

No Escape *from* **Diesel Exhaust**



How to Reduce Commuter Exposure

CLEAN AIR TASK FORCE

February 2007

To view this report online, see real time videos of CATF's diesel monitoring, and read the accompanying white paper go to: www.catf.us/goto/noescape

CLEAN AIR TASK FORCE

18 Tremont Street, Boston, MA 02108
Tel: 617-624-0234 / Fax: 617-624-0230

Credits

Written by: **Conrad G. Schneider**, *Advocacy Director*
and **L. Bruce Hill, Ph.D.**, *Senior Scientist*

Principal Investigator: **L. Bruce Hill, Ph.D.**, *Senior Scientist*

Research Assistant: **James Gooch**

Edited by: **Maria Padian**

Designed by: **Jill Bock Design**

Printed by: **Spectrum Printing and Graphics, Inc.**

© 2007 Clean Air Task Force

Acknowledgements

The Beldon Fund, George Gund Foundation, Heinz Endowments, John Merck Fund, Kendeda Fund, Marisla Foundation, New York Community Trust, Oak Foundation, Prospect Hill Foundation, and Turner Foundation have provided support that made this report possible. Tom Balon and Todd Danos of M.J. Bradley Associates provided technical support. John D. Spengler and Jonathan I. Levy, Harvard School of Public Health and George Allen of the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management provided invaluable advice regarding monitoring techniques. Staff from Texas Public Citizen, Ohio Environmental Council, and volunteers Andrew Hill and Windy Kelly provided field support in Austin, Texas, Columbus, Ohio, Boston, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, respectively. We thank Kenneth and Wilma Johnsen for their assistance in Columbus. We thank staff from the American Lung Association of New York State for their assistance in New York City.

February 2007

- *This report has been printed on recycled (50% recycled/25% post consumer waste), Processed Chlorine Free (PCF) with soy inks.*



FSC

Mixed Sources
Product group from well-managed
forests, controlled sources and
recycled wood or fiber

Cert no. SW-COC-2128
www.fsc.org
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

Foreword

Exposure to diesel exhaust is part of our everyday lives. We encounter diesel-powered vehicles, and the air pollution they create, each day. This occurs in our neighborhoods where diesel-powered vehicles make deliveries or pick up trash, or when we drive behind them during our daily rounds to the store or travel on a highway. Most often, Americans are exposed to diesel pollution on their way to and from work or school, whether commuting via a car, riding on diesel buses and trains, or on foot or bike near a busy thoroughfare.

In thousands of medical studies, scientists have documented serious adverse health impacts from the air pollutants resulting from diesel exhaust. Our own studies at New York University have linked diesel pollution exposures to higher incidences of asthma in New York City communities. One of the most dangerous of these diesel emissions is carbonaceous particulate matter, or fine particle soot. Diesel particles are very tiny in comparison to many other atmospheric particles. They are so small, in fact, that they can even penetrate from the lungs into the bloodstream, carrying with them other toxic substances. Some health researchers have estimated that such fine particles are responsible for shortening the lives of at least 70,000 Americans each year, and studies have also associated this pollution with a host of other serious adverse health impacts, such as asthma attacks. Scientists now even have evidence that these very tiny particles may disrupt normal heart rhythms and cause inflammation leading to cardiovascular problems, such as heart attacks and stroke.

Given the potentially severe health dangers posed by diesel exhaust, it is important to ask: When are we most exposed to these deadly particles? Findings in published, peer-reviewed health research estimate that, although we spend only about six percent of our day commuting to and from work, over half of our exposure to these particles may occur during that travel time.

The Clean Air Task Force (CATF), using the same type of monitoring instruments and scientific methodologies presently used by health researchers at major universities, has investigated the levels of diesel particles during commutes in several cities. These investigators measured pollutant levels during commutes by car, transit bus, commuter train, ferry, and while walking. They found that regardless of how you get to work, there is no escape from exposure to diesel exhaust, and that pollution levels measured inside cars, buses, and trains during commutes were many times greater than levels in the outdoor air in these cities at that same time. The combined weight of scientific evidence from this new CATF diesel exposure study along with the existing medical studies supports the conclusion that exposure to diesel exhaust during commutes poses a serious public health risk that needs to be addressed.

Solving the problem will require political will. But as the CATF investigation also helps illustrate, the good news is that cleaner fuels and emissions control technologies that can reduce the emissions of this pollution by up to 90 percent are here today. We need to make retrofitting the diesel engines on the road today with these highly effective emissions controls a public health priority, so that we can all breathe easier.



George D. Thurston, Sc.D.

New York University School of Medicine

Executive Summary

Every day, Americans are needlessly sickened from exposure to air pollution in the form of fine particles. Overall, health researchers estimate that fine particles, such as those found in diesel exhaust, shorten the lives of 70,000 Americans each year. Many more suffer the effects of particle-related respiratory and cardiovascular disease.

When during our day are we exposed to these particles? According to the California Air Resources Board, although we spend only about six percent of our day commuting to and from work, it is during that time when we receive over half of our exposure to ultrafine particles.

For the most part, the particles we breathe come from the diesel engines we encounter while driving or taking diesel-powered mass transit. According to the Transportation Research Board, one hundred and fifty million people—roughly half the population—travel to and from work in the U.S. daily. Most commuters drive, but many others take diesel-powered trains or city buses and ferries. Today's average commute lasts 25 minutes each way, and current trends indicate that our commutes, and therefore our exposures, are lengthening.


Legions of published, peer-reviewed studies have documented the increased exposure and resultant health risk from particles in and around nearby roadways. Using comparable instruments and research techniques as those employed by health researchers

at major universities, Clean Air Task Force (CATF) investigated the exposure to diesel particles during typical commutes in four cities: Austin, Texas, Boston, Massachusetts, New York City, and Columbus, Ohio. In addition, CATF tested the air quality benefits due to emission control retrofits of transit buses in Boston and transit buses and garbage trucks in New York City.


CATF's investigation demonstrated that whether you commute by car, bus, ferry, train, or on foot, you may be exposed to high levels of diesel particles. Specifically, CATF documented diesel particle levels four to eight times higher inside commuter cars, buses, and trains than in the ambient outdoor air in those cities. In some cases, the ultrafine particle levels during the commutes were so high as to be comparable to driving with a smoker!

Several cities like Seattle, Boston and New York have purchased new cleaner transit buses and retrofitted many of their older buses and garbage trucks with effective emission controls. These emission controls are widely available today because U.S. EPA rules require them for new diesel engines starting this year. The only commutes where the researchers found little or no diesel exposure were commutes on electric-powered subways and commuter trains, on buses that have been retrofitted with diesel particulate filters or run on alternative fuels like compressed natural gas, and in cars traveling along routes with little or no truck traffic.

Although we may spend only 6% of our day commuting, that is when we get up to 60% of our daily exposure to harmful ultrafine particles



Percent of Day Commuting



Percent of Daily Exposure to Harmful Particles


(SOURCE: CARB)

It's the Diesels

In Austin, Texas, CATF compared the particle levels in a car during a commute on Interstate 35 between Roundrock and Austin to the levels experienced in the same car traveling on the MOPAC (an expressway that follows the Missouri-Pacific railroad line). MOPAC provided a “no-truck” alternative for comparison because MOPAC prohibits truck traffic. CATF also compared the levels on I-35 to levels monitored in

downtown Austin. Ultrafine particle levels on I-35 were consistently higher than on the MOPAC and black carbon levels were six times greater than at the downtown site.

CATF also documented similarly high levels of diesel pollution during car commutes in Boston, Massachusetts and Columbus, Ohio. See Findings on pages 10-11.



In-cabin particle exposures are much higher for commuters along routes with diesel trucks. The MOPAC highway (right) a no-truck alternative to I-35 (left) in Austin, Texas, had lower diesel pollution levels.

A Solution Within Our Reach

The good news is that affordable technology exists today that can reduce diesel particle emissions by up to 90 percent. CATF tested pollution levels in a commuter car following directly behind a conventional diesel truck and recorded high levels of diesel particles inside the car.

However, after being retrofitted with a diesel particulate filter (DPF), the next day the same truck emits such low amounts of diesel particles that the levels in the car following directly behind are barely detectable.



Fine particle levels behind a conventional box truck (left), and behind the same truck after being retrofitted with a diesel particle filter (right). To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

■ Transit Buses

CATF's researchers investigated in-cabin levels of diesel pollution on city buses in Boston. We found the levels inside the conventional buses on average were about four times greater than the outdoor air. We then compared those levels to the levels monitored

during commutes on similar buses in Boston that had been retrofitted with diesel particle filters. The monitoring demonstrated the filters substantially reduced the pollution in the buses.



CATF researchers measured high ultrafine particle levels on a conventional transit bus in Boston (left), while levels on a bus retrofitted with a particle filter were barely detectable (right).



Conventional and retrofit MBTA buses in Boston show the benefits of diesel particle filters to people in cars following behind. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

How to Reduce Exposure to Diesel Exhaust While Commuting

The best solution is to clean up the existing diesels with diesel particle filters so that we can all breathe easier. Until then, commuters can help protect themselves by taking clean transit such as electrified subways and light rail. If you must

drive to work, choose commuter routes that are less heavily traveled by trucks. When in traffic, close your windows and set your ventilation system to recirculate the cabin air.

■ Commuter Trains

CATF researchers observed that when a diesel locomotive pulls its passenger cars, the plume of diesel exhaust from the engine blows down onto the cars following the locomotive and invades the coaches. Pollution levels in these pulled coaches increased during the course of the commutes.

When a train is pushed, however, the diesel exhaust plume trails behind the locomotive and does not invade the coaches. The difference measured between the levels in a pulled versus a pushed train demonstrates the amount of in-coach pollution attributable to the diesel locomotive's engine. Measured ultrafine particle levels in the coaches of a pulled train were four times higher than the pushed train and as much as 17 times greater than the outdoor air. Regardless of whether the coaches were pulled or pushed, pollutant levels in the coaches skyrocketed when the trains arrived at an under-



ground station. CATF documented diesel exhaust penetrating into the cabins of commuter trains through the open doors at the platform when the diesel locomotives entered underground rail stations in Boston.



When pulled by a locomotive (left), pollution from the engine invades the coaches behind. When the train is pushed, the pollution plume trails behind leaving in-coach levels low (right).

The plume of diesel exhaust from the engine invades the coaches.



Policy Recommendations

The good news is that affordable technology is available today that can virtually eliminate commuter exposure to diesel particles on the road. The Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) can reduce tailpipe emissions of these particles by up to 90 percent. EPA rules for new engines now mandate emissions consistent with this technology and the cleaner fuel it requires. These filters also work on the vast majority of existing diesel vehicles. CATF's study documented that particle concentrations did not increase above outdoor levels in cars following trucks and buses retrofitted with DPFs. In the interior of transit buses retrofitted with a DPF, passenger exposure from the bus exhaust was virtually eliminated. The following policies will be necessary for all Americans to enjoy a cleaner commute:

- **State and local governments should clean up public fleets and fleets doing public work.**

States and local governments should take steps to clean up existing transit bus, school bus, garbage truck, and other public fleets. States should follow the lead of California, which is implementing a comprehensive diesel cleanup program, and New York, which recently required all state-owned or contracted fleets to use best available emission controls.

- **States should create diesel cleanup funds.**

States should follow the lead of California (Carl Moyer) and Texas (Texas Emission Reduction Plan or TERP) in creating publicly-funded programs to provide the money necessary to retrofit existing dirty diesel fleets.

- **Congress should fully fund federal diesel cleanup programs and states should use the money for diesel retrofits.**

The 2005 Transportation Bill (SAFETEA-LU) included \$8.6 billion for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects. Congress gave priority to funding diesel retrofits because of their cost-effectiveness. It is up to local metropolitan planning organizations and state departments of transportation to award CMAQ monies for diesel retrofits. To date, only a few such projects have been funded at the state and metropolitan government level. In addition,


in 2005, Congress passed the Diesel Emission Reduction Act (DERA) authorizing up to 200 million dollars a year over five years to pay for the cost of diesel retrofits. To date, however, Congress has failed to appropriate the money. To clear the air and create a healthier ride for hundreds of millions of commuters stuck in traffic with dirty diesels, Congress should fully fund DERA and state and local governments should prioritize awarding money to diesel retrofit projects.

- **U.S. EPA should adopt an engine rebuild rule requiring long-haul trucks to upgrade their emission controls whenever their engines are rebuilt.**

Long-haul truck engines are typically driven for up to a million miles before they are replaced. Most of these engines are rebuilt several times during their useful lives. They emit the lion's share of diesel pollution that affects commuters on highways. Because these interstate trucks cross state borders, cleaning them up will likely require a federal solution. EPA should use its authority under the Clean Air Act to require that their owners install best available controls whenever these engines are rebuilt.

- **U.S. EPA should finalize its new engine rules for ferries and locomotives.**

U.S. EPA in the next year plans to issue emission standards for new marine vessels and locomotives. Over time this will mean significant improvement in emissions from these sources. In the near term, it should help demonstrate the viability and lower the cost of emission control solutions for existing ferries and locomotives.



Why We Care: Health Consequences of Breathing Diesel Exhaust

While the link between lung cancer and a lifetime of breathing diesel fumes has been known for years, recent research links the particulate components of diesel exhaust to cardiovascular and respiratory harms over much shorter time frames, such as a single day. The following is a summary of selected findings:

Years of Breathing Diesel Particles May Lead to...

- **Lung Cancer.** Diesel exhaust is a probable carcinogen based on occupational health studies of truckers and railroad workers.¹ Diesel particulate matter is recognized as such by U.S. EPA, the State of California and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC).^{2,3,4} Gaseous and particulate compounds found in diesel exhaust, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and formaldehyde, are also carcinogens.
- **Cardiovascular death.** Two of the largest long term air pollution studies ever conducted (one tracking one million people in 150 cities over 16 years) found a strong association between exposure to fine particles—a major component of diesel exhaust—with an elevated risk of premature cardiac death.⁵ A four-year study of 65,000 women in 36 cities found that those living in cities with higher levels of particle pollution are at greater risk of death from cardiovascular causes. The risk varied within cities suggesting the importance of localized pollution sources.^{6,7}
- **Stroke.** Diesel exhaust particles may increase the risk of stroke.⁸
- **Asthma, respiratory infections and allergic symptoms.** Multiple studies link diesel particles to asthma and allergic sensitization.^{9,10} An East Bronx, New York, study suggests children exposed to higher levels of truck exhaust have higher incidences of asthma.¹¹ In a California study, asthma and bronchitis were found to be seven percent higher among children attending school in high-traffic areas, compared with a neighborhood with quieter streets.¹²



- **Reduced lung function growth.** In a cohort of 3677 children tracked for 8 years, those living within 500 meters of a California freeway had deficits in lung volume growth.^{13,14}
- **Slowed fetal growth** as a result of maternal exposure during pregnancy.¹⁵
- **Infant mortality.**^{16,17}
- **DNA damage.**¹⁸

A Day of Breathing Diesel Particles May Lead to....

- **Asthma symptoms and asthma attacks** in children.^{19,20,21}
- **Increased susceptibility to allergy.**^{22,23}
- **Premature death,** based on a 90-city study associating daily particle exposures with premature death.²⁴
- **Increased circulatory and cardiovascular risk for diabetics** based on 24 hour exposures to particles.²⁵
- **Nervous system impairment** based on a study of railroad workers exposed to diesel exhaust, which concluded: “crews may be unable to operate trains safely.”²⁶
- **Increased allergies,** with increased sensitization caused by diesel exhaust exposures.²⁷
- **Infant mortality.**²⁸

A Few Hours of Breathing Diesel Particles May Lead to...

- **Irritation of nose and eyes, respiratory/lung function changes, cough, headache, fatigue and nausea.**
- **Pulmonary inflammation** found after one hour of exposure to diesel exhaust.²⁹
- **Increased risk of pulmonary inflammation to asthmatics** after two hours of exposure.³⁰
- **Adverse cardiovascular effects.** Changes in heart rate variability, heartbeat and blood indices were recorded in North Carolina Highway troopers

exposed to elevated in-vehicle particulate matter during midnight to 9 AM shifts.³¹

- **Doubled risk of death due to stroke.** Risk increased by a factor greater than two within two hours of exposure to high levels of fine particles in a Japanese study.³²
- **Suppressed defense mechanisms and increased susceptibility to lung bacterial infection for a week after exposure.** Rats exposed to diesel exhaust for four hours per day for five days experienced prolonged growth of bacteria in the lung during exposure.³³

Findings

Exposure to Fine Particles has Deadly Consequences

Particulate matter is a potent pollutant. In fact, medical researchers believe that fine particulate matter pollution in the air is responsible for at least 70,000 deaths a year.^{34,35} Two analyses by Abt Associates for the Clean Air Task Force, following EPA Science Advisory Board-approved methodologies, have estimated that approximately 45,000 American lives are lost prematurely each year from exposure to particulate matter pollution from two sources of



particles—21,000 from diesel engines and 24,000 from power plants.³⁶ This is roughly equivalent to the 44,000 motor vehicle deaths per year in the U.S. each year.³⁷

For the average risk from diesel pollution in your community go to the CATF website at: www.catf.us/projects/diesel/dieselhealth/. Our study suggests that your exposure may be considerably higher if you commute.

Our Daily Commute: Over Half of Our Exposure to Diesel Particles



Studies throughout the world show that people who live or work around diesel engines are at highest risk.³⁸ But what about the rest of us? Exposure studies, including this study, suggest that commuters on busy roadways, on diesel transit buses, and on commuter trains receive above-average exposures to fine

particles. Studies by California Air Resources Board (CARB) researchers estimate that during the relatively small part of the day when we are in our vehicles, we experience *over half* of our exposures to ultrafine particles and black carbon.^{39,40,41}







CATF researchers wanted to determine whether the California studies are applicable to other areas of the country. We chose Columbus, Ohio, whose particulate air pollution is commonly thought to come largely from coal-fired power plants. CATF completed approximately two dozen runs and ten commuter “profiles” investigating particle exposures at home, in traffic, and at work, to estimate the relative proportion of ultra-fine particles experienced during different times of a commuter’s day. The researchers found that, as in California, Columbus commuters experience the majority of their exposures to particles during their trips to and from work.

Columbus, Ohio




Cars



Car commute exposures for the four primary diesel pollutants were similarly high across the three cities where we conducted car tests. Bars represent for all runs the average and peak pollution levels inside the car compared to outdoor levels. (Pollutant exposure data was normalized by subtracting daily ambient background concentrations.)

Case Study: Austin, Texas

In Austin, Texas, CATF investigated simultaneous commuter exposures during commutes on Interstate 35 and on the MOPAC expressway between Austin and Roundrock, Texas, the home of Dell Computer. I-35 is a truck route while MOPAC prohibits heavy trucks, thereby providing a no-truck “control” for our study. All diesel pollutants were significantly higher on I-35 than on MOPAC, even when the two routes were comparably congested, and were many times higher than levels measured in downtown Austin.



In-cabin fine particle exposures are much higher for commuters along routes with diesel trucks. The MOPAC highway (right) a no-truck alternative to I-35 (left) in Austin, Texas, had lower diesel pollution levels.

Case Study: Boston, Massachusetts

CATF investigated car commutes from the southern suburbs to downtown Boston and back along one of the busiest commuter routes in the northeast: the Southeast Expressway (I-93). Inbound morning commutes typically included heavy truck traffic, leading to elevated levels of all the measured pollut-

ants. Some outbound evening commutes involved little or no truck traffic, providing a reasonable no-truck “control” for comparison purposes. CATF found pollutant levels during the car commutes in the presence of trucks were four times greater than during the commutes without trucks.



Above left: inbound traffic with trucks results in high diesel ultrafine particle exposures. Above right: traffic without trucks means commuting without particle pollution. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

Case study: Columbus, Ohio

CATF investigated car commutes in Columbus, Ohio, and recorded levels typically three times higher than at a monitoring site located in a downtown area. The level of pollution measured in the commuter car corresponded directly to the presence or absence of

trucks in the roadway around the monitoring vehicle. CATF found that particle exposures were minimally higher than levels in the outdoor air when there were no trucks on the road. Truck-filled roads were found to result in much higher particle exposures.



In Columbus, Ohio, CATF found that particle exposures were lower when there were no trucks on the road (right). Truck-filled roads resulted in higher exposures (left). To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

Diesel Particle Filter: The 90 Percent Solution

Starting this year, because of new EPA regulations, new diesel trucks will be sold with a diesel particulate filter (DPF) that achieves a 90 percent-plus reduction in diesel particles. Cleaner, ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel is now available nationwide to help these cleaner engines stay that way. However, the EPA rules do not regulate the emissions from the 13 million diesel

engines in use today. Nevertheless, most of these vehicles can take a diesel particle filter and achieve a comparable 90 percent level of reduction. These filters work. Our researchers detected minimal diesel pollutants following a truck retrofitted with a DPF. DPFs can be installed on most trucks built since 1994.



Solutions that work: CATF's installation of a diesel particle filter on a box truck dramatically reduced fine particles (PM_{2.5}) near the tailpipe from 5,000 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ to 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. As a result, fine particles from the truck barely registered in the car following behind. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

The combination of Diesel Particulate Filters (DPFs) and Ultra-Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) can achieve a 90% reduction in diesel particles.



Above: Honeycomb particle trap from DPF on box truck.

Left: Installation of a DPF simply requires replacement of muffler and tailpipe.

Because CATF's investigation demonstrated that the level of pollution exposure in the cabin of a commuter car is a function of the presence of diesel truck traffic, we wanted to test the difference in cabin exposure for commuters following a conventional truck vs. the same truck retrofitted with a diesel particle filter.

Our monitoring car followed behind the conven-

tional truck and measured the elevated levels of diesel particles in the car's cabin. We then had a diesel particle filter installed on the same truck. When following the newly retrofitted truck, the investigators found minimal increases in diesel fine particles in the cabin of the chase vehicle. The particle filter virtually eliminated the exposure to diesel particles from the truck for the commuter car following behind.

■ Transit Buses

CATF investigated particle levels inside transit buses in Boston and following buses in Boston and New York City. In CATF's earlier school bus studies, we found that diesel exhaust from the bus tailpipe infiltrated the bus cabins, thus elevating on-board pollution levels. See www.catf.us/publications/view/82. CATF's results in the present study suggest that this same effect occurs in transit buses. However, inside buses that had

been retrofitted with DPFs, particle levels were substantially lower.

Case Study: Boston, Massachusetts

In Boston, CATF researchers boarded conventional buses as well as those retrofitted with particulate filters and measured in-cabin diesel particle levels. The Metropolitan Boston Transit Authority has replaced or



Left: Pollution from a conventional bus infiltrates the cabin exposing passengers to elevated levels. Right: Diesel ultrafine particle pollution from the bus is undetectable in the cabin of a bus with a DPF.


retrofitted the vast majority of its bus fleet. Levels on the remaining conventional buses were on average four times higher than outdoors, whereas the

particle levels on the new and retrofitted buses were substantially lower and sometimes even below outdoor levels, resulting in a cleaner, healthier ride.

Case Study: New York City

In the past few years, New York City has retrofitted or replaced with lower-emitting diesel-electric hybrid buses the vast majority of its fleet. To test the benefits of these improvements relative to the conventional buses still on the street, CATF investigators followed

buses in a commuter car outfitted with monitoring equipment. The investigators found high diesel exhaust levels behind conventional buses while levels behind buses with DPFs were barely detectable.



Left: Exhaust from a conventional New York City transit bus infiltrates a car following behind. Right: Ultrafine particle levels behind a bus equipped with a diesel particulate filter are virtually eliminated. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

Commuter Trains

CATF investigators monitored pollutant levels inside passenger trains in Boston and New York City. Results suggest surprisingly high exposures to diesel exhaust in the passenger compartment, especially with the locomotive pulling the train. While trains with emissions control equipment were unavailable to test against conventional diesel trains, we nevertheless were able to conduct a “controlled” experiment. Many commuter trains are so-called “push-pull” trains. That is, the locomotive pulls the train in one direction to the end of its commuter run, e.g., inbound, and then pushes the train back to the other end of the line, e.g., outbound. CATF researchers observ-

ed that when a diesel locomotive pulls its passenger cars, the plume of diesel exhaust from the engine blows down onto the cars following the locomotive and invades the coaches. Pollution levels in the coach typically increased during the course of the commutes in a pulled train. However, on a train pushed by the diesel locomotive such that the exhaust plume was left behind, particle levels remained low. Even in trains being pushed by a locomotive, investigators found

pollution levels spiked in the passenger cars when the doors opened at an underground station platform with inadequate ventilation in Boston.



Case Study: Boston, Massachusetts

In Boston, CATF investigators rode commuter trains inbound and outbound to study the relative pollution levels on board a “push” versus a “pull” train. Levels in

the coaches of the trains being pulled by a diesel locomotive were many times higher than those when the train was being pushed.




In-coach levels of ultrafine diesel particles in this test were 10-100 times higher in coaches being pulled by a locomotive (left) than in coaches being pushed (right).

Case Study: New York City


As in Boston, our researchers found elevated particle levels in New York City-area commuter trains being pulled by a locomotive while levels were low in trains that were pushed.

In New York City, like Boston, monitoring revealed a stark difference in ultrafine particle levels on commuter trains between the “push” and “pull” segments.



■ Pedestrians

People who walk to work near thoroughfares traveled by diesel vehicles also are exposed to high levels of pollutants. CATF investigators engaged in street-level monitoring in Boston, Massachusetts, and Columbus, Ohio. Peak pollutant levels on downtown streets next to traffic rivaled exposures experienced during commutes using other modes.




Above: Exposure during walking commutes in Boston and Columbus.

Far Left: Researcher with monitoring equipment in a backpack.

Commuting via Ferry

A relatively few commuters travel to work on a passenger ferry, but if they think they are getting fresh air, they may be wrong.




Extreme PM_{2.5} exposures on Boston harbor ferry. Exhaust smoke eddies behind the boat and enters through the rear door.




Motor Vehicle and Rail Tunnels

It may come as no surprise that air quality in vehicular and rail tunnels is exceptionally poor. A variety of tunnel studies have been undertaken in California. One study documented black carbon levels up to 50 times as high as in the already polluted outdoor air, especially in the presence of

numerous trucks in the tunnel. Where one tunnel bore allows trucks and another does not, heavy-duty trucks were responsible for 93 percent of the black carbon emissions in the truck-influenced bore.⁴² CATF's investigation confirms extreme exposures in tunnels.



Extreme change in particle levels entering and leaving Boston's Big Dig (O'Neill) Tunnel



Extreme particle levels in Boston's Back Bay train station

Summary of Results

Peak and average levels below indicate how many times greater CATF researchers found the pollution

levels were in commuter vehicles compared to the levels in the outdoor air.

POLLUTANT		PM _{2.5}			Ultrafine Particles			PAH			Black Carbon		
		# runs	Peak	Average	# runs	Peak	Average	# runs	Peak	Average	# runs	Peak	Average
CAR													
Austin	I-35	15	8	1.4	15	35	4	4	22	3	15	33	7
Boston	I-93	15	14	1.7	15	38	4	6	60	9	14	35	6
Columbus	I-71	31	5	1.0	34	19	4	17	14	4	25	12	5
<i>All-city Mean</i>			9	1.4		30	4		32	5		27	6
BUS													
Boston	Conventional	5	11	2.4	5	11	4	1	22	12	n/a	n/a	n/a
	DPF	9	14	3.4	5	3	1	6	30	7	4	7	3
TRAIN													
Boston	Push	6	34	3.6	6	44	4	4	54	4	4	22	6
	Pull	6	45	3.2	6	60	17	5	69	15	4	45	17
New York	Push	2	28	1.0	2	19	5	2	11	2	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Pull	3	29	1.7	3	49	15	3	12	3	n/a	n/a	n/a
FERRY													
Boston		2	14	2.6	3	21	3	2	117	17	1	50	6
PEDESTRIAN													
Boston		6	12	1.5	5	19	2	1	43	8	1	15	2
Columbus		3	16	1.4	3	29	3	1	34	2	n/a	n/a	n/a

CATF's commuter study results suggest that breathing particles while commuting resulted in exposures that are many times greater than breathing air pollution in the outdoor air—no matter the mode of commute.

How the Studies Were Done

Representative cities were selected for investigating commuter exposure to diesel exhaust (Austin, TX; Boston, MA, Columbus, OH and New York City) using methodologies developed at major universities. Four key constituents of diesel exhaust were tracked with continuous monitors: fine particles ($PM_{2.5}$), ultrafine particles ($PM_{<0.1}$), black carbon, and particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Because CATF's monitoring suggests ultrafine particles may be the best marker of fresh diesel exhaust across all modes of transit, those results are highlighted in this report. Graphics were selected to illustrate key findings. Pollutant exposure data was normalized by subtracting daily ambient background concentrations. For in-depth results and methodological details see companion white paper at www.catf.us/goto/noescape/.

- **Car Commutes:** In Boston, Austin and Columbus typical commute routes were run in a 2006 minivan equipped with four monitors for a total of 107 runs over 79 hours. CATF investigated the effects of window position, air conditioning, and recirculation of cabin air. The



A dashboard-mounted digital video camera inside the chase car allowed researchers to film the driver's-eye-view behind the diesel vehicles while monitoring instruments recorded pollution levels inside the car. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

results from "windows open" runs are reported here.

- **Transit Buses:** Researchers boarded buses in Boston and Columbus using monitors housed in backpacks and roll-around bags.



Above: CATF researcher setting up particle monitoring equipment to monitor both cabin and outdoor air simultaneously with two sets of equipment.

Left: Monitoring equipment in a roll-around suitcase was used for recording pollution levels in buses, trains and ferries.

- **Commuter Rail:** Researchers boarded trains in Boston and New York City with monitors housed in backpacks and roll-around bags for inbound (locomotive push) and outbound (locomotive pull) runs.
- **Ferries:** Researchers boarded Boston commuter ferries with monitors housed in a backpack.
- **Walking Commutes:** With monitors in backpacks, researchers walked from residential to commercial areas in Boston and Columbus.
- **Chase Studies:** CATF monitored comparative particle levels behind conventional and DPF retrofitted buses in New York City and Boston and behind garbage trucks in New York City. As a controlled experiment, CATF retrofitted a Class-5 box truck with a DPF, testing air behind the truck before and after.

Previous Commuter Exposure Studies

Previously published, peer-reviewed studies firmly establish that we can be exposed to high levels of diesel pollution when we are commuting. Numerous exposure studies confirm that diesel pollutants are concentrated in areas of high traffic. Methods have been developed to quantify commuter pollutant exposures in a variety of cities around the world. CATF researchers employed similar instruments and protocols to those used in these previous studies:

- A 2003 California study points to commuting as the principal route of human diesel exposure accounting for up to one half of total exposure.⁴³ The ultrafine particle concentrations in California vehicles were seven times higher than the national average. Exposure levels on Los Angeles freeways were similar to the findings of the CATF study.⁴⁴
- In a Los Angeles study, elevated exposures were recorded within 100 meters of a freeway (about the length of one large-city block) beyond which they fell rapidly.⁴⁵
- A London study investigated ultrafine particle exposures while commuting on foot, by bicycle, in a car, in buses, and by taxi in London.⁴⁶ As in the CATF study, the researchers documented elevated exposures in every mode of transit. Exposures in taxicabs were the highest. Personal exposures on sidewalks were multiple times higher than fixed urban background monitoring sites.⁴⁷
- A 2004 study by researchers at the Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management of Boston diesel commuter rail exposures documented high levels of black carbon particles in passenger coaches and at train stations.⁴⁸
- In Amsterdam, black carbon levels increased near highways by a factor of three times over more distant areas.⁴⁹
- Elevated black carbon exposures on Harlem, New York, sidewalks are associated with increased truck and bus counts.⁵⁰ Exposures increased near a bus depot.⁵¹ Researchers concluded that adolescents in Harlem are exposed to elevated levels of diesel exhaust.
- A personal exposure study in Mexico City found elevated fine particle exposures in a variety of microenvironments, including people riding in cars and using public transportation.⁵²



London Taxi Study

You might think riding in a taxi would expose you to less air pollution than you would get walking down a city sidewalk, but that does not seem to be the case. Researchers at Imperial College, London, walked, biked, drove, and rode buses or taxis up and down streets in central London. Surprisingly, riding in a taxi resulted in the worst exposure—nearly twice as much as walking. The suggested explanation: taxis tend to get stuck in traffic surrounded by other pollution-belching vehicles. CATF used a similar methodology to the published, peer-reviewed techniques used in the London study to conduct its commuter study.

Health Effects of Diesel Exhaust

Diesel exhaust is unhealthy to breathe. The scientific community has been aware of the adverse health effects of breathing diesel pollution for decades. Diesel exhaust is a toxic combination of carbon, sulfur and nitrogen particulate matter compounds and related gases created from combustion of diesel fuel and burnt lubricating oil commonly containing minute metallic particles from the engine. Research, based on occupational studies conducted in the U.S. and Canada, has linked diesel exhaust exposure to cancer.⁵³ Recent investigations of health damages resulting from exposure to pollutants found in diesel exhaust include long-term, short-term and laboratory studies. But commuters are not the only people exposed to diesel exhaust—we all breathe it every day whenever we are near diesel vehicles whether we drive on a country road or a city street. We are surrounded by 13 million diesel engines—workhorses that power tractor-trailer trucks, transit and school buses, trains, ferries, and construction and agricultural equipment.

Particulate matter may be the most carcinogenic and harmful component in diesel exhaust. The International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) states that there is sufficient animal experimental evidence to establish the carcinogenicity of diesel engine exhaust particles, but inadequate evidence for the carcinogenicity of gas-phase diesel engine exhaust.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, coronary artery constriction has been documented in animal studies resulting from exposure to these gas-phase diesel compounds.⁵⁵

Diesel particles are not only

toxic, they also make up the tiniest fraction of combustion particles. In general, diesels emit two sizes of particles—*fine particles*, less than two and one-half microns (a millionth of a meter) in diameter, and *ultrafine particles*, less than a tenth of a micron. Under U.S. law, the Environmental Protection Agency has set daily and annual health standards for fine particles (35 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ and 15 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ respectively). Health standards have not yet been established for ultrafine particles, but recent health research suggests that their extremely small size may allow them to pass easily into the bloodstream where they can cause oxidative stress and inflammation leading to cardiovascular disease symptoms.⁵⁶ These particles are, at their core, commonly made up of black carbon. This core often is coated in toxic substances such as particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), a probable carcinogen, and metals from engine wear.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's most recent National Air Toxics Assessment estimated that the average concentration of diesel particles in the air in the U.S. is about 1.2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$, much lower than CATF found in commuter vehicles.⁵⁷ Using the cancer

potency factor developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), this translates to about 363 lung cancers per million, well above EPA's acceptable level of one cancer per million. Moreover, the cancer risk from diesel exhaust in the U.S. exceeds the combined total of all the other 132 air toxics tracked by EPA.⁵⁸ However, in many areas, diesel particles may be even more concentrated in 'hot spots' such as areas of congested traffic, heavy machinery use, or construction.



Proximity to Traffic is Associated with Adverse Health Risk

Traffic studies have consistently and overwhelmingly defined an adverse relationship between proximity to highly trafficked areas and a variety of illnesses. Epidemiological studies generally suggest that living within approximately 50-100 meters of a busy road

may result in mild to acute respiratory symptoms. A New York City study underway links asthma to truck traffic.⁵⁹ An assessment of the health impacts of traffic-related air pollution estimated approximately 40,000 premature deaths annually in Austria, France and

Switzerland, a whopping six percent of total mortality.⁶⁰

Importantly, studies find that the volume of truck traffic is most strongly related to health risks rather than car volume.^{61,62,63} These studies comport with our findings that particle levels on freeways are directly associated with volume of truck traffic.

Medical studies have linked proximity to traffic to:

- **Heart attacks** (myocardial infarction).^{64,65,66} A study of 700 heart attack survivors shows that they were most likely to have been in heavy traffic the hour before they suffered the heart attack than any other hour of the day.
- **Increased risk of mortality.**⁶⁷
- **Reduced lung function growth.** In a cohort of 3677 children tracked for 8 years, those living

within 500 meters of a California freeway had deficits in lung volume growth.⁶⁸

- **Heart rate variability changes.** A study of North Carolina highway patrolmen found particle concentrations were linked to heart rate variability changes and irregular heartbeats.^{69,70}
- **Chronic respiratory symptoms** in children and adults such as cough, persistent wheeze and bronchitis.^{71,72,73,74,75,76}
- **Asthma in children**, with larger effects in girls, and children's hospital admissions for asthma.^{77,78,79,80}
- **School absences.**⁸¹
- **Agging effect** ("mortality rate advancement"), similar in magnitude to chronic respiratory and pulmonary diseases and diabetes.⁸²



State Trooper Exposure Study

In a 2004 study, University of North Carolina researchers tracked particle exposures and cardiac response in young (ages 23-30), healthy and physically fit highway patrolmen on their daily shift. Using the same or similar monitoring devices as used by CATF researchers,

particulate matter concentrations—well within the same ranges as CATF observed in the present study—were linked to significant changes in heart rate variability, irregular heartbeats, and increases in blood inflammatory markers within hours of exposure.

Recommendations: Today's Technology Can Mean Cleaner Commutes Now

Tackling this serious public health problem now—for the health of this generation of Americans—depends on aggressive efforts to retrofit existing engines rather than waiting decades for cleaner new engines to replace the older dirty ones. While EPA's new engine rules will mean huge air quality improvements over time, a child born today will be 23 years old by the time those rules are fully effective. The emissions control technology required for new engines starting this year is available, affordable, and proven to reduce

pollution significantly from most of the vehicles on the road today. In order to improve our health, and that of our children, millions of older engines still in use must be retrofitted using the same technology as required for today's new engines.

Retrofitting buses and trucks to reduce diesel particles by up to 90 percent can be as simple as replacing the muffler with a diesel particulate filter (DPF). In fact, the vast majority of highway diesel engines built since 1994 can be retrofit with a DPF.

With the availability now nationwide of ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel, there is no obstacle remaining to cleaning up today's diesel fleet.

■ **State and local governments should clean up public fleets and fleets doing public work.**

The State of New York recently required that every state-owned diesel vehicle and every vehicle used by firms that contract with the State use best available control technology on these vehicles. Cities such as Seattle, Washington, D.C., New York, and Boston have taken a lead, retrofitting much of their transit bus fleets with diesel particulate filters. Several cities,



New York, Boston and Seattle operate large fleets of new or retrofitted diesel particulate filter-equipped transit buses.



The New York City garbage truck on the left leaves a diesel exhaust plume behind, in comparison to the truck on the right that has been retrofitted with a diesel particulate filter which leaves no measurable plume in its wake. The investment New York has made in DPFs means healthier air quality in and alongside the roadway and in adjacent neighborhoods. To view videos, go to www.catf.us/goto/noescape/

including Chattanooga, Tennessee, have been replacing their older buses with new diesel-electric hybrid or compressed natural gas buses. New York City has also retrofitted most of its fleet of sanitation trucks. Other cities are experimenting with other emissions controls strategies, such as the use of biodiesel fuel in Columbus, Ohio.

■ **States should create diesel cleanup funds.**

The current cost of retrofitting a highway diesel engine with a diesel particulate filter averages between \$5000-7000 per vehicle. It is likely that EPA's new engine rules will result in better economies of scale for the manufacture of diesel particulate filters and thus reduce their cost. States must step up to the plate to provide diesel retrofit funding. States can follow the lead of California (Carl Moyer \$140 million

per year) and Texas (Texas Emission Reduction Plan or TERP \$120 million per year) in creating publicly funded programs to provide the money necessary to retrofit existing dirty diesel fleets.

■ **Congress should fully fund federal diesel cleanup programs and states should use the money for diesel retrofits.**

In 2005, as part of the Energy Bill, Congress passed the Diesel Emission Reduction Act (DERA) authorizing up to \$200 million a year for five years to pay for the cost of diesel retrofits. To date, however, Congress has failed to appropriate the money. To clear the air and create a healthier ride for hundreds of millions of commuters stuck in traffic with dirty diesels, Congress should fully fund DERA and state and local governments should prioritize awarding federal money to diesel retrofit projects.

In addition, the 2005 Transportation Bill (SAFETEA-LU) included \$8.6 billion for congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) projects. Congress gave priority to funding diesel retrofits because of their cost-effectiveness. The Federal Highway Administration should recognize this priority in its CMAQ guidance and urge states to target CMAQ funds to diesel retrofits. Ultimately though, it is up to local metropolitan planning organizations and state departments of transportation to award CMAQ monies for diesel retrofits. To date, only a few such projects have been funded.

■ **U.S. EPA should adopt an engine rebuild rule requiring long-haul trucks to upgrade their emission controls whenever their engines are rebuilt.**

Particularly key to healthier commutes will be regulations to clean up interstate long-haul trucks that travel city-to-city and state-to-state. A vast majority of retrofit funding to date has been focused on public fleets such as garbage collection, transit buses and even school buses in part because the source of the funding has been public. Long-haul trucks, however, consume the vast majority of the on-road diesel fuel sold every year and as a result represent most of the diesel pollution annually. They are typically corporately or privately owned. U.S. EPA has the authority under the Clean Air Act to require that trucks upgrade their pollution controls whenever they rebuild their engines. EPA should exercise this authority and require that existing engines meet today's emission standards.



■ **U.S. EPA should finalize its new engine rules for ferries and locomotives.**

Retrofitting non-road vehicles is also an important part of the solution. Technologies to clean up locomotives and ferries are still largely under development with the most recent progress being the successful proof-of-concept for implementing oxidation catalyst technology on two-stroke diesel engines. For locomotive and ferry engines, the best practice first includes rebuilding with new internal components or repowering with the newer Tier 2 engines, followed by retrofitting with diesel emission control technology such as an oxidation catalyst. EPA should issue the new Tier 3 and Tier 4 standards in late 2007 and these new technology-forcing standards are expected to drive the implementation of diesel particulate filter (DPF) technology for these applications. This is substantially similar to the technology pathway on-road and off-road diesel engines have followed, but the timelines for rail and marine have lagged behind these other sectors. These emission control technologies also need ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD) fuel to perform at their best. For ferries and locomotives this fuel will not be required until 2012. Until then, the results of the CATF study suggest the need to improve coach ventilation systems on trains, have locomotives push passenger trains to the maximum extent feasible, and ban the use of diesel in underground stations and tunnels.

Overall, the best solution to the problem of commuter exposure to diesel exhaust is to clean up the existing diesel fleet with diesel particle filters so that we can all breathe easier. Until then, commuters can help protect themselves by taking clean transit, such as electrified subways and light rail. If you must drive to work, choose commuter routes that are less heavily traveled by trucks. To reduce your exposure when in traffic, our study suggests that you should close your windows and set your ventilation system to recirculate the cabin air.

Installing a catalyzed diesel particulate filter (DPF) is nearly as simple as replacing the muffler. DPFs are extremely effective and remove over 90 percent of diesel exhaust particles. These filters can typically be installed on 1994 and newer vehicles that have electronic engine systems.

Endnotes

- 1 Lipsett, M., Campleman, S., (1999). Occupational exposure to diesel exhaust and lung cancer: a meta-analysis. *American Journal of Public Health* v. 89, no 7, p. 1009-1017.
- 2 EPA, Health Assessment Document for Diesel Exhaust: Office of Research and Development, EPA/600/8-90/057F May 2002. P.9-14;
- 3 California Air Resources Board (1998): Resolution 98-35—Identification of diesel exhaust as a toxic air contaminant. Go to: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/diesltac/diesltac.htm>;
- 4 International Agency on Cancer, Monograph 46. See at: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol46volume46.pdf>.
- 5 See, e.g., Pope, C.A., Thun, M.J., Namboodiri, M.M. and Dockery, D.W., et al.; Particulate Air Pollution as a Predictor of Mortality in a Prospective Study of U.S. Adults. 151 *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* (1995). Available online at <http://ajrccm.atsjournals.org/search.shtml>.
Krewski, D., Burnett, R.T., Goldberg, M.S., Hoover, K., Siemiatycki, J., Jerrett, M., Abrahamowicz, A. and White, W.H., Reanalysis of the Harvard Six Cities Study and the American Cancer Society Study of Particulate Matter and Mortality; Special Report to the Health Effects Institute, Cambridge, MA (July 2000).
- 6 Miller, K., Siscovick, D., Sheppard, L., Shepherd, K., Sullivan, J., Anderson, G. and Kaufman, J. (2007). Long-term exposure to air pollution and incidence of cardiovascular events in women. *New England Journal of Medicine*, v. 356, No. 5, p. 447-458, February 1, 2007.
- 7 Dockery, D., and Stone, P. (2007) Cardiovascular risks from fine particulate air pollution. *Editorial, New England Journal of Medicine*, v. 356, no 5, p. 511-513, February 1, 2007.
- 8 Nemmar, A., Hoet, P., Dinsdale, D., Vermeylen, J., Hoylaerts, M., and Nemery, B., Diesel Exhaust Particles in Lung Acutely Enhance Experimental Peripheral Thrombosis, *Circulation*. Vol. 107, (2003), pp.1202-1208.
- 9 Brown, J., and Frew, A. (2002). Diesel exhaust particles and respiratory allergy. *European Respiratory Mon.* v. 21, p.180-192.
- 10 Brauer, M et al. (2002). Air pollution from traffic and the development of respiratory infections and asthmatic and allergic symptoms in children. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, v. 166, p. 1092-1098.
- 11 Pandya, R., Solomon, G., Kinner, A., and Balmes, J. (2002). Diesel exhaust and asthma: hypotheses and molecular mechanisms. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 110, supplement 1, p. 103-112.
- 12 Kim, J., Smorodinsky, S., Lipsett, M., Singer, B., Hodgson, A., and Ostro, B. (2004). Traffic-related Air Pollution near Busy Roads The East Bay Children's Respiratory Health Study. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, vol 170, p. 520-526.
- 13 Gauderman, W.J., McConnell, R., Gilliland, F., London, S., Thomas, D., Avol, E., Vora, H., Berhane, K., Rappaport, E., Lurmann, F., Margolis, H.G., and Peters, J. 2000. Association between air pollution and lung function growth in Southern California children. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, vol. 162, no. 4, pp. 18.
- 14 Gauderman, J., Vora, H., McConnell, R., Berhane, K., Gilliland, F., Thomas, D., Lurmann, F., Avol, E., Kunzli, N., Jerrett, M., and Peters, J. (2007). Effect of exposure to traffic on lung development from 10-18 years of age: a cohort study. *The Lancet*, Early Online Publication, 26 January 2007.
- 15 Dejmek, J., Selevan, S., Benes, I., Solansku, I., and Sram, R. (1999). Fetal growth and maternal exposure to particulate matter during pregnancy; *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 107, no. 6.
- 16 Woodruff, T., Grillo, J. and Schoendorf, K. 1997. The relationship between selected causes of postneonatal infant mortality and particulate air pollution in the United States. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, vol. 105, 608-612.
- 17 Kaiser, R., Romieu, I., Medina, S., Schwartz, J., Krzyzanowski, M., and Kunzli, N. (2004). Air pollution attributable postneonatal infant mortality in U.S. metropolitan areas: a risk assessment study. *Environmental Health, A Global Access Science Source* v. 3, no. 4.
- 18 Upadhyay, D., Panduri V., Ghio A, Kamp DW. (2003) Particulate matter induces alveolar epithelial cell DNA damage and apoptosis: role of free radicals and the mitochondria. *Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol*. 2003 Aug; 29(2):180-7. Epub 2003 Feb 21.
- 19 Norris, G, Young Pong, S., Koenig, J., Larson, T., Sheppard, L., and Stout, J. (1999). An association between fine particles and asthma emergency department visits for children in Seattle. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 107, no. 6.
- 20 Gielen, M., van der Zee, S., Winjen, J., van Steen, C., and Brunkreef, B. (1997). Acute effects of summer air pollution on respiratory health of asthmatic children. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, v. 155, p. 2105-2108.
- 21 Yu, O., Sheppard, L., Lumley, T., Koenig, J., and Shapiro, G. (2000). Effects of ambient air pollution on symptoms of asthma in Seattle-area children enrolled in the CAMP study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 108, no. 12, p. 1209-1214.
- 22 Finkelstein, F, Yang, M., Orekhova, T., Clyne, E., Bernstein, J., Whitekus, M, Diaz-Sanchez, D., and Morris, S. (2004) Diesel Exhaust Particles Suppress In Vivo IFN- γ Production by Inhibiting Cytokine Effects on NK and NKT Cells. *Journal of Immunology*. V. 172, no. 6, p. 3803-3813.
- 23 Brown, J. and Frew, A. (2002) Diesel exhaust particles and respiratory allergy. *Eur Respir Mon*, 2002, 21, 180-192.
- 24 See e.g., Samet, J.M., Dominici, F., Zeger, S.L., Schwartz, J. and Dockery, D.W.; National Morbidity, Mortality and Air Pollution Study, Part II: Morbidity, Mortality and Air Pollution in the United States; Health Effects Institute Research Report No. 94, Cambridge MA (June 2000).
Dockery, D.W., Pope, C.A., Xu, S. and Spengler, J.D., et al; An Association Between Air Pollution and Mortality in Six U.S. Cities; 329 *New England J. Medicine* 1753-59 (1993). Available online at <http://nejm.org/content/1993/0329/0024/1753.asp>.
- 25 O'Neill, M., Veves, A., Zanobetti, A., Sarnat, J., Gold, D., Economides, P., Horton, E., and Schwartz, J. (2005). Diabetes Enhances Vulnerability to Particulate Air Pollution-Associated Impairment in Vascular Reactivity and Endothelial Function. *Circulation*, Jun 2005; 111: 2913-2920.
- 26 Kilburn, K.H. (2000). Effects of diesel exhaust on neurobehavioral and pulmonary functions. *Archives of Environmental Health*, v. 55, no. 1, p. 11-17.
- 27 Sydbom, A., Blomberg, A., Parnia, S., Stenfors, N., Sandström, T., and Dahlén, S-E. (2001) Health effects of diesel exhaust

- emissions. *Eur. Respir. J.*; 17: 733-746.
- 28 Loomis, D., Castillejos, M., Gold, D., McDonnell, W. Borja-Aburto, V. (1999). Air pollution and infant mortality in Mexico City. *Epidemiology*, vol. 10, p. 118-123.
 - 29 Salvi, S., Blomberg, A., Rudell, B., Kelly, F., Sandstrom, T., Holgate, S. and Frew, A. (1999). Acute inflammatory responses in the airways and peripheral blood after short-term exposure to diesel exhaust in healthy human volunteers. *American Jour. Resp. Crit. Care Medicine*, v. 159, 702-709.
 - 30 Stenfors, N., Nordenhäll, C., Salvi, S., Mudway, I., Söderberg, M., Blomberg, A., Helleday, R., Levin, J., Holgate, S., Kelly, F., Frew, A., and Sandström, T. (2004). Different airway inflammatory responses in asthmatic and healthy humans exposed to diesel. *Eur. Respir. J.*, Jan 2004; 23: 82-86.
 - 31 Riediker, M., Cascia, W., Griggs, T., Herbst, M., Bromberg, P., Neas, L., Williams, R., and Devlin, R. (2004). Particulate matter exposure in cars is associated with cardiovascular effects in healthy young men. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, v. 169, p. 934-940.
 - 32 Yamazaki, S, Nitta, H., Ono, M., Green, J., Fukuhara, S. (2006) Intracerebral hemorrhage associated with hourly concentration of ambient particulate matter: case-cross-over analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* September 2006 online. <http://oem.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/short/oem.2005.021097v3> Also see Reuters news report Thurs Sept 21, 2006, "Brief exposure to dirty air may raise stroke risk."
 - 33 Yin, X., Dong, C., Ma, J., Antonini, J., Roberts, J. Barger, M., and Ma, J. (2005). Sustained Effect of Inhaled Diesel Exhaust Particles on T-Lymphocyte-Mediated Immune Responses Against *Listeria monocytogenes*. *Toxicological Sciences*, v. 88, no.1, 73-81.
 - 34 Joel Schwartz, "Air pollution deadlier than previously thought." Harvard School of Public Health Press release, March 2, 2000.
 - 35 Francine Laden, Harvard Six Cities Study Follow Up: Reducing Soot Particles Is Associated with Longer Lives. Press Release Harvard School of Public Health <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/press/releases/press03152006.html>. Wednesday, March 15, 2006
 - 36 See Abt Associates analytical reports at: http://www.catf.us/projects/diesel/dieselhealth/20041216-REMSAD_No_Diesel_Report.pdf (diesel) and <http://www.catf.us/publications/view/25> (power plants).
 - 37 CDC at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr54nvsr54_19.pdf.
 - 38 Garshick, E., Laden, F., Hart, J., Rosner, B., Smith, T., Dockery, D. and Speizer, F., *Lung Cancer in Railroad Workers Exposed to Diesel Exhaust*, *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Vol. 122, No. 15, (November 2004), pp. 1539-1543. Kaur, S., Clark, R., Walsh, P., Arnold, J., Colvie, R., Nieuwenhuijsen, M. (2006). Exposure visualization of ultrafine particle counts in a transport microenvironment. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 40, p. 386-398. Zhu, Y., Hinds, W., Kim, S., and Sioutas, C. (2002). Concentration and size distribution of ultrafine particles near a major highway. *Journal of Air and Waste Management Association*, v. 52, p. 1032-1042. Zhu, Y., Hinds, W., Kim, S., Shen, S., Sioutas, C. (2002). Study of ultrafine particles near a major highway with heavy duty diesel traffic. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. v. 36, p. 4323-4335. Kaur, S., Nieuwenhuijsen, M., Colvie (2005). Personal exposure of street canyon intersection users to PM2.5, ultrafine particles counts and carbon monoxide in Central London, UK. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 39, p. 3629-3641. Schauer, J., Rogge, W., Hildemann, L., Mazurek, M., and Class, G. (1996) Source apportionment of airborne particulate matter using organic compounds as tracers. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 30, no. 22, p. 3837-3855.
 - 39 Fruin, S. (2003). *Characterizing Black Carbon Inside Vehicles: Implications for Refined Exposure Assessments for Diesel Exhaust Particulate Matter*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
 - 40 Fruin, S., Winer, A., and Rodes, C. (2004). Black carbon concentration in California vehicles and estimation of in-vehicle diesel exhaust particulate matter exposures. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 38, p. 4123-4133.
 - 41 Fruin, S. (2006) "Assessment of In-Vehicle Exposure to Traffic-Related Ultrafine Particles and Other Pollutants." Conference presentation: Ultrafine Particles, Science, Technology and Policy Issues. South Coast Air Quality Management District, April/May 2006. http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/Ultrafine_Presentations/Session2_1_Fruin.pdf
 - 42 Miguel, A., Kirchstetter, T., Harley R. and Herring, S. (1998) On-road emissions of particulate polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and black carbon from gasoline and diesel vehicles. *Environmental Science and Technology*, vol. 32, no. 4, p. 450-454.
 - 43 Fruin, S. (2003). *Characterizing Black Carbon Inside Vehicles: Implications for Refined Exposure Assessments for Diesel Exhaust Particulate Matter*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles
 - 44 Fruin, S., Winer, A., and Rodes, C. (2004). Black carbon concentration in California vehicles and estimation of in-vehicle diesel exhaust particulate matter exposures. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 38, p. 4123-4133.
 - 45 Zhua, Y., Hinds, W., Kimb, S., Shenc, S. and Sioutas, C. (2002). Study of ultrafine particles near a major highway with heavy-duty diesel traffic *Atmospheric Environment* 36 (2002) 4323-4335.
 - 46 Kaur, S., Clark, R., Walsh, P., Arnold, S., Colvile, R., and Nieuwenhuijsen, M (2006). Exposure visualization of ultrafine particle counts in a transport microenvironment. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 40, p. 386-398.
 - 47 Kaur, S., Nieuwenhuijsen, M., and Colville, R. (2005). Pedestrian exposure to air pollution along a major road in central London, UK. *Atmospheric Environment*, v. 39, p. 7307-7320.
 - 48 Allen, G. and Johnson, P. (2004). Commuter rail diesel locomotive exposure characterization: recent pilot work on Boston-in-cabin and in-station monitoring, Powerpoint Presentation, March 20, 2004. Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management.
 - 49 Roemer W. and van Wijnen, J. (2001). Differences among black smoke, PM10 and PM1 levels at urban measurements sites. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 109, no. 2, p. 151-154.
 - 50 Kinney, P., Aggarwal, M., Northridge, M., Janssen, N. and Shepard, P. (2000). Airborne Concentrations of PM2.5 and Diesel Exhaust Particles on Harlem Sidewalks: A Community-Based Pilot Study. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, vol 108, no.3.
 - 51 Lena, S., Ochieng, V., Carter, M., Holguín-Veras, J., and Kinney, P. (2002) Elemental Carbon and PM2.5 Levels in an Urban Community Heavily Impacted by Truck Traffic. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, vol 110, no.10.

- 52 Vallejo, M., Lerma, C., Infante, O., Hermosillo, A., Riojas-Rodriguez, H., and Cardenas, M. (2004). Personal exposure to particulate matter less than 2.5 um in Mexico City: a pilot study. *Journal of Exposure Analysis and Environmental Epidemiology*, v. 14, no. 4, p. 323-329.
- 53 Frumkin, H., Thun, M. J. (2001); Diesel Exhaust. *Environmental Carcinogens*, vol. 51, number 3, pp. 193-198, May/June 2001.
- 54 International Agency on Cancer, Monograph 46. See at: <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol46/volume46.pdf>.
- 55 Campen, M., Babu, S., Helms, A., Pett, S., Wernly, J., Mehran, R., and McDonald, J. (2005). Nonparticulate Components of Diesel Exhaust Promote Constriction in Coronary Arteries from ApoE-/- Mice. *Toxicological Sciences*, v. 88, no. 1, p. 95-102.
- 56 Nemmar, A., Hoet, P., Vanquickenborne, B., Dinsdale, D., Thomeer, M., Hoylaerts, M., Vanbilloen, H., Mortelmans, L., and Nemery, B. (2002). Passage of inhaled particles into the blood circulation in humans. *Circulation*, v. 105, p. 411-414.
- 57 According to the EPA's categorization of counties as urban or rural, the average ASPEN 1999 ambient diesel fine particle concentration is 1.3822 ug/m3 for urban counties and 0.4730 ug/m3 for rural counties. The overall national average is 1.2096 ug/m3. These averages are population weighted. These averages convert (using the 0.0003 factor) to cancer risks of 415 per million urban, 142 per million rural, and 363 per million average.
- 58 See CATF report and analysis at: http://www.catf.us/publications/reports/Diesel_Health_in_America.pdf.
- 59 See NY Times, Oct 29, 2006. A study links truck's exhaust to Bronx schoolchildren's asthma." Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/10/29/nyregion/29asthma.html?ex=1319778000&en=876d277b91b2c6fa&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>, by Manny Fernandez.
- 60 Kunzli, N, et al (2000). Public health impact of outdoor and traffic-related air pollution: a European Assessment. *The Lancet* v. 356, p. 795-783.
- 61 Janssen, N. et al (2003) The relationship between air pollution from heavy traffic and allergic sensitization, bronchial hyperresponsiveness and respiratory symptoms in Dutch schoolchildren. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 111 no 12, p. 1512-1518.
- 62 Ciccone, G et al (1998). Road traffic and adverse respiratory effects in children. *Occup, Environ. Med.* V. 55, p. 771-778.
- 63 Fruin, S (2003). Characterizing Black Carbon Inside Vehicles: Implications for Refined Exposure Assessments for Diesel Exhaust Particulate Matter. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- 64 Peters, A., et al (2004). Exposure to traffic and onset of myocardial infarction. *New England Journal of Medicine*, v. 351, no. 17. p. 1721-1730.
- 65 Tonne, C., Melly, S., Mittleman, M., Coull, B., Goldberg, R., Schwartz, J. (2007). A Case-Control Analysis of Exposure to Traffic and Acute Myocardial Infarction. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 115, no. 1, January 2007.
- 66 Peters et al (2004). Exposure to traffic and the onset of myocardial infarction. *New England Journal of Medicine*, Volume 351 no 17, p. 1721-1730, October 21, 2004. Also see: "Traffic triggers heart attacks" October 20, 2004. WebMD Medical News.
- 67 Hoek, G., Brunekreef, B., Goldbohm, S., Fischer, P. and van den Brandt, P. (2002). Association between mortality and indicators of traffic-related air pollution in the Netherlands: a cohort study. *The Lancet* vol. 360, p. 1203-1209. December 19, 2002.
- 68 Gauderman, J., Vora, H., McConnell, R., Berhane, K., Gilliland, F., Thomas, D., Lurmann, F., Avol, E., Kunzli, N., Jerrett, M., and Peters, J. (2007). Effect of exposure to traffic on lung development from 10-18 years of age: a cohort study. *The Lancet*, Early Online Publication, 26 January 2007.
- 69 Riediker, M., Cascia, W., Griggs, T., Herbst, M. m Bromberg, P., Neas, L., Williams, R., and Devlin, R. (2004). Particulate matter exposure in cars is associated with cardiovascular effects in healthy young men. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, v. 169, p. 934-940.
- 70 Riediker, M, Williams, R., Devlin, R., Griggs, T., and Bromberg, P. (2003). Exposure to particulate matter, volatile organic compounds and other air pollutants inside patrol cars. *Environmental Science and Technology*, v. 37, p. 2084-2093.
- 71 Ciccone, G. et al (1998). Road traffic and adverse respiratory effects in children. *Occup. Environ. Med.* v. 55, p. 771-778.
- 72 VanVliet et al (1997). Motor vehicle exhaust and chronic respiratory symptoms in children living near freeways. *Environmental research*, v. 74, no. 2, p. 122-132.
- 73 Venn AJ, Lewis SA, Cooper M, Hubbard R, Britton J. (2001) Living near a main road and the risk of wheezing illness in children. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med.* v. 164 no. 12, p. 2177-80.
- 74 Lee, Y., Shaw, C., Su, H., Lai, J., Ko, Y., Huang, S., Sung, F., and Guo, Y. (2003). Climate, traffic-related air pollutants and allergic rhinitis prevalence in middle-school children in Taiwan. *European Respiratory Journal*, v. 21, p. 964-970.
- 75 Kim, J., Smoorodinisky, S., Lipsett, M., Singer, B., Hodgson, A., and Ostro, B. (2004). Traffic-related air pollution near busy roads. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, v. 170, p. 520-526.
- 76 Garshick, E., Laden, F., Hart, J., and Caron, A. (2003). Residence near a major road and respiratory symptoms in U.S. veterans. *Epidemiology*, v. 14, no. 6, p. 728-736.
- 77 McConnell et al (2006). Traffic, susceptibility, and childhood asthma. *Environmental health perspectives*, v. 114, no. 5, p. 766-772.
- 78 Nicolai, T. et al (2003). Urban traffic and pollutant exposure related to respiratory outcomes and atopy in a large sample of children. *European Respiratory Journal*. V. 21, 956-963.
- 79 English, P., Neutra, R., Scalf, R., Sullivan, M., Walter, L., and Zhu, Li. (1999). Examining associations between childhood asthma and traffic flow using a geographic information system. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, v. 107, no. 9.
- 80 Lin, S., Munsie, J., Hwang, S., Fitzgerald, E. And Cayo, M. (2002). Childhood asthma hospitalization and residential exposure to state route traffic. *Environmental Research, Section A*, v. 88, p. 73-81.
- 81 Makino, K. (2000). Association of school absence with air pollution in areas around arterial roads. *Journal of Epidemiology*, v. 10, no. 5., p. 292-299.
- 82 Finkelstein, M., Jerrett, M., and Sears, M. (2004). Traffic air pollution and mortality rate advancement periods. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, v. 160, p. 173-177.



CLEAN AIR TASK FORCE

18 Tremont Street
Boston, MA 02108
Tel: 617-624-0234 / Fax: 617-624-0230

www.catf.us