



NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

1301 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20004-1725
Phone: (202) 785-3355
Fax: (202) 452-1805

61 Broadway, 6th Floor
New York, NY 10006-2701
Phone: (212) 315-8700
Fax: (212) 315-8800

www.LungUSA.org

**Statement of Mary Partridge
Chair of the Board
American Lung Association
August 3, 2009**

Good morning. My name is Mary Partridge and I'm Chair of the Board of Directors for the American Lung Association. I have been a volunteer for the Lung Association for thirty years. Thank you for the opportunity to share the position of the American Lung Association on EPA's proposed national air quality standards for nitrogen dioxide.

The American Lung Association saves lives through the prevention of lung disease and the promotion of lung health. We are committed to the fight for healthy air.

Key to that fight has been our work to support stronger national ambient air quality standards. We recognize the critical role that national air quality standards play—that these standards quite literally drive the work we do as a nation to clean up air pollution.

We are pleased that for the first time since 1971, the EPA is recommending providing more protection from nitrogen dioxide. The American Lung Association agrees with the conclusion reached by both EPA and the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee that the current standard fails to protect public health.

We are pleased that EPA has proposed a new, one-hour standard to strengthen that protection, but we disagree with the proposed range. The proposed range—even at the low end of 80 parts per billion—would allow too much nitrogen dioxide to truly protect the health of the public. We recommend EPA adopt a much tighter one-hour standard of 50 parts per billion, set at the 99th percentile.

The Lung Association also urges EPA to set a much tighter annual standard. We recommend EPA adopt the annual standard that California has set, which is 30 parts per billion.

We need greater protection because nitrogen dioxide is dangerous. Science tells us that this noxious gas makes people cough and wheeze and inflames the tissues of the lungs. Nitrogen dioxide increases the likelihood that asthma sufferers will have to rush to the emergency department or be admitted to the hospital, and even increases the risk that we could catch lung infections such as influenza.

Children who grow up near highways may suffer long-term health effects from breathing nitrogen dioxide from the constant stream of traffic. The California Children's Study found these children grew up with measurably lower lung function, a hidden threat that puts them—for the rest of their lives—at greater risk of developing a serious lung disease.

Millions of people face higher risk. EPA's own proposal noted that 36 million people live near highways, railroads or ports, where they breathe air pollution that is consistently more polluted than in other parts of the country.

Neighborhoods near major highways tend to be home to people with lower incomes, as well as communities of color. Many busy highways pass through dense urban neighborhoods or near schools. Those communities often have higher prevalence of lung disease, putting them at even

greater risk from breathing traffic exhaust. I know what that is like, because for years I lived near Highways I-59 and I-45 in Houston. The pollution was a constant presence in those neighborhoods.

In addition to those who live near highways are those who work on or near them, including truck drivers, police officers, and commuters. Others at high risk include children, teenagers, older adults and any one of the 22.9 million people with asthma in this country.

We applaud the proposed national network of nitrogen dioxide monitors located near highways. We hope this will only be the beginning of what is truly needed—a network that will routinely gather information along our highways, the place in every community that has some of the highest levels of the most dangerous pollutants.

However, the Lung Association disagrees with the option that, in lieu of the nationwide monitoring, EPA would tighten the one-hour standard to a level lower than the proposed range. The American Lung Association does not believe that the level of a national air quality standard should depend on the level of monitoring. We need both a strong network of monitors and a strong standard.

The science is clear. The law is clear. EPA has a legal requirement to set the standard where it protects the health of the public—including vulnerable people like the members of my family who have asthma—with a margin of safety. The proposed nitrogen dioxide standards are important steps toward that goal—but they do not go far enough. On behalf of the American Lung Association, I urge you to adopt a substantially stronger nitrogen dioxide standard. Quite literally, the health of members of my family and my old neighbors in Houston—depend on you.

Thank you again for your consideration.