginaah et al., 2003 Windsor (males)	5.56 (-10.57, 24.59)	1h Od	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0-106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor
Luginaah et al., 2003 Windsor (females)	-6.83 (-23.92, 14.09)	1h 0d	39.3 (31.6)	78	85	0-106	4/1/95 - 12/31/00 4 sites in Winsdor

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		n Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Thurston et al., 1992 Buffalo NY	4.94 (-0.23, 10.12)	1h 2d	60 (58.9)	125.5	133	24-133	June-Aug 1988-1989 NYDEC monitors
Delfino et al., 1994 Montreal	4.05 (1.00, 7.11)	8h 4d	32.1	69	73.8	8.6-82.3	Jul-Aug 1984-1988 7 sites in Montreal; 2 sites near heavy traffic areas not used
Burnett et al., 1994 Toronto	3.95 (2.50, 5.43)	1h 1d	(41.7)	79	81.5	15-104.3	1983-1988 Ont Min Environ 22 sites May-August
Burnett et al., 1997 16 Canadian city	6.72 (3.52, 10.02)	1h 1d	32.9 (25.3)	47.1	51.3	6.2-68.4	4/1/81 - 12/31/91 used Apr-Dec data, all stations in each city
Burnett et al., 1997 Toronto	17.57 (10.44, 25.15)	1h 1-3d ave	41.2 (31.6)	62	64	0-79	summers 1992, 93, 94 7-9 sites in metro Toronto
Yang et al., 2003 Vancouver (<3 yo)	50.43 (32.64, 70.61)	24h 4d	13.41 (21.3)	42.7	47.3	1.1-71.9	1/1/86 - 12/31/98 25 sites, Great Vancouver Regional District
Yang et al., 2003 Vancouver (65+yo)	28.53 (18.47, 39.43)	24h 4d	13.41 (21.3)	42.7	47.3	1.1-71.9	1/1/86 - 12/31/98 25 sites, Great Vancouver Regional District
Schwartz et al., 1996 Cleveland	3.51 (0.88, 6.20)	1h 1-2d ave	56 (55.1)	91	99	5-120.3	1988-1990 Cuyahoga county warm season only
Moolgavkar et al., 1997 Minneapolis/St. Paul	8.08 (4.47, 11.81)	24h 1d	26.2 (45.1)	83.2	87.7	4.6-101.8	1/1/86 - 12/31/91 AQS data from all monitoring stations
Gwynn et al., 2001 NYC (white)	1.08 (-0.44, 2.63)	24h 1d	22.1 (34.2)	90.6	106	6-125	1988-1990 AQS data

Study period;	ily max air **	n Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Air Quality Stuc	Effect Estimate	Study;
Monitoring information	Range	99 <sup>th</sup> %	98 <sup>th</sup> %	Mean	Ave time; Lag	(lower CL, upper CL)	Location
1988-1990 AQS data	6-125	106	90.6	22.1 (34.2)	24h 1d	4.01 (2.47, 5.57)	Gwynn et al., 2001 NYC (nonwhite)
1988-1990 AQS data	6-125	106	90.6	22.1 (34.2)	24h 1d	4.51 (2.80, 6.25)	Gwynn et al., 2001 NYC (uninsured)
June-Aug 1988-1989 NYDEC monitor				29.1	1h 3d	0.42 (0.10, 0.74)	Thurston et al., 1992 NYC
1988-1990 AQS data from multiple sites in Buffalo/Rochester area	4.5-123	104	92.5	26.2 (38.7)	24h 1d	3.94 (1.78, 6.15)	Gwynn et al., 2000 Buffalo
1988-1990 1 residential site	NA	NA	NA	79	1h 2d	19.08 (0.17, 41.57)	Schwartz et al., 1996 Spokane
July-Aug, 1986-1986 Breadalbane site	8-125	94	92	57.47 (45.8)	1hr Od	15.30 (4.11, 26.50)	Thurston et al., 1994 Toronto
						Asthma	Hospital Admissions: A
1987-1994 1 site at Lake Sammamisl	2-100	73	65	30.4	8h 2d	3.44 (0.58, 6.39)	Sheppard et al., 2003 Seattle, WA
(11/15-3/1)1991-1994 2 SCAQMD sites in zip codes 90029 and 90012	2-67	50.5	46.5	19.88 (19.1)	24h 0d	1.00 (-6.28, 8.84)	Nauenberg et al., 1999 Los Angeles (all insurance)
1/1/80 - 12/31/94 4 site:	9-110.8	83.7	77.7	45.2 (38.6)	1h 5d ave	30.25 (16.87, 45.15)	Burnett et al., 2001 Toronto (<2 yo)
June-Aug 1988-1989 NYDEC monitor	24-133	133	125.5	60 (58.9)	1h 3d	6.59 (1.29, 11.89)	Thurston et al., 1992 Buffalo NY

d;	Study period;	ily max air **	or 8-hr da ality data	Statistics for qu	Data from ly *	Air Quality Stuc	Effect Estimate	Study;
nation	Monitoring information	Range	99 <sup>th</sup> %	98 <sup>th</sup> %	Mean	Ave time; Lag	(lower CL, upper CL)	Location
s 1992, 93, 94 metro Toronto	summers 1992 7-9 sites in metro	0.1-110.8	74.8	68.4	19.5 (26.7)	24h 1-3d ave	6.47 (3.68, 9.33)	Burnett et al., 1999 Toronto
1981-1993 ario Ministry of nt and Energy use-crossover)	198 4 sites, Ontario Mir Environment and (case-cro	0.14-110.8	74.8	68.4	28.2	1h Od	-7.84 (-22.02, 8.92) (female) -26.04 (-44.53, -1.39) (male)	Lin et al., 2003 Toronto, 6-12 yo
ug 1988-1989 DEC monitors	June-Aug 198 NYDEC m				29.1	1h 1d	0.95 (0.20, 1.69)	Thurston et al., 1992 New York City
1986-1989 and 89, 8 sites in 87 and 88	198 AQS data 9 sites in 86 and 89, in 87	10-122.7	88.5	82.8	21 (37.6)	24h 1d	10.81 (5.13, 16.80)	Schwartz et al., 1994 Detroit
						ses	Other respiratory disea	Hospital Admissions: (
/86 - 12/31/91 toring stations	1/1/86 - 1 AQS data from all monitoring s	4.6-101.8	87.7	83.2	26.2 (45.1)	24h 1d	8.90 (4.62, 13.34)	Moolgavkar et al., 1997 Minneapolis/St. Paul pneumonia
1992-1994 4 ozone sites	199 AQS data, 4 ozor	4.3-101.3	85	80	25 (38.7)	24h 3d	3.10 (-1.84, 8.28)	Ito, 2003 Detroit MI pneumonia
1992-1994 4 ozone sites	199 AQS data 4 ozor	4.3-101.3	85	80	25 (38.7)	24h 3d	1.25 (-3.55, 6.28)	Ito, 2003 Detroit MI COPD
s 1992, 93, 94 metro Toronto	summers 1992 7-9 sites in metro	0.1-110.8	74.8	68.4	19.5 (26.7)	24h 2-4d ave	7.49 (4.00, 11.10)	Burnett et al., 1999 Toronto COPD

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Stud	Data from dy *	Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Schwartz et al., 1994 Detroit COPD	11.68 (2.92, 21.19)	24h 1d	21 (37.6)	82.8	88.5	10-122.7	1986-1989 AQS data 9 sites in 86 and 89, 8 sites in 87 and 88
Moolgavkar et al., 1997 Minneapolis/St. Paul COPD	6.04 (1.22, 11.10)	24h 1d	26.2 (45.1)	83.2	87.7	4.6-101.8	1/1/86 - 12/31/91 AQS data from all monitoring stations
Burnett et al., 1999 Toronto Respiratory Infection	4.52 (2.43, 6.64)	24h 1-2d ave	19.5	68.4	74.8	0.1-110.8	summers 1992, 93, 94 7-9 sites in metro Toronto
Mortality: Total nonacc	idental			-	_	-	
Bell et al., 2004 95 U.S. cities (warm)	0.44 (0.14, 0.74)	24h 0d	26.84				1987-2000 AQS data, 10% trimmed mean to average across monitors after correction for each monitor
Bell et al., 2004 95 U.S. cities (warm)	0.78 (0.26, 1.30)	24h 0-6d dl	26.84				1987-2000 AQS data, 10% trimmed mean to average across monitors after correction for each monitor
Schwartz et al., 2004 14 U.S. cities (warm)	1.04 (0.30, 1.79)	1h 0d	45.9				1986-1993 AQS data, May-September (case-crossover)
Ostro et al., 2003 Coachella Valley CA	-1 (-4.42, 2.55)	1h	62				1/1/89 – 12/20/98 sites in Palm Springs and Indio

Study period;	ily max air **	or 8-hr da ality data	Statistics f qu	Air Quality Data from Study *		Effect Estimate	Study;
Monitoring information	Range	99 <sup>th</sup> %	98 <sup>th</sup> %	Mean	Ave time; Lag	(lower CL, upper CL)	Location
1980-198 4 sites in San Bernardino an Riverside counties: Upland Rubidoux, Redlands, Perri				140	1h 0d	0.80 (-0.18, 1.78)	Ostro et al., 1995 2 Southern CA counties
1973-198 AQS dat				35.5	24h 1d	2.82 (1.33, 4.33)	Moolgavkar et al., 1995 Philadelphia (summer)
1985-199 AQS data, 4 ozone site	2-123.5	88.7	81.5	20.9 (34.3)	24h 0d	0.86 (-0.36, 2.09)	lto, 2003 Detroit MI
1992-199 AQS data, 4 ozone site	4.3-101.3	85	80	25 (38.7)	24h 0d	1.88 (-1.69, 5.58)	lto, 2003 Detroit MI
1989-199 San Jose 4th St. sit	2-105	74	67	29	8-h 0d	2.81 (-0.27, 5.99)	Fairley, 2003 San Jose CA
1989-199 1 site with daily obs, used only dat between 1200 and 2000 hour	2.3-92.5	88.9	80	(35.4)	1h Od	-1.48 (-5.63, 2.85)	Chock et al., 2000 Pittsburg PA (<75 yo)
1989-199 1 site with daily obs, used only dat between 1200 and 2000 hour	2.3-92.5	88.9	80	(35.4)	1h Od	-1.82 (-6.03, 2.59)	Chock et al., 2000 Pittsburg PA (75+ )
1985-199 8 ozone site	5.4-156.1	130	115.3	70 (53.4)	1h 1d	0.00 (-4.90, 5.15)	Kinney et al., 1995 Los Angeles
1990-199 TNRCC data, 2-3 sites in Dallas Co	2-98.7	86.3	81	22 (37.9)	24h 1-2d	3.69 (0.85, 6.62)	Gamble et al., 1998 Dallas TX
Sept 1985-August 198 Harvard site on S side of cit				22.5	24h 1d	0.60 (-2.46, 3.750	Dockery et al., 1992 St. Louis

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Stud	Data from dy *	Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Study period;
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information
Dockery et al., 1992 E Tennesse	-1.30 (-7.91, 5.78)	24h 1d	23				Sept 1985-August 1986 Harvard site, ~50 km SW of Knoxville
Ito et al., 1996 Cook County	3.89 (2.21, 5.59)	1h 0-1d	38.1 (31.8)	76	85.6	2.7-124	1985-1990 AQS sites with at least 4 y data, 5 O3 sites
Klemm et al., 2004 Atlanta quartknot **	2.40 (-3.39, 8.54)	8h 0-1d	47.03			6.63- 124.41	ARIES database, as described in Klemm 2000
Klemm et al., 2004 Atlanta monthknot **	4.16 (-2.42, 11.19)	8h 0-1d	47.03			6.63- 124.41	ARIES database, as described in Klemm 2000
Goldberg et al., 2003 Montreal (CHFunderlying)	4.26 (-5.30, 14.78)	24h 0-2d	29				1984-1993 Environment Canada data, 9 sites
Vedal et al., 2003 Vancouver	16.63 (5.54, 28.88)	1h 0d	27.4 (21.4)	53.3	47.3	1.1-58.7	Jan 94 - Dec 96 19 sites in Greater Vancouver Regional District and EC
Villeneuve et al., 2003 Vancouver	1.31 (-0.78, 3.45)	24h 0d	13.4 (21.3)	69.3	47.3	3.1-71.9	1/1/86 - 12/31/98 13 census subdivisions
Mortality: Cardiovascu	lar or Cardiorespiratory	y diseases					
Bell et al., 2004 95 U.S. cities	1.28 (0.61, 1.96)	24h 0-6d dl	26.84				1987-2000 AQS data, 10% trimmed mean to average across monitors after correction for each monitor

Study period;	ily max air **	Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Air Quality Stud	Effect Estimate	Study;
Monitoring information	Range	99 <sup>th</sup> %	98 <sup>th</sup> %	Mean	Ave time; Lag	(lower CL, upper CL)	Location
June 1- Sept 30, 1987-19 AQS da				18-56	24h 0d	1.47 (0.54, 2.40)	Huang et al., 2004 19 U.S. cities
May 92 - Sept 1 Camden and 1 Phila s	2.3-116.6	93.6	88.8	44.76 (39.7)	1h 0-1dave	30.19 (p<0.055)	Lipfert, et al., 2000 Philadelphia
May 92 - Sept 1 Camden and 1 Phila s	2.3-116.6	93.6	88.8	44.76 (39.7)	1h 0-1dave	-2.00 (p<0.055)	Lipfert, et al., 2000 Philadelphia
1/1/89 – 12/20/ sites in Palm Springs and Inc				62	1h	-4 (-8.88, 1.14)	Ostro et al., 2003 Coachella Valley
1985-19 AQS data, 4 ozone sit	2-123.5	88.7	81.5	20.9 (34.3)	24h 0d	1.45 (-0.29, 3.21)	Ito, 2003 Detroit MI
1992-19 AQS data, 4 ozone sit	4.3-101.3	85	80	25 (38.7)	24h 0d	1.79 (-3.38, 7.24)	Ito, 2003 Detroit MI
1989-199 San Jose 4th St. s	2-105	74	67	29	8h 0d	2.36 (-2.12, 7.04)	Fairley, 2003 San Jose CA
1990-19 TNRCC data, 2-3 sites in Dallas C	2-98.7	86.3	81	22 (37.9)	24h 1-2d	3.28 (-1.48, 8.27)	Gamble et al., 1998 Dallas TX
1985-199 AQS sites with at least 4 y data, 5 o sit	2.7-124	85.6	76	38.1 (31.8)	1h 0-1d	4.64 (2.07, 7.27)	lto et al., 1996 Cook County
1987-19 AQS da				18	24h 0d	0.30 (0.16, 0.44)	Moolgavkar et al., 2003 Cook County
1/1/86 - 12/31/ 13 census subdivisio	3.1-71.9	47.3	69.3	13.4 (21.3)	24h 0d	0.66 (-2.57, 3.99)	Villeneuve et al., 2003 Vancouver

Study;	Effect Estimate	Air Quality Data from Study *		Statistics for 8-hr daily max air quality data **			Study period;		
Location	(lower CL, upper CL)	Ave time; Lag	Mean	98 <sup>th</sup> %	99 <sup>th</sup> %	Range	Monitoring information		
Goldberg et al., 2001 Montreal	2.81 (1.35, 4.30)	24h 0-2d	29				1984-1993 Environment Canada data, 9 sites		
Vedal et al., 2003 Vancouver	16.19 (-0.67, 35.91)	1h 0d	27.4 (21.4)	53.3	47.3	1.1-58.7	Jan 94 - Dec 96 19 sites in Greater Vancouver Regional District and EC		
Mortality: Respiratory Diseases									
Ostro et al., 2003 Coachella Valley	3 (-8.77, 16.29)	1h	62				1/1/89 – 12/20/98 sites in Palm Springs and Indio		
Ito, 2003 Detroit MI	0.07 (-4.34, 4.68)	24h 0d	20.9 (34.3)	81.5	88.7	2-123.5	1985-1990 AQS data, 4 ozone sites		
Ito, 2003 Detroit MI	7.44 (-5.37, 21.99)	24h 0d	25 (38.7)	80	85	4.3-101.3	1992-1994 AQS data, 4 ozone sites		
Vedal et al., 2003 Vancouver	6.01 (-22.53, 45.06)	1h 0d	27.4 (21.4)	53.3	47.3	1.1-58.7	Jan 94 - Dec 96 19 sites in Greater Vancouver Regional District and EC		
Villeneuve et al., 2003 Vancouver	1.50 (-4.24, 7.58)	24h 0d	13.4 (21.3)	69.3	47.3	3.1-71.9	1/1/86 - 12/31/98 13 census subdivisions		
Moolgavkar et al., 2003 Cook County (COPD)	0.30 (-0.10, 0.71)	24h 0d	18				1987-1995 AQS data		

\* Includes ozone averaging period and lag period for effect estimate calculation; for example, 1h represents 1-hour maximum concentration and 0d represents a 0-day lag period. Mean values taken from study publications, for the ozone averaging period used in the study (e.g., 1h, 8h, 24h). Where 8-hour daily max ozone concentrations were used, the mean 8-hour daily max concentration is presented in parentheses.

\*\* Using ozone data obtained for the study period in the location of the study, 8-hour daily maximum concentrations were derived and statistics calculated. The 98<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile values for the full study period distribution are presented here, along with the range (minimum-maximum)

of concentrations. Since the time periods of the studies vary in length, from several weeks to over 10 years, the 98<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile values were selected for presentation here as a high study period concentration that roughly approximates a 4<sup>th</sup> maximum concentration, depending on the study period length. NA= data not available

Oz Concen	one ntration <sup>b</sup>	Exposure	Exposure	Number and			
ppm	µg/m³	Duration and Activity	Conditions	tions Subjects Characteristics		Observed Effect(s)	Reference
0.0 0.4	0 784	2 h IE 4 $\times$ 15 min on bicycle,	NA	5 M, 4 F	Healthy adults $25 \pm 2$ years old	$O_3$ -induced reductions in FVC (12%, 10%) and FEV <sub>1</sub> (13%, 11%) for asthmatic and healthy subjects. Significant reductions in mid-flows in both asthmatics and	Alexis et al. (2000)
		$v_E = 30 L/min$		о M, / F	asthmatics $22 \pm 0.7$ years old	decreased FVC and FEV <sub>1</sub> responses to $O_3$ in healthy but not asthmatic subjects. See Section AX6.3.2 and Tables AX6-3 and AX6-13.	
0.0 0.2	0 392	2 h IE $4 \times 15 \text{ min}$ at $\dot{V}_E = 20$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	20 °C 50% RH	8 M, 5 F	Healthy NS median age 23 years	Median $O_3$ -induced decrements of 70 mL, 190 mL, and 400 mL/s in FVC, FEV <sub>1</sub> , and FEF <sub>25.75</sub> , respectively. Spirometric responses not predicted of inflammatory responses. <i>See Sections AX6.2.5.2, AX6.5.6, and AX6.9.3 and Table AX6-12.</i>	Blomberg et al. (1999)
0.0 0.2	0 392	2 h IE $4 \times 15 \text{ min}$ at $\dot{V}_E = 20$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	20 °C 50% RH	10 M, 12 F	Healthy NS mean age 24 years	Significant $O_3$ -induced decrement in FEV <sub>1</sub> immediately postexposure but not significantly different from baseline 2 h later. No correlation between Clara cell protein (CC16) and FEV <sub>1</sub> decrement. CC16 levels, elevated by $O_3$ exposure, remained high at 6 h postexposure, but returned to baseline by 18 h postexposure. <i>See Table AX6-13</i> .	Blomberg et al. (2003)
0.0 0.33	0 647	2 h IE 4 × 15 min on bicycle ergometer (600 kpm/min)	NA	9 M	Healthy NS 26.7 ± 7 years old	$O_3$ -induced reductions in FVC (7%). FRC not altered by $O_3$ exposure. Post FA, normal gradient in ventilation which increased from apex to the base of the lung. Post $O_3$ , ventilation shifted away from the lower-lung into middle and upper-lung regions. The post $O_3$ increase in ventilation to mid-lung region was correlated with decrease in midmaximal expiratory flow (r = 0.76, p < 0.05).	Foster et al. (1993)
0.0 0.35	0 690	2.2 h IE 2 × 30 min on treadmill $(\dot{V}_E \approx 50 \text{ L/min})$ Final 10 min rest	19-23 °C 48-55% RH	15 M	Healthy NS 25.4 ± 2 years old	Pre- to post-O <sub>3</sub> , mean FVC and FEV <sub>1</sub> decreased by 12 and 14%, respectively. Following O <sub>3</sub> exposure, there was a pronounced slow phase evident in multibreath nitrogen washouts which, on average, represented a 24% decrease in the washout rate relative to pre-O <sub>3</sub> .	Foster et al. (1997)

#### Table 3C-1. Controlled Exposure of Healthy Humans to Ozone for 1 to 2 Hours During Exercise<sup>a</sup>
Oz Concen	one tration <sup>b</sup>	Exposure	Exposure	Number and	6.1.1.4		
ppm	µg/m³	Activity	Conditions	Gender of Subjects	Subject Characteristics	Observed Effect(s)	Reference
$\begin{array}{c} 0.0 \\ 0.12 \\ 0.18 \\ 0.24 \\ 0.30 \\ 0.40 \end{array}$	0 235 353 471 589 784	2 h rest or IE (4 × 15 min at $\dot{V}_{E}$ = 25 or 35 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA)	22 °C 40% RH	485 M (each subject exposed at one activity level to one $O_3$ concentration)	Healthy NS 18 to 36 years old mean age 24 years	Statistical analysis of 8 experimental chamber studies conducted between 1980 and 1993 by the U.S. EPA in Chapel Hill, NC. Decrement in FEV <sub>1</sub> described by sigmoid- shaped curve as a function of subject age, O <sub>3</sub> concentration, $\dot{V}_{E}$ , and time. Response decreased with age, was minimally affected by body size corrections, and was not more sensitive to O <sub>3</sub> concentration than $\dot{V}_{E}$ . <i>Also see Section</i> <i>AX6.5</i> .	McDonnell et al. (1997)
0.4	784	2 h IE 20 min mild-mod. exercise, 10 min rest	NA	4 M, 5 F	Healthy NS $30 \pm 3$ years old	Subjects previously in Nightingale et al. (2000) study. Placebo-control: Immediately postexposure decrements in FVC (9%) and FEV <sub>1</sub> (14%) relative to pre-exposure values. FEV <sub>1</sub> decrement only 9% at 1 hr postexposure. By 3 h postexposure, recovery in FVC to 97% and FEV <sub>1</sub> to 98% of preexposure values. Significant increases in 8-isoprostane at 4 h postexposure. Budesonide for 2 wk prior to exposure did not affect responses.	Montuschi et al. (2002)
0.0 0.2	392	2 h IE $4 \times 15 \text{ min}$ at $\dot{V}_{E} = 20$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	20 °C 50% RH	6 M, 9 F 9 M, 6 F	Healthy adults 24 years old Mild asthmatics	$O_3$ -induced FEV <sub>1</sub> decrement (8%, healthy adults; 3% asthmatics) and PMN increase (20.6%, healthy adults; 15.2% asthmatics). Primary goal was to investigate relationship between antioxidant defenses and $O_3$	Mudway et al. (2001) Stenfors et al. (2002)
					29 years old	responses in asthmatics and healthy adults. See Tables AX6-3 and AX6-13.	
0.4	784	2 h IE 20 min mild-mod. exercise, 10 min rest	NA	6 M, 9 F	Healthy NS mean age ~31 years	Placebo-control: $O_3$ caused significant decrements in FEV <sub>1</sub> (13.5%) and FVC (10%) immediately following exposure, a small increase in MCh-reactivity, and increased PMNs and myeloperoxidase in induced sputum at 4 h postexposure. FEV <sub>1</sub> at 96% and FVC at 97% preexposure values at 3 h postexposure. Budesonide for 2 wk prior to exposure did not affect spirometric responses. <i>See Section AX6.2.5 and Table AX6-13.</i>	Nightingale et al. (2000)

### Table 3C-1 (cont'd). Controlled Exposure of Healthy Humans to Ozone for 1 to 2 Hours during Exercise<sup>a</sup>

Oz Concen	one tration <sup>b</sup>	Exposure	Exposure	Number and	Subject		
ppm	μg/m <sup>3</sup>	Activity	Conditions	Subjects	Characteristics	Observed Effect(s)	Reference
0.0 0.4	784	2 h IE 4 × 15 min at $\dot{V}_{E} = 18 \text{ L/min/m}^{2}$ BSA 2 exposures: 25% subjects exposed to air-air, 75% to O <sub>3</sub> -O <sub>3</sub>	21 °C 40% RH	Weak responders 7 M, 13F Strong responders 21 M, 21 F	Healthy NS 20 to 59 years old	Significant $O_3$ -induced decrements in spirometric lung function. Young adults (<35 years) were significantly more responsive than older individuals (>35 years). Sufentanil, a narcotic analgesic, largely abolished symptom responses and improved FEV <sub>1</sub> in strong responders. Naloxone, an opioid antagonist, did not affect $O_3$ effects in weak responders. <i>See Section AX6.2.5.1</i> .	Passannante et al. (1998)
0.0 0.4	784	2 h IE 4 × 15 min at $\dot{V}_E = 20$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	20 °C 40% RH	Placebo group 15 M, 1 F Antioxidant group 13 M, 2 F	Healthy NS mean age 27 years	Placebo and antioxidant groups had $O_3$ -induced decrements in FEV <sub>1</sub> (20 and 14%) and FVC (13 and 10%), respectively. Percent neutrophils and IL-6 levels in BAL fluid obtained 1 h postexposure were not different in the two treatment groups. <i>See Table AX6-13</i> .	Samet et al. (2001) Steck-Scott et al. (2004)
0.0 0.25	490	$\frac{1 \text{ h CE}}{\dot{V}_{E}} = 30 \text{ L/min}$	NA Face mask exposure	32 M, 28 F	Healthy NS 22.6 ± 0.6 years old	Mean $O_3$ -induced FEV <sub>1</sub> decrements of 15.9% in males and 9.4% in females (gender differences not significant). FEV <sub>1</sub> decrements ranged from -4 to 56%; decrements >15% in 20 subjects and >40% in 4 subjects. Uptake of $O_3$ greater in males than females, but uptake not correlated with spirometric responses.	Ultman et al. (2004)

#### Table 3C-1 (cont'd). Controlled Exposure of Healthy Humans to Ozone for 1 to 2 Hours during Exercise<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>See Appendix A for abbreviations and acronyms.

<sup>b</sup>Listed from lowest to highest O<sub>3</sub> concentration. <sup>c</sup>Studies conducted in exposure chamber unless otherwise indicated.

Ozone Conce	ntration <sup>b</sup>	Exposure	<b>F</b>	Number and	G1-*4		
ppm	µg/m³	and Activity	Exposure Conditions	Gender of Subjects	Characteristics	Observed Effect(s)	Reference
Studies with 4	hr Exposur	es					
0.18	353	4 h IE (4 × 50 min) $\dot{V}_{E} = 35$ L/min	23 °C 50% RH	2 M, 2 F	Adults NS, 21 to 33 years old	FVC decreased 19% and $\text{FEV}_1$ decreased 29% in these four pre-screened sensitive subjects.	Adams (2000a)
0.0 0.20	0 392	4 h IE (4 × 50 min cycle ergometry or treadmill running [ $\dot{V}_E = 40 L/min$ ])	20 °C 50% RH	FA: 11 M, 3 F O <sub>3</sub> : 9 M, 3 F	Adult NS, 19 to 41 years old	Decrease in FVC, $FEV_1$ , $V_T$ , and SRaw and increase in $f_B$ with $O_3$ exposure compared with FA; total cell count and LDH increased in isolated left main bronchus lavage and inflammatory cell influx occurred with $O_3$ exposure compared to FA exposure.	Aris et al. (1993)
0.2	392	4 h IE (4 × 50 min) $\dot{V}_E = 25 \text{ L/min/m}^2$ BSA	20 °C 50% RH	42 M, 24 F	Adults NS, 18 to 50 years old	$FEV_1$ decreased by 18.6%; Pre-exposure methacholine responsiveness was weakly correlated with the functional response to O <sub>3</sub> exposure. Symptoms were also weakly correlated with the $FEV_1$ response (r = -0.31 to -0.37)	Aris et al. (1995)
0.0 0.24	0 470	4 h IE (4 × 15 min) $\dot{V}_E = 20$ L/min	24 °C 40% RH	10 M 9 M	Healthy NS, 60 to 69 years COPD 59 to 71 years	Healthy: small, 3.3%, decline in FEV <sub>1</sub> ( $p = 0.03$ [not reported in paper], paired-t on O <sub>3</sub> versus FA pre-post FEV <sub>1</sub> ). COPD: 8% decline in FEV <sub>1</sub> ( $p = ns$ , O <sub>3</sub> versus FA). Adjusted for exercise, ozone effects did not differ significantly between COPD patients and healthy subjects. <i>See Section AX6.5.1.</i>	Gong et al. (1997a)
Studies with >0	ó hr Exposu	res					
0.0 0.06 0.08 0.04 (mean, peak of 0.05)	0 118 157 78	6.6 h IE (6 × 50min) $\dot{V}_{E} = 20 \text{ L/min/m}^{2}$ BSA	25 °C 40-60% RH	15 M, 15 F	Healthy NS Males 23.5 ± 3.0 yrs Females	FEV <sub>1</sub> and symptom responses after 6.6 h exposure to 0.04 and 0.06 ppm not significantly different from FA. Following exposure to 0.08 ppm, $O_3$ -induced FEV <sub>1</sub> (-6.1%, square-wave; -7.0%, triangular) and symptom responses significantly greater than after 0.04 and 0.06 ppm exposures. Triangular exposure to 0.08 ppm caused peak decrement in FEV, at 5.6 h of exposure whereas peak	Adams (2006)
0.06 (mean, peak of 0.09) 0.08 (mean, peak of 0.15)	118 157				$22.8 \pm 1.2$ yrs	for square-wave exposure occurred at 6.6 h.	
0.0 0.04 0.08 0.12	0 78 157 235	6.6 h IE (6 × 50min) $\dot{V}_{E}$ = 20 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	23 °C 50% RH	15 M, 15 F	Healthy NS, $22.4 \pm 2.4$ yrs old	$FEV_1$ and total symptoms after 6.6 h exposure to 0.04 ppm not significantly different from FA. $FEV_1$ (-6.4%) and total symptoms significant at 6.6 h exposure to 0.08 ppm. $FEV_1$ (-15.4%) at 6.6 h not significantly different between chamber and face mask exposure to 0.12 ppm.	Adams (2002)

### Table 3C-2. Pulmonary Function Effects after Prolonged Exposures to Ozone<sup>a</sup>

Ozone Concen	itration <sup>b</sup>	Exposure	Emport	Number and	Subject		
ppm	μg/m <sup>3</sup>	and Activity	Conditions	Subjects	Characteristics	<b>Observed Effect(s)</b>	Reference
0.12	235	3 day-6.6h/day IE (6 $\times$ 50 min) $\dot{V}_E$ = 17 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> , 20 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA, and 23 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA	23 °C 50% RH	15 M, 15 F	Healthy NS, 18 to 31 years old	FEV <sub>1</sub> at 6.6 h decreased significantly by 9.3%, 11.7%, and 13.9%, respectively at three different exercise $\dot{V}_E$ rates, but were not significantly different from each other. Total symptoms at the highest $\dot{V}_E$ protocol were significantly greater than for the lowest $\dot{V}_E$ protocol beginning at 4.6 h. Largest subjects (2.2 m <sup>2</sup> BSA) had significantly greater average FEV <sub>1</sub> decrement for the three protocols, 18.5% compared to the smallest subjects (1.4 m <sup>2</sup> BSA), 6.5%.	Adams (2000b)
(a) 0.08 (b) 0.08 (mean) varied from 0.03 to 0.15	235 235 (mean)	6.6 h IE (6 × 50 min) $\dot{V}_E = 20 \text{ L/min/m}^2$ BSA	23 °C 50% RH	15 M 15 F	Healthy NS, 18 to 25 years old	<ul> <li>(a) FEV<sub>1</sub> decreased 6.2% after 6.6 h in square-wave exposures. Total symptoms significantly increased at 5.6 and 6.6 h.</li> <li>(b) FEV<sub>1</sub> decreased 5.6 to 6.2% after 4.6 to 6.6 h, respectively, in varied exposure; total symptoms significantly increased also after 4.6 to 6.6 h. No significant difference between face mask and chamber exposures.</li> </ul>	Adams (2003a)
(a) 0.08	157	6.6 h IE (6 × 50 min) $\dot{V}_E = 20 \text{ L/min/m}^2$ BSA	23 °C 50% RH	15 M 15 F	Healthy NS, 18 to 25 years old	Significantly greater FEV <sub>1</sub> decrement (12.4%) for 2-h, 0.30 ppm exposure than for 6.6-h, 0.08 ppm exposure (3.6%).	Adams (2003b)
(b) 0.30	588	2 h IE (4 × 15 min) $\dot{V}_E$ = 35 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA					
(a) 0.12	235	6.6 h IE (6 × 50 min)	23 °C 50% RH	6 M, 6 F	Healthy NS, 19 to 25 years	(a) FEV <sub>1</sub> decreased 11% at 6.6 h in square-wave exposure. Total symptoms significant from 4.6 to 6.6 h.	Adams and Ollison (1997)
(b) 0.12 (mean) varied from 0.07 to 0.16	235 (mean)	(a,b,c) $\dot{V}_E = 20$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA (d) $\dot{V}_E = 12$ L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA			old	(b) FEV <sub>1</sub> decreased 13% at 6.6 h; not significantly different from square-wave exposure. Total symptoms significant from 4.6 to 6.6 h.	
(c) 0.12 (mean) varied from 0.11 to 0.13	235 (mean)					(c) $\text{FEV}_1$ decreased 10.3% at 6.6 h; not significantly different from square-wave exposure. Total symptoms significant from 4.6 to 6.6 h.	
(d) 0.12	235					(d) FEV <sub>1</sub> decreased 3.6% at 6.6 h; significantly less than for 20 L/min/m <sup>2</sup> BSA protocols.	

### Table 3C-2 (cont'd). Pulmonary Function Effects after Prolonged Exposures to Ozone<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>See Appendix A for abbreviations and acronyms. <sup>b</sup>Listed from lowest to highest  $O_3$  concentration.

Appendix 4A

**Population Exposure Tables** 

# Table 4A-1. Percent of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAll people, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	1.6%	1.8%	6.8%
Boston	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	1.0%	2.5%	3.2%	3.4%	5.2%	12.6%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	1.0%	1.6%	9.4%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	1.1%	1.5%	3.9%	19.1%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.7%	2.1%	11.3%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	6.8%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	10.6%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	0.9%	1.5%	15.4%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.0%	3.0%	3.6%	5.8%	21.5%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.7%	9.4%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	1.2%	3.4%	4.6%	6.9%	14.2%
Washington	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.8%	2.0%	2.1%	4.2%	15.5%

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.3%	2.1%
Boston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.7%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	6.7%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	2.4%

### Table 4A-2. Percent of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrChildren, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	1.1%	2.5%	2.7%	11.0%
Boston	0.1%	0.5%	0.7%	1.5%	4.4%	5.5%	5.8%	8.8%	20.9%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.5%	1.5%	2.5%	15.6%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.5%	2.2%	6.6%	31.7%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	3.0%	18.8%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	1.0%	10.9%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	16.4%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.7%	1.3%	2.3%	25.7%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.7%	1.2%	4.5%	5.6%	9.1%	35.3%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	13.6%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.5%	4.5%	6.5%	10.3%	22.0%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.9%	2.9%	3.0%	7.0%	26.0%

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	3.0%
Boston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.2%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.9%	9.7%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.9%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	4.1%

### Table 4A-3. Percent of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrActive children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%	1.7%	3.2%	3.4%	12.9%
Boston	0.1%	0.4%	0.7%	1.5%	4.8%	6.0%	6.3%	9.5%	22.9%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	2.1%	3.5%	19.8%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.5%	2.6%	8.8%	37.5%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.6%	0.8%	3.6%	23.7%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	1.1%	12.3%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	17.1%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%	0.8%	1.6%	2.8%	29.3%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	1.3%	5.0%	6.4%	10.4%	40.7%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	1.0%	15.2%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.6%	1.2%	5.0%	7.6%	12.3%	26.3%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	1.1%	3.3%	3.5%	8.3%	30.1%

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.5%	3.2%
Boston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.1%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	1.2%	10.7%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.5%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	5.6%

## Table 4A-4. Percent of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAsthmatic children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	1.3%	3.0%	3.3%	12.6%
Boston	0.1%	0.4%	0.9%	1.7%	4.9%	5.9%	6.2%	9.1%	21.6%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	1.3%	2.8%	16.4%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	1.7%	2.6%	7.8%	31.9%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.6%	2.9%	18.4%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	0.5%	0.9%	10.5%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	17.2%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.8%	1.4%	2.7%	28.8%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.5%	5.3%	6.4%	10.1%	36.5%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.8%	14.9%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.9%	1.7%	4.4%	6.6%	10.3%	21.9%
Washington	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.2%	3.2%	3.2%	7.2%	28.3%

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.5%
Boston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Chicago	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%
Cleveland	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Detroit	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Houston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	1.1%	9.4%
Los Angeles	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.5%
New York	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
Philadelphia	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.8%
Sacramento	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
St. Louis	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Washington	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%	4.5%

# Table 4A-5. Number of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAll people, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	3,710	3,940	11,600	28,700	60,600	64,800	249,000
Boston	1,050	17,900	22,700	43,300	111,000	142,000	151,000	230,000	561,000
Chicago	0	931	2,790	5,280	14,400	34,300	73,200	119,000	696,000
Cleveland	0	295	540	2,800	5,110	26,100	34,100	90,600	438,000
Detroit	0	89	89	625	14,600	21,700	29,100	89,800	474,000
Houston	0	0	562	2,090	1,440	11,500	15,700	27,800	272,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	4,090	7,370	7,640	1,420,000
New York	0	2,140	6,760	18,900	11,700	87,200	147,000	244,000	2,540,000
Philadelphia	0	4,470	12,000	31,400	46,800	137,000	166,000	265,000	982,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	96	418	3,960	6,720	11,600	147,000
St. Louis	0	2,890	6,290	12,900	25,600	72,500	98,800	148,000	308,000
Washington	0	3,790	6,060	23,100	47,300	119,000	123,000	252,000	928,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	152	227	682	3,030	11,000	11,900	77,200
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	95	190	2,290	32,500
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,950
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,650
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,430
Houston	0	0	0	80	160	7,380	10,500	25,400	266,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	819	1,640	1,270,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356	136,000
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	778	46,600
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,900
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Washington	0	0	0	252	379	3,030	3,030	8,330	143,000

### Table 4A-6. Number of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrChildren, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	1,060	1,140	4,170	10,400	22,900	24,200	99,900
Boston	571	5,520	7,140	15,900	46,600	57,500	60,700	93,000	221,000
Chicago	0	0	1,090	1,710	4,040	9,930	27,800	46,900	292,000
Cleveland	0	98	196	736	1,720	8,390	12,400	37,700	182,000
Detroit	0	0	0	89	4,200	6,790	8,660	31,700	201,000
Houston	0	0	80	642	481	3,850	6,180	10,000	115,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	1,910	2,460	2,460	581,000
New York	0	356	2,140	7,480	5,340	27,800	50,500	90,400	1,020,000
Philadelphia	0	680	2,630	8,360	14,200	51,200	64,200	103,000	402,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	64	96	933	1,640	3,640	54,000
St. Louis	0	459	1,420	4,130	8,490	25,200	36,500	57,800	123,000
Washington	0	379	1,510	5,930	13,000	41,600	42,800	99,800	372,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	531	3,340	3,710	27,500
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	952	12,200
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,240
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,520
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Houston	0	0	0	80	80	3,290	4,490	9,950	102,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55,900
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486	18,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,890
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
Washington	0	0	0	0	126	883	757	2,650	58,900

## Table 4A-7. Number of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrActive children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	606	682	2,430	7,280	14,200	15,200	56,600
Boston	286	2,000	3,050	7,140	22,600	28,100	29,200	44,500	107,000
Chicago	0	0	621	1,090	2,640	5,740	17,700	29,300	165,000
Cleveland	0	0	0	196	687	3,680	6,330	21,100	90,000
Detroit	0	0	0	0	1,880	2,860	3,660	16,800	112,000
Houston	0	0	80	241	321	1,530	2,810	5,060	57,900
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	1,090	1,090	1,090	276,000
New York	0	0	1,420	3,560	1,780	13,900	27,800	50,200	522,000
Philadelphia	0	389	1,460	3,990	7,000	26,200	33,200	54,400	213,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	32	64	515	708	1,450	22,600
St. Louis	0	275	597	1,520	3,210	13,100	19,900	32,300	69,100
Washington	0	252	883	3,410	7,190	22,300	23,200	56,000	202,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	227	2,050	2,120	14,100
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476	5,050
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	931
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Houston	0	0	0	0	0	1,770	2,570	5,780	51,400
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32,700
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	8,650
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,990
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	1,140	37,600

## Table 4A-8. Number of people with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAsthmatic children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	152	152	531	1,440	3,410	3,790	14,300
Boston	95	762	1,620	2,950	8,670	10,400	10,900	16,100	38,100
Chicago	0	0	155	310	310	466	3,570	7,450	44,200
Cleveland	0	0	49	245	442	1,470	2,210	6,630	27,100
Detroit	0	0	0	0	268	714	982	4,460	28,700
Houston	0	0	0	80	80	481	722	1,120	13,900
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	546	546	546	76,400
New York	0	0	712	1,070	1,070	4,980	8,900	16,700	178,000
Philadelphia	0	194	583	1,360	2,820	10,000	12,000	19,100	68,500
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	129	161	418	7,430
St. Louis	0	46	275	734	1,380	3,490	5,280	8,260	17,500
Washington	0	126	505	1,260	2,150	5,810	5,810	13,000	51,100

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	76	531	531	2,810
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,810
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	0	401	642	1,440	12,400
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73,700
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,400
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	3,310
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	505	8,080

### Table 4A-9. Number of person-days with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAll people, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	3,790	4,020	11,800	29,300	62,900	67,500	278,000
Boston	1,050	18,300	23,300	45,700	117,000	151,000	160,000	253,000	682,000
Chicago	0	931	2,790	5,280	14,400	34,800	75,000	122,000	784,000
Cleveland	0	295	540	2,800	5,150	27,600	36,100	99,300	593,000
Detroit	0	89	89	625	14,900	22,400	29,900	93,400	546,000
Houston	0	0	562	2,090	1,440	11,500	15,700	27,800	296,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	4,090	7,640	7,910	2,120,000
New York	0	2,140	6,760	19,200	11,800	90,100	153,000	253,000	3,240,000
Philadelphia	0	4,570	12,200	31,800	48,100	147,000	180,000	300,000	1,410,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	97	418	3,960	6,760	11,900	179,000
St. Louis	0	2,890	6,330	13,100	25,900	75,200	104,000	161,000	363,000
Washington	0	3,790	6,180	23,500	48,600	127,000	131,000	277,000	1,190,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	152	227	682	3,030	11,000	11,900	80,000
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	95	191	2,380	33,800
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,950
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,690
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,430
Houston	0	0	0	80	161	7,380	10,500	25,800	295,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	819	1,640	1,750,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	356	139,000
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	778	47,600
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,700
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Washington	0	0	0	252	379	3,030	3,030	8,330	146,000

### Table 4A-10. Number of person-days with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrChildren, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	1,060	1,140	4,170	10,500	23,400	24,900	111,000
Boston	571	5,620	7,330	17,100	50,100	62,500	65,800	105,000	278,000
Chicago	0	0	1,090	1,710	4,040	10,100	28,600	48,300	336,000
Cleveland	0	98	196	736	1,720	8,690	12,900	40,900	256,000
Detroit	0	0	0	89	4,290	6,960	8,840	32,700	234,000
Houston	0	0	80	642	482	3,850	6,180	10,000	125,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	1,910	2,460	2,460	892,000
New York	0	356	2,140	7,830	5,340	29,500	53,000	94,300	1,360,000
Philadelphia	0	681	2,630	8,360	14,700	53,900	69,500	120,000	632,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	64	97	933	1,640	3,730	64,900
St. Louis	0	459	1,420	4,130	8,580	26,100	38,500	63,600	149,000
Washington	0	379	1,510	5,930	13,000	43,800	45,400	110,000	493,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	531	3,340	3,710	28,200
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	952	12,400
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,240
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,520
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	268
Houston	0	0	0	80	80	3,290	4,490	10,100	113,000
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	705,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56,600
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	486	18,100
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,080
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
Washington	0	0	0	0	126	883	757	2,650	59,800

### Table 4A-11. Number of person-days with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrActive children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	606	682	2,430	7,430	14,600	15,700	62,900
Boston	286	2,100	3,140	7,710	24,300	30,700	31,900	51,400	137,000
Chicago	0	0	621	1,090	2,640	5,740	18,300	30,400	193,000
Cleveland	0	0	0	196	687	3,830	6,580	23,000	132,000
Detroit	0	0	0	0	1,960	2,950	3,750	17,100	134,000
Houston	0	0	80	241	321	1,530	2,810	5,060	62,800
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	1,090	1,090	1,090	412,000
New York	0	0	1,420	3,920	1,780	15,700	29,900	53,400	714,000
Philadelphia	0	389	1,460	3,990	7,190	27,600	36,600	63,100	344,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	32	64	515	708	1,540	26,700
St. Louis	0	275	597	1,520	3,210	13,600	21,100	35,800	85,100
Washington	0	252	883	3,410	7,190	23,700	25,000	62,500	275,000

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	227	2,050	2,120	14,400
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	476	5,050
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	931
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	785
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
Houston	0	0	0	0	0	1,770	2,570	5,940	56,700
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	299,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33,100
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	8,750
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,030
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	1,140	38,100

### Table 4A-12. Number of person-days with 8-hour exposures above 0.08 ppm-8hrAsthmatic children, moderate exertion

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	152	152	531	1,440	3,410	3,870	15,900
Boston	95	762	1,620	3,330	9,810	11,700	12,200	18,400	47,200
Chicago	0	0	155	310	310	466	3,570	7,600	49,400
Cleveland	0	0	49	245	442	1,520	2,310	7,120	37,400
Detroit	0	0	0	0	268	804	1,070	4,640	34,900
Houston	0	0	0	80	80	482	722	1,120	14,700
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	546	546	546	113,000
New York	0	0	712	1,070	1,070	4,980	8,900	16,700	241,000
Philadelphia	0	194	583	1,360	2,820	10,500	13,000	21,800	111,000
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	129	161	450	9,010
St. Louis	0	46	275	734	1,380	3,530	5,460	9,000	20,900
Washington	0	126	505	1,260	2,150	6,060	6,180	14,400	67,600

#### year=2002

City	64/4	70/4	74/3	74/4	74/5	80/4	84/3	84/4	recent
Atlanta	0	0	0	0	0	76	531	531	2,810
Boston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,810
Chicago	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Cleveland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	295
Detroit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Houston	0	0	0	0	0	401	642	1,530	13,900
Los Angeles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102,000
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12,100
Philadelphia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	194	3,310
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
St. Louis	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	252	252	505	8,330

### **APPENDICES FOR CHAPTER 5**

#### 5A.1. Ozone Air Quality Information for 12 Urban Areas

	Fourth D	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID	A	Year-Specific		
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
1305700011	0.089			
1306700031	0.100	0.084	0.073	0.085
1307700021	0.099	0.077	0.083	0.086
1308500012	0.088	0.077	0.068	0.077
1308900021	0.095	0.080	0.084	0.086
1308930011	0.090	0.091	0.088	0.089
1309700041	0.098	0.085	0.080	0.087
1311300011	0.088	0.077	0.084	0.083
1312100551	0.100	0.091	0.089	0.093
1313500021	0.089	0.088	0.092	0.089
1315100021	0.099	0.082	0.085	0.088
1322300031	0.099	0.083	0.073	0.085
1324700011	0.099	0.078	0.087	0.088
Average:	0.095	0.083	0.082	
	0.093			

Table 5A-1. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Atlanta, GA

\*The design value is the maximum of the monitor-specific averages of the annual fourth daily maximum 8-hour average over the 3 year period.

Table 54-2	Monitor-S	necific O	Δir	Quality	Information.	<b>Boston</b>	МΔ
Table SA-Z.	WOIIIIOI-3		3 <b>A</b> II	Quality	mormation.	ουδιοπ,	

AIRS Monitor ID	Fourth D	aily Maximur	Average of the 3 Year-Specific	
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
2500900051	0.088			
2500920061	0.100	0.079	0.081	0.086
2500940041	0.094	0.080	0.077	0.083
2501711021	0.096	0.073	0.070	0.079
2502130031	0.107	0.088	0.078	0.091
2502500411	0.102	0.078	0.079	0.086
2502500421	0.074	0.074	0.064	0.07
2502700151	0.091	0.080	0.074	0.081
Average:	0.094	0.079	0.075	
	0.091			

	Fourth	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID		Average (pp	m)	Year-Specific
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
1703100011	0.094	0.077	0.065	0.078
1703100321	0.096	0.080	0.067	0.081
1703100422	0.103			
1703100501	0.084	0.069		
1703100641	0.085	0.067	0.054	0.068
1703100721	0.085	0.075	0.060	0.073
1703100761			0.068	
1703110032	0.092	0.071	0.067	0.076
1703116011	0.081	0.075	0.067	0.074
1703140021	0.084	0.070	0.059	0.071
1703140071	0.093	0.073	0.064	0.076
1703142011	0.087	0.080	0.067	0.078
1703142012	0.067		0.051	
1703170021	0.091	0.082	0.071	0.081
1703180031	0.074			
1704360011	0.084	0.066	0.065	0.071
1708900051	0.082	0.076	0.069	0.075
1709710021	0.090	0.074	0.068	0.077
1709710071	0.100	0.078	0.071	0.083
1709730011	0.087			
1711100011	0.090	0.079	0.068	0.079
1719710081	0.086	0.077	0.063	0.075
1719710111	0.087	0.073	0.068	0.076
1808900221	0.094	0.076	0.064	0.078
1808900241	0.086	0.081		
1808900301			0.064	
1808920081	0.101	0.081	0.067	0.083
1809100051	0.107	0.082	0.070	0.086
1809100101	0.100	0.084		
1812700202	0.097	0.079		
1812700241	0.101	0.077	0.069	0.082
1812700261	0.100	0.082	0.072	0.084
5505900021	0.110	0.085		
5505900191	0.116	0.088	0.078	0.094
5505900221	0.096	0.088		
Average:	0.092	0.077	0.066	
		D	esign Value*:	0.094

Table 5A-3. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Chicago, IL

	Fourth D	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID	A	Average (ppm	ı)	Year-Specific
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
3900710011	0.103	0.099	0.081	0.094
3903500341	0.090	0.076	0.057	0.074
3903500641	0.090	0.079	0.063	0.077
3903550021	0.098	0.089	0.077	0.088
3905500041	0.115	0.097	0.075	0.095
3908500031	0.104	0.092	0.079	0.091
3908530021	0.088	0.080	0.076	0.081
3909300171	0.099	0.085	0.074	0.086
3910300031	0.091	0.086	0.077	0.084
3913310011	0.097	0.091	0.081	0.089
3915300201	0.103	0.089	0.077	0.089
Average:	0.098	0.088	0.074	
		De	sign Value*:	0.095

Table 5A-4. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Cleveland, OH

#### Table 5A-5. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Detroit, MI

	Fourth D	n 8-Hour	Average of the 3	
AIRS Monitor ID	A	Year-Specific		
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
2604900211	0.088	0.087	0.075	0.083
2604920011	0.089	0.091	0.077	0.085
2609900091	0.095	0.102	0.081	0.092
2609910031	0.092	0.101	0.071	0.088
2612500012	0.093	0.090	0.075	0.086
2614700051	0.100	0.086	0.074	0.086
2616100081	0.091	0.091	0.071	0.084
2616300012	0.088	0.085	0.065	0.079
2616300161	0.092	0.084	0.066	0.08
2616300192	0.083	0.098	0.066	0.082
Average:	0.091	0.092	0.072	
		De	sign Value*:	0.092

	Fourth D	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID		Average (ppm	ו)	Year-Specific
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
4803910032	0.095			
4803910041	0.092	0.097	0.103	0.097
4803910161			0.081	
4816700141	0.093	0.092	0.088	0.091
4816710022	0.083	0.082		
4820100242	0.096	0.095	0.096	0.095
4820100263	0.088	0.098	0.085	0.09
4820100292	0.098	0.096	0.090	0.094
4820100461	0.078	0.093	0.084	0.085
4820100472	0.072	0.082	0.083	0.079
4820100512	0.101	0.103	0.095	0.099
4820100551	0.094	0.107	0.104	0.101
4820100621	0.095	0.094	0.097	0.095
4820100661	0.084	0.081	0.097	0.087
4820100701	0.088	0.100	0.078	0.088
4820100751	0.078	0.096	0.093	0.089
4820110151		0.108	0.093	
4820110342	0.093	0.102	0.091	0.095
4820110353	0.092	0.105	0.092	0.096
4820110391	0.095	0.113	0.097	0.101
4820110411	0.090			
4820110501	0.094	0.092	0.097	0.094
4833900781	0.082	0.094	0.080	0.085
Average:	0.090	0.097	0.091	
		De	sign Value*:	0.101

Table 5A-6. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Houston, TX

	Fourth	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID		Average (ppn	n)	Year-Specific
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
0603700021	0.097	0.104	0.092	0.097
0603700161	0.111	0.123	0.095	0.109
0603701131	0.073	0.083	0.076	0.077
0603710021	0.091	0.096	0.089	0.092
0603711031	0.077	0.082	0.078	0.079
0603712011	0.111	0.119	0.101	0.11
0603713011	0.049	0.057	0.065	0.057
0603716011	0.074	0.082	0.079	0.078
0603717011	0.099	0.109	0.095	0.101
0603720051	0.095	0.101	0.093	0.096
0603740021	0.059	0.063	0.070	0.064
0603750011	0.064	0.070		
0603750051			0.085	
0603760121	0.131	0.137	0.107	0.125
0603790331	0.102	0.103	0.095	0.1
0605900071	0.069	0.080	0.088	0.079
0605910031	0.066	0.079	0.076	0.073
0605920221	0.081	0.095	0.085	0.087
0605950011	0.071	0.080	0.075	0.075
0606500121	0.113	0.127	0.112	0.117
0606520021	0.097	0.100	0.094	0.097
0606550011	0.109	0.105	0.099	0.104
0606560011	0.107	0.116	0.095	0.106
0606580011	0.109	0.120	0.111	0.113
0606590011	0.104	0.112	0.100	0.105
0606590031			0.060	
0607100011	0.092	0.088	0.082	0.087
0607100051	0.131	0.130	0.122	0.127
0607100121	0.115	0.103	0.097	0.105
0607100171	0.087	0.084	0.087	0.086
0607103061	0.106	0.104	0.085	0.098
0607110042	0 105	0 114	0 102	0 107
0607112341	0.089	0.087	0.082	0.086
0607120021	0.114	0.132	0.111	0.119
0607140011	0 113	0 110	0.099	0 107
0607140031	0 1 1 7	0 137	0 119	0 124
0607190021	0 101	0 111	0 102	0 104
0607190041	0.101	0.123	0.102	0.101
0611100051	0.076	0.120	0.112	0.110
0611100071	0.080	0 087	0.086	0 084
0611100091	0.087	0.093	0.086	0.088
0611110041	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000
0611120021	0.007	0.000	0.002	0.007
0611120021	0.032	0.033	0.032	0.032
0611120001	0.004	0.069	0.003	0.003
	0.004	0.003	0.000	0.000
/wordge.	0.000	D	esign Value*:	0.127

Table 5A-7. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Los Angeles, CA

	Fourth D	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID	ŀ	Year-Specific		
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
3600500831	0.096	0.079	0.074	0.083
3600501101	0.089	0.082	0.069	0.08
3602700071	0.111	0.081	0.076	0.089
3607150011	0.082	0.087	0.078	0.082
3607900051	0.102	0.082	0.082	0.088
3608100981	0.082	0.072	0.064	0.072
3608101241	0.089	0.086	0.075	0.083
3608500671	0.099	0.086	0.083	0.089
3610300021	0.108	0.094	0.081	0.094
3610300041	0.090	0.082		
3610300092	0.103	0.102	0.079	0.094
3611110051	0.084	0.082	0.076	0.08
3611920041	0.102	0.091	0.078	0.09
Average:	0.095	0.085	0.076	
		De	sign Value*:	0.094

Table 5A-8. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: New York, NY

Table 5A-9.	Monitor-Specific O <sub>2</sub>	Air Quality	v Information:	Philadelphia, PA
		/ III Quality	,	1 11114401p1114, 17

AIRS Monitor ID	Fourth Daily Maximum 8-Hour AIRS Monitor ID Average (ppm)					
	2002	2002 2003 2004				
4201700121	0.111	0.087	0.082	0.093		
4202900501	0.104	0.085				
4202901001	0.112	0.085	0.094			
4204500021	0.106	0.106 0.080 0.081		0.089		
4209100131	0.101	0.085 0.083		0.089		
4210100041	0.082	0.069 0.054		0.068		
4210100141	0.098	0.083 0.077		0.086		
4210100241	0.110	0.082 0.091		0.094		
4210101361	0.094	94 0.070 0.073		0.079		
Average:	0.102	0.081	0.078			
		De	sign Value*:	0.094		

	Fourth D	Average of the 3		
AIRS Monitor ID		Average (ppm	ו)	Year-Specific
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)
0601700101	0.098	0.096	0.089	0.094
0601700111	0.067	0.065		
0601700121	0.077	0.075	0.073	0.075
0601700201	0.111	0.106	0.089	0.102
0605700051	0.099	0.098	0.093	0.096
0605700071	0.093	0.090	0.085	0.089
0605710011	0.065			
0606100021	0.101	0.094	0.092	0.095
0606100041	0.101	0.089	0.087	0.092
0606100061	0.095	0.085	0.082	0.087
0606100071	ĺ	0.068		
0606130011	0.097			
0606700021	0.095	0.086	0.076	0.085
0606700061	0.105	0.097	0.083	0.095
0606700101	0.083	0.076	0.067	0.075
0606700111	0.069	0.087	0.077	0.077
0606700121	0.104	0.098	0.087	0.096
0606700131	0.079	0.075	0.067	0.073
0606750031	0.097	0.097	0.089	0.094
0611300041	0.076	0.077	0.071	0.074
0611310031	0.088	0.082	0.069	0.079
Average:	0.090	0.086	0.081	
	,	De	sign Value*:	0.102

Table 5A-10. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: Sacramento, CA

	Fourth D	Average of the 3					
AIRS Monitor ID	/	Average (ppm)					
	2002	2003	2004	Values (ppm)			
1708310011	0.100	0.083	0.073	0.085			
1711700021	0.085	0.077	0.068	0.076			
1711900081	0.094	0.089	0.074	0.085			
1711910091	0.090	0.088	0.078	0.085			
1711920072	0.090	0.082	0.068	0.08			
1711930071	0.084	0.083	0.073	0.08			
1716300102	0.093	0.079	0.073	0.081			
2909900121	0.093	0.082	0.070	0.081			
2918310021	0.099	0.091	0.077	0.089			
2918310041	0.098	0.090	0.076	0.088			
2918900041	0.098	0.088	0.070	0.085			
2918900061	0.094	0.086	0.067	0.082			
2918930011	0.094	0.082	0.067	0.081			
2918950011	0.095	0.088	0.068	0.083			
2918970031	0.093	0.088	0.069	0.083			
2951000071	0.090	0.084					
2951000721	0.081	0.071	0.058	0.07			
2951000861	0.098	0.090	0.072	0.086			
Average:	0.093	0.085	0.071				
		De	sign Value*:	0.089			

Table 5A-11. Monitor-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Air Quality Information: St. Louis, MO

Table 54-12	Monitor-Specific	O. Air O	uality Informatio	n Washington DC
TADIE JA-12.	women opecine		uanty informatio	n. washington, D.C.

AIRS Monitor ID	Fourth D	ximum 8-Hour Average o (ppm) Year-Spo		
	2002	Values (ppm)		
1100100251	0.097	0.079	0.080	0.085
1100100411	0.102	0.082	0.070	0.084
1100100431	0.106	0.081	0.081	0.089
Average:	0.102 0.081 0.077			
	0.089			

Table 5A-13. Composite Monitor Statistics: 2004

Urban Araa	24-Hour Average (ppm)			1-Ho	1-Hour Maximum (ppm)			8-Hour Maximum (ppm)		
Urban Area	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	
Atlanta	0.0091	0.0279	0.0504	0.0170	0.0578	0.1267	0.0146	0.0499	0.1103	
Boston 1*	0.0060	0.0276	0.0571	0.0185	0.0433	0.1060	0.0128	0.0379	0.0904	
Boston 2*	0.0114	0.0310	0.0603	0.0218	0.0450	0.0956	0.0194	0.0411	0.0842	
Chicago	0.0110	0.0270	0.0453	0.0152	0.0432	0.0758	0.0119	0.0389	0.0679	
Cleveland	0.0080	0.0257	0.0445	0.0123	0.0404	0.0743	0.0090	0.0360	0.0676	
Detroit	0.0074	0.0239	0.0459	0.0140	0.0430	0.0793	0.0094	0.0375	0.0730	
Houston	0.0075	0.0262	0.0572	0.0155	0.0510	0.1243	0.0137	0.0443	0.1082	
Los Angeles 1**	0.0204	0.0338	0.0491	0.0351	0.0634	0.1005	0.0319	0.0555	0.0867	
Los Angeles 2**	0.0249	0.0398	0.0568	0.0410	0.0656	0.0992	0.0387	0.0597	0.0888	
New York 1***	0.0055	0.0242	0.0494	0.0128	0.0449	0.0920	0.0085	0.0378	0.0811	
New York 2***	0.0052	0.0241	0.0491	0.0115	0.0447	0.0883	0.0076	0.0378	0.0806	
Philadelphia	0.0037	0.0272	0.0486	0.0090	0.0492	0.0915	0.0057	0.0426	0.0775	
Sacramento	0.0164	0.0323	0.0462	0.0307	0.0593	0.0953	0.0241	0.0520	0.0806	
St. Louis	0.0078	0.0248	0.0425	0.0175	0.0468	0.0890	0.0114	0.0409	0.0688	
Washington, D.C.	0.0055	0.0283	0.0526	0.0140	0.0521	0.1020	0.0103	0.0450	0.0916	

\*"Boston 1" denotes Suffolk County; "Boston 2" denotes Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Worcester Counties.

\*\*\*Los Angeles 1" denotes Los Angeles County; "Los Angeles 2" denotes Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties.

\*\*\*\*New York 1" denotes the 5 boroughs of New York City -- Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, Bronx, and Staten Island. "New York 2" denotes the 5 boroughs plus Westchester County.

#### Table 5A-14. Composite Monitor Statistics: 2002

Linhan Area	24-Hou	24-Hour Average (ppm)			1-Hour Maximum (ppm)			8-Hour Maximum (ppm)		
Ulball Alea	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Mean	Maximum	
Atlanta	0.0102	0.0308	0.0559	0.0193	0.0623	0.1307	0.0157	0.0540	0.1166	
Boston 1*	0.0133	0.0314	0.0783	0.0210	0.0503	0.1185	0.0178	0.0434	0.1128	
Boston 2*	0.0132	0.0359	0.0852	0.0213	0.0526	0.1213	0.0169	0.0479	0.1162	
Chicago	0.0101	0.0295	0.0545	0.0206	0.0488	0.0986	0.0137	0.0437	0.0899	
Cleveland	0.0103	0.0338	0.0685	0.0177	0.0548	0.1070	0.0138	0.0488	0.1044	
Detroit	0.0085	0.0277	0.0572	0.0170	0.0516	0.0987	0.0151	0.0450	0.0923	
Houston	0.0089	0.0258	0.0568	0.0163	0.0492	0.1167	0.0131	0.0427	0.1017	
Los Angeles 1**	0.0158	0.0313	0.0492	0.0283	0.0613	0.1009	0.0252	0.0525	0.0842	
Los Angeles 2**	0.0192	0.0385	0.0586	0.0292	0.0652	0.0967	0.0247	0.0587	0.0881	
New York 1***	0.0062	0.0280	0.0565	0.0130	0.0529	0.1294	0.0088	0.0448	0.0999	
New York 2***	0.0075	0.0286	0.0576	0.0133	0.0537	0.1333	0.0088	0.0458	0.1032	
Philadelphia	0.0069	0.0322	0.0619	0.0133	0.0573	0.1235	0.0091	0.0501	0.0999	
Sacramento	0.0182	0.0353	0.0604	0.0242	0.0647	0.1090	0.0212	0.0564	0.0954	
St. Louis	0.0058	0.0289	0.0585	0.0157	0.0556	0.1127	0.0087	0.0484	0.1000	
Washington, D.C.	0.0095	0.0357	0.0708	0.0193	0.0627	0.1430	0.0164	0.0548	0.1210	

\*"Boston 1" denotes Suffolk County; "Boston 2" denotes Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Worcester Counties.

\*\*\*Los Angeles 1" denotes Los Angeles County; "Los Angeles 2" denotes Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties.

\*\*\*\*New York 1" denotes the 5 boroughs of New York City -- Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, Bronx, and Staten Island. "New York 2" denotes the 5 boroughs plus Westchester County.

### 5A.2 Scatter Plots

This Appendix provides scatter plots comparing 8-hr daily maximum concentrations at the highest monitor with the average of the 24-hr average over all monitors within each of the 12 urban areas included in the risk assessment.

















Draft – Do Not Quote or Cite









Draft – Do Not Quote or Cite
















5A-20









5A-22

#### 5B.1 Tables of Study-Specific Information

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obso Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			,	Ū	Metric		in Model	min.	max.			••
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	71	0.00020	-0.00084	0.00123
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	71	0.00120	-0.00039	0.00279
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	со	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117

#### Table 5B-1. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Atlanta, GA

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-2. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Boston, MA

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obs Concentrat	erved tions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
				-	Metric		in Model	min.	max.			
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms chest tightness		0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	27	126	0.00462	0.00000	0.00784
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms chest tightness		0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	PM2.5	27	126	0.00771	0.00331	0.01220
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms chest tightness		0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	PM2.5	27	126	0.00701	0.00262	0.01153
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms chest tightness		0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	logistic	none	21	100	0.00570	0.00172	0.00965
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms shortness of breath		0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	27	126	0.00398	0.00040	0.00743
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms shortness of breath		0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	logistic	none	21	100	0.00525	0.00098	0.00952
Gent et al. (2003)	Respiratory symptoms wheeze		0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	PM2.5	21	100	0.00600	0.00209	0.01002

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to  $O_{3}$ .

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

Table 5B-3.	Study-S	pecific	Information	for O <sub>3</sub>	Studies	in Chicago,	IL
	Olduy-O		mormation	101 03	oluaica	m onicago,	

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obs Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
				-	Metric		in Model	min.	max.	-		
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Schwartz (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00099	0.00031	0.00166
Schwartz 14 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00037	0.00012	0.00062
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	65	0.00075	-0.00067	0.00218
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	со	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-4. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Cleveland, OH

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			<b>3</b> **		Metric		in Model	min.	max.	,		
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	2	75	0.00061	-0.00038	0.00161
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	2	75	0.00148	-0.00004	0.00299
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	СО	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117
Schwartz et al. (1996)	Hospital admissions, respiratory illness	460-519	65+	avg of 1-day and 2-day lags	1 hr max.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00169	0.00039	0.00291

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb. NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-5. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Detroit, MI

					Exposure		Other	Obs	erved ions** (ppb)	0.	Lower	Upper
Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Metric	Model	Pollutants in Model	min.	max.	Coefficient	Bound	Bound
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	2	75	0.00076	-0.00024	0.00177
Bell et al 95 US Cities	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Schwartz (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00068	-0.00011	0.00148
Schwartz 14 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00037	0.00012	0.00062
lto (2003)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str.	none	NA	55	0.00093	-0.00085	0.00271
Ito (2003)	Mortality, respiratory	460-519	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	55	0.00359	-0.00276	0.00993
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	2	75	0.00135	-0.00015	0.00286
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	со	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pneumonia	480-486	65+	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)**	none	NA	55	-0.00218	-0.00621	0.00186
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pneumonia	480-486	65+	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	-0.00054	-0.00459	0.00352
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pneumonia	480-486	65+	2-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	0.00066	-0.00342	0.00473
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pneumonia	480-486	65+	3-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	0.00190	-0.00216	0.00595
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), COPD	490-496	65+	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	-0.00191	-0.00667	0.00286
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), COPD	490-496	65+	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	0.00187	-0.00293	0.00667
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), COPD	490-496	65+	2-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	-0.00027	-0.00513	0.00459
lto (2003)	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), COPD	490-496	65+	3-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear (GAM str. estimation)	none	NA	55	0.00011	-0.00475	0.00497

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

\*\*\*\*"GAM str. estimation" denotes that estimation of the log-linear C-R function used a generalized additive model with a stringent convergence criterion. This study also estimated log-linear C-R functions using generalized linear models (GLM).

NA denotes "not available."

Table 5B-6. Study-Specific Information for $O_3$ Studies in Houston,
--

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lan	Exposure	Model	Other	Obse	erved	O. Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Study	fiediti Lifecta	icb-9 codes	Ayes	Lay	Metric	WOUGH	in Model	min.	max.	03 Obenicient	Lower Bound	opper Bound
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	1	76	0.00079	0.00005	0.00154
Bell et al 95 US Cities	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Schwartz (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00044	0.00004	0.00084
Schwartz 14 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non-accidental	< 800	all	0-day lag	1 hr max.	logistic	none	NA	NA	0.00037	0.00012	0.00062
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	1	76	0.00122	-0.00016	0.00261
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	СО	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb. NA denotes "not available."

Table 5B-7. Study-Specific Information for	r O₃ Studies in Los Angeles, CA
--	---------------------------------

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
					Wethc		in Model	min.	max.			
Bell et al. (2004)***	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	68	0.00018	-0.00043	0.00079
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Huang et al. (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	68	0.00107	0.00001	0.00213
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	СО	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117
Linn et al. (2000)****	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pulmonary illness	75-101*****	30+	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	1	70	0.00110	-0.00047	0.00267
Linn et al. (2000)****	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), pulmonary illness	75-101*****	30+	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	1	70	0.00060	-0.00077	0.00197

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

\*\*\*Los Angeles is defined in this study as Los Angeles County. \*\*\*\*Los Angeles is defined in this study as Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Orange Counties. \*\*\*\*\*Linn et al. (2000) used DRG codes instead of ICD codes.

Table 5B-8. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in New York, NY

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
			,	Ū	Metric		in Model	min.	max.	-		
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Huang et al. (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	-2	81	0.00170	0.00054	0.00286
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)***	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	со	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117
Thurston et al. (1992)****	Hospital admissions (unscheduled),	466, 480-486, 490, 491, 492, 493	all	3-day lag	1 hr max.	linear	none	NA	206	1.370E-08	3.312E-09	2.409E-08
Thurston et al. (1992)****	Hospital admissions (unscheduled), asthma	493	all	1-day lag	1 hr max.	linear	none	NA	206	1.170E-08	2.488E-09	2.091E-08

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

\*\*\*New York in this study is defined as the five boroughs of New York City plus Westchester County.

\*\*\*\*New York in this study is defined as the five boroughs of New York City.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-9. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Philadelphia, PA

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved tions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
-			-	-	Metric		in Model	min.	max.			
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065
Moolgavkar et al. (1995)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	1	159	0.00140	0.00086	0.00191
Moolgavkar et al. (1995)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	TSP, SO2	1	159	0.00139	0.00066	0.00212
Huang et al. (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	-3	84	0.00151	0.00007	0.00296
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00124	0.00047	0.00201
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	PM10	NA	NA	0.00074	-0.00033	0.00171
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	NO2	NA	NA	0.00060	0.00011	0.00109
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	SO2	NA	NA	0.00051	0.00001	0.00102
Huang et al 19 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, cardiorespiratory	390-448; 490-496; 487; 480-486; 507.	all	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	со	NA	NA	0.00069	0.00020	0.00117

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-10. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Sacramento, CA

Study	Health Effects* ICD-9	ICD-9 Codes Ages	lan	Exposure	Model	Other	Observed Concentrations** (ppb)		O Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Study	Health Enects	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lay	Metric	Model	in Model	min.	max.	O <sub>3</sub> Coencient	Lower Bound	opper bound
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	71	0.00026	-0.00079	0.00131
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to  $O_3$ .

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-11. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in St. Louis, MO

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure Metric	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
					metrio		in Model	min.	max.			
Bell et al. (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	0	118	0.00044	-0.00072	0.00159
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

#### Table 5B-12. Study-Specific Information for O<sub>3</sub> Studies in Washington, D.C.

Study	Health Effects*	ICD-9 Codes	Ages	Lag	Exposure	Model	Other Pollutants	Obse Concentrat	erved ions** (ppb)	O <sub>3</sub> Coefficient	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
					Wethe		in Model	min.	max.			
Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	Mortality, non- accidental	< 800	all	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	log-linear	none	NA	NA	0.00039	0.00013	0.00065

\*Health effects are associated with short-term exposures to  $O_3$ .

\*\*Rounded to the nearest ppb.

NA denotes "not available."

# 5B.2 Concentration-Response Functions and Health Impact Functions

Notation:

 $y_{0} = Incidence under baseline conditions$  $y_{c} = Incidence under control conditions$  $\Delta y = y_{0} - y_{c}$  $x_{0} = O_{3} levels under baseline conditions$  $x_{c} = O_{3} levels under control conditions$  $\Delta x = x_{0} - x_{c}$ 

# 5B.2.1 Log-linear

The log-linear concentration-response function is:  $y = Be^{\beta x}$ 

The derivation of the corresponding health impact function is as follows:

$$y = Be^{\beta x}$$

$$y_{0} = Be^{\beta x_{0}}$$

$$y_{c} = Be^{\beta x_{c}}$$

$$\Delta y = Be^{\beta x_{0}} - Be^{\beta x_{c}}$$

$$\Delta y = Be^{\beta x_{0}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{Be^{\beta x_{c}}}{Be^{\beta x_{0}}}\right)$$

$$\Delta y = Be^{\beta x_{0}} \cdot \left(1 - e^{\beta \cdot (x_{c} - x_{0})}\right)$$

$$\Delta y = Be^{\beta x_{0}} \cdot \left(1 - e^{-\beta \Delta x}\right)$$

$$\Delta y = y_{0} \cdot \left(1 - e^{-\beta \Delta x}\right)$$

# 5B.2.2 Linear

The linear concentration-response function is:  $y = \alpha + \beta x$ 

The derivation of the corresponding health impact function is as follows:

$$y = \alpha + \beta x$$
  

$$y_0 = \alpha + \beta x_0$$
  

$$y_c = \alpha + \beta x_c$$
  

$$\Delta y = y_0 - y_c = \beta x_0 - \beta x_c$$
  

$$\Delta y = \beta (x_0 - x_c) = \beta \Delta x$$

### 5B.2.3 Logistic

The logistic concentration-response function is:  $y = \left(\frac{e^{\beta x}}{1 + e^{\beta x}}\right) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\beta x}}$ 

The derivation of the corresponding health impact function is as follows:



$$y_{c} + y_{c} \cdot \left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x} = \left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}$$

$$y_{c} \cdot \left[1 + \left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}\right] = \left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}$$

$$y_{c} = \frac{\left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}}{1 + \left(\frac{y_{0}}{1 - y_{0}}\right) \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}}$$

$$y_{c} = \frac{y_{0} \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}}{1 - y_{0} + y_{0} \cdot e^{-\beta \Delta x}}$$

$$y_{c} = \frac{y_{0}}{(1 - y_{0}) \cdot e^{\beta \Delta x} + y_{0}}$$

$$y_{0} - y_{c} = y_{0} - \frac{y_{0}}{(1 - y_{0}) \cdot e^{\beta \Delta x} + y_{0}}$$

$$\Delta y = y_{0} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1 - y_{0}) \cdot e^{\beta \Delta x} + y_{0}}\right)$$

# **5B.3** The Calculation of "Shrinkage" Estimates from the Location-Specific Estimates Reported in Huang et al. (2004)

"Shrinkage" estimates were calculated from the location-specific estimates reported in Table 1 of Huang et al. (2004), using the method described in DuMouchel (1994). Both Huang et al. (2004) and DuMouchel (1994) consider a Bayesian hierarchical model. Although they use different notation, the models are the same. The notation comparison is given in Table B-13 below.

Given a posterior distribution for  $\tau$ ,  $\pi(\tau \mid y)$ , a shrinkage estimate for the ith location is calculated as:

$$\theta_i^* \equiv E[\theta_i | y] = \int \theta_i^*(\tau) \pi(\tau | y) d\tau$$

where

$$\theta_i^*(\tau) \equiv E[\theta_i | y, \tau] = \mu^*(\tau) + [y_i - \mu^*(\tau)]\tau^2 / (\tau^2 + s_i^2)$$

where

$$\mu^{*}(\tau) \equiv E[\mu | y, \tau] = \sum_{i} w_{i}(\tau) y_{i} ,$$

where  $w_i(\tau) = (\tau^2 + s_i^2)^{-1} / \sum_j (\tau^2 + s_j^2)^{-1}$ .

A shrinkage estimate for the ith location is thus defined to be the expected value of the ith location-specific parameter, given all the location-specific estimates (see Table 1 for notation explanations). The posterior variance of the true ith location-specific parameter, given all the location-specific estimates, is given by:

$$\theta_i^{**} \equiv V[\theta_i \mid y] = \int \{V[\theta_i \mid y, \tau] + [\theta_i^*(\tau) - \theta_i^*]^2 \} \pi(\tau \mid y) d\tau,$$

where

$$V[\theta_i | y, \tau] = [s_i^2 / (\tau^2 + s_i^2)]^2 / \sum_j (\tau^2 + s_j^2)^{-1} + \tau^2 s_i^2 / (\tau^2 + s_i^2).$$

A 95 percent credible interval around the ith shrinkage estimate was calculated as  $\theta_i^* \pm 1.96^* (\sqrt{\theta_i^{**}})$ .

Table 5B-13.	Notation
--------------	----------

	Huang et al. (2004)	DuMouchel (1994)
Location indicator	С	i
parameter being estimated for location c (or	$\theta^{c}$	$\Theta_{i}$
i)		
Estimate of parameter for location c (or i)*	$\hat{ heta}^{c}$	$y_i$
variance in the overall distribution of true $\theta$ s.	$ au^2$	$\tau^2$
variance of the estimate of $\theta^c$ or $(\theta_i)^{**}$	v <sup>c</sup>	$s_i^2$
The mean of the overall distribution of true	μ	μ
θs		
The model:	$\hat{\theta}^c \sim N(\theta^c, v^c) \tag{1}$	$y_i = \mu + \delta_i + \varepsilon_i \tag{1}$
	$\theta^c \sim N(\mu, \tau^2) \tag{2}$	$\theta_i = \mu + \delta_i \tag{2}$
	$(1)\&(2) \Longrightarrow \hat{\theta}^c \sim N(\mu, \nu^c + \tau^2)$	$\delta_i \sim N(0, \tau^2) \tag{3}$
		$\mathcal{E}_i \sim N(0, s_i^2) \tag{4}$
		(2) and (3) $\Rightarrow \theta_i \sim N(\mu, \tau^2)$
		$(1), (2), (3) \& (4) \Longrightarrow y_i \sim N(\mu, \tau^2 + s_i^2)$

\*Given in Table 1 of Huang et al. (2004)

\*\*Estimated by taking the square of the location-specific standard error, reported in Huang et al. (2004) for each location.

# APPENDIX 5C. ADDITIONAL HEALTH RISK ASSESSMENT ESTIMATES

Table 5C-1. Number of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exercise Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung<br/>Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That Just Meet the Current and Alternative Daily<br/>Maximum 8-Hour Standards: Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Number o	f Active Child	ren (in 1000s)	Estimated to	Experience a	t Least One L	ung Function	Response			
	Assoc	iated with O <sub>3</sub>	Concentratio	ns that Just N	leet the Curre	nt and Altern	ative O <sub>3</sub> Stand	ards**			
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4			
		Re	sponse = Dec	rease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than	or Equal to 1	0%				
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-Al	32	32	28	24	23	22	19	15			
	(9 - 57)	(9 - 56)	(7 - 51)	(5 - 45)	(5 - 43)	(5 - 42)	(4 - 37)	(2 - 31)			
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	24	21	21	20	17	15	14	11			
	(5 - 46)	(4 - 42)	(4 - 41)	(4 - 39)	(3 - 34)	(2 - 32)	(2 - 30)	(1 - 24)			
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City II -IN-WI	33	30	28	25	23	21	19	14			
	(5 - 65)	(5 - 61)	(4 - 58)	(3 - 53)	(3 - 48)	(2 - 46)	(2 - 42)	(1 - 32)			
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	11	10	10	8	8	7	7	5			
	(2 - 22)	(2 - 20)	(2 - 20)	(1 - 17)	(1 - 16)	(1 - 15)	(1 - 15)	(1 - 12)			
Detroit-Warren-Elint MI	24	22	21	20	17	15	14	11			
	(5 - 46)	(4 - 43)	(4 - 41)	(4 - 40)	(3 - 34)	(2 - 32)	(2 - 30)	(1 - 24)			
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	34	31	29	25	24	22	20	15			
	(10 - 58)	(8 - 54)	(8 - 52)	(6 - 45)	(5 - 43)	(5 - 40)	(4 - 38)	(2 - 30)			
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-RiversideCA	62	58	51	38	37	34	29	14			
	(15 - 110)	(14 - 104)	(11 - 93)	(7 - 71)	(7 - 69)	(6 - 65)	(5 - 55)	(2 - 28)			
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-N I-CT-PA	82	76	71	55	56	53	49	37			
new_rork-newark-bridgeponnr-no-cr-rA	(16 - 160)	(14 - 151)	(12 - 142)	(7 - 116)	(8 - 119)	(7 - 113)	(6 - 105)	(3 - 84)			
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-N I-DE-MD	32	29	28	23	22	20	19	15			
	(8 - 58)	(6 - 54)	(6 - 52)	(4 - 45)	(4 - 44)	(3 - 41)	(3 - 38)	(2 - 32)			
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	6	6	5	4	4	4	3	2			
	(2 - 10)	(1 - 10)	(1 - 9)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 6)	(0 - 4)			
St. Louis-St. Charles-Earmington MO-II	15	14	13	11	10	10	9	7			
	(3 - 28)	(3 - 26)	(3 - 25)	(2 - 22)	(2 - 21)	(1 - 19)	(1 - 18)	(1 - 15)			
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_VirginiaDC-	44	39	39	33	31	28	26	20			
MD-VA-WV	(12 - 79)	(9 - 72)	(9 - 71)	(7 - 62)	(6 - 59)	(5 - 55)	(5 - 53)	(3 - 42)			
	Response = Decrease in FEV <sub>1</sub> Greater Than or Equal to 15%										
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-Al	9	9	7	5	5	4	3	2			
	(1 - 35)	(1 - 35)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 18)			
Boston-Worcester-Manchester_MA-NH	5	4	4	4	2	2	2	1			

Location	Number of	Number of Active Children (in 1000s) Estimated to Experience at Least One Lung Function Response										
Location	Assoc	iated with O <sub>3</sub>	Concentration	ns that Just M	leet the Curre	nt and Alterna	ative O₃ Stand	ards**				
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4				
	(0 - 28)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 19)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 14)				
Chicago-Naporvillo Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	5	4	4	3	2	2	2	1				
	(0 - 39)	(0 - 36)	(0 - 34)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 28)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 19)				
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	0				
	(0 - 13)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 9)	(0 - 9)	(0 - 7)				
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	5	4	4	3	2	2	2	1				
	(0 - 28)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 19)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 14)				
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	10	8	8	5	5	4	4	2				
	(1 - 37)	(1 - 33)	(1 - 32)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 18)				
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	14	13	10	6	6	6	4	2				
	(0 - 67)	(0 - 63)	(0 - 56)	(0 - 42)	(0 - 41)	(0 - 39)	(0 - 32)	(0 - 17)				
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-NJ-CT-PA	15	13	11	6	7	6	5	3				
	(0 - 96)	(0 - 90)	(0 - 85)	(0 - 68)	(0 - 70)	(0 - 67)	(0 - 62)	(0 - 49)				
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-NJ-DE-MD	7	6	6	4	4	3	3	2				
· _	(0 - 35)	(0 - 33)	(0 - 32)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 19)				
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-NV	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0				
	(0 - 6)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 5)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 3)	(0 - 2)				
StLouis-StCharles-FarmingtonMO-IL	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1				
	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 13)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 11)	(0 - 11)	(0 - 9)				
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_Virginia_DC-	11	9	9	6	6	5	4	2				
MD-VA-WV	(1 - 49)	(1 - 44)	(1 - 43)	(0 - 38)	(0 - 35)	(0 - 33)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 25)				
		Re	sponse = Dec	rease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than	or Equal to 2	20%					
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-Al	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0				
Ananta-Januy_Jprings-Janesvine_JA-AL	(0 - 23)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 14)	(0 - 12)				
Pester Werester Menchester MA NU	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Boston-worcester-manchestermA-nn	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 13)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 11)	(0 - 9)				
Chieses Neperville Michigen City, IL IN WI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Chicago-Napervine-Michigan_CityiL-IN-Wi	(0 - 24)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 19)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 11)				
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	(0 - 8)	(0 - 8)	(0 - 7)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 5)	(0 - 4)				
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
	(0 - 18)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 13)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 11)	(0 - 9)				
Houston-Baytown-HuntsvilleTX	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0				

Location	Number of	Active Child	ren (in 1000s)	Estimated to	Experience a	t Least One L	ung Function	Response
Location	Assoc	iated with O <sub>3</sub>	Concentration	ns that Just N	leet the Curre	nt and Altern	ative O₃ Stand	ards**
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	(0 - 24)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 11)
Los Angolos Long Boach-Riversido CA	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 44)	(0 - 42)	(0 - 37)	(0 - 28)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 11)
Now York Newerk Bridgenert NY N LCT BA	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
New_York-Newark-Bridgeport_NY-NJ-CI-PA	(0 - 60)	(0 - 57)	(0 - 53)	(0 - 42)	(0 - 43)	(0 - 41)	(0 - 38)	(0 - 29)
Bhiladalphia Camdon Vincland BAN LDE MD	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
r madeipma-camden-vineiand_rA-NJ-DE-MD	(0 - 23)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 14)	(0 - 11)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 4)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 3)	(0 - 3)	(0 - 3)	(0 - 2)	(0 - 2)
St. Louis St. Charlos Farmington MO-II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 11)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 8)	(0 - 8)	(0 - 7)	(0 - 7)	(0 - 5)
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_VirginiaDC-	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
MD-VA-WV	(0 - 31)	(0 - 28)	(0 - 28)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 15)

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) numbers of children. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O3 coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest 1000.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 --

0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Table 5C-2. Percent of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exercise Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung<br/>Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That Just Meet the Current and Alternative Daily<br/>Maximum 8-Hour Standards: Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Percent of	Active Childre	n Estimated to	Experience at I	Least One Lung	Function Res	ponse Associa	ted with O <sub>3</sub>
		Concer	ntrations that J	ust Meet the Cu	urrent and Alter	rnative O <sub>3</sub> Stan	dards**	
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
			Response = De	crease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than o	or Equal to 10%	)	
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-	7.2%	7.1%	6.3%	5.4%	5%	5%	4.3%	3.4%
AL	(2% - 12.7%)	(1.9% - 12.5%)	(1.6% - 11.3%)	(1.2% - 10.1%)	(1.1% - 9.5%)	(1% - 9.4%)	(0.8% - 8.3%)	(0.5% - 6.9%)
Baston Worcester Manchester MA NH	5%	4.5%	4.4%	4.2%	3.5%	3.2%	3%	2.3%
BOSION-WOICESIEI-ManchesierMA-NH	(1.1% - 9.5%)	(0.9% - 8.7%)	(0.9% - 8.6%)	(0.8% - 8.2%)	(0.6% - 7.1%)	(0.5% - 6.6%)	(0.4% - 6.3%)	(0.2% - 5.1%)
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_City_IL-IN-	3.7%	3.4%	3.2%	2.8%	2.6%	2.4%	2.1%	1.6%
wi	(0.6% - 7.4%)	(0.5% - 7%)	(0.5% - 6.6%)	(0.4% - 6%)	(0.3% - 5.5%)	(0.3% - 5.2%)	(0.2% - 4.7%)	(0.1% - 3.7%)
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	4.5%	4.1%	3.9%	3.2%	3.1%	2.8%	2.7%	2.1%
	(0.9% - 8.7%)	(0.7% - 8%)	(0.7% - 7.8%)	(0.5% - 6.7%)	(0.4% - 6.4%)	(0.4% - 6%)	(0.3% - 5.7%)	(0.2% - 4.6%)
Detroit-Warren-Elint MI	4.9%	4.4%	4.2%	4%	3.3%	3%	2.9%	2.2%
	(1% - 9.3%)	(0.8% - 8.5%)	(0.8% - 8.3%)	(0.7% - 8%)	(0.5% - 6.8%)	(0.4% - 6.3%)	(0.4% - 6.1%)	(0.2% - 4.8%)
Houston-Baytown-HuntsvilleTX	6.9%	6.3%	6%	5%	4.8%	4.4%	4.1%	3.1%
	(2% - 11.9%)	(1.7% - 11%)	(1.6% - 10.6%)	(1.2% - 9.2%)	(1.1% - 8.9%)	(0.9% - 8.3%)	(0.8% - 7.7%)	(0.5% - 6.1%)
l os Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	3.8%	3.6%	3.2%	2.4%	2.3%	2.1%	1.8%	0.9%
	(0.9% - 6.8%)	(0.8% - 6.4%)	(0.7% - 5.7%)	(0.4% - 4.4%)	(0.4% - 4.3%)	(0.4% - 4%)	(0.3% - 3.4%)	(0.1% - 1.7%)
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-NJ-CT-	4.5%	4.2%	3.9%	3%	3.1%	2.9%	2.6%	2%
РА	(0.9% - 8.7%)	(0.8% - 8.2%)	(0.7% - 7.8%)	(0.4% - 6.3%)	(0.4% - 6.5%)	(0.4% - 6.2%)	(0.3% - 5.7%)	(0.2% - 4.6%)
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland_PA-NJ-	5.9%	5.4%	5.2%	4.3%	4.2%	3.8%	3.5%	2.8%
DE-MD	(1.4% - 10.9%)	(1.2% - 10.1%)	(1.1% - 9.8%)	(0.8% - 8.4%)	(0.7% - 8.2%)	(0.6% - 7.7%)	(0.5% - 7.1%)	(0.3% - 5.9%)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-	4%	3.7%	3.4%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3%	2%	1.4%
NV	(1% - 6.9%)	(0.9% - 6.5%)	(0.8% - 6%)	(0.6% - 4.9%)	(0.5% - 4.6%)	(0.5% - 4.3%)	(0.4% - 3.7%)	(0.2% - 2.7%)
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-II	5.4%	4.9%	4.7%	3.9%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	2.5%
	(1.2% - 10%)	(1% - 9.4%)	(0.9% - 9%)	(0.7% - 7.7%)	(0.6% - 7.4%)	(0.5% - 6.9%)	(0.4% - 6.5%)	(0.3% - 5.3%)
Washington-Baltimore-	6.4%	5.7%	5.6%	4.8%	4.5%	4%	3.9%	2.9%
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(1.7% - 11.5%)	(1.4% - 10.5%)	(1.3% - 10.4%)	(0.9% - 8.7%)	(0.7% - 8%)	(0.7% - 7.7%)	(0.4% - 6.2%)	
			Response = De	crease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than o	or Equal to 15%	)	
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-	2%	1.9%	1.5%	1.2%	1%	1%	0.7%	0.4%
AL	(0.2% - 7.9%)	(0.2% - 7.7%)	(0.1% - 7%)	(0.1% - 6.1%)	(0% - 5.7%)	(0% - 5.7%)	(0% - 5%)	(0% - 4.1%)

Location	Percent of Active Children Estimated to Experience at Least One Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub>										
Location		Concer	ntrations that J	ust Meet the Cu	urrent and Alter	native O <sub>3</sub> Stan	dards**				
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4			
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	1.1%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%			
	(0.1% - 5.8%)	(0% - 5.2%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.2%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.7%)	(0% - 3%)			
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_City_IL-IN-	0.6%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%			
wi	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 4.1%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.1%)			
	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%			
Cieveland-Akion-Liyna_On	(0% - 5.2%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.8%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.4%)	(0% - 2.7%)			
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%			
	(0% - 5.6%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4%)	(0% - 3.7%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 2.8%)			
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	2%	1.7%	1.6%	1.1%	1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.4%			
	(0.2% - 7.5%)	(0.2% - 6.8%)	(0.1% - 6.6%)	(0.1% - 5.6%)	(0.1% - 5.4%)	(0% - 5%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 3.6%)			
l os Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%			
	(0% - 4.1%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.5%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2%)	(0% - 1%)			
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-NJ-CT-	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%			
РА	(0% - 5.2%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 3.7%)	(0% - 3.8%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.4%)	(0% - 2.7%)			
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-NJ-	1.4%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%			
DE-MD	(0.1% - 6.6%)	(0% - 6.1%)	(0% - 5.9%)	(0% - 5%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.5%)	(0% - 4.2%)	(0% - 3.5%)			
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-	1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%			
NV	(0% - 4.2%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.2%)	(0% - 1.6%)			
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-IL	1.1%	1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%			
	(0% - 6.1%)	(0% - 5.6%)	(0% - 5.4%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 4.1%)	(0% - 3.8%)	(0% - 3.1%)			
Washington-Baltimore-	1.7%	1.3%	1.3%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%			
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(0.1% - 7.1%)	(0.1% - 6.4%)	(0.1% - 6.3%)	(0% - 5.5%)	(0% - 5.2%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 3.6%)			
			Response = De	crease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than o	or Equal to 20%					
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%			
AL	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 5%)	(0% - 4.5%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.7%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 2.6%)			
Pastan Waraastar Manahastar MA NU	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
Boston-worcester-manchestermA-nn	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2.3%)	(0% - 1.8%)			
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_City_IL-IN-	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
wi	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2.2%)	(0% - 2%)	(0% - 1.9%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.3%)			
	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2.2%)	(0% - 2.1%)	(0% - 1.6%)			
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%			
	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 3%)	(0% - 2.5%)	(0% - 2.3%)	(0% - 2.2%)	(0% - 1.7%)			

Location	Percent of	Active Childre	n Estimated to	Experience at	Least One Lung	g Function Res	ponse Associa	ted with O <sub>3</sub>
Location		Concer	ntrations that J	ust Meet the Co	urrent and Alte	rnative O₃ Stan	dards**	
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 4.3%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 3%)	(0% - 2.3%)
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LUS_AIIgeles-LUIIg_Deacli-RiversideCA	(0% - 2.7%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.3%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.6%)	(0% - 1.3%)	(0% - 0.7%)
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-NJ-CT-	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
РА	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.3%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2.2%)	(0% - 2.1%)	(0% - 1.6%)
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-NJ-	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
DE-MD	(0% - 4.2%)	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.7%)	(0% - 3.2%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.1%)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
NV	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 1.9%)	(0% - 1.8%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.5%)	(0% - 1%)
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-II	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	(0% - 3.9%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.4%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 1.9%)
Washington-Baltimore-	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(0% - 4.5%)	(0% - 4.1%)	(0% - 4%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3%)	(0% - 2.9%)	(0% - 2.3%)

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) percents of children. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O3 coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Table 5C-3. Number of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exercise Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung<br/>Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That Just Meet the Current and Alternative Daily<br/>Maximum 8-Hour Standards: April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Number of Assoc	f Active Child iated with O <sub>3</sub>	ren (in 1000s) Concentratio	Estimated to ns that Just N	Experience a leet the Curre	t Least One L nt and Alterna	ung Function ative O <sub>3</sub> Stand	Response ards**		
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4		
		Re	sponse = Dec	rease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than	or Equal to 1	0%			
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-Al	45	45	40	35	33	32	28	22		
······································	(16 - 74)	(15 - 73)	(13 - 67)	(10 - 60)	(9 - 57)	(9 - 57)	(7 - 50)	(5 - 42)		
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	53	47	46	43	36	33	31	24		
	(20 - 84)	(17 - 76)	(16 - 76)	(15 - 72)	(11 - 63)	(9 - 58)	(9 - 56)	(5 - 46)		
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_CityIL-IN-WI	89 (32 - 145)	83 (28 - 137)	77 (25 - 129)	69 (21 - 118)	63 (18 - 109)	58 (16 - 104)	53 (13 - 97)	41 (8 - 78)		
Claveland Akron Elvria OH	30	27	26	22	21	19	18	14		
	(12 - 48)	(10 - 44)	(9 - 43)	(7 - 38)	(7 - 36)	(5 - 33)	(5 - 32)	(3 - 27)		
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	55	50	48	47	39	35	33	26		
	(21 - 89)	(17 - 81)	(17 - 80)	(16 - 78)	(11 - 67)	(10 - 62)	(9 - 59)	(6 - 48)		
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	34	30	29	24	23	22	20	14		
· _	(10 - 57)	(8 - 53)	(8 - 51)	(6 - 44)	(5 - 42)	(5 - 40)	(4 - 37)	(2 - 28)		
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-RiversideCA	63	61	53	38	37	36	29	15		
	(16 - 110)	(15 - 107)	(12 - 95)	(7 - 70)	(7 - 69)	(7 - 67)	(5 - 55)	(2 - 29)		
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-NJ-CT-PA	178	167	156	123	127	120	110	85		
	(60 - 296)	(54 - 280)	(48 - 267)	(32 - 221)	(34 - 227)	(31 - 216)	(26 - 202)	(17 - 165)		
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-NJ-DE-MD	70	63	61	51	49	45	43	33		
	(28 - 108)	(24 - 101)	(23 - 98)	(17 - 85)	(16 - 82)	(14 - 77)	(12 - 74)	(8 - 61)		
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-NV	11	10	9	8	(0, 40)	(0, 40)	6	4		
	(4 - 17)	(3 - 16)	(3 - 15)	(2 - 13)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 11)	(1 - 8)		
StLouis-StCharles-FarmingtonMO-IL	30 (15 55)	(12 52)	(12 50)	21 (0_11)	20 (9 42)	23 (7 20)	(6 27)	(4 20)		
Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia DC-	(13 - 33)	(13 - 32)	(12 - 30)	(3 - ++) 63	(0 - 42) 58	(7 - 39) 52	(0 - 37) 50	(4 - 30) 40		
MD-VA-WV	(31 - 130)	(25 - 118)	(25 - 117)	(20 - 106)	(18 - 100)	(15 - 91)	(14 - 88)	(0 - 73)		
	(31 - 130)	(20 - 110) Ro	$\frac{(23 - 117)}{\text{snonse} - \text{Dec}}$	rease in FFV.	Greater Than		<b>5%</b>	(3-73)		
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-AL	16	16	13	10	9	9	/	4		

Location	Number of Assoc	Active Child iated with O <sub>3</sub>	ren (in 1000s) Concentratio	Estimated to	Experience a leet the Curre	t Least One L nt and Altern	ung Function ative O <sub>3</sub> Stand	Response ards**
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	(3 - 49)	(3 - 48)	(2 - 43)	(1 - 38)	(1 - 35)	(1 - 35)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 25)
Boston-Worcester-ManchesterMA-NH	21	17	17	15	11	9	9	5
	(5 - 57)	(4 - 51)	(3 - 50)	(3 - 47)	(2 - 40)	(1 - 37)	(1 - 35)	(0 - 28)
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_CityIL-IN-WI	33	29	25	21	17	15	13	8
	(6 - 95)	(5 - 89)	(3 - 83)	(2 - 75)	(2 - 68)	(1 - 64)	(1 - 59)	(0 - 47)
Cleveland-Akron-ElyriaOH	12 (3 - 32)	10 (2 - 29)	10 (2 - 28)	7 (1 - 24)	7 (1 - 23)	5 (0 - 21)	5 (0 - 20)	3 (0 - 16)
Detroit-Warren-FlintMI	21	18	17	16	11	9	9	5
	(4 - 59)	(3 - 53)	(3 - 52)	(2 - 50)	(1 - 42)	(1 - 38)	(1 - 36)	(0 - 29)
Houston-Baytown-HuntsvilleTX	10	8	8	6	5	5	4	2
	(1 - 36)	(1 - 33)	(1 - 32)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 17)
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-RiversideCA	15	15	12	7	7	6	5	2
	(1 - 67)	(1 - 65)	(0 - 57)	(0 - 42)	(0 - 41)	(0 - 40)	(0 - 32)	(0 - 17)
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-NJ-CT-PA	62	55	49	32	34	30	25	15
	(10 - 192)	(8 - 180)	(6 - 169)	(2 - 136)	(3 - 141)	(2 - 133)	(1 - 123)	(0 - 99)
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-NJ-DE-MD	29	25	23	17	16	14	12	8
	(7 - 74)	(5 - 68)	(4 - 65)	(2 - 55)	(2 - 53)	(2 - 49)	(1 - 46)	(0 - 37)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-NV	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1
	(0 - 11)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 10)	(0 - 8)	(0 - 8)	(0 - 7)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 5)
StLouis-StCharles-FarmingtonMO-IL	15	13	12	9	8	7	6	4
	(4 - 38)	(3 - 35)	(2 - 33)	(1 - 29)	(1 - 27)	(1 - 25)	(1 - 23)	(0 - 18)
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_VirginiaDC-	33	26	26	21	18	15	14	9
MD-VA-WV	(7 - 88)	(5 - 77)	(4 - 77)	(3 - 68)	(2 - 63)	(1 - 57)	(1 - 55)	(0 - 44)
		Re	sponse = Dec	rease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than	or Equal to 2	20%	
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-AL	4	4	3	2	2	2	1	0
	(0 - 31)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 16)
Boston-Worcester-ManchesterMA-NH	7	5	5	4	3	2	2	1
	(1 - 36)	(1 - 32)	(1 - 32)	(0 - 30)	(0 - 25)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 17)
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_CityIL-IN-WI	9	8	6	4	3	3	2	1
	(1 - 61)	(0 - 57)	(0 - 53)	(0 - 48)	(0 - 44)	(0 - 41)	(0 - 38)	(0 - 30)
Cleveland-Akron-ElyriaOH	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	0

Location	Number of Active Children (in 1000s) Estimated to Experience at Least One Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**										
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4			
	(0 - 21)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 13)	(0 - 12)	(0 - 10)			
Detroit-Warron-Elint MI	6	5	4	4	2	2	1	1			
	(0 - 38)	(0 - 34)	(0 - 33)	(0 - 32)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 24)	(0 - 23)	(0 - 18)			
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0			
	(0 - 23)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 20)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 14)	(0 - 11)			
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0			
Los_Angeles-Long_Deach-Miverside_OA	(0 - 45)	(0 - 43)	(0 - 38)	(0 - 28)	(0 - 27)	(0 - 26)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 11)			
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-N I-CT-PA	16	13	11	5	6	5	4	1			
	(1 - 122)	(1 - 115)	(0 - 108)	(0 - 87)	(0 - 89)	(0 - 85)	(0 - 78)	(0 - 62)			
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-N I-DE-MD	10	8	7	4	4	3	2	1			
	(1 - 47)	(1 - 43)	(1 - 42)	(0 - 35)	(0 - 34)	(0 - 31)	(0 - 30)	(0 - 24)			
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0			
	(0 - 7)	(0 - 7)	(0 - 6)	(0 - 5)	(0 - 5)	(0 - 5)	(0 - 4)	(0 - 3)			
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-II	5	4	4	2	2	2	1	1			
	(1 - 24)	(0 - 22)	(0 - 21)	(0 - 18)	(0 - 17)	(0 - 16)	(0 - 15)	(0 - 12)			
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_VirginiaDC-	10	7	7	5	4	3	2	1			
MD-VA-WV	(1 - 56)	(0 - 49)	(0 - 49)	(0 - 43)	(0 - 40)	(0 - 36)	(0 - 35)	(0 - 28)			

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) numbers of children. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O3 coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest 1000.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Table 5C-4. Percent of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exercise Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung<br/>Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That Just Meet the Current and Alternative Daily<br/>Maximum 8-Hour Standards: Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Percent	of Active Child	ren Estimated to	Experience at I	Least One Lung	Function Respo	onse Associated	with O <sub>3</sub>			
Location		Conc	entrations that	Just Meet the Cu	urrent and Alteri	native O <sub>3</sub> Standa	ards**				
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4			
			Response = D	ecrease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than o	r Equal to 10%	·				
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-	10.2%	10%	8.9%	7.8%	7.3%	7.3%	6.2%	5%			
GainesvilleGA-AL	(3.5% - 16.6%)	(3.4% - 16.4%)	(2.8% - 14.9%)	(2.3% - 13.5%)	(2% - 12.8%)	(2% - 12.7%)	(1.5% - 11.3%)	(1% - 9.4%)			
Boston-Worcester-ManchesterMA-	11.1%	9.8%	9.7%	9.1%	7.7%	7%	6.6%	5.1%			
NH	(4.3% - 17.7%)	(3.5% - 16.1%)	(3.4% - 16%)	(3.1% - 15.2%)	(2.3% - 13.3%)	(2% - 12.3%)	(1.8% - 11.8%)	(1.1% - 9.6%)			
Chicago-Naperville-	10.5%	9.7%	9.1%	8.1%	7.4%	6.9%	6.3%	4.8%			
Michigan_CityIL-IN-WI	(3.7% - 17%)	(3.3% - 16.1%)	(2.9% - 15.2%)	(2.4% - 13.9%)	(2.1% - 12.9%)	(1.8% - 12.2%)	(1.6% - 11.4%)	(1% - 9.2%)			
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	12.4%	11.1%	10.7%	9.2%	8.8%	7.8%	7.4%	5.9%			
	(4.8% - 19.6%)	(4% - 17.9%)	(3.8% - 17.5%)	(3% - 15.5%)	(2.8% - 14.9%)	(2.2% - 13.6%)	(2% - 13%)	(1.4% - 10.9%)			
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	11.6%	10.4%	10.1%	9.8%	8%	7.3%	6.9%	5.3%			
	(4.3% - 18.5%)	(3.6% - 17%)	(3.5% - 16.6%)	(3.3% - 16.2%)	(2.4% - 13.9%)	(2% - 12.8%)	(1.8% - 12.4%)	(1.2% - 10.1%)			
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	7.1%	6.4%	6.1%	5.1%	4.9%	4.5%	4.1%	3%			
houston Baytown hantsvine_1X	(2.1% - 12%)	(1.8% - 11%)	(1.6% - 10.7%)	(1.2% - 9.2%)	(1.1% - 8.9%)	(1% - 8.4%)	(0.9% - 7.8%)	(0.5% - 6%)			
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-	3.9%	3.8%	3.3%	2.3%	2.3%	2.2%	1.8%	0.9%			
RiversideCA	(1% - 6.8%)	(0.9% - 6.6%)	(0.8% - 5.8%)	(0.5% - 4.3%)	(0.5% - 4.2%)	(0.4% - 4.1%)	(0.3% - 3.3%)	(0.2% - 1.8%)			
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-	9.9%	9.2%	8.6%	6.8%	7%	6.6%	6.1%	4.7%			
NJ-CT-PA	(3.3% - 16.3%)	(3% - 15.5%)	(2.7% - 14.7%)	(1.8% - 12.2%)	(1.9% - 12.5%)	(1.7% - 12%)	(1.5% - 11.2%)	(0.9% - 9.1%)			
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland_PA-	13.1%	11.9%	11.5%	9.6%	9.2%	8.5%	8%	6.3%			
NJ-DE-MD	(5.2% - 20.4%)	(4.5% - 18.9%)	(4.2% - 18.4%)	(3.2% - 16%)	(3% - 15.5%)	(2.6% - 14.5%)	(2.3% - 13.9%)	(1.5% - 11.4%)			
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-	7.2%	6.6%	6.1%	5%	4.8%	4.5%	4%	2.9%			
TruckeeCA-NV	(2.4% - 11.5%)	(2.1% - 10.7%)	(1.9% - 10.1%)	(1.4% - 8.5%)	(1.3% - 8.2%)	(1.2% - 7.7%)	(1% - 7%)	(0.6% - 5.3%)			
StLouis-StCharles-	13.4%	12.3%	11.6%	10%	9.4%	8.6%	8%	6.2%			
FarmingtonMO-IL	(5.4% - 20.7%)	(4.8% - 19.4%)	(4.4% - 18.5%)	(3.4% - 16.4%)	(3.1% - 15.6%)	(2.7% - 14.6%)	(2.4% - 13.7%)	(1.5% - 11.2%)			
Washington-Baltimore-	12.1%	10.6%	10.5%	9.2%	8.6%	7.7%	7.4%	5.8%			
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(4.6% - 19.1%)	(3.7% - 17.3%)	(3.7% - 17.2%)	(3% - 15.5%)	(2.6% - 14.6%)	(2.2% - 13.4%)	(2% - 13%)	(1.3% - 10.7%)			
	Response = Decrease in FEV <sub>1</sub> Greater Than or Equal to 15%										
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-	3.6%	3.5%	2.8%	2.3%	2%	2%	1.5%	1%			
GainesvilleGA-AL	(0.6% - 10.9%)	(0.6% - 10.7%)	(0.4% - 9.5%)	(0.2% - 8.5%)	(0.2% - 7.9%)	(0.2% - 7.9%)	(0.1% - 6.9%)	(0% - 5.6%)			

Location	Location Percent of Active Children Estimated to Experience at Least One Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub>											
Location		Conc	entrations that	Just Meet the Co	urrent and Altern	native O <sub>3</sub> Standa	ards**					
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4				
Boston-Worcester-ManchesterMA-	4.5%	3.6%	3.6%	3.2%	2.4%	2%	1.8%	1.1%				
NH	(1.1% - 12%)	(0.8% - 10.6%)	(0.7% - 10.5%)	(0.6% - 9.9%)	(0.3% - 8.4%)	(0.2% - 7.7%)	(0.2% - 7.4%)	(0.1% - 5.8%)				
Chicago-Naperville-	3.9%	3.4%	3%	2.4%	2.1%	1.8%	1.5%	0.9%				
Michigan_City_IL-IN-WI	(0.7% - 11.2%)	(0.5% - 10.4%)	(0.4% - 9.8%)	(0.3% - 8.8%)	(0.2% - 8%)	(0.1% - 7.5%)	(0.1% - 7%)	(0% - 5.5%)				
Claveland Akron Elvria OH	5.1%	4.2%	3.9%	3%	2.8%	2.2%	2%	1.3%				
Cleveland-Akron-Elyna_On	(1.1% - 13.3%)	(0.7% - 11.8%)	(0.7% - 11.5%)	(0.4% - 9.9%)	(0.3% - 9.5%)	(0.2% - 8.5%)	(0.2% - 8.1%)	(0.1% - 6.6%)				
Detroit-Warren-Elint MI	4.5%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	2.4%	2%	1.8%	1.1%				
	(0.8% - 12.3%)	(0.6% - 11.1%)	(0.5% - 10.8%)	(0.5% - 10.5%)	(0.2% - 8.7%)	(0.1% - 8%)	(0.1% - 7.6%)	(0% - 6.1%)				
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	2.1%	1.8%	1.6%	1.2%	1.1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%				
	(0.3% - 7.6%)	(0.2% - 6.9%)	(0.1% - 6.6%)	(0.1% - 5.6%)	(0.1% - 5.4%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.7%)	(0% - 3.5%)				
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-	0.9%	0.9%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%				
RiversideCA	(0% - 4.1%)	(0% - 4%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 2.6%)	(0% - 2.5%)	(0% - 2.4%)	(0% - 2%)	(0% - 1.1%)				
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-	3.4%	3%	2.7%	1.8%	1.9%	1.7%	1.4%	0.9%				
NJ-CT-PA	(0.6% - 10.6%)	(0.4% - 10%)	(0.3% - 9.4%)	(0.1% - 7.5%)	(0.2% - 7.8%)	(0.1% - 7.4%)	(0.1% - 6.8%)	(0% - 5.5%)				
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-	5.5%	4.7%	4.4%	3.3%	3%	2.6%	2.3%	1.5%				
NJ-DE-MD	(1.3% - 13.9%)	(0.9% - 12.7%)	(0.8% - 12.2%)	(0.5% - 10.3%)	(0.4% - 9.9%)	(0.3% - 9.2%)	(0.2% - 8.7%)	(0.1% - 7%)				
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-	2.5%	2.1%	1.9%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1%	0.6%				
TruckeeCA-NV	(0.3% - 7.4%)	(0.2% - 6.8%)	(0.2% - 6.4%)	(0.1% - 5.3%)	(0.1% - 5%)	(0.1% - 4.7%)	(0% - 4.3%)	(0% - 3.2%)				
StLouis-StCharles-	5.8%	5%	4.6%	3.5%	3.1%	2.7%	2.4%	1.5%				
FarmingtonMO-IL	(1.4% - 14.2%)	(1.1% - 13.1%)	(0.9% - 12.4%)	(0.5% - 10.7%)	(0.4% - 10%)	(0.3% - 9.3%)	(0.2% - 8.6%)	(0.1% - 6.8%)				
Washington-Baltimore-	4.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3%	2.6%	2.2%	2%	1.3%				
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(1% - 12.8%)	(0.7% - 11.3%)	(0.6% - 11.3%)	(0.4% - 10%)	(0.3% - 9.3%)	(0.2% - 8.4%)	(0.2% - 8.1%)	(0.1% - 6.5%)				
		·	Response = D	ecrease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Than o	r Equal to 20%	•					
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-	1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%				
GainesvilleGA-AL	(0.1% - 7%)	(0.1% - 6.8%)	(0% - 6.1%)	(0% - 5.4%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 3.6%)				
Boston-Worcester-ManchesterMA-	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%				
NH	(0.2% - 7.6%)	(0.1% - 6.8%)	(0.1% - 6.7%)	(0.1% - 6.3%)	(0% - 5.3%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.6%)	(0% - 3.6%)				
Chicago-Naperville-	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%				
Michigan_CityIL-IN-WI	(0.1% - 7.2%)	(0% - 6.7%)	(0% - 6.2%)	(0% - 5.6%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 3.5%)				
	1.6%	1.2%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%				
Cleveland-Akron-ElyriaOH	(0.1% - 8.4%)	(0.1% - 7.5%)	(0.1% - 7.3%)	(0% - 6.3%)	(0% - 6%)	(0% - 5.4%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.2%)				
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	1.3%	1%	0.9%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%				
	(0.1% - 7.8%)	(0% - 7.1%)	(0% - 6.9%)	(0% - 6.7%)	(0% - 5.6%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 3.8%)				

Lesstien	Percent	of Active Child	ren Estimated to	Experience at I	Least One Lung	Function Respo	onse Associated	with O <sub>3</sub>
Ebcation		Conc	entrations that	Just Meet the Cu	urrent and Alteri	native O <sub>3</sub> Standa	ards**	
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.5%)	(0% - 4.3%)	(0% - 3.6%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3%)	(0% - 2.3%)
Los_Angeles-Long_Beach-	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
RiversideCA	(0% - 2.7%)	(0% - 2.7%)	(0% - 2.3%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.7%)	(0% - 1.6%)	(0% - 1.3%)	(0% - 0.7%)
New_York-Newark-BridgeportNY-	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%
NJ-CT-PA	(0.1% - 6.8%)	(0% - 6.3%)	(0% - 6%)	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.9%)	(0% - 4.7%)	(0% - 4.3%)	(0% - 3.5%)
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-	1.8%	1.4%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%
NJ-DE-MD	(0.2% - 8.9%)	(0.1% - 8.1%)	(0.1% - 7.8%)	(0% - 6.6%)	(0% - 6.3%)	(0% - 5.8%)	(0% - 5.6%)	(0% - 4.5%)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
TruckeeCA-NV	(0% - 4.8%)	(0% - 4.4%)	(0% - 4.2%)	(0% - 3.5%)	(0% - 3.3%)	(0% - 3.1%)	(0% - 2.8%)	(0% - 2.1%)
StLouis-StCharles-	1.9%	1.6%	1.4%	0.9%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%
FarmingtonMO-IL	(0.2% - 9.1%)	(0.1% - 8.4%)	(0.1% - 7.9%)	(0% - 6.8%)	(0% - 6.4%)	(0% - 5.9%)	(0% - 5.5%)	(0% - 4.4%)
Washington-Baltimore-	1.5%	1.1%	1%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	(0.1% - 8.2%)	(0.1% - 7.2%)	(0.1% - 7.2%)	(0% - 6.3%)	(0% - 5.9%)	(0% - 5.3%)	(0% - 5.1%)	(0% - 4.1%)

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) percents of children. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O<sub>3</sub> coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Table 5C-5. Estimated Number of Occurrences of Lung Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That JustMeet the Current and Alternative Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards Among Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in<br/>Moderate Exercise: April - September, Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Number of Occurrences (in 1000s) of Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**									
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4		
		Respo	onse = Decre	ease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	n or Equal t	to 10%			
Atlanta Sandy, Springs Gainasvilla CA Al	333	327	298	264	248	245	219	179		
	(31 - 1143)	(29 - 1129)	(24 - 1058)	(18 - 974)	(16 - 932)	(16 - 925)	(12 - 852)	(8 - 737)		
Resten Waresstar Manchester MA NH	205	186	184	176	154	142	135	110		
Boston-worcester-manchestermA-NH	(15 - 767)	(12 - 716)	(11 - 711)	(10 - 691)	(8 - 629)	(6 - 594)	(6 - 576)	(3 - 497)		
Chicago Nanarvilla Michigan City II IN WI	319	297	281	252	229	214	195	151		
chicago-napervine-michigan_city_it-in-wi	(16 - 1181)	(14 - 1120)	(12 - 1072)	(10 - 988)	(8 - 916)	(7 - 869)	(6 - 808)	(3 - 654)		
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	115	106	103	88	85	79	74	60		
	(7 - 420)	(6 - 396)	(6 - 386)	(4 - 346)	(4 - 336)	(3 - 319)	(3 - 304)	(2 - 256)		
Potroit Warron-Flint MI	219	201	195	189	162	150	142	113		
	(14 - 805)	(12 - 756)	(11 - 742)	(10 - 724)	(7 - 650)	(6 - 613)	(5 - 589)	(3 - 497)		
Jouston-Baytown-Huntsville TY	266	242	233	194	187	170	155	99		
	(31 - 602)	(26 - 542)	(24 - 519)	(18 - 413)	(17 - 395)	(14 - 346)	(12 - 297)	(7 - 85)		
os Angeles-Long Beach-Piverside CA	1106	1058	966	729	700	646	521	279		
	(73 - 3598)	(67 - 3472)	(56 - 3213)	(35 - 2455)	(33 - 2357)	(29 - 2168)	(21 - 1712)	(9 - 731)		
New York-Newark-Bridgenort NY-N I-CT-PA	795	754	710	582	596	570	526	412		
Tork-Newark-DhageponNT-No-OT-LA	(48 - 2939)	(42 - 2833)	(36 - 2717)	(22 - 2363)	(24 - 2405)	(21 - 2326)	(18 - 2195)	(10 - 1813		
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-N I-DF-MD	331	307	296	254	248	232	218	178		
	(27 - 1085)	(23 - 1028)	(21 - 1002)	(15 - 899)	(14 - 881)	(12 - 841)	(10 - 802)	(6 - 687)		
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	94	88	82	69	66	62	56	41		
	(7 - 315)	(6 - 300)	(5 - 283)	(4 - 248)	(3 - 238)	(3 - 228)	(2 - 208)	(1 - 160)		
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-IL	150	139	132	113	108	100	92	72		
	(12 - 507)	(10 - 478)	(9 - 461)	(6 - 409)	(6 - 395)	(5 - 373)	(4 - 351)	(3 - 288)		
Nashington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia DC-MD-VA-WV	394	356	353	313	295	269	260	210		
	(34 - 1374)	(27 - 1281)	(27 - 1274)	(20 - 1173)	(18 - 1124)	(15 - 1054)	(13 - 1028)	(8 - 881)		
		Respo	onse = Decre	ease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	n or Equal t	to 15%			
Atlanta-Sandy_Springs-GainesvilleGA-AL	27	26	20	15	13	13	9	6		
July 2006	- <b>U</b>	5C-	-13	•	1	Dr	aft – Do N	ot Quote		

Location	Numb	per of Occur	rences (in 10	000s) of Lun	g Function	Response A	ssociated w	ith O₃
Location	C	Concentratio	ons that Just	Meet the Cu	urrent and A	Iternative O	3 Standards*	*
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	(1 - 592)	(1 - 584)	(1 - 544)	(0 - 497)	(0 - 473)	(0 - 469)	(0 - 430)	(0 - 368)
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	12	10	9	8	6	5	4	2
	(0 - 391)	(0 - 363)	(0 - 360)	(0 - 349)	(0 - 315)	(0 - 297)	(0 - 286)	(0 - 244)
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City II -IN-WI	13	11	9	7	5	5	4	2
	(0 - 615)	(0 - 581)	(0 - 555)	(0 - 510)	(0 - 471)	(0 - 446)	(0 - 413)	(0 - 333)
Cleveland-Akron-Flyria OH	6	5	4	3	3	2	2	1
	(0 - 218)	(0 - 205)	(0 - 200)	(0 - 178)	(0 - 172)	(0 - 163)	(0 - 155)	(0 - 130)
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	12	10	9	8	5	4	4	2
	(0 - 416)	(0 - 389)	(0 - 381)	(0 - 371)	(0 - 330)	(0 - 310)	(0 - 297)	(0 - 249)
Houston-Bavtown-Huntsville TX	27	22	21	15	14	11	10	5
	(1 - 374)	(1 - 341)	(1 - 328)	(0 - 271)	(0 - 260)	(0 - 235)	(0 - 210)	(0 - 106)
Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside CA	58	53	43	26	24	21	15	5
	(1 - 1948)	(1 - 1878)	(0 - 1738)	(0 - 1340)	(0 - 1290)	(0 - 1192)	(0 - 962)	(0 - 479)
New_York-Newark-Bridgeport_NY-NJ-CT-PA	38	33	28	16	17	15	12	6
	(1 - 1521)	(0 - 1461)	(0 - 1397)	(0 - 1202)	(0 - 1225)	(0 - 1183)	(0 - 1112)	(0 - 910)
Philadelphia-Camden-VinelandPA-NJ-DE-MD	23	19	17	12	11	9	8	4
	(1 - 581)	(0 - 548)	(0 - 533)	(0 - 475)	(0 - 465)	(0 - 443)	(0 - 422)	(0 - 359)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-TruckeeCA-NV	5	5	4	3	3	2	2	1
	(0 - 166)	(0 - 158)	(0 - 149)	(0 - 130)	(0 - 124)	(0 - 119)	(0 - 108)	(0 - 83)
StLouis-StCharles-FarmingtonMO-IL	10	8	7	5	4	4	3	2
	(0 - 267)	(0 - 251)	(0 - 241)	(0 - 212)	(0 - 205)	(0 - 193)	(0 - 181)	(0 - 148)
Washington-Baltimore-Northern_VirginiaDC-MD-VA-WV	29	23	23	17	14	11	10	6
	(1 - 711)	(1 - 659)	(1 - 654)	(0 - 598)	(0 - 571)	(0 - 533)	(0 - 519)	(0 - 440)
		Respo	onse = Decre	ase in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	an or Equal	to 20%	
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-AL	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0
	(0 - 244)	(0 - 240)	(0 - 218)	(0 - 194)	(0 - 182)	(0 - 180)	(0 - 160)	(0 - 131)
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 149)	(0 - 135)	(0 - 134)	(0 - 128)	(0 - 111)	(0 - 103)	(0 - 98)	(0 - 79)
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City II -IN-WI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 235)	(0 - 219)	(0 - 206)	(0 - 185)	(0 - 167)	(0 - 156)	(0 - 142)	(0 - 109)
Cleveland-Akron-Flyria OH	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 84)	(0 - 78)	(0 - 75)	(0 - 65)	(0 - 62)	(0 - 58)	(0 - 54)	(0 - 43)

Location	Number of Occurrences (in 1000s) of Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**									
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4		
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 160)	(0 - 147)	(0 - 143)	(0 - 138)	(0 - 118)	(0 - 109)	(0 - 103)	(0 - 81)		
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	3	2	2	1	1	1	0	0		
	(0 - 202)	(0 - 185)	(0 - 178)	(0 - 150)	(0 - 145)	(0 - 133)	(0 - 122)	(0 - 80)		
l os Angeles-I ong Beach-Riverside CA	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 826)	(0 - 791)	(0 - 723)	(0 - 545)	(0 - 524)	(0 - 483)	(0 - 390)	(0 - 213)		
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-NJ-CT-PA	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 583)	(0 - 553)	(0 - 520)	(0 - 424)	(0 - 435)	(0 - 415)	(0 - 382)	(0 - 296)		
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-NJ-DF-MD	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 244)	(0 - 227)	(0 - 219)	(0 - 188)	(0 - 183)	(0 - 172)	(0 - 161)	(0 - 130)		
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 70)	(0 - 66)	(0 - 61)	(0 - 51)	(0 - 49)	(0 - 46)	(0 - 41)	(0 - 30)		
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-II	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	(0 - 111)	(0 - 103)	(0 - 98)	(0 - 83)	(0 - 80)	(0 - 74)	(0 - 68)	(0 - 53)		
Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia DC-MD-VA-WV	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	0		
	(0 - 288)	(0 - 261)	(0 - 258)	(0 - 229)	(0 - 215)	(0 - 196)	(0 - 190)	(0 - 152)		

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) numbers of occurrences. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O<sub>3</sub> coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest 1000.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Table 5C-6. Estimated Number of Occurrences of Lung Function Response Associated with Exposure to O3 Concentrations That JustMeet the Current and Alternative Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards Among Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in<br/>Moderate Exercise: April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Nun	nber of Occu Concentrati	rrences (in 1 ons that Jus	000s) of Lun t Meet the Cu	g Function I	Response As Iternative O₃	sociated wit Standards**	h O <sub>3</sub>
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
		Resp	onse = Decr	ease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	n or Equal to	o 10%	
Atlanta Sandy, Springs Cainasvilla, CA AL	404	399	362	327	306	305	271	224
	(55 - 1203)	(53 - 1192)	(44 - 1116)	(35 - 1037)	(31 - 992)	(31 - 989)	(24 - 909)	(16 - 792)
Poston Waraastar Manahastar MA NH	378	344	340	326	289	268	258	215
Boston-worcester-manchestermA-NH	(57 - 1146)	(47 - 1079)	(46 - 1072)	(42 - 1044)	(32 - 966)	(27 - 921)	(24 - 899)	(16 - 798)
Chieses Neperville Michigen City II IN W	662	623	592	542	498	474	441	361
Chicago-Napervine-michigan_CityiL-in-wi	(97 - 1881)	(85 - 1802)	(77 - 1742)	(64 - 1638)	(53 - 1545)	(48 - 1493)	(41 - 1418)	(26 - 1234)
Cleveland-Akron-Elvria OH	254	233	228	200	193	178	171	142
	(42 - 712)	(35 - 673)	(33 - 664)	(25 - 609)	(24 - 595)	(20 - 565)	(18 - 550)	(12 - 486)
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	433	396	387	378	325	298	287	235
	(69 - 1227)	(57 - 1155)	(55 - 1140)	(52 - 1121)	(38 - 1014)	(31 - 959)	(29 - 934)	(18 - 819)
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	227	207	199	165	158	145	130	79
	(28 - 475)	(23 - 423)	(22 - 402)	(16 - 310)	(15 - 291)	(13 - 252)	(11 - 201)	(6 - 3)
l os Angeles-l ong Beach-Riverside CA	997	966	856	609	601	571	436	218
	(70 - 3105)	(67 - 3020)	(54 - 2685)	(32 - 1862)	(31 - 1830)	(29 - 1721)	(20 - 1207)	(9 - 281)
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-N.I-CT-PA	1587	1506	1435	1197	1228	1173	1099	894
	(212 - 4682)	(189 - 4524)	(170 - 4384)	(114 - 3888)	(120 - 3957)	(108 - 3839)	(93 - 3677)	(59 - 3183)
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-N.I-DF-MD	641	596	580	511	494	463	443	371
	(108 - 1710)	(93 - 1627)	(87 - 1598)	(67 - 1469)	(62 - 1437)	(54 - 1376)	(49 - 1334)	(32 - 1184)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	140	132	125	108	104	99	91	73
	(15 - 436)	(13 - 418)	(12 - 401)	(9 - 361)	(8 - 351)	(8 - 338)	(6 - 318)	(4 - 268)
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-IL	282	263	252	222	210	198	185	151
<b>3 1</b>	(50 - 744)	(44 - 709)	(40 - 688)	(31 - 630)	(28 - 607)	(25 - 581)	(22 - 555)	(14 - 480)
Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia DC-MD-VA-WV	712	646	641	578	546	501	487	406
	(110 - 2044)	(90 - 1917)	(89 - 1909)	(72 - 1781)	(63 - 1715)	(53 - 1621)	(49 - 1592)	(33 - 1409)
		Resp	onse = Decr	ease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	n or Equal to	o 15%	
Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville GA-AL	51	49	40	32	27	27	20	13
	(4 - 647)	(4 - 641)	(2 - 596)	(1 - 550)	(1 - 524)	(1 - 522)	(0 - 477)	(0 - 411)

Logation	000s) of Lun	00s) of Lung Function Response Associated with O <sub>3</sub>						
Location		Concentrati	ons that Just	t Meet the Cu	urrent and A	Iternative O <sub>3</sub>	Standards**	
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Boston-Worcester-Manchester MA-NH	55	44	43	39	29	24	21	13
	(7 - 614)	(5 - 572)	(5 - 569)	(4 - 551)	(2 - 505)	(1 - 478)	(1 - 465)	(0 - 407)
Chicago Naporvillo Michigan City II IN-W/I	92	80	71	58	48	42	35	21
Chicago-napervine-michigan_CityiL-na-wi	(8 - 1033)	(6 - 985)	(5 - 949)	(3 - 887)	(2 - 832)	(2 - 801)	(1 - 758)	(0 - 652)
Cleveland-Akron-Elyria OH	40	33	32	23	22	18	16	10
	(5 - 391)	(3 - 366)	(3 - 360)	(2 - 327)	(1 - 318)	(1 - 300)	(1 - 291)	(0 - 254)
Detroit-Warren-Flint MI	66	54	52	49	34	28	25	15
	(6 - 670)	(4 - 626)	(4 - 616)	(3 - 605)	(2 - 540)	(1 - 508)	(1 - 493)	(0 - 427)
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	25	21	19	14	13	11	9	5
	(1 - 307)	(1 - 278)	(1 - 267)	(0 - 217)	(0 - 207)	(0 - 187)	(0 - 161)	(0 - 65)
l os Angeles-l ong Beach-Riverside CA	57	54	43	24	24	22	15	6
	(1 - 1718)	(1 - 1671)	(1 - 1494)	(0 - 1068)	(0 - 1052)	(0 - 997)	(0 - 741)	(0 - 292)
New York-Newark-Bridgeport NY-N.I-CT-PA	197	174	155	99	106	94	79	47
	(15 - 2539)	(11 - 2442)	(9 - 2357)	(3 - 2063)	(4 - 2103)	(3 - 2034)	(2 - 1940)	(1 - 1661)
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-NJ-DE-MD	104	88	83	61	57	49	44	28
	(12 - 957)	(8 - 905)	(7 - 887)	(4 - 807)	(3 - 787)	(2 - 750)	(2 - 725)	(1 - 636)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	14	12	10	8	7	6	5	3
	(1 - 232)	(0 - 221)	(0 - 212)	(0 - 189)	(0 - 184)	(0 - 176)	(0 - 166)	(0 - 138)
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-IL	49	42	39	29	26	23	20	12
	(6 - 416)	(5 - 394)	(4 - 380)	(2 - 345)	(2 - 331)	(1 - 316)	(1 - 300)	(0 - 256)
Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia DC-MD-VA-WV	105	84	83	66	57	47	43	28
······································	(11 - 1109)	(7 - 1030)	(7 - 1025)	(4 - 949)	(3 - 909)	(2 - 854)	(2 - 836)	(1 - 731)
		Resp	onse = Decre	ease in FEV <sub>1</sub>	Greater Tha	n or Equal to	o 20%	
Atlanta Sandy, Springs Cainasvilla CA Al	8	7	5	3	3	3	1	1
Allanta-Sandy_Springs-Gamesvine_GA-AL	(0 - 293)	(0 - 290)	(0 - 264)	(0 - 239)	(0 - 225)	(0 - 224)	(0 - 199)	(0 - 165)
	11	8	8	7	4	3	2	1
Boston-worcester-manchesterMA-NH	(1 - 272)	(1 - 248)	(1 - 246)	(0 - 236)	(0 - 210)	(0 - 195)	(0 - 188)	(0 - 157)
Chinaga Nanamilla Mishinga City, II IN MI	15	12	10	7	5	4	3	1
Chicago-Naperville-Michigan_City_IL-IN-Wi	(1 - 480)	(0 - 452)	(0 - 431)	(0 - 396)	(0 - 365)	(0 - 348)	(0 - 324)	(0 - 266)
Claveland Akron Eluria OH	8	6	5	3	3	2	2	1
	(0 - 183)	(0 - 168)	(0 - 165)	(0 - 145)	(0 - 140)	(0 - 130)	(0 - 125)	(0 - 104)
Detroit Warron Flint MI	12	9	8	7	4	3	2	1
	(0 - 312)	(0 - 286)	(0 - 280)	(0 - 273)	(0 - 236)	(0 - 218)	(0 - 210)	(0 - 173)

Location	Num	nber of Occu	rrences (in 1	000s) of Lur	g Function F	Response As	sociated wit	h O₃
Location		Concentrati	ons that Just	t Meet the Cu	urrent and A	Iternative O <sub>3</sub>	Standards**	
	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Houston-Baytown-Huntsville TX	3	2	2	1	1	1	0	0
	(0 - 172)	(0 - 158)	(0 - 152)	(0 - 128)	(0 - 123)	(0 - 114)	(0 - 102)	(0 - 65)
Los Angeles long Beach-Piverside CA	3	3	2	1	1	1	0	0
LUS_AIIgeles-LUIIg_Deach-IniversideCA	(0 - 745)	(0 - 722)	(0 - 641)	(0 - 458)	(0 - 452)	(0 - 430)	(0 - 331)	(0 - 172)
Now York Newark Bridgeport NY-N LCT-BA	29	24	19	9	10	8	6	2
new_ron-newark-bridgeport_ini-inj-ci-rA	(1 - 1154)	(1 - 1097)	(0 - 1047)	(0 - 878)	(0 - 900)	(0 - 861)	(0 - 808)	(0 - 659)
Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland PA-N I-DE-MD	20	15	14	8	7	6	5	2
	(1 - 463)	(1 - 432)	(1 - 421)	(0 - 373)	(0 - 361)	(0 - 340)	(0 - 325)	(0 - 274)
Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Truckee CA-NV	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
	(0 - 103)	(0 - 97)	(0 - 92)	(0 - 80)	(0 - 77)	(0 - 73)	(0 - 68)	(0 - 54)
St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington MO-II	10	8	7	4	4	3	2	1
orcours-oronaries-r armingtonwo-re	(1 - 203)	(0 - 190)	(0 - 182)	(0 - 161)	(0 - 153)	(0 - 145)	(0 - 136)	(0 - 111)
Washington Baltimore Northern Virginia DC MD VA WV	19	13	13	9	7	5	4	2
	(1 - 515)	(1 - 468)	(1 - 465)	(0 - 421)	(0 - 398)	(0 - 367)	(0 - 357)	(0 - 299)

\*Numbers are median (0.5 fractile) numbers of occurrences. Numbers in parentheses below the median are 95% confidence intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O3 coefficient.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest 1000.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 --

0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

Respiratory Symptoms*	Study	Ages	Lag	Exposure Metric	Other Pollutants in Model	Incidence	of Respirato	ory Symptom Meet the Cu	-Days (in 100 Irrent and Ali	)s) Associate ternative O <sub>3</sub> \$	ed with O₃ Co Standards**	oncentrations	s that Just
						0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Chest	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	45	42	42	41	38	36	35	31
tightness	(2003)					(7 - 79)	(7 - 75)	(7 - 74)	(7 - 73)	(6 - 67)	(6 - 64)	(6 - 62)	(5 - 55)
Chest	Gent et al.	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	72	68	67	66	61	58	56	50
tightness	(2003)					(32 - 107)	(30 - 102)	(30 - 101)	(29 - 99)	(27 - 92)	(26 - 88)	(25 - 85)	(22 - 75)
Chest	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	66	62	62	61	56	53	52	45
tightness	(2003)					(25 - 102)	(24 - 97)	(24 - 96)	(23 - 94)	(21 - 87)	(20 - 83)	(20 - 81)	(17 - 71)
Chest	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	46	44	43	42	39	37	36	31
tightness	(2003)					(15 - 75)	(14 - 71)	(14 - 70)	(13 - 69)	(12 - 63)	(12 - 61)	(11 - 59)	(10 - 52)
Shortness of	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	48	46	45	44	41	39	38	33
breath	(2003)					(6 - 87)	(6 - 83)	(5 - 82)	(5 - 80)	(5 - 74)	(5 - 71)	(5 - 69)	(4 - 60)
Shortness of	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	53	50	50	49	45	43	41	36
breath	(2003)					(10 - 92)	(10 - 87)	(10 - 87)	(9 - 85)	(9 - 78)	(8 - 75)	(8 - 72)	(7 - 64)
Wheeze	Gent et al.	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	132	124	123	121	111	106	103	90
	(2003)					(47 - 208)	(44 - 197)	(44 - 196)	(43 - 192)	(39 - 177)	(37 - 169)	(36 - 164)	(32 - 145)

# Table 5C-7. Estimated Incidence of Health Risks Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: Boston, MA, April - September, Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations

\*Respiratory symptoms among asthmatic medication-users associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences of respiratory symptom-days are rounded to the nearest 100.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

Note: Numbers in parentheses are 95% confidence or credible intervals based on statistical uncertainty surrounding the O3 coefficient.
## Table 5C-8. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Health Risks Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: Boston, MA, April - September, Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations

Respiratory Symptoms*		Ages	Lag	Expo- sure Metric	Other Pollutants in Model	Percent of ⊺	Fotal Incidence	of Respiratory Curr	v Symptom-Day ent and Alterna	rs Associated v tiive O₃ Standa	with O₃ Concer rds**	itrations that J	ust Meet the
						0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	8%	7.6%	7.5%	7.4%	6.8%	6.5%	6.3%	5.5%
						(1.3% - 14.2%)	(1.2% - 13.4%)	(1.2% - 13.3%)	(1.2% - 13.1%)	(1.1% - 12%)	(1% - 11.5%)	(1% - 11.2%)	(0.9% - 9.8%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	12.9%	12.2%	12.1%	11.9%	11%	10.5%	10.1%	8.9%
						(5.8% - 19.3%)	(5.5% - 18.3%)	(5.4% - 18.2%)	(5.3% - 17.8%)	(4.9% - 16.5%)	(4.6% - 15.8%)	(4.5% - 15.3%)	(3.9% - 13.5%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	11.9%	11.2%	11.1%	10.9%	10%	9.6%	9.3%	8.2%
						(4.6% - 18.4%)	(4.3% - 17.4%)	(4.3% - 17.3%)	(4.2% - 17%)	(3.8% - 15.7%)	(3.7% - 15%)	(3.5% - 14.6%)	(3.1% - 12.8%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	8.3%	7.8%	7.8%	7.6%	7%	6.7%	6.5%	5.7%
						(2.6% - 13.4%)	(2.5% - 12.7%)	(2.5% - 12.6%)	(2.4% - 12.4%)	(2.2% - 11.4%)	(2.1% - 10.9%)	(2% - 10.6%)	(1.8% - 9.3%)
Shortness of breath	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	7%	6.6%	6.5%	6.4%	5.9%	5.6%	5.4%	4.7%
						(0.8% - 12.6%)	(0.8% - 11.9%)	(0.8% - 11.8%)	(0.8% - 11.6%)	(0.7% - 10.6%)	(0.7% - 10.2%)	(0.6% - 9.9%)	(0.6% - 8.7%)
Shortness of breath	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	7.6%	7.2%	7.2%	7%	6.4%	6.1%	5.9%	5.2%
						(1.5% - 13.2%)	(1.4% - 12.5%)	(1.4% - 12.4%)	(1.4% - 12.2%)	(1.2% - 11.2%)	(1.2% - 10.7%)	(1.1% - 10.4%)	(1% - 9.1%)
Wheeze	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	10.1%	9.6%	9.5%	9.3%	8.6%	8.2%	7.9%	6.9%
						(3.6% - 16%)	(3.4% - 15.2%)	(3.4% - 15.1%)	(3.3% - 14.8%)	(3% - 13.7%)	(2.9% - 13%)	(2.8% - 12.7%)	(2.4% - 11.2%)

\*Respiratory symptoms among asthmatic medication-users associated with short-term exposures to O<sub>3</sub>.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

Respiratory	Study	Ages	Laq	Exposure	Other Pollutants	Incidence	of Respirat Jus	ory Sympto at Meet the C	m-Days (in 1 Current and	100s) Assoc Alternative	iated with C O₃ Standard	)₃ Concentra Js**	ations that
Symptoms*				Metric	in Model	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Chest tightness	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	61	58	58	57	53	52	50	46
	(2003)					(10 - 105)	(9 - 101)	(9 - 1)	(9 - 99)	(9 - 93)	(8 - 90)	(8 - 88)	(7 - 80)
Chest tightness	Gent et al.	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	96	93	92	90	85	82	80	73
	(2003)					(44 - 141)	(42 - 136)	(42 - 135)	(41 - 133)	(38 - 126)	(37 - 122)	(36 - 119)	(33 - 109)
Chest tightness	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	89	85	85	83	78	76	74	67
	(2003)					(35 - 135)	(33 - 130)	(33 - 129)	(32 - 127)	(30 - 120)	(29 - 116)	(29 - 114)	(26 - 104)
Chest tightness	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	64	61	60	59	56	54	53	48
	(2003)					(21 - 101)	(20 - 97)	(20 - 97)	(19 - 95)	(18 - 90)	(17 - 87)	(17 - 85)	(15 - 77)
Shortness of	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	66	63	63	61	58	56	54	49
breath	(2003)					(8 - 117)	(8 - 113)	(8 - 112)	(8 - 110)	(7 - 103)	(7 - 1)	(7 - 98)	(6 - 89)
Shortness of	Gent et al.	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	73	70	70	68	64	62	61	55
breath	(2003)					(15 - 125)	(14 - 120)	(14 - 119)	(13 - 117)	(13 - 110)	(12 - 107)	(12 - 104)	(11 - 95)
Wheeze	Gent et al.	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	178	171	169	166	156	151	147	134
	(2003)					(65 - 277)	(62 - 266)	(61 - 264)	(60 - 259)	(56 - 245)	(54 - 238)	(53 - 232)	(48 - 212)

### Table 5C-9. Estimated Incidence of Health Risks Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: Boston, MA, April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations

\*Respiratory symptoms among asthmatic medication-users associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences of respiratory symptom-days are rounded to the nearest 100.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

Respiratory		Ades	Lag	Expos-	Other Pollu-	Percent of T	otal Incidence	of Respiratory Curre	Symptom-Day	vs Associated v ntive O <sub>3</sub> Standa	vith O <sub>3</sub> Concen rds**	trations that J	ust Meet the
Symptoms*		лусэ	Lay	Metric	tants in Model	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	11%	10.5%	10.4%	10.2%	9.6%	9.3%	9%	8.2%
						(1.8% - 18.9%)	(1.7% - 18.2%)	(1.7% - 18.1%)	(1.6% - 17.7%)	(1.5% - 16.7%)	(1.5% - 16.2%)	(1.4% - 15.8%)	(1.3% - 14.4%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	17.3%	16.6%	16.5%	16.2%	15.3%	14.8%	14.4%	13.1%
						(7.9% - 25.4%)	(7.6% - 24.5%)	(7.5% - 24.3%)	(7.3% - 23.9%)	(6.9% - 22.6%)	(6.7% - 21.9%)	(6.5% - 21.4%)	(5.9% - 19.6%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	16%	15.3%	15.2%	14.9%	14%	13.6%	13.3%	12%
						(6.3% - 24.3%)	(6% - 23.3%)	(6% - 23.2%)	(5.8% - 22.7%)	(5.5% - 21.5%)	(5.3% - 20.9%)	(5.1% - 20.4%)	(4.6% - 18.7%)
Chest tightness	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	11.4%	10.9%	10.9%	10.6%	10%	9.7%	9.5%	8.6%
						(3.7% - 18.2%)	(3.5% - 17.5%)	(3.5% - 17.4%)	(3.4% - 17%)	(3.2% - 16.1%)	(3.1% - 15.6%)	(3% - 15.2%)	(2.7% - 13.9%)
Shortness of breath	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	1 hr max.	none	9.5%	9.1%	9%	8.8%	8.3%	8%	7.8%	7.1%
						(1.2% - 16.9%)	(1.1% - 16.2%)	(1.1% - 16.1%)	(1.1% - 15.8%)	(1% - 14.9%)	(1% - 14.4%)	(0.9% - 14%)	(0.9% - 12.8%)
Shortness of breath	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	1-day lag	8 hr max.	none	10.6%	10.1%	10%	9.8%	9.2%	8.9%	8.7%	7.9%
						(2.1% - 17.9%)	(2% - 17.2%)	(2% - 17.1%)	(1.9% - 16.8%)	(1.8% - 15.8%)	(1.8% - 15.4%)	(1.7% - 15%)	(1.5% - 13.7%)
Wheeze	Gent et al. (2003)	0 - 12	0-day lag	1 hr max.	PM2.5	13.7%	13.1%	13%	12.8%	12%	11.6%	11.3%	10.3%
						(5% - 21.3%)	(4.8% - 20.5%)	(4.7% - 20.4%)	(4.6% - 20%)	(4.3% - 18.9%)	(4.2% - 18.3%)	(4.1% - 17.9%)	(3.7% - 16.3%)

### Table 5C-10. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Health Risks Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: Boston, MA, April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations

\*Respiratory symptoms among asthmatic medication-users associated with short-term exposures to O3.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

Table 5C-11. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Hospital Admissions Associated with O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: New York, NY, April - September, Based on 2004 O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations

Hospital Admissions	Lag	Incidence of	Health Effects A	Associated with	O3 Concentratio	ns that Just Mee	et the Current ar	nd Alternative O <sub>3</sub>	standards**
		0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	366	334	341	314	304	279	278	241
(unscheduled)		(89 - 644)	(81 - 588)	(82 - 599)	(76 - 551)	(73 - 534)	(67 - 490)	(67 - 489)	(58 - 424)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	313	286	291	268	259	238	238	206
		(66 - 559)	(61 - 510)	(62 - 520)	(57 - 479)	(55 - 464)	(51 - 425)	(51 - 425)	(44 - 368)
		Incidence of	Health Effects pe	er 100,000 Relev	ant Population	Associated with	O <sub>3</sub> Concentratio	ons that Just Me	et the Current
Hospital Admissions	Lag				and Alternative	e O <sub>3</sub> Standards			
	Lug	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	4.6	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.5	3
(unscheduled)		(1.1 - 8)	(1 - 7.3)	(1 - 7.5)	(0.9 - 6.9)	(0.9 - 6.7)	(0.8 - 6.1)	(0.8 - 6.1)	(0.7 - 5.3)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	3.9	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.2	3	3	2.6
		(0.8 - 7)	(0.8 - 6.4)	(0.8 - 6.5)	(0.7 - 6)	(0.7 - 5.8)	(0.6 - 5.3)	(0.6 - 5.3)	(0.5 - 4.6)
		Percent of Tota	al Incidence of H	ealth Effects As	sociated with O	3 Concentration	s that Just Meet	the Current and	Alternative O3
Hospital Admissions	Lag				Stand	dards			
	_~g	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	1%	0.9%	1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%
(unscheduled)		(0.3% - 1.8%)	(0.2% - 1.7%)	(0.2% - 1.7%)	(0.2% - 1.6%)	(0.2% - 1.5%)	(0.2% - 1.4%)	(0.2% - 1.4%)	(0.2% - 1.2%)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	2.4%	2.2%	2.2%	2%	2%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6%
		(0.5% - 4.3%)	(0.5% - 3.9%)	(0.5% - 4%)	(0.4% - 3.6%)	(0.4% - 3.5%)	(0.4% - 3.2%)	(0.4% - 3.2%)	(0.3% - 2.8%)

\*Based on single-pollutant models from Thurston et al. (1992) relating daily hospital admissions among all ages to daily 1-hr maximum O<sub>3</sub> exposures. New York in this study is defined as the five boroughs of New York City.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest whole number; incidences per 100,000 relevant population and percent of total incidence are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

### Table 5C-12. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Hospital Admissions Associated with O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: New York, NY, April - September, Based on 2002 O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations

		Incidence of	Health Effects A	ssociated with	O <sub>3</sub> Concentratio	ns that Just Mee	et the Current ar	d Alternative O	Standards**
Hospital Admissions	Lag	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	513	472	483	452	439	404	410	365
(unscheduled)		(124 - 902)	(114 - 830)	(117 - 850)	(109 - 795)	(106 - 772)	(98 - 710)	(99 - 721)	(88 - 642)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	438	403	413	386	375	345	350	312
		(93 - 783)	(86 - 720)	(88 - 738)	(82 - 690)	(80 - 670)	(73 - 617)	(75 - 626)	(66 - 558)
		Incidence of H	lealth Effects pe	r 100,000 Relev	ant Population A	Associated with	O3 Concentratio	ons that Just Me	et the Current
Hospital Admissions	Lag				and Alternative	e O3 Standards			
	Lug	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	6.4	5.9	6	5.6	5.5	5	5.1	4.6
(unscheduled)		(1.5 - 11.3)	(1.4 - 10.4)	(1.5 - 10.6)	(1.4 - 9.9)	(1.3 - 9.6)	(1.2 - 8.9)	(1.2 - 9)	(1.1 - 8)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	5.5	5	5.2	4.8	4.7	4.3	4.4	3.9
		(1.2 - 9.8)	(1.1 - 9)	(1.1 - 9.2)	(1 - 8.6)	(1 - 8.4)	(0.9 - 7.7)	(0.9 - 7.8)	(0.8 - 7)
		Percent of Tota	I Incidence of H	ealth Effects As	sociated with O	3 Concentration	s that Just Meet	the Current and	Alternative O3
Hospital Admissions	Lag		1	1	Stand	dards			
	g	0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Respiratory illness	3-day lag	1.5%	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%	1%
(unscheduled)		(0.4% - 2.6%)	(0.3% - 2.3%)	(0.3% - 2.4%)	(0.3% - 2.2%)	(0.3% - 2.2%)	(0.3% - 2%)	(0.3% - 2%)	(0.2% - 1.8%)
Asthma (unscheduled)	1-day lag	3.3%	3.1%	3.1%	2.9%	2.9%	2.6%	2.7%	2.4%
		(0.7% - 6%)	(0.7% - 5.5%)	(0.7% - 5.6%)	(0.6% - 5.3%)	(0.6% - 5.1%)	(0.6% - 4.7%)	(0.6% - 4.8%)	(0.5% - 4.2%)

\*Based on single-pollutant models from Thurston et al. (1992) relating daily hospital admissions among all ages to daily 1-hr maximum O<sub>3</sub> exposures. New York in this study is defined as the five boroughs of New York City.

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest whole number; incidences per 100,000 relevant population and percent of total incidence are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppm and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 0.084/4 -- 0.084 ppm, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average using the current rounding convention.

\*\*\*\*This alternative 8-hr standard assumes an alternative rounding convention where the standard is specified to the third decimal place.

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Incidence of	f Non-Accident	al Mortality As Current and A	sociated w Iternative C	vith O₃ Con D₃ Standarc	centration: Is**	s that Just I	Neet the
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3
Atlanta				(-20 - 29)	(-20 - 29)	(-18 - 26)	(-16 - 23)	(-15 - 22)	(-15 - 22)	(-13 - 19)	(-11 - 16)
, manu	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	9	9	8	7	7	7	6	5
	Cities (2004)			(3 - 15)	(3 - 15)	(3 - 14)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 10)	(2 - 8)
Boston	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	6	5	5	5	4	4	4	3
Boston	Cities (2004)			(2 - 9)	(2 - 9)	(2 - 9)	(2 - 8)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 6)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	33	31	29	26	23	22	19	14
	Cities (2004)			(11 - 55)	(10 - 52)	(10 - 48)	(9 - 43)	(8 - 39)	(7 - 36)	(6 - 32)	(5 - 24)
Chicago	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	314	300	288	268	249	238	222	183
Cilicago				(99 - 525)	(95 - 501)	(91 - 482)	(85 - 448)	(79 - 417)	(75 - 399)	(70 - 372)	(58 - 307)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	118	113	108	101	93	89	83	69
	Cities (2004)			(37 - 199)	(35 - 190)	(34 - 182)	(31 - 170)	(29 - 157)	(28 - 151)	(26 - 140)	(21 - 116)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	19	18	17	15	14	14	13	10
Cleveland				(-12 - 49)	(-11 - 46)	(-11 - 44)	(-9 - 39)	(-9 - 37)	(-9 - 36)	(-8 - 33)	(-6 - 26)
Cleveland	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	12	11	11	9	9	9	8	6
	Cities (2004)			(4 - 20)	(4 - 19)	(4 - 18)	(3 - 16)	(3 - 15)	(3 - 14)	(3 - 13)	(2 - 11)
Detroit	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	24	22	21	21	17	16	15	11
				(-8 - 56)	(-7 - 51)	(-7 - 49)	(-7 - 48)	(-6 - 40)	(-5 - 38)	(-5 - 35)	(-4 - 27)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	12	11	11	11	9	8	8	6
	Cities (2004)			(4 - 20)	(4 - 19)	(4 - 18)	(4 - 18)	(3 - 15)	(3 - 14)	(3 - 13)	(2 - 10)
	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	107	102	99	97	87	83	78	66
				(-17 - 229)	(-17 - 218)	(-16 - 212)	(-16 - 209)	(-14 - 186)	(-13 - 178)	(-13 - 168)	(-11 - 142)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	58	55	54	53	47	45	42	36
	Cities (2004)			(18 - 98)	(17 - 93)	(17 - 91)	(17 - 89)	(15 - 79)	(14 - 76)	(13 - 72)	(11 - 61)

# Table 5C-13. Estimated Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: April - September, Based on 2004 O3 Concentrations\*

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Incidence o	f Non-Acciden	al Mortality As Current and A	sociated w Iternative C	vith O₃ Con D₃ Standarc	centration ds**	s that Just I	Meet the
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	Ito (2003)	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	29	27	26	25	21	20	18	14
				(-27 - 85)	(-25 - 78)	(-24 - 75)	(-23 - 73)	(-20 - 62)	(-18 - 57)	(-17 - 53)	(-13 - 41)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	22	20	19	17	16	15	13	8
				(1 - 42)	(1 - 39)	(1 - 37)	(1 - 32)	(1 - 30)	(1 - 28)	(1 - 25)	(0 - 15)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	11	10	10	8	8	7	6	4
Houston	Cities (2004)			(4 - 18)	(3 - 16)	(3 - 16)	(3 - 13)	(3 - 13)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 11)	(1 - 6)
nousion	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	70	66	65	59	57	55	52	42
				(6 - 132)	(6 - 126)	(6 - 123)	(5 - 112)	(5 - 109)	(5 - 104)	(5 - 99)	(4 - 80)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	58	55	54	49	48	46	43	35
	Cities (2004)			(18 - 98)	(17 - 93)	(17 - 91)	(15 - 83)	(15 - 81)	(14 - 77)	(14 - 73)	(11 - 59)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	31	30	27	22	20	19	16	9
Los Angeles				(-74 - 135)	(-72 - 131)	(-66 - 120)	(-52 - 95)	(-49 - 90)	(-46 - 83)	(-38 - 69)	(-22 - 41)
LUS Angeles	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	67	64	59	47	44	41	34	20
	Cities (2004)			(22 - 111)	(22 - 107)	(20 - 98)	(16 - 78)	(15 - 74)	(14 - 68)	(11 - 56)	(7 - 33)
New York	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	43	38	39	35	33	29	29	24
New TOR	Cities (2004)			(15 - 72)	(13 - 63)	(13 - 65)	(12 - 58)	(11 - 55)	(10 - 48)	(10 - 49)	(8 - 39)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	17	15	15	13	13	12	11	9
Philadelphia	Cities (2004)			(6 - 28)	(5 - 25)	(5 - 25)	(4 - 22)	(4 - 21)	(4 - 20)	(4 - 19)	(3 - 15)
1 madeipina	Moolgavkar et al.	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	59	54	54	47	46	42	41	33
	(1995)			(37 - 81)	(34 - 75)	(34 - 74)	(30 - 65)	(29 - 63)	(27 - 58)	(26 - 56)	(21 - 46)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	8	8	8	7	7	7	6	5
Sacramento				(-25 - 42)	(-25 - 41)	(-23 - 39)	(-21 - 35)	(-21 - 34)	(-20 - 34)	(-19 - 31)	(-16 - 26)
Cucramente	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	12	12	11	10	10	10	9	8
	Cities (2004)			(4 - 21)	(4 - 20)	(4 - 19)	(4 - 17)	(3 - 17)	(3 - 17)	(3 - 15)	(3 - 13)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
St Louis				(-4 - 9)	(-4 - 8)	(-4 - 8)	(-3 - 6)	(-3 - 6)	(-2 - 5)	(-2 - 5)	(-1 - 3)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1
	Cities (2004)			(1 - 4)	(1 - 3)	(1 - 3)	(1 - 3)	(0 - 2)	(0 - 2)	(0 - 2)	(0 - 1)

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Incidence o	f Non-Acciden	al Mortality As Current and A	sociated w Iternative C	vith O₃ Con D₃ Standarc	centration Is**	s that Just I	Meet the
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
Washington	Bell et al 95 US Cities (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	7 (2 - 12)	6 (2 - 10)	6 (2 - 11)	6 (2 - 9)	6 (2 - 9)	5 (2 - 8)	5 (2 - 8)	4 (1 - 7)

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest whole number.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppb and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 84/4 -- 84 ppb, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average.

Table 5C-14. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the
Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: April - September, Based on 2004 O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations*

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Percent of T	otal Incidence	of Non-Accid	lental Mortalit ent and Alterr	y Associated ative O <sub>3</sub> Star	with O₃ Cond dards**	centrations th	at Just Meet
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Atlanta		lag		(-0.4% -0.6%)	(-0.4% -0.6%)	(-0.4% -0.6%)	(-0.3% -0.5%)	(-0.3% -0.5%)	(-0.3% -0.5%)	(-0.3% -0.4%)	(-0.2% -0.3%)
Atlanta	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)
Boston	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Boston	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)
Chicago	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%
Cincago				(0.5% -2.5%)	(0.5% -2.4%)	(0.4% -2.3%)	(0.4% -2.1%)	(0.4% -2%)	(0.4% -1.9%)	(0.3% -1.8%)	(0.3% -1.5%)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
	Cities (2004)			(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.1% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Cleveland		lag		(-0.2% -0.7%)	(-0.1% -0.6%)	(-0.1% -0.6%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)
Cleveland	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)
Detroit	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%
		lag		(-0.1% -0.6%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.5%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)	(0% -0.3%)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)
	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.7%
				(-0.2% -2.4%)	(-0.2% -2.3%)	(-0.2% -2.3%)	(-0.2% -2.2%)	(-0.1% -2%)	(-0.1% -1.9%)	(-0.1% -1.8%)	(-0.1% -1.5%)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%
	Cities (2004)			(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.6%)
	Ito (2003)	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%

Location	Study	Log	Exposure	Percent of To	otal Incidence	of Non-Accid	lental Mortalit	y Associated	with O <sub>3</sub> Cond	centrations th	at Just Meet
Location	Study	Lay	Metric			the Curre	ent and Alterr	native O <sub>3</sub> Star	dards**		
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
				(-0.3% -0.9%)	(-0.3% -0.8%)	(-0.3% -0.8%)	(-0.2% -0.8%)	(-0.2% -0.7%)	(-0.2% -0.6%)	(-0.2% -0.6%)	(-0.1% -0.4%)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
		lag		(0% -0.5%)	(0% -0.4%)	(0% -0.4%)	(0% -0.4%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
Houston	Cities (2004)	lag		(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)
Houston	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
				(0.1% -1.5%)	(0.1% -1.4%)	(0.1% -1.4%)	(0.1% -1.2%)	(0.1% -1.2%)	(0.1% -1.1%)	(0.1% -1.1%)	(0% -0.9%)
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%
	Cities (2004)			(0.2% -1.1%)	(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.7%)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
Los Angeles		lag		(-0.3% -0.5%)	(-0.3% -0.5%)	(-0.2% -0.4%)	(-0.2% -0.3%)	(-0.2% -0.3%)	(-0.2% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)
LUS Angeles	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)
New York	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
New IOK	Cities (2004)	lag		(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Philadelphia	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)
i inadeipina	Moolga∨kar et al.	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%
	(1995)			(0.5% -1%)	(0.4% -0.9%)	(0.4% -0.9%)	(0.4% -0.8%)	(0.4% -0.8%)	(0.3% -0.7%)	(0.3% -0.7%)	(0.3% -0.6%)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Sacramento		lag		(-0.6% -1%)	(-0.6% -1%)	(-0.6% -0.9%)	(-0.5% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.7%)	(-0.4% -0.6%)
Gaeramento	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
St Louis		lag		(-0.2% -0.5%)	(-0.2% -0.4%)	(-0.2% -0.4%)	(-0.1% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)	(-0.1% -0.1%)
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)
Washington	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Percent of To	otal Incidence	of Non-Accid	lental Mortalit ent and Alterr	y Associated ative O <sub>3</sub> Stan	with O <sub>3</sub> Cond dards**	entrations th	at Just Meet
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppb and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 84/4 -- 84 ppb, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average.

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**								
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4	
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	7	7	6	6	6	6	5	4	
Atlanta				(-30 - 43)	(-30 - 43)	(-28 - 40)	(-26 - 38)	(-24 - 35)	(-24 - 35)	(-22 - 32)	(-19 - 27)	
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	14	14	13	12	11	11	10	9	
	US Cities (2004)			(5 - 23)	(5 - 23)	(4 - 21)	(4 - 20)	(4 - 19)	(4 - 19)	(3 - 17)	(3 - 14)	
Boston	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	9	8	8	8	7	7	7	6	
Desteri	US Cities (2004)			(3 - 15)	(3 - 14)	(3 - 14)	(3 - 13)	(3 - 12)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 12)	(2 - 10)	
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	55	52	50	47	44	43	40	34	
	US Cities (2004)			(18 - 91)	(18 - 87)	(17 - 84)	(16 - 79)	(15 - 74)	(14 - 71)	(13 - 67)	(11 - 57)	
Chicago	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	427	412	401	381	361	350	335	294	
omougo				(136 - 712)	(131 - 687)	(127 - 669)	(121 - 636)	(115 - 603)	(111 - 585)	(106 - 559)	(93 - 493)	
	Schwartz 14	0-day lag	1 hr max.	161	156	151	144	136	132	126	111	
	US Cities (2004)			(51 - 271)	(49 - 261)	(47 - 254)	(45 - 242)	(43 - 229)	(41 - 222)	(39 - 212)	(35 - 187)	
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	49	47	46	43	42	40	39	35	
Cleveland				(-31 - 128)	(-30 - 123)	(-29 - 120)	(-27 - 112)	(-26 - 109)	(-25 - 105)	(-25 - 102)	(-22 - 91)	
Cicroland	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	31	30	29	27	27	26	25	22	
	US Cities (2004)			(10 - 52)	(10 - 50)	(10 - 49)	(9 - 45)	(9 - 44)	(9 - 43)	(8 - 41)	(7 - 37)	
Detroit	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	46	43	43	42	38	35	34	29	
				(-15 - 106)	(-14 - 100)	(-14 - 98)	(-14 - 97)	(-12 - 87)	(-11 - 81)	(-11 - 79)	(-9 - 67)	
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	24	22	22	22	19	18	18	15	
	US Cities (2004)			(8 - 39)	(7 - 37)	(7 - 36)	(7 - 36)	(6 - 32)	(6 - 30)	(6 - 29)	(5 - 25)	
	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	158	150	148	147	134	128	125	111	
				(-26 - 336)	(-24 - 320)	(-24 - 316)	(-24 - 313)	(-22 - 287)	(-21 - 274)	(-20 - 268)	(-18 - 239)	
	Schwartz 14	0-day lag	1 hr max.	86	82	81	80	73	70	68	61	
	US Cities (2004)			(27 - 144)	(26 - 137)	(25 - 136)	(25 - 134)	(23 - 123)	(22 - 117)	(21 - 115)	(19 - 102)	
	Ito (2003)	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	56	53	52	51	46	43	42	36	

Table 5C-15. Estimated Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and
Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations*

Leastion	Ctudy	Lag	Exposure	Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and									
Location	Study	Lag	Metric			Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**							
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4		
		<u></u>		(-52 - 162)	(-49 - 151)	(-48 - 150)	(-48 - 147)	(-42 - 132)	(-40 - 124)	(-39 - 120)	(-33 - 103)		
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	18	16	16	13	13	12	11	7		
				(1 - 34)	(1 - 32)	(1 - 31)	(1 - 26)	(1 - 25)	(1 - 23)	(1 - 21)	(0 - 13)		
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	9	8	8	7	6	6	5	3		
Houston	US Cities (2004)			(3 - 15)	(3 - 13)	(3 - 13)	(2 - 11)	(2 - 10)	(2 - 10)	(2 - 9)	(1 - 5)		
HOUSION	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	63	59	58	53	51	48	46	36		
				(6 - 119)	(5 - 113)	(5 - 110)	(5 - 100)	(5 - 97)	(4 - 92)	(4 - 87)	(3 - 69)		
	Schwartz 14	0-day lag	1 hr max.	53	50	49	44	43	40	38	30		
	US Cities (2004)			(16 - 88)	(16 - 84)	(15 - 82)	(14 - 74)	(13 - 72)	(13 - 68)	(12 - 64)	(9 - 51)		
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	24	23	21	15	15	13	11	7		
Los Angolos				(-58 - 105)	(-55 - 100)	(-50 - 91)	(-36 - 66)	(-35 - 64)	(-32 - 59)	(-26 - 48)	(-16 - 29)		
LUS Allycies	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	52	49	45	33	32	29	24	14		
	US Cities (2004)			(17 - 86)	(17 - 82)	(15 - 74)	(11 - 54)	(11 - 53)	(10 - 48)	(8 - 39)	(5 - 23)		
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	84	76	78	73	70	64	65	57		
NEW IOR	US Cities (2004)			(28 - 139)	(25 - 126)	(26 - 130)	(24 - 121)	(23 - 116)	(21 - 106)	(22 - 108)	(19 - 95)		
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	30	28	28	26	26	24	24	21		
Philadelphia	US Cities (2004)			(10 - 50)	(10 - 47)	(9 - 47)	(9 - 43)	(9 - 42)	(8 - 40)	(8 - 40)	(7 - 35)		
Гшачырты	Moolgavkar et al.	1-day lag	24 hr avg.	107	101	101	93	91	86	85	75		
	(1995)			(67 - 146)	(63 - 138)	(63 - 137)	(58 - 127)	(57 - 124)	(54 - 117)	(53 - 116)	(47 - 103)		
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	12	12	11	11	10	10	10	9		
Sacramento				(-37 - 60)	(-36 - 58)	(-35 - 57)	(-32 - 53)	(-32 - 52)	(-31 - 50)	(-30 - 49)	(-27 - 44)		
Oderamente	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	18	17	17	16	15	15	14	13		
	US Cities (2004)			(6 - 30)	(6 - 29)	(6 - 28)	(5 - 26)	(5 - 26)	(5 - 25)	(5 - 24)	(4 - 22)		
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	3		
St Louis				(-9 - 20)	(-9 - 19)	(-8 - 18)	(-8 - 16)	(-7 - 15)	(-7 - 15)	(-6 - 14)	(-5 - 12)		
	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3		
	US Cities (2004)			(2 - 8)	(2 - 8)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 7)	(1 - 6)	(1 - 6)	(1 - 6)	(1 - 5)		
Washington	Bell et al 95	distributed lag	24 hr avg.	14	12	13	12	12	10	11	10		

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure Metric	Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**								
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4	
	US Cities (2004)			(5 - 23)	(4 - 20)	(4 - 21)	(4 - 19)	(4 - 19)	(3 - 17)	(4 - 18)	(3 - 16)	

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Incidences are rounded to the nearest whole number.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppb and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 84/4 -- 84 ppb, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average.

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure	Percent of Total Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the								
	<b>,</b>	5	Metric		Current and Alternative O <sub>3</sub> Standards**							
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4	
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	
Atlanta		lag		(-0.7% -0.9%)	(-0.6% -0.9%)	(-0.6% -0.9%)	(-0.6% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.8%)	(-0.5% -0.7%)	(-0.4% -0.6%)	
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	
Boston	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	
DOSION	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	
Chicago	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	2%	2%	1.9%	1.8%	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	
omougo		o day lag		(0.6% -3.4%)	(0.6% -3.3%)	(0.6% -3.2%)	(0.6% -3%)	(0.5% -2.9%)	(0.5% -2.8%)	(0.5% -2.7%)	(0.4% -2.3%)	
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	
	Cities (2004)	o day lag		(0.2% -1.3%)	(0.2% -1.2%)	(0.2% -1.2%)	(0.2% -1.1%)	(0.2% -1.1%)	(0.2% -1.1%)	(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	
Cleveland		lag		(-0.4% -1.7%)	(-0.4% -1.7%)	(-0.4% -1.6%)	(-0.4% -1.5%)	(-0.4% -1.5%)	(-0.3% -1.4%)	(-0.3% -1.4%)	(-0.3% -1.2%)	
Cicveland	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	
Detroit	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	
		lag		(-0.2% -1.1%)	(-0.1% -1.1%)	(-0.1% -1%)	(-0.1% -1%)	(-0.1% -0.9%)	(-0.1% -0.9%)	(-0.1% -0.8%)	(-0.1% -0.7%)	
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	
	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	
		o day lag		(-0.3% -3.6%)	(-0.3% -3.4%)	(-0.3% -3.4%)	(-0.3% -3.3%)	(-0.2% -3%)	(-0.2% -2.9%)	(-0.2% -2.8%)	(-0.2% -2.5%)	
	Schwartz 14 US	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	
	Cities (2004)			(0.3% -1.5%)	(0.3% -1.5%)	(0.3% -1.4%)	(0.3% -1.4%)	(0.2% -1.3%)	(0.2% -1.2%)	(0.2% -1.2%)	(0.2% -1.1%)	
	Ito (2003)	0-day lag	24 hr avg.	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	

Table 5C-16. Estimated Percent of Total Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the<br/>Current and Alternative 8-Hour Daily Maximum Standards: April - September, Based on 2002 O3 Concentrations\*

Location Study Lag Exposure Percent of Total Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentration										rations that J	ust Meet the				
20041011	orady	_~g	Metric		Current and Alternative O3 Standards**           0.084/4***         0.084/3         0.080/4****         0.074/5         0.074/4         0.074/3         0.070/4****										
				0.084/4***	0.084/3	0.080/4****	0.074/5	0.074/4	0.074/3	0.070/4****	0.064/4				
				(-0.6% -1.7%)	(-0.5% -1.6%)	(-0.5% -1.6%)	(-0.5% -1.6%)	(-0.5% -1.4%)	(-0.4% -1.3%)	(-0.4% -1.3%)	(-0.3% -1.1%)				
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				
		lag		(0% -0.4%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)				
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%				
Houston	Cities (2004)	lag		(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)				
nousion	Schwartz (2004)	0-day lag	1 hr max.	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%				
		0-uay lag		(0.1% -1.3%)	(0.1% -1.2%)	(0.1% -1.2%)	(0.1% -1.1%)	(0.1% -1.1%)	(0% -1%)	(0% -1%)	(0% -0.8%)				
	Schwartz 14 US	0 day lag	1 hr max.	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%				
	Cities (2004)	0-uay lag		(0.2% -1%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.9%)	(0.2% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)				
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0%	0%	0%				
		lag		(-0.2% -0.4%)	(-0.2% -0.4%)	(-0.2% -0.3%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)	(-0.1% -0.2%)	(-0.1% -0.1%)				
LOS Angeles	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%				
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.2%)	(0% -0.1%)	(0% -0.1%)				
Now York	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%				
New TOTK	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)				
	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%				
Philadelphia	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.5%)	(0.1% -0.4%)				
Filladelpilla	Moolgavkar et al.	1 day lag	24 hr avg.	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	0.9%				
	(1995)	I-uay lay		(0.8% -1.8%)	(0.8% -1.7%)	(0.8% -1.7%)	(0.7% -1.6%)	(0.7% -1.5%)	(0.7% -1.5%)	(0.7% -1.4%)	(0.6% -1.3%)				
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%				
Sacramonto		lag		(-0.9% -1.4%)	(-0.8% -1.4%)	(-0.8% -1.3%)	(-0.8% -1.3%)	(-0.8% -1.2%)	(-0.7% -1.2%)	(-0.7% -1.2%)	(-0.6% -1%)				
Sacramento	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%				
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.5%)				
	Bell et al. (2004)	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%				
St Louis		lag		(-0.5% -1%)	(-0.4% -0.9%)	(-0.4% -0.9%)	(-0.4% -0.8%)	(-0.4% -0.8%)	(-0.3% -0.7%)	(-0.3% -0.7%)	(-0.3% -0.6%)				
St Louis	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%				
	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.4%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0.1% -0.3%)	(0% -0.2%)				
Washington	Bell et al 95 US	distributed	24 hr avg.	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%				
Washington	Cities (2004)	lag		(0.2% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.2% -0.8%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)	(0.1% -0.7%)	(0.1% -0.6%)				

Location	Study	Lag	Exposure	osure Percent of Total Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality Associated with O <sub>3</sub> Concentrations that J									
	010.0.5	_~9	Metric			e O <sub>3</sub> Standar	tandards**						
				0.084/4***	0.084/4*** 0.084/3 0.080/4**** 0.074/5 0.074/4 0.074/3 0.070/4**** 0.064								

\*\*Incidence was quantified down to estimated policy relevant background levels. Percents are rounded to the nearest tenth.

\*\*\*An 8-hr average standard, denoted m/n is characterized by a concentration of m ppb and an nth daily maximum. So, for example, the current standard is 84/4 -- 84 ppb, 4th daily maximum 8-hr average.

Figure 5C-1. Percent of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exertion Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung Function Response (Decrement in FEV<sub>1</sub> ≥ 15 %) Associated with Exposure to O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations That Just Meet the Current and Alternative Average 4<sup>th</sup> Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards, for Location-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Seasons: Based on Adjusting 2002 O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations



Boston



Figure 5C-2a. Percent of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exertion Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung Function Response (Decrement in FEV1 ≥ 15 %) Associated with Exposure to Recent (2002) O<sub>3</sub> Levels and Levels That Just Meet Alternative Average 4th Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards, for Location-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Seasons: Based on Adjusting 2002 O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations

Atlanta

Figure 5C-2b. Percent of Active Children (Ages 5-18) Engaged in Moderate Exertion Estimated to Experience At Least One Lung Function Response (Decrement in FEV1 ≥ 15 %) Associated with Exposure to Recent (2002) O<sub>3</sub> Levels and Levels That Just Meet Alternative Average 4th Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards, for Location-Specific O<sub>3</sub> Seasons: Based on Adjusting 2002 O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations (cont'd)



July 2006

5C-39

Draft – Do Not Quote or Cite

Figure 5C-3. Estimated Symptom-Days for Chest Tightness Among Moderate/Severe Asthmatic Children (Ages 0 – 12) in Boston Associated with O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative Average 4<sup>th</sup> Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards (Based on Gent et al., 2003): April – September, 2002



Figure 5C-4. Estimated Incidence of (Unscheduled) Respiratory Hospital Admissions per 100,000 Relevant Population in New York Associated with Recent O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations and with O<sub>3</sub> Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative Average 4<sup>th</sup> Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards (Based on Thurston et al., 1992): April – September, 2002



Figure 5C-5. Estimated Incidence of Non-Accidental Mortality per 100,000 Relevant Population Associated with Recent O3 Concentrations and with O3 Concentrations that Just Meet the Current and Alternative Average 4<sup>th</sup> Daily Maximum 8-Hour Standards: April – September, 2002



Figure5C-6a. Annual Warm Season (April to September) Estimated Cases of Ozone-Related Non-Accidental Mortality per Hundred Thousand Relevant Population Associated with Recent Air Quality (2002) and with Just Meeting Alternative 8-hr Ozone Standards (Using Bell et al., 2004 – 95 U.S. Cities), Based on 2002 Ozone Concentrations



July 2006

Figure 5C-6b. Annual Warm Season (April to September) Estimated Cases of Ozone-Related Non-Accidental Mortality per Hundred Thousand Relevant Population Associated with Recent Air Quality (2002) and with Just Meeting Alternative 8-hr Ozone Standards (Using Bell et al., 2004 – 95 U.S. Cities), Based on 2002 Ozone Concentrations (cont'd)



### APPENDIX 7A: BIOLOGICALLY RELEVANT FORMS OF AIR QUALITY INDICES APPROPRIATE FOR CHARACTERIZING VEGETATION EXPOSURES AND ASSOCIATED LEVELS

### **APPENDIX 7A.**

This appendix provides a general overview of several biologically relevant forms considered appropriate for characterizing exposures relevant to vegetation and currently in use or considered for use in a management context.

# CUMULATIVE, CONCENTRATION WEIGHTED FORMS: SUM06, W126, AOT40

In an analysis done by Lee, et al., 1989, a group of cumulative, concentrationweighted forms performed equally well in predicting crop yield loss using data from the NCLAN studies. All three indices were evaluated in the 1996 Staff Paper. In some cases such  $O_3$  exposure indices have been shown to explain  $O_3$  effects as well or better than calculated internal  $O_3$  dose (Grulke, et al. 2002; Hanson et al., 1994). Additional research needs to be done to better evaluate the performance of these indices under a wide range of exposure scenarios.

In the interim between the 1996 proposal notice and the 1997 final rule, the results of a consensus-building workshop on the need for a long-term cumulative secondary  $O_3$  standard were published. At this workshop, expert scientists expressed their judgments on what standard form(s) and level(s) would provide vegetation with adequate protection from  $O_3$ -related adverse effects. After agreeing that some form of a cumulative standard would be most appropriate for a secondary standard, consensus was achieved that the SUM06 and W126 forms would give very similar protection against  $O_3$  effects on vegetation. It was agreed that SUM06 was an acceptable form of a secondary standard with the caveat that the acceptance of the SUM06 should not be interpreted as an acceptance of a threshold (Heck and Cowling, 1997).

Consensus was also reached with respect to selecting appropriate levels in terms of a 3-month, 12-hr SUM06 standard. Below are the 3-month, 12-hr SUM06 ranges participants agreed should be considered for a number of endpoints. For foliar injury to natural ecosystems – a SUM06 range of 8 to 12 ppm-hr; for growth effects to tree seedlings in natural forest stands – a range of 10 to 15 ppm-hr; for growth effects to tree seedlings and saplings in plantations – a range of 12 to 16 ppm-hr; and for yield reductions in agricultural crops – a range of 15 to 20 ppm-hr (Heck and Cowling, 1997). Staff note that the AOT40 is another cumulative, concentration weighted form that is currently in use in Europe. This form cumulates the area over the 40 ppb threshold by subtracting 40 ppb from the value of the measured O<sub>3</sub> level. See the Critical Level discussion below for levels of the AOT40 identified with protection for various vegetation effects endpoints.

#### **FLUX-BASED INDICES**

As discussed in Chapter 7 above, a measure or prediction of plant  $O_3$  uptake is intuitively a better predictor of plant response to  $O_3$  exposure in the field than a measure of ambient exposure because it accounts for the plant's integration of environmental factors that influence stomatal conductance. In practice, however, there are a number of complicating factors that are not easily accounted for in predictive uptake models. These include:

(1) The potential disconnect between the timing of two diunal patterns: 1) of maximum stomatal conductance and 2) the timing of peak exposure events. In the absence of synchronicity between these patterns, maximal stomatal conductance of  $O_3$  will not occur and the predicted  $O_3$  effect for that species/individual on the basis of flux will be an overestimation. This concern is especially apparent when assessing the impact of  $O_3$  across all the varied climatic regions and species occurring within the United States.

(2) Not all  $O_3$  stomatal uptake results in a reduction in yield. This nonlinear relationship between  $O_3$  uptake and plant injury (not growth alteration) response depends to some degree on the amount of internal detoxification occurring with each particular species; species having high amounts of detoxification potential may show less of a relationship between  $O_3$  stomatal uptake and plant response. Because detoxification potential is genetically determined, it cannot be generalized across species. Scientific understanding of the detoxification mechanisms is not yet complete, so that much more needs to be learned about the detoxification processes available to plants and to what extent they modify the potentially phytotoxic dose in the leaf interior before this factor can be meaningfully considered in a biologically-relevant index.

(3) The varying significance of nocturnal stomatal conductance. Musselman and Minnick (2000) performed an extensive review of the literature and reported that a large number of species had varying degrees of nocturnal stomatal conductance (Musselman and Minnick, 2000). Although stomatal conductance was lower at night than during the day for most plants, nocturnal conductance could result in some measurable  $O_3$  flux into the plants. In addition, it was suggested that plants might be more susceptible to  $O_3$  exposure at night than during the daytime, because of possibly lower plant defenses at night (Musselman and Minnick, 2000). Nocturnal  $O_3$  flux also depends on the level of

turbulence that intermittently occurs at night. Thus, it would appear that the importance of nocturnal conductance and its contribution to total diurnal flux is species and site specific. For additional information on nocturnal conductance see Chapter 9 and AX9 of CD (EPA, 2006).

As is evident from the above discussion, multiple meteorological, species- and site-specific factors influence  $O_3$  uptake. In order to integrate those factors that drive the patterns of stomatal conductance and exposure, the use of  $O_3$  flux models is required. Though significant new research into flux model development has occurred since the last review, at this point in time these models remain species and site specific which limits their usefulness in national or regional scale risk assessments. However, in some countries, efforts are under way to incorporate flux into the policy context (see Critical Level discussion below).

#### The Critical Level Approach

Both the concentration-based and flux-based exposure index forms can be used to establish a "critical level" for plant exposure to  $O_3$ . One definition of a critical level is "the concentration of pollutant in the atmosphere above which direct adverse effects on receptors, such as plants, ecosystems, or materials may occur according to present knowledge" (UNECE, 1988). As used by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe International Cooperative Programme (UNECE ICP), the critical levels are not air quality regulatory standards in the U.S. sense, but rather planning targets for reductions in pollutant emissions to protect ecological resources. Critical levels for  $O_3$  are intended to prevent long-term deleterious effects on the most sensitive plant species under the most sensitive environmental conditions, but not to quantify  $O_3$  effects. The nature of the "adverse effects" was not specified in the original definition, which provided for different levels for different types of harmful effect (e.g., visible injury or loss of crop yield). There are also different levels for crops, forests, and seminatural vegetation. The caveat, "according to present knowledge," is important because critical levels are not rigid; they are revised periodically as new scientific information becomes available. To date, critical levels (Level I) have been set for agricultural crops, for foliar injury symptoms in the field and for forest trees in terms of the AOT40 index (see section 7.2.5 and EPA, 2005b). Specifically, critical levels of a 3 month, 3 ppm-hr and a 6 month, 10 ppm-hr AOT40 have been established for crops and tree seedlings, respectively. An additional provisional level of 7 ppm-hr over 6 months for herbaceous perennials has been recommended. Level I critical levels are currently used to map and identify areas in

Europe in which the levels are exceeded, and that information is then used to plan optimized and effects-based abatement strategies.

In the 1990s, however, many exposure studies demonstrated that the simple, exposure-based approach led to the overestimation of effects in some regions and underestimation in others (Fuhrer et al., 1997; Kärenlampi and Skärby, 1996) because it did not differentiate between plant species, and it did not include modifying site and micrometeorological factors of O<sub>3</sub> uptake such vapor pressure deficit (VPD), water stress, temperature, and light and variation in canopy height. At that time, a decision was made by the UNECE ICP to work towards a flux-based approach for the critical levels ("Level II"), with the goal of modeling O<sub>3</sub> flux-effect relationships for three vegetation types: crops, forests, and seminatural vegetation (Grünhage and Jäger, 2003). Progress has been made in modeling flux (Ashmore et al., 2004a,b) and the Mapping Manual is being revised (Ashmore et al., 2004a,b; Grennfelt, 2004; Karlsson et al., 2003). The revisions may include a flux-based approach for three crops: wheat, potatoes, and cotton. However, because of a lack of flux-response data, a cumulative, cutoff concentration-based (e.g., AOT40) exposure index will remain in use for the near future for most crops and for forests and seminatural herbaceous vegetation (Ashmore et al., 2004a).

### Summary

Flux-based models are currently limited by the species-specific information required and by the observed nonlinearity between total flux and plant response. Better understanding of the detoxification and compensation processes would be required to account for this nonlinearity in future models. Other relevant information that should be evaluated include the extent to which: (1) nighttime exposures represent a significant percentage of total diurnal exposures, and whether their impact on growth or foliar injury effects are proportional; (2) the degree to which elevation and nocturnal turbulence alter actual nocturnal uptake; and (3) differences in plant defense mechanisms and other processes at night.

Until such research can be done, the current CD (EPA, 2006) concludes that, at this time, based on the current state of knowledge, exposure indices that differentially weight the higher hourly average  $O_3$  concentrations but include the mid-level values still represent the best approach for relating vegetation effects to  $O_3$  exposure in the U.S.. This is due in part to the existence of a large database that has been used for establishing

exposure-response relationships. Such a database does not yet exist for relating  $O_3$  flux to growth response.

Staff anticipate that, as the overlapping mathematical relationships of conductance, concentration, and defense mechanisms are better defined,  $O_3$ -flux-based models may be able to predict vegetation injury and/or damage at least for some categories of canopy-types with more accuracy than the currently available exposure-response models. The results of these studies and reviews indicate the need to continue to develop indices that are more physiologically and meteorologically connected to the actual dose of  $O_3$  the plant receives. The flux approach should provide an opportunity to improve upon the concentration-based exposure index in the future, recognizing that a concerted research effort is needed to develop the necessary experimental data and modeling tools that will provide the scientific basis for such critical levels for  $O_3$  (Dämmgen et al., 1994; Fuhrer et al., 1997; Grünhage et al., 2004).

### APPENDIX 7B: CMAQ EXPOSURE MODEL

### **APPENDIX 7B.**

Staff investigated the appropriateness of using the spatial scaling from the EPA/NOAA Community Multi-scale Air Quality (CMAQ) model system (http://www.epa.gov/asmdnerl/CMAQ, Byun and Ching, 1999; Arnold et al. 2003, Eder and Yu, 2005) O<sub>3</sub> outputs to improve spatial interpolations based on a regionally limited and unevenly distributed  $O_3$  monitoring network in the western U.S. (see section 7.5.3). The CMAQ model is a multi-pollutant, multiscale air quality model that contains stateof-science techniques for simulating all atmospheric and land processes that affect the transport, transformation, and deposition of atmospheric pollutants and/or their precursors on both regional and urban scales. It is designed as a science-based modeling tool for handling many major pollutants (including photochemical oxidants/O<sub>3</sub>, particulate matter, and nutrient deposition) holistically. The CMAQ model can generate estimates of hourly  $O_3$  concentrations for the contiguous U.S., making it possible to express model outputs in terms of a variety of exposure indices (e.g., SUM06, 8-hr average). Due to the significant resources required to run CMAQ, however, model outputs are only available for a limited number of years. For this review, 2001 outputs from CMAQ version 4.5 were the most recent data available. This version of CMAQ utilizes the more refined 12 km x 12 km grid for the eastern U.S., while using the 36 km x 36 km grid for the western U.S. The 12 km x 12 km domain covers an area from roughly central Texas, north to North Dakota, east to Maine, and south to central Florida.

The CMAQ modeling system has undergone two external peer reviews through the Community Modeling and Analysis System (CMAS) based at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (<u>UNC</u>) Carolina Environmental Program (Amar et al. 2005, 2004). In addition, EPA/NOAA recently conducted an initial evaluation of the eastern U.S. domain of CMAQ version 4.5 (Appel et al., 2005; http://www.cmascenter.org/docs/CMAQ/v4.5/CMAQv4.5\_EvaluationDocument-Final2005.pdf). Based on this evaluation, hourly O<sub>3</sub> patterns are predicted well during the daytime. The prediction of daily maximum 8-hr average O<sub>3</sub> was relatively good, showing a slight positive normalized mean bias of 1.62% and a normalized mean error of 17.4%. Overall, CMAQ predictions of daily maximum 8-hr O<sub>3</sub> averages were improved in the 12 km x 12 km grid size when compared to the 36 km x 36 km grid size. However, the CMAQ consistently over-predicted hourly O<sub>3</sub> at night. Since many of the assessments outlined below rely daytime O<sub>3</sub> accumulated in the 12-hr SUM06 (8 am-8 pm), the night-time over-prediction is less of an issue. The results of the CMAQ version 4.5 evaluation should be used with caution for several reasons. First, this evaluation ignores the mismatch of spatial resolution and treats CMAQ output as a point-value, a concern raised by Fuentes and Rafterty 2005. The problem is well known, but is often ignored since there are not standard operational methods that can be applied to the CMAQ model output to deal with this problem. Secondly, the size of the grid being used is unable to capture the rapidly changing  $O_3$  gradients that often occur in complex terrain, across urban/rural gradients and along coastal areas. In these cases significant differences in  $O_3$  concentration could occur with a 12x12km cell and the uncertainties associated with these areas are unknown. Many such features occur in rural areas of importance in this assessment and it is recognized that any estimates of  $O_3$  exposure in complex terrain are very uncertain. Unfortunately, complex terrain is of greater significance in the west, where the CMAQ grid is even larger and the monitoring network is for the most part, sparse. These limitations proved to be determinant in selecting an interpolation technique for the west.

The CMAQ model incorporates output fields from emissions and meteorological modeling systems and several other data sources through special interface processors into the CMAQ Chemical Transport Model (CCTM). Currently, the Sparse Matrix Operator Kernel Emissions (SMOKE) System produces the emissions factors and the Fifth Generation Penn State University/ National Center for Atmospheric Research Mesoscale Model (MM5) provides the meteorological fields. CCTM then performs chemical transport modeling for multiple pollutants on multiple scales. Emission inventories of SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, NOx, and VOCs are based on EPA's 2001 National Emission Inventory (NEI) and are consistent with inventories used for the analysis of the Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) rule (EPA, 2005b). Biogenic emissions, from natural sources, were processed using the Biogenic Emissions Inventory System (BEIS) version 3.13. The staff recognizes that O<sub>3</sub> exposures vary between years depending on meteorology and other factors.

Recently EPA/NOAA conducted an initial evaluation of the eastern U.S. domain of CMAQ version 4.5 (Appel et al., 2005;

http://www.cmascenter.org/docs/CMAQ/v4.5/CMAQv4.5\_EvaluationDocument-Final2005.pdf). This evaluation used the same metrics published by Eder and Yu (2005) for the CMAQ version 4.4 model release. For the modeled summer months of June, July and August of 2001, CMAQ version 4.5 predictions were compared to AQS monitor sites. The prediction of daily maximum 8-hr average O<sub>3</sub> was relatively good, showing a slight positive normalized mean bias of 1.62% and a normalized mean error of 17.4%. Hourly ozone patterns are predicted well during the daytime. However, the CMAQ consistently over-predicted hourly  $O_3$  at night. Nighttime over-predictions in  $O_3$  have been improved over CMAQ version 4.4 by modifications to the minimum  $K_z$ approximation in CMAQ version 4.5, but additional investigations are needed. Again, since many of the assessments outlined below rely daytime O<sub>3</sub> accumulated in the 12-hr SUM06 (8 am to 8 pm), the night-time over-prediction is less of an issue. Overall, CMAQ predictions of daily 8hr O<sub>3</sub> averages were improved in the 12km x 12km grid size when compared to the 36km x 36km grid size. Since CMAQ output is averaged over large square blocks and monitor observations are effectively averages over much smaller regions, CMAQ output and monitor observations have a mismatch in spatial resolution. (Fuentes and Rafterty 2005). The problem is well known, but is often ignored since there are not standard operational methods that can be applied to the CMAQ model output to deal with this problem. The CMAQ version 4.5 evaluation described above ignores the mismatch of spatial resolution and treats CMAQ output as a point-value. The staff believes this simplification is reasonable in flat rural areas where many important crops and vegetation grow, because  $O_3$  is a secondary pollutant and its concentration generally varies fairly smoothly across those areas. However,  $O_3$  is notably more variable in complex terrain, across urban/rural gradients and along coastal areas. In these cases significant differences in  $O_3$  concentration could occur with a 12x12km cell and the uncertainties associated with these areas are unknown. The current assessment is most concerned with rural areas and it is recognized that any estimates of O<sub>3</sub> exposure in complex terrain are very uncertain. Unfortunately, complex terrain is of greater significance in the west, where the CMAQ grid is larger and the monitoring network is for the most part, sparse. These limitations proved to be determinant in selecting an interpolation technique for the west.

### APPENDIX 7C. INTERPOLATED 3MONTH, 12-HR W126 EXPOSURES
#### Figure 7C-1. Estimated 12-Hr W126 Ozone Exposure – Max 3-months for 2001 "As Is" scenario



### APPENDIX 7D. NCLAN RE-ANALYSIS USING THE 8-HR AVERAGE METRIC

**Figure 7D-1.** Median crop yield loss from NCLAN crops characterized the annual 4<sup>th</sup> highest maximum 8-hr average (the current standard form).



4th highest maximum daily 8-h average (ppm)

Distribution of biomass loss predictions from Weibull exposure-response models that relate yield to  $O_3$  exposure characterized with the 4<sup>th</sup> highest max. 8-hr average statistic using data from 31 crop studies from National Crop Loss Assessment Network (NCLAN). Separate regressions were calculated for studies with multiple harvests or cultivars, resulting in a total of 54 individual equations from the 31 NCLAN studies. Each equation was used to calculate the predicted relative yield or biomass loss at 0.02, 0.04, 0.06, 0.10 and 0.12 ppm, and the distributions of the resulting loss were plotted. The solid line represents the Weibull fit at the 50th percentile.

# APPENDIX 7E. C-R FUNCTIONS USED IN CROP AND TREE SEEDLING ANALYSES

Ozone Index	Quantity	Crop Function	
W126	Max	Cotton	1-exp(-(index/74.6)^1.068)
W126	Min	Cotton	1-exp(-(index/113.3)^1.397)
W126	Median	Cotton	1-exp(-(index/96.1)^1.482)
W126	Max	Field Corn	1-exp(-(index/92.7)^2.585)
W126	Min	Field Corn	1-exp(-(index/94.2)^4.167)
W126	Median	Field Corn	1-exp(-(index/97.9)^2.966)
W126	Median	Grain Sorghum*	1-exp(-(index/205.9)^1.963)
W126	Median	Peanut*	1-exp(-(index/96.8)^1.890)
W126	Max	Soybean	1-exp(-(index/130.1)^1)
W126	Min	Soybean	1-exp(-(index/476.7)^1.113)
W126	Median	Soybean	1-exp(-(index/110.2)^1.359)
W126	Max	Winter Wheat	1-exp(-(index/24.7)^1.0)
W126	Min	Winter Wheat	1-exp(-(index/76.8)^2.031)
W126	Median	Winter Wheat	1-exp(-(index/53.4)^2.367)
W126	Median	Lettuce*	1-exp(-(index/54.6)^4.917)
W126	Median	Kidney Bean*	1-exp(-(index/43.1)^2.219)
W126	Min	Potato	1-exp(-(index/113.8)^1.299)
W126	Max	Potato	1-exp(-(index/96.3)^1)
W126	Median	Potato	1-exp(-(index/99.5)^1.242)

 Table 7E-1. Ozone Exposure-Response Functions for Selected NCLAN Crops

Source: Lee and Hogsett (1996) table 10. \*Peanuts, Grain Soghum, Lettuce and Kidney Bean only have one C-R function and therefore do not have a max and min.

Ozone Index	Quantity	Fruit/Vegetable	Function	
12-hr	Median	Onion*	1-(5034-(10941*12hr))/(5034-	
			(10941*base12))	
7-hr	Median	Rice*	1-(exp(-((7hr/0.2016)^2.474)))/	
			(exp(-((base7/0.2016)^2.474)))	
12-hr	Median	Valencia Oranges*	1-(53.7-(261.1*12hr))/(53.7-	
			(261.1*base12))	
7-hr	Median	Cantaloupes*	1-(35.8-(280.8*7hr))/(35.8-	
			(280.8*base7))	
12-hr	Min	Grapes	1-(1.121-(6.63*12hr))/(1.121-	
			(6.63*base12))	
12-hr	Max	Grapes	1-(9315-(64700*12hr))/(9315-	
			(64700*base12))	
12-hr	Median	Grapes	1-(357.254-(2300*12hr))/(357.254-	
			(2300*base12))	
12-hr	Max	Tomatoes-	1-(8590-(41277*12hr))/(8590-	
		Processing	(41277*base12))	
12-hr	Min	Tomatoes-	1-(6315-(21070*12hr))/(6315-	
		Processing	(21070*base12))	
12-hr	Median	Tomatoes-	1-(9055-(32367*12hr))/(9055-	
		Processing	(32367*base12))	

Table 7E-2. Ozone Exposure-Response Functions for Selected Fruits and Vegetable Crops

Source: Abt (1995) Exhibit 11. \*Onions, Rice, Oranges, and Cantaloupes only have one C-R function and therefore do not have a max and min. base7 = 0.027 and base12 = 0.025 which are equal to the concentrations in the charcoal-filtered treatments.

Table 7E-3. Median Composite Ozone Exposure-Response Functions\* for Tree Seedlings

Ozone Index	Quantity	Сгор	Function
W126	Median	Ponderosa Pine	1-exp(-(index/159.63)^1.190)
W126	Median	Red Alder	1-exp(-(index/179.06)^1.2377)
W126	Median	Black Cherry	1-exp(-(index/38.92)^0.9921)
W126	Median	Tulip Poplar	1-exp(-(index/51.38)^20889)
W126	Median	Sugar Maple	1-exp(-(index/36.35)^5.7785)
W126	Median	E. White Pine	1-exp(-(index/63.23)^1.6582)
W126	Median	Red Maple	1-exp(-(index/318.12)^1.3756)
W126	Median	Douglas Fir	1-exp(-(index/106.83)^5.9631)
W126	Median	Aspen	1-exp(-(index/109.81)^1.2198)
W126	Median	Virginia Pine	1-exp(-(index/1714.64)^1)

Source: Lee and Hogsett (1996) table 14. \*Individual exposure-response curves are reported using the 12-hr-SUM06 index adjusted to a 92-day exposure duration.

	Air Quality Scenarios				
Crops	As Is (2001)	8-hr, 84 ppb	SUM06 25	8-hr, 70 ppb	SUM06 15
Kidney Bean	3.8%	1.8%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%
Grapes	23.5%	20.5%	16.6%	16.7%	15.0%
Lettuce	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Potato	12.6%	8.6%	3.2%	3.3%	2.0%
Rice	18.1	15.7%	11.2%	11.4%	9.8%
Grain Sorghum	1.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Cantaloupe	23.5%	19.1%	14.9%	14.8%	12.8%
Corn	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Cotton	7.7%	4.8%	1.3%	1.3%	0.7%
Onion	8.1%	7.0%	5.7%	5.8%	5.2%
Peanut	5.4%	3.1%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%
Soybean	3.4%	1.7%	1.7%	0.8%	0.8%
Valencia	17.0%	15.1%	12.0%	12.1%	10.8%
Orange					
Tomato	13.8%	11.9%	9.8%	9.8%	8.8%
Processing					
Winter Wheat	1.4%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%

 Table 7E-4. Median Percent Relative Yield Loss\* for Crops

\* Modified from Figures for Yield Loss (5-5) and Yield Gain (5.6 to 5-9) in the draft Environmental Assessment TSD (Abt, 2006)

	Air Quality Scenarios				
Tree Species	As Is (2001)	8-hr, 84 ppb	SUM06 25	8-hr, 70 ppb	SUM06 15
Aspen	12.0%	5.6%	6.3%	2.3%	3.3%
Black Cherry	40.9%	24.1%	25.5%	12.3%	15.9%
Douglas Fir	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Ponderosa Pine	19.9%	10.6%	3.1%	4.2%	2.2%
Red Alder	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Red Maple	2.3%	1.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%
Sugar Maple	3.0%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Tulip Poplar	13.5%	3.6%	5.1%	0.8%	1.4%
Virginia Pine	1.2%	0.6%	0.7%	0.3%	0.4%
Eastern White	13.6%	5.8%	5.6%	1.9%	2.4%
Pine					

 Table 7E-5. Median Percent Relative Biomass Loss\* for Tree Seedlings

\* Modified from Figures for Tree Seedling Biomass Loss (5-10) and Biomass Gain (5-11 to 5-14) in the draft Environmental Assessment TSD (Abt, 2006)

## APPENDIX 7F. PREDICTED YIELD LOSS FOR SELECTED MAJOR COMMODITY CROPS BASED ON PLANTING AREAS AND PREDICTIONS OF 2001 O<sub>3</sub> EXPOSURE USING THE 12-HR W126 INDEX.







Figure 7F-2. Estimated cotton yield loss based on interpolated 2001 3-month 12-hr W126





## APPENDIX 7G. TREE SEEDLING BIOMASS LOSS AND GAIN MAPS UNDER VARYING AIR QUALITY SCENARIOS





\* This map indicates the geographic range for black cherry, but it does not necessarily indicate that black cherry will be found at every point within its range.

**Figure 7G-2.** Estimated black cherry seedling\* annual biomass **gain** for air quality rolled-back to the 4<sup>th</sup> highest maximum 8-hr average of 0.08 ppm. Values expressed in terms of W126 form.



\*. This map indicates the geographic range for black cherry, but it does not necessarily indicate that black cherry will be found at every point within its range.

**Figure 7G-3.** Estimated black cherry seedling\* annual biomass **gain** for 2001interpolated air quality rolled-back to the 4<sup>th</sup> highest maximum 8-hr average of 0.070 ppm. Values expressed in terms of the 12-hr W126



\*. This map indicates the geographic range for black cherry, but it does not necessarily indicate that black cherry will be found at every point within its range.





\*. This map indicates the geographic range for black cherry, but it does not necessarily indicate that black cherry will be found at every point within its range.



**Figure 7G-5.** Estimated black cherry\* seedling annual biomass **gain** for air quality rolled-back to a 12-hr SUM06 of 15 ppm-hr. Values expressed in terms of the 12-hr W126.

\* This map indicates the geographic range for black cherry, but it does not necessarily indicate that black cherry will be found at every point within its range.

**Figure 7G-6.** Estimated ponderosa pine\* seedling annual biomass **loss** based on interpolated 2001 air quality. Values expressed in terms of 12-hr W126.



\*This map indicates the geographic range for ponderosa pine, but it does not necessarily indicate that ponderosa pine will be found at every point within its range.

#### APPENDIX 7H. COUNTY-LEVEL INCIDENCE OF FOLIAR INJURY

**Figure 7H-1.** 2002 County-level incidence of visible foliar injury in the eastern and western U.S. as measured by the US Forest Service FIA program

