

 **AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION®**  
State of the Air: 2008

www.lungusa.org

*Improving Life, One Breath at a Time*

1-800-LUNGUSA



The State of the Air in  
**California**



# Acknowledgments

*The American Lung Association State of the Air 2008 is the result of the hard work of many people:*

*Outside the American Lung Association:* Allen S. Lefohn of A.S.L. & Associates, who compiled the data; Deborah Shprentz, who researched and reviewed the science; Cindy Wright of CJW Associates, who developed marketing and field materials; Kristin Lawton at Convio, Inc., who partnered with Online Services on website development for the report; and Frank O'Donnell of Clean Air Watch, who helped with media outreach.

*In the American Lung Association National Headquarters:* Paul G. Billings, who supervised the work; Janice E. Nolen, who directed the project, analyzed data and wrote the text; Blake Early, who reviewed and revised materials; and Josephine Ceselski, who coordinated trend data, field outreach and e-advocacy; Andrea Stansfield, MPH, who converted the raw data into meaningful tables and comparisons, calculated all the at-risk population data and reviewed the report; Zach Jump, who assisted in the data analysis and review; Susan Rappaport, MPH, who spearheaded the data analysis; Elizabeth Lancet, MPH, who consulted on the data analysis; Norman Edelman, MD, who reviewed the science and health discussions; Jean Haldorsen, who supervised production and scheduling for print and online editions; Tony Javed who oversaw the online development and Robin Fostel who coordinated website development for the report and promotional materials for the field; and Carrie Martin, who directed marketing materials development and media outreach, and Elizabeth Margulies who assisted with media coordination.

*In the nationwide American Lung Association:* All Lung Association field offices reviewed and commented on the data for their states. Hard-working staff across the nation went out of their way to ensure that their state and local air directors were in the loop.

Finally, great appreciation goes to the National Association of Clean Air Administrators, who along with their Executive Director, Bill Becker, and Amy Royden-Bloom, strove to make this report better through their comments, review and concerns. Many of their members reviewed and commented on the individual state data presented and the methodology to help make this report more accurate. We appreciate them as our partners in the fight against air pollution. This report should in no way be construed as a comment on the work they do.

The American Lung Association assumes sole responsibility for the content of the *American Lung Association State of the Air 2008*.

## **American Lung Association**

### **National Headquarters**

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

### **Washington Office**

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

<http://www.lungusa.org>

Copyright © 2008 by the American Lung Association  
American Lung Association is a registered trademark.

***Improving Life, One Breath at a Time***

Designed by Our Designs, Inc., Nashville, TN  
Printing and binding by Hard Copy Printing, New York, NY



# *Contents*

Executive Summary .....	5
The State of the Air in 2004-2006. ....	9
Rankings	
Tables 1, 1a and 1b: Populations at Risk in the U.S. ....	14
Tables 2, 2a and 2b: Most Polluted Cities in the U.S.. ....	19
Tables 3, 3a, and 3b: Most Polluted Counties in the U.S.. ....	22
Tables 4 and 4a: Most Polluted Counties in Each State .....	25
Tables 5, 5a and 5b: Cleanest Cities in the U.S. ....	28
Tables 6, 6a and 6b: Cleanest Counties in the U.S. ....	31
Health Effects of Ozone and Particle Pollution .....	37
Description of Methodology. ....	51
Notes for State Data Table .....	57
State Table. ....	58



## *Executive Summary*

**A**ir pollution continued to challenge the nation in 2004, 2005, and 2006. Some cities—notably Los Angeles and Houston—managed to steadily cut ozone and particle pollution. Progress stalled in many other cities, slowing or eroding gains recorded earlier in the decade. For the first time, a city outside of California—Pittsburgh—topped one of the lists of the most polluted city—and stands on the verge of topping a second.

The adoption of a new ozone standard on March 12<sup>th</sup> will require redoubled efforts to reduce the nation's most common air pollutant. The history of battling ozone shows that aggressive measures can cut emissions, leading to much cleaner air. However, the trends shown in this report warn that progress can stall without putting more measures in place to reduce ozone. Unfortunately, some have proposed changes that would weaken the Clean Air Act and set back the progress toward healthier air.

Looking at the nation as a whole, the *American Lung Association State of the Air 2008* finds:

- **Two of every five people—42 percent—in the U.S. live in counties that have unhealthful levels of either ozone or particle pollution.**

Almost 125 million Americans live in 216 counties where they are exposed to unhealthful levels of air pollution in the form of either ozone or short-term or year-round levels of particles.

- **Nearly one-third of the U.S. population—31 percent—live in areas with unhealthful levels of ozone.**

Counties that were graded F for ozone levels have a combined population of over 92.5 million. One in three Americans live in counties where the monitored air quality places them at risk for decreased lung function, respiratory infection, lung inflammation and aggravation of respiratory illness.

- **Over one quarter of the people in the United States live in an area with unhealthful short-term levels of particle pollution.**

Over 81.4 million Americans live in areas where there are too many days of unhealthy spikes in particle pollution. Short-term spikes in particle pollution can last from hours to several days and can increase the risk of heart attacks, strokes and emergency-room visits for asthma and cardiovascular disease, and most importantly, can increase the risk of early death.

- **One in six people in the United States lives in an area with unhealthy year-round levels of particle pollution.**

Nearly 50 million Americans suffer from chronic exposure to particle pollution. Even when levels are fairly low, exposure to particles over time can increase risk of hospitalization for asthma, damage to the lungs and, significantly, increase the risk of premature death.

- **About 30.4 million Americans—roughly one in 10 people—live in 18 counties with unhealthy levels of all three: ozone and short-term and year-round particle pollution.**

With the risks from airborne pollution so great, the American Lung Association seeks to inform people who may be in danger. Many people are at greater risk because of their age or because they have asthma or other chronic lung or cardiovascular diseases or diabetes. Here are the numbers of people in each at-risk group.

- **People with Asthma**—Approximately 2.2 million children and over 5.5 million adults with asthma live in parts of the United States with very high levels of ozone. Nearly 5 million adults and over 1.9 million children with asthma live in areas with high levels of short-term particle pollution. Nearly 3 million adults and over 1.2 million children with asthma live in counties with unhealthy levels of year-round particle pollution.
- **Older and Younger**—Over 10.2 million adults age 65 and over and nearly 24 million children age 18 and under live in counties with unhealthy ozone levels. Over 9.4 million seniors and 20.6 million children live in counties with unhealthy short-term levels of particle pollution. Over 5.5 million seniors and 13 million children live in counties with unhealthy levels of year-round particle pollution.
- **Chronic Bronchitis and Emphysema**—Nearly 2.9 million people with chronic bronchitis and over 1.2 million with emphysema live in counties with unhealthy ozone levels. Nearly 2.6 million people with chronic bronchitis and 1.1 million with emphysema live in counties with unhealthy levels of short-term particle pollution. Over 1.5 million people with chronic bronchitis and over 644,000 people with emphysema live in counties with unhealthy year-round levels of particle pollution.
- **Cardiovascular Diseases**—Nearly 20.1 million people with cardiovascular diseases live in areas with unhealthy levels of short-term particle pollution; nearly 12 million people live in counties with unhealthy levels of year-round particle pollution. Cardiovascular disease includes coronary heart disease, heart attacks, strokes, hypertension and angina pectoris.
- **Diabetes**—Over 4.6 million people with diabetes live in areas with unhealthy levels of short-term particle pollution; over 2.7 million people live in counties with unhealthy levels of year-round particle pollution.

Research indicates that diabetics face increased risk due to the damage particle pollution can cause to their cardiovascular systems.

The American Lung Association also calls for these key steps needed to improve the air we all breathe.

- **Ensure every county is protected from ozone.** The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has just adopted a new, tighter national standard for ozone, an important step that drives the measures to clean up the sources of ozone pollution all across the nation. Now the EPA must determine which counties to protect and which counties to leave out of the clean up requirements. The American Lung Association urges the EPA to include every county in planning and protection in every metropolitan area that has monitored unhealthy levels of ozone. The Lung Association opposes leaving counties left out of the planning for protection from this dangerous pollutant.
  - **Protect the Clean Air Act.** Since 1970, the Clean Air Act has proven to be one of the nation's leading public health laws. Thanks to clean-up measures put in place under the Act, emissions from all pollutants have dropped in half since 1980. However, in March the EPA proposed substantial changes to the Act, changes that would weaken decades-old protections to the public. The American Lung Association will oppose any changes that weaken the Clean Air Act.
  - **Clean up dirty power plants.** Old, coal-fired power plants are among the biggest industrial contributors to unhealthful air, especially particle pollution in the eastern United States. The toll of death, disease and environmental destruction caused by coal-fired power plant pollution continues to mount. The EPA issued rules in 2005 that give states the tools to clean up these plants. However, the EPA has issued other rules that give the electric power plants huge loopholes in complying with the Clean Air Act. The American Lung Association and our partners will continue to take steps to ensure that loopholes are removed.
- Several Northeastern states are considering adopting even more stringent requirements for their power plants. The American Lung Association repeatedly urged the EPA to use this opportunity to clean up even more pollution, faster. The American Lung Association supports efforts in Congress to strengthen the Clean Air Act to further clean up these heavy polluters.
- **Clean up existing diesel equipment.** New diesel buses, trucks, and heavy equipment are cleaner than ever, thanks to clean up requirements EPA has put in place in the last decade. Diesel fuels are also much cleaner. However, old diesel engines last a long time. Diesel engines in school buses, highway trucks, and other equipment continue to operate for hundreds of thousands of miles, threatening the health of millions—especially those on or near highways—with dangerous exposure to diesel exhaust. Each community

should move rapidly to retrofit and replace old diesel school buses and other equipment in the public diesel fleet. Communities should require contractors to clean up trucks and construction equipment. These and other steps can reduce the burden of pollution from old, dirty, diesel equipment and vehicles.

- **Require all ships calling on U.S. ports to use cleaner marine fuels and engines.** Although international shipping is essential to the global economy, it also produces large amounts of air pollution. Emissions from these engines seriously worsen national ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxide, and particle pollution levels, especially in communities near commercial ports such as Seattle, Oakland, Chicago, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and New York. Both foreign-flagged as well as U S ships must be required to use much cleaner fuels and engines.

Individual citizens can do a great deal to help reduce air pollution outdoors as well. Simple, but effective ways include:

- **Drive less.** Combine trips, walk, bike, carpool or vanpool, and use buses, subways or other alternatives to driving. Vehicle emissions are a major source of air pollution. Support community plans that provide ways to get around that don't require a car, such as more sidewalks, bike trails and transit systems.
- **Don't burn wood or trash.** Burning firewood and trash are among the largest sources of particles in many parts of the country. If you must use a fireplace or stove for heat, convert your woodstoves to natural gas, which has far fewer polluting emissions. Compost and recycle as much as possible and dispose of other waste properly; don't burn it. Support efforts in your community to ban outdoor burning of construction and yard wastes. Avoid the use of outdoor hydronic heaters, also called outdoor wood boilers, which are often much more polluting than woodstoves.
- **Get involved.** Participate in your community's review of its air pollution plans and support state and local efforts to clean up air pollution.
- **Use less electricity.** Turn out the lights and use energy-efficient appliances. Generating electricity is one of the biggest sources of pollution, particularly in the eastern United States.
- **Send a message to decision makers.** Send an email or fax to urge Congress to oppose measures that weaken the Clean Air Act. Log on at [www.lungusa.org](http://www.lungusa.org) to see how easy that can be.

## *The State of the Air in 2004–2006*

**A**ir pollution continued to challenge the nation in 2004, 2005, and 2006. Some cities—notably Los Angeles and Houston—managed to steadily cut ozone and particle pollution. Progress stalled in many other cities, however, slowing or eroding gains recorded earlier in the decade. For the first time, a city outside of California—Pittsburgh—topped one of the lists of the most polluted cities—and stands on the verge of topping a second. Over 124.7 million people live in places where air pollution levels for ozone or fine particle pollution place human health at risk.

Many cities have multiple problems. Eight metropolitan areas ranked as the nation's most polluted cities by every measure. Five of the eight are from California—Los Angeles, Bakersfield, Fresno, Visalia-Porterfield, and Hanford-Corcoran—with Washington, DC-Baltimore, St. Louis, and Birmingham rounding out the list. Seven metropolitan areas landed on two of the three lists, including Pittsburgh, Atlanta, New York City, Detroit, Chicago, Louisville, and Merced, California.

Two cities ranked at the top of the cleanest cities in the United States: Fargo, North Dakota, and Salinas, California. These metropolitan areas recorded no unhealthy ozone or particle pollution days and ranked as having some of the lowest annual levels of particle pollution. Three cities scored the best for ozone and annual levels of particle pollution: Albuquerque, New Mexico; Duluth, Minnesota; and Honolulu, Hawaii.

### **Policy changes**

On March 12, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) adopted a tighter national air quality standard for ozone based on the new research that shows serious harm at much lower levels of exposure. Meeting that standard will require redoubled efforts to reduce the nation's most common air pollutant. The history of battling ozone shows that aggressive measures can cut emissions, leading to much cleaner air. However, the trends shown in this report warn that progress can stall without putting more measures in place to reduce ozone.

Unfortunately, that same day, the EPA announced recommendations for changes that would dismantle the core principles that are embodied in the Clean Air Act. The EPA Administrator offered to allow the state and local governments to determine which pollutants to ignore and which to clean up. The Clean Air Act recognized these pollutants as the national priority because they were the most widespread and dangerous. The EPA has the responsibility to protect the health of all of the public from these pollutants, not just some,

and required the states and local governments to reduce the burden of all these pollutants, not just some.

On March 14, the EPA announced the long-awaited requirements for much cleaner diesel locomotive and marine equipment. Trains and ships contribute tons of diesel particle pollution and tons of nitrogen oxides that lead to ozone problems. This step will help reduce pollution from ports, rivers and industrial areas across the nation. This action will require the clean-up of diesel locomotives, barges, tugs, and boats beginning in 2008.

### **Particle pollution**

For the first time, a city not in California—Pittsburgh—moved to the top of a most polluted list. Pittsburgh edged out Los Angeles, despite having slightly fewer days in this report than last year. In addition, Pittsburgh’s annual level of particle pollution just missed tying Los Angeles in this year’s report, and may overtake it next year. Aggressive emissions controls in the Los Angeles basin dropped the year-round particle levels by just under one-third during this decade. By contrast, the ranking for Pittsburgh remains only marginally better than in the 2007 report and tied with its level in the 2006 report. Los Angeles remains at the top of the list of cities most polluted year-round by particle pollution.

Several cities that also reduced year-round particle pollution dropped off the “25 most polluted” list this year, including New York City, Chicago, Philadelphia and Indianapolis. Several cities saw increased particle pollution, including Atlanta, Birmingham, Hanford-Corcoran (California), and Macon (Georgia).

By contrast, most cities curtailed the number of days with dangerous levels of short-term particle pollution. On the list of the cities most polluted by these spikes in particles, cities shifted rankings based more on how they compared with other cities than on their own improvements. Several metro areas had markedly fewer days of high particle pollution, including Washington, DC-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, Eugene (OR), Harrisburg (PA), San Diego and Weirton-Steubenville (WV-OH). Sacramento and Modesto, California reported more days with high particle pollution spikes.

In a report published in January, 2008, the EPA analyzed trends in particle pollution, along with ozone and four other pollutants. The analysis of particle pollution shows a clear drop from 2000 to 2006, but most of that drop occurred between 2000 and 2002. Adjusted for weather, the three-year average particle pollution levels declined during 2004-2006 compared to 2003-2005. However, the adjustment shows a general stalling in particle levels between 2002 and 2006.

## Nationwide particle pollution trends, 2000-2006




Fig. 1. Chart showing changes in particle pollution concentrations nationwide in monitored data (observed trend) and in particle pollution concentrations adjusted for meteorology (adjusted trend). From U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Latest Findings on National Air Quality: Status and Trends through 2006*. January 2008.

Rankings for the year-round particle pollution list also changed despite improved levels in some cities because other cities made even greater improvements. For example, Louisville saw its rankings worsen, moving to 18<sup>th</sup> most polluted from 22<sup>nd</sup>, despite a slight improvement in year-round levels because other cities made much greater progress.

A few other cities also improved their air quality, despite continuing to rank in the list of cities most polluted by year-round levels of particle pollution. Detroit and Cleveland both dropped their annual levels. Improvements tapered off in other cities.

### Ozone

The five worst cities for ozone all saw good improvement in their ozone levels during 2004-2006, including Los Angeles and Houston—two cities with most infamous smog problems. In particular, Fresno (CA) marked a remarkable decline in high ozone days since a peak in 2001-2003, showing a drop of two-thirds in that metro area's weighted average. Most cities on the list of the most polluted had fewer high ozone days in the 2004-2006 period, compared to last year's report, including Dallas, New York City, and Philadelphia. Several cities on the most ozone-polluted list fared worse in 2004-2006 over the previous report—Sacramento, San Diego, Washington, DC-Baltimore, Atlanta and Charlotte. New to the list of most polluted cities for ozone is Birmingham.

Much of the eastern United States continues to benefit from controls placed between 1999 and 2004 on coal-fired power plants and other sources of nitrogen oxides, one of the precursors to ozone. Cleaner cars and other measures continue to cut emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the other ozone precursor nationwide. The cool, wet summer of 2004 helped keep ozone days down in some parts of the nation, though warmer summers returned in 2005 and 2006.

Although ozone levels remain lower, they appear to be leveling off. In January 2008, the EPA analyzed ozone trends from 1990 to 2006 nationwide and adjusted them for weather, finding that the adjusted levels showed a seven percent decline from 1997 to 2006. However, the adjusted levels between 2004 and 2006 showed a distinct uptick, though still well below the levels of a decade earlier.

### Nationwide ozone pollution trends, 2000-2006




Fig. 2. Chart showing changes in ozone concentrations in monitored data (observed trend) and in ozone levels adjusted for weather (adjusted trend). From U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Latest Findings on National Air Quality: Status and Trends through 2006*. January 2008.

Cities showing significantly more ozone problems in the 2004-2006 report include Birmingham, which moved to the most polluted list for ozone for the first time, and San Diego, which returned to the list for the first time since the 2004 report. Many cities on the most polluted list improved, including Merced, California, which improved its ranking to 17<sup>th</sup> from 6<sup>th</sup> most polluted. Three cities improved enough to drop completely from the most polluted list, although they continue to receive a failing grade: Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Grand Rapids, Michigan; and Cleveland, Ohio.

## Tables

### *Populations at Risk in the U.S.*

Table 1:	Estimated Populations at Risk from Short-term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	14
Table 1a:	Estimated Populations at Risk from Year-Round Particle Pollution (Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	16
Table 1b:	Estimated Populations at Risk from Ozone	17

### *Most Polluted Cities in the U.S.*

Table 2:	People at Risk In 25 U.S. Cities Most Polluted by Short-term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	19
Table 2a:	People at Risk In 25 U.S. Cities Most Polluted by Year-Round Particle Pollution (Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	20
Table 2b:	People at Risk In 25 Most Ozone-Polluted Cities	21

### *Most Polluted Counties in the U.S.*

Table 3:	People at Risk in 25 Counties Most Polluted by Short-term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	22
Table 3a:	People at Risk In 25 Counties Most Polluted by Long-term Particle Pollution (Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	23
Table 3b:	People at Risk in 25 Most Ozone-Polluted Counties	24

### *Most Polluted Counties in Each State*

Table 4:	Counties with the Worst Particle Pollution (PM <sub>2.5</sub> 24-Hour and Annual Averages) in Each State	25
Table 4a:	Counties with the Worst Ozone Air Pollution in Each State	27

### *Cleanest Cities in the U.S.*

Table 5:	Cleanest U.S. Cities for Short-term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	28
Table 5a:	Top 25 Cleanest U.S. Cities for Long-term Particle Pollution (Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	29
Table 5b:	Cleanest U.S. Cities for Ozone Air Pollution	30

### *Cleanest Counties in the U.S.*

Table 6:	Cleanest Counties for Short-term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	31
Table 6a:	Top 25 Cleanest Counties for Long-term Particle Pollution (Annual PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	32
Table 6b:	Cleanest Counties for Ozone Air Pollution	33

**Table 1:** *Estimated Populations at Risk from Short-Term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)*

	Report Year	Chronic Diseases					
		Adult Asthma	Pediatric Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema	CV Disease	Diabetes
Grade A (0.0)	2004	1,098,109	427,013	677,090	238,588	4,417,584	(1)
	2005	1,265,970	486,791	721,673	275,701	6,069,486	1,214,415
	2006	1,907,529	663,978	1,042,736	425,983	8,362,853	1,775,331
	2007	723,267	254,527	366,951	162,864	2,870,181	678,454
	2008	799,193	298,995	438,739	195,191	3,531,603	808,561
Grade B (0.3-0.9)	2004	2,091,803	777,232	1,234,260	429,795	7,998,682	(1)
	2005	2,177,008	850,022	1,165,895	421,841	9,554,840	1,899,681
	2006	2,508,661	882,494	1,296,874	507,256	10,178,986	2,151,354
	2007	1,430,438	498,993	738,503	328,417	5,784,989	1,367,113
	2008	1,542,507	583,082	852,038	373,474	6,794,782	1,556,669
Grade C (1.0-2.0)	2004	2,494,275	941,891	1,500,267	514,544	9,635,256	(1)
	2005	2,241,512	849,957	1,181,534	419,786	9,612,249	1,905,198
	2006	2,881,178	1,002,944	1,465,631	574,248	11,532,058	2,435,734
	2007	2,351,675	892,012	1,223,190	510,249	9,167,840	2,190,730
	2008	3,088,726	1,133,161	1,605,538	686,637	12,608,195	2,894,763
Grade D (2.1-3.2)	2004	1,341,788	496,552	783,391	263,649	4,966,969	(1)
	2005	1,711,703	622,929	873,476	312,009	7,131,044	1,413,876
	2006	1,182,987	394,221	597,144	232,231	4,665,231	985,191
	2007	2,062,482	798,520	1,063,714	443,747	7,959,894	1,899,877
	2008	1,966,230	767,766	1,014,248	423,894	7,852,670	1,803,902
Grade F (3.3+)	2004	4,468,378	1,766,912	2,649,823	888,281	16,729,853	(1)
	2005	4,606,903	1,679,638	2,254,726	801,992	18,325,151	3,627,483
	2006	3,907,150	1,421,992	1,974,959	763,403	15,371,186	3,236,265
	2007	5,509,134	2,125,283	2,846,148	1,194,055	21,368,462	5,093,142
	2008	4,999,185	1,914,328	2,580,828	1,086,461	20,071,520	4,606,131
National Population in Counties with PM <sub>2.5</sub> Monitors	2004	11,731,287	4,497,507	6,985,770	2,383,863	44,661,067	(1)
	2005	13,606,631	5,060,978	7,032,822	2,540,957	50,692,770	11,444,651
	2006	13,109,352	4,607,401	6,738,927	2,643,257	52,913,571	11,178,920
	2007	12,888,115	4,867,064	6,647,841	2,809,175	50,202,520	11,958,143
	2008	13,055,765	4,932,066	6,828,038	2,908,815	53,493,186	12,274,890

(1) 2005 was the first year in which people with diabetes were incorporated as a high-risk group.

(2) 2005 was the first year those 18 and under were incorporated as a sensitive group. In previous versions of the report, 14 and under was used.

	Report Year	Age Groups		Total Population	Number of Counties	Number of High PM <sub>2.5</sub> Days			
		Under 18	Over 65			Orange	Red	Purple	Maroon
Grade A (0.0)	2004	(2)	2,602,983	20,387,885	177	0	0	0	0
	2005	5,720,170	3,216,121	23,463,883	185	0	0	0	0
	2006	7,839,172	4,324,071	32,447,762	218	0	0	0	0
	2007	2,859,856	1,582,448	11,752,625	80	0	0	0	0
	2008	3,221,928	1,816,035	13,338,408	88	0	0	0	0
Grade B (0.3-0.9)	2004	(2)	4,618,540	37,207,266	185	224	28	0	0
	2005	9,988,540	4,646,290	39,108,293	194	254	18	0	0
	2006	10,419,050	4,845,683	41,426,762	198	252	17	1	0
	2007	5,606,667	3,195,860	23,494,442	149	213	2	0	0
	2008	6,283,211	3,414,159	26,047,545	134	196	4	0	0
Grade C (1.0-2.0)	2004	(2)	5,426,388	45,286,047	136	503	40	0	0
	2005	9,987,706	4,518,985	39,637,741	120	448	28	0	0
	2006	11,841,092	5,475,538	46,848,907	104	371	37	1	0
	2007	10,022,611	4,571,794	39,966,818	166	716	4	0	0
	2008	12,210,786	5,944,519	49,614,525	183	784	9	2	0
Grade D (2.1-3.2)	2004	(2)	2,718,105	23,768,590	51	337	34	1	0
	2005	7,319,930	3,358,629	29,187,894	59	381	49	1	0
	2006	4,654,292	2,225,319	18,973,903	37	249	27	0	0
	2007	8,972,131	4,026,457	35,070,995	87	651	23	1	0
	2008	8,273,338	3,596,014	32,165,224	74	562	12	1	0
Grade F (3.3+)	2004	(2)	9,356,704	81,757,891	106	2,724	446	7	0
	2005	19,737,219	8,878,003	76,509,309	94	2,494	327	4	0
	2006	16,788,579	7,377,704	64,324,359	71	1,773	236	5	0
	2007	23,879,579	10,965,349	93,704,219	137	3,589	186	2	0
	2008	20,628,539	9,453,874	81,460,730	112	2,876	157	3	6
National Population in Counties with PM <sub>2.5</sub> Monitors	2004	(2)	25,234,335	212,631,740	726	3,788	548	8	0
	2005	59,470,893	28,046,929	235,287,598	735	3,577	422	5	0
	2006	54,396,663	25,587,775	215,558,018	718	2,645	317	7	0
	2007	54,686,116	25,874,255	217,389,252	718	5,169	215	3	0
	2008	53,147,263	25,460,763	213,024,419	681	4,418	182	6	6

**Table 1a: Estimated Populations at Risk from Year-Round Particle Pollution (Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

	Report Year	Chronic Diseases					Age Groups		Total Population	Number of Counties	
		Adult Asthma	Pediatric Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema	CV Disease	Diabetes	Under 18			Over 65
Pass	2004	6,221,496	2,374,312	3,719,521	1,268,996	23,779,701	(1)	(2)	13,359,480	112,896,625	396
	2005	6,841,000	2,594,982	3,615,962	1,306,929	29,641,691	5,887,389	30,493,216	14,392,539	120,845,855	435
	2006	8,071,754	2,830,224	4,201,235	1,656,530	33,107,960	6,996,832	33,414,601	16,084,169	133,680,848	467
	2007	8,179,468	3,041,301	4,233,660	1,801,792	32,144,480	7,650,058	34,171,923	16,688,256	137,594,967	455
	2008	8,603,999	3,183,397	4,510,181	1,935,261	35,492,146	8,142,404	34,303,851	17,064,455	139,570,176	460
Fail	2004	3,564,838	1,430,102	2,147,177	720,826	13,569,611	(1)	(2)	7,597,861	66,207,360	120
	2005	3,466,484	1,282,823	1,717,548	610,587	13,957,208	2,763,144	15,074,296	6,737,881	58,311,751	82
	2006	3,208,987	1,173,640	1,628,006	627,882	12,672,297	2,665,505	13,856,441	6,032,060	53,054,643	68
	2007	3,091,746	1,256,707	1,642,524	685,390	12,279,896	2,928,550	14,120,305	6,273,908	54,480,556	73
	2008	2,964,275	1,206,421	1,551,525	644,038	11,962,737	2,746,838	13,000,222	5,505,897	49,771,699	58
National Population in Counties with PM <sub>2.5</sub> Monitors	2004	9,786,334	3,804,414	5,866,698	1,989,822	37,349,312	(1)	(2)	20,957,341	179,103,985	516
	2005	10,307,484	3,877,805	5,333,510	1,917,516	43,598,899	8,650,533	45,567,512	21,130,420	179,157,606	517
PM <sub>2.5</sub> Monitors	2006	11,280,741	4,003,864	5,829,241	2,284,412	45,780,257	9,662,337	47,271,042	22,116,229	186,735,491	535
	2007	11,271,214	4,298,008	5,876,184	2,487,182	44,424,376	10,578,608	48,292,228	22,962,164	192,075,523	528
	2008	11,568,274	4,389,818	6,061,707	2,579,299	47,454,882	10,889,242	47,304,073	22,570,352	189,341,875	518

(1) 2005 was the first year people with diabetes are incorporated as a high risk group.

(2) 2005 was the first year those 18 and under are incorporated as a sensitive group. In previous versions, 14 and under was used.

**Table 1b: Estimated Populations at Risk from Ozone**

	Report Year <sup>1</sup>	Chronic Diseases			
		Adult Asthma	Pediatric Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema
Grade A (0.0)	2004	791,444	295,702	479,335	163,687
	2005	816,733	300,035	434,229	158,458
	2006	1,101,423	371,502	606,774	253,035
	2007	1,444,708	505,761	772,761	346,761
	2008	1,759,104	614,996	940,070	415,461
Grade B (0.3-0.9)	2004	835,492	312,162	509,065	181,520
	2005	818,571	322,006	483,003	185,875
	2006	1,065,860	384,181	580,847	232,928
	2007	1,348,081	516,736	723,870	311,496
	2008	1,783,384	659,278	956,703	419,584
Grade C (1.0-2.0)	2004	777,159	294,538	482,637	172,954
	2005	1,046,738	400,744	570,187	210,265
	2006	1,183,001	419,134	608,112	238,066
	2007	1,975,636	732,459	1,006,458	421,078
	2008	2,257,962	811,161	1,144,601	486,933
Grade D (2.1-3.2)	2004	849,726	352,390	528,588	177,904
	2005	531,289	207,069	284,197	103,901
	2006	413,923	140,501	217,638	88,754
	2007	1,683,506	593,353	848,895	363,798
	2008	1,493,588	538,647	764,719	328,216
Grade F (3.3+)	2004	7,497,712	2,917,201	4,444,370	1,502,981
	2005	8,402,314	3,118,942	4,224,519	1,502,371
	2006	8,573,183	3,052,922	4,353,739	1,686,664
	2007	5,608,752	2,293,031	2,979,685	1,233,743
	2008	5,529,099	2,224,828	2,898,572	1,204,067
National Population in Counties with Ozone Monitors	2004	11,275,592	4,343,905	6,744,494	2,305,126
	2005	12,080,816	4,498,334	6,229,914	2,245,723
	2006	12,726,163	4,497,070	6,562,587	2,576,661
	2007	12,383,917	4,760,020	6,497,821	2,748,891
	2008	13,130,903	4,961,396	6,868,903	2,926,348

(1) Data from the reports issued in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 were omitted to simplify the table, but are available upon request.

(2) 2005 was the first year those 18 and under are incorporated as a sensitive group. In previous versions, 14 and under was used.

**Table 1b: (continued) Estimated Populations at Risk from Ozone**

	Report Year <sup>1</sup>	Age Groups		Total Population	Number of Counties	Number of High Ozone Days		
		Under 18	Over 65			Orange	Red	Purple
Grade A (0.0)	2004	(2)	1,719,616	14,417,418	77	0	0	0
	2005	3,525,678	1,755,385	14,339,204	87	0	0	0
	2006	4,386,141	2,624,697	18,604,687	110	0	0	0
	2007	5,682,711	3,389,213	24,345,906	145	0	0	0
	2008	6,627,115	3,820,210	28,340,629	189	0	0	0
Grade B (0.3-0.9)	2004	(2)	2,021,935	15,211,187	56	77	0	0
	2005	3,783,850	2,198,284	15,646,414	67	97	0	0
	2006	4,535,795	2,328,379	18,337,580	81	118	1	0
	2007	5,806,019	2,927,058	23,457,531	132	173	2	0
	2008	7,104,286	3,824,068	29,271,854	150	196	1	0
Grade C (1.0-2.0)	2004	(2)	1,918,297	14,373,424	77	324	3	0
	2005	4,709,090	2,379,449	18,887,354	94	397	4	0
	2006	4,948,370	2,280,662	19,486,872	99	429	7	0
	2007	8,229,881	3,822,577	32,897,057	143	579	24	0
	2008	8,740,961	4,221,714	35,510,432	133	562	9	0
Grade D (2.1-3.2)	2004	(2)	1,861,308	16,275,763	53	420	10	0
	2005	2,433,258	1,148,216	9,502,497	54	413	10	0
	2006	1,658,808	898,495	6,797,619	42	316	11	0
	2007	6,666,892	3,377,432	27,354,130	90	635	50	0
	2008	5,804,390	2,853,013	23,592,422	75	565	23	2
Grade F (3.3+)	2004	(2)	15,701,385	136,081,799	373	9,991	1,220	95
	2005	36,650,356	16,313,879	142,743,621	353	9,403	1,319	127
	2006	36,043,999	16,036,647	140,539,448	337	7,551	1,113	101
	2007	25,764,398	11,119,853	99,006,369	163	3,713	535	64
	2008	23,974,441	10,228,563	92,548,342	133	3,301	336	28
National Population in Counties with Ozone Monitors	2004	(2)	24,393,223	205,205,712	707	10,812	1,233	95
	2005	52,859,356	24,745,650	208,721,127	723	10,310	1,333	127
	2006	53,094,168	24,922,402	209,951,406	737	8,414	1,132	101
	2007	53,483,376	25,312,854	212,433,979	744	5,100	611	64
	2008	53,463,324	25,593,024	214,263,229	746	4,624	369	30

(1) Data from the reports issued in 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 were omitted to simplify the table, but are available upon request.

(2) 2005 was the first year those 18 and under are incorporated as a sensitive group. In previous versions, 14 and under was used.

**Table 2: People at Risk in 25 U.S. Cities Most Polluted by Short-Term Particle Pollution (24-Hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

2008 Rank <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Areas	Total Population <sup>2</sup>	Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,10</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,10</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,10</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,10</sup>	CV Disease <sup>8,10</sup>	Diabetes <sup>9,10</sup>
1	Pittsburgh-New Castle, PA	2,462,571	518,671	422,233	48,133	167,378	88,115	42,618	748,125	170,918
2	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	17,775,984	4,835,924	1,813,198	448,774	971,597	536,717	215,729	4,058,081	932,010
3	Fresno-Madera, CA	1,038,101	309,610	100,674	28,732	54,251	29,871	11,830	223,864	51,375
4	Bakersfield, CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	161,673	37,147
5	Birmingham-Hoover-Cullman, AL	1,180,206	286,314	151,406	26,570	78,466	38,808	17,023	309,601	71,022
6	Logan, UT-ID	111,156	36,010	9,036	3,342	6,384	2,934	1,064	20,881	4,786
7	Salt Lake City-Ogden-Clearfield, UT	1,632,814	492,982	139,302	45,749	94,968	46,416	17,738	340,497	78,352
8	Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Yuba City, CA-NV	2,373,596	589,107	278,436	54,669	135,208	75,438	31,687	585,909	134,394
9	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	5,410,014	1,364,806	634,415	126,654	383,598	174,927	75,046	1,376,296	316,339
10	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	8,211,213	2,002,876	855,777	185,867	545,154	263,298	107,719	2,011,954	463,297
11	Eugene-Springfield, OR	337,870	69,407	47,140	6,441	26,191	11,694	5,190	93,986	21,543
12	Provo-Orem, UT	474,180	166,065	31,414	15,411	26,046	11,716	3,956	80,039	18,370
13	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	9,725,317	2,531,912	1,055,954	234,961	598,142	304,377	126,077	2,343,679	538,608
13	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	21,976,224	5,273,371	2,797,470	489,369	1,380,661	720,038	313,120	5,713,550	1,310,234
15	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH	2,917,801	699,991	411,924	64,959	213,283	98,171	44,766	802,561	183,909
16	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	7,228,948	1,683,595	846,025	156,238	424,768	237,271	100,193	1,848,665	424,827
17	Hanford-Corcoran, CA	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406	28,207	6,483
18	Indianapolis-Anderson-Columbus, IN	1,984,644	516,762	221,718	47,956	123,413	62,496	26,211	484,900	111,411
18	Visalia-Porterville, CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	86,913	19,945
20	Harrisburg-Carlisle-Lebanon, PA	652,263	144,517	95,425	13,411	44,117	22,427	10,242	183,517	42,028
21	Louisville-Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN	1,356,798	330,418	166,556	30,663	84,560	44,549	19,331	353,001	81,082
21	Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD	6,382,714	1,547,208	830,364	143,581	413,222	210,028	92,485	1,679,649	385,159
23	Modesto, CA	512,138	147,599	51,201	13,697	27,284	15,060	6,033	113,645	26,088
24	State College, PA	140,953	23,577	15,625	2,188	10,620	4,628	1,742	33,654	7,699
25	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ	800,336	180,381	117,317	16,739	53,042	27,272	12,439	223,002	51,039

Notes:

- (1) Cities are ranked using the highest weighted average for any county within that Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations for all counties within the respective Combined Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) **CV disease** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census). CV disease includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.
- (9) **Diabetes** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (10) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

**Table 2a: People at Risk In 25 U.S. Cities Most Polluted by Year-Round Particle Pollution (Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

2008 Rank <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Areas	Total Population <sup>2</sup>	Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,10</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,10</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,10</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,10</sup>	CV Disease <sup>8,10</sup>	Diabetes <sup>9,10</sup>
1	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	17,775,984	4,835,924	1,813,198	448,774	971,597	536,717	215,729	4,058,081	932,010
2	Pittsburgh-New Castle, PA	2,462,571	518,671	422,233	48,133	167,378	88,115	42,618	748,125	170,918
3	Bakersfield, CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	161,673	37,147
4	Birmingham-Hoover-Cullman, AL	1,180,206	286,314	151,406	26,570	78,466	38,808	17,023	309,601	71,022
5	Visalia-Porterville, CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	86,913	19,945
6	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL	5,478,667	1,460,802	448,912	135,562	320,442	165,438	62,787	1,208,473	279,015
7	Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington, OH-KY-IN	2,147,617	542,837	252,603	50,375	150,251	68,882	29,389	540,124	124,045
8	Fresno-Madera, CA	1,038,101	309,610	100,674	28,732	54,251	29,871	11,830	223,864	51,375
8	Hanford-Corcoran, CA	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406	28,207	6,483
8	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	5,410,014	1,364,806	634,415	126,654	383,598	174,927	75,046	1,376,296	316,339
8	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH	2,917,801	699,991	411,924	64,959	213,283	98,171	44,766	802,561	183,909
12	Macon-Warner Robins-Fort Valley, GA	381,641	100,009	43,991	9,281	22,375	12,064	5,129	94,386	21,677
13	St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	2,858,549	699,809	364,870	64,942	184,375	93,790	41,144	748,278	171,677
14	Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	125,168	25,168	23,386	2,336	9,074	4,609	2,300	39,941	9,116
14	Charleston, WV	305,526	67,146	46,708	6,231	20,358	10,733	5,025	89,231	20,445
16	Lancaster, PA	494,486	124,995	70,706	11,600	32,198	16,215	7,405	132,700	30,353
16	York-Hanover-Gettysburg, PA	517,427	117,359	70,088	10,891	34,886	17,482	7,775	140,678	32,257
18	Louisville-Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN	1,356,798	330,418	166,556	30,663	84,560	44,549	19,331	353,001	81,082
19	Rome, GA	95,322	23,599	13,394	2,190	5,686	3,102	1,392	25,105	5,739
19	Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH	285,475	61,696	44,337	5,725	19,430	9,906	4,596	81,889	18,725
21	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	523,249	135,886	61,491	12,610	30,346	16,731	7,192	131,795	30,279
22	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	8,211,213	2,002,876	855,777	185,867	545,154	263,298	107,719	2,011,954	463,297
22	Canton-Massillon, OH	409,764	94,894	62,548	8,806	30,139	14,101	6,601	117,218	26,831
22	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	1,203,795	285,061	157,937	26,454	69,966	39,885	17,561	318,944	73,131
25	Columbus-Auburn-Opelika, GA-AL	437,222	110,229	47,630	10,229	27,250	13,608	5,539	103,680	23,793
25	Hagerstown-Martinsburg, MD-WV	257,619	59,104	32,516	5,485	17,135	8,455	3,619	66,436	15,228

Notes:

- (1) Cities are ranked using the highest weighted average for any county within that Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations for all counties within the respective Combined Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) **CV disease** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census). CV disease includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.
- (9) **Diabetes** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (10) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

**Table 2b: People at Risk In 25 Most Ozone-Polluted Cities**

2008 Rank <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Areas	Total Population <sup>2</sup>	Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,8</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,8</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,8</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,8</sup>
1	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	17,775,984	4,835,924	1,813,198	448,774	971,597	536,717	215,729
2	Bakersfield, CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401
3	Visalia-Porterville, CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577
4	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	5,641,077	1,583,322	453,950	146,932	292,570	166,956	63,328
5	Fresno-Madera, CA	1,038,101	309,610	100,674	28,732	54,251	29,871	11,830
6	Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Yuba City, CA-NV	2,373,596	589,107	278,436	54,669	135,208	75,438	31,687
7	Dallas-Fort Worth, TX	6,359,758	1,747,838	540,269	162,199	332,845	188,814	71,913
8	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	21,976,224	5,273,371	2,797,470	489,369	1,380,661	720,038	313,120
9	Washington-Baltimore--Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	8,211,213	2,002,876	855,777	185,867	545,154	263,298	107,719
10	Baton Rouge-Pierre Part, LA	789,986	199,274	80,926	18,493	34,841	24,710	9,962
11	Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD	6,382,714	1,547,208	830,364	143,581	413,222	210,028	92,485
12	Charlotte-Gastonia-Salisbury, NC-SC	2,191,604	553,784	230,924	51,391	112,281	69,215	28,368
12	San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA	2,941,454	745,182	327,369	69,153	164,778	91,371	37,390
12	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL	5,478,667	1,460,802	448,912	135,562	320,442	165,438	62,787
15	St. Louis--St. Charles--Farmington, MO-IL	2,858,549	699,809	364,870	64,942	184,375	93,790	41,144
15	Beaumont-Port Arthur, TX	379,640	94,593	50,633	8,778	21,028	12,389	5,506
17	Merced, CA	245,658	77,953	22,559	7,234	12,393	6,797	2,643
18	El Centro, CA	160,301	47,295	16,478	4,389	8,365	4,614	1,844
19	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	4,039,182	1,095,184	455,447	101,633	256,998	123,144	51,121
20	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	2,034,796	522,422	230,076	48,481	128,461	64,737	27,328
21	Modesto, CA	512,138	147,599	51,201	13,697	27,284	15,060	6,033
22	Birmingham-Hoover-Cullman, AL	1,180,206	286,314	151,406	26,570	78,466	38,808	17,023
23	Las Vegas-Paradise-Pahrump, NV	1,820,232	470,100	193,905	43,625	102,090	56,636	23,149
24	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	9,725,317	2,531,912	1,055,954	234,961	598,142	304,377	126,077
24	Hanford-Corcoran, CA	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406
24	Milwaukee-Racine-Waukesha, WI	1,706,077	432,931	209,494	40,176	111,371	55,367	24,147

Notes:

- (1) Cities are ranked using the highest weighted average for any county within that Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations for all counties within the respective Combined Statistical Area or Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to ozone and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.

**Table 3: People at Risk in 25 Counties Most Polluted by Short-term Particle Pollution (24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

2008 Rank <sup>1</sup>	County	ST	Total Population <sup>2</sup>	At-Risk Groups							High PM <sub>2.5</sub> Days in Unhealthy Ranges 2004-2006		
				Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,10</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,10</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,10</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,10</sup>	CV Disease <sup>8</sup>	Diabetes <sup>9</sup>	Weighted Avg. <sup>11</sup>	Grade <sup>12</sup>
1	ALLEGHENY	PA	1,223,411	260,084	208,070	24,136	82,980	43,618	21,048	369,779	84,488	62.0	F
2	RIVERSIDE	CA	2,026,803	558,015	227,387	51,784	108,629	60,147	24,481	458,324	104,810	46.7	F
3	FRESNO	CA	891,756	269,100	85,720	24,972	46,386	25,537	10,107	191,302	43,908	40.5	F
4	KERN	CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	161,673	37,147	40.2	F
5	LOS ANGELES	CA	9,948,081	2,680,206	1,013,531	248,723	546,345	301,816	121,319	2,282,052	524,249	35.3	F
6	JEFFERSON	AL	656,700	160,016	88,032	14,849	43,602	21,773	9,736	175,808	40,310	32.7	F
7	CACHE	UT	98,662	31,775	7,617	2,949	5,633	2,582	912	18,098	4,149	31.0	F
8	SALT LAKE	UT	978,701	290,056	82,647	26,917	57,387	28,043	10,674	205,228	47,248	28.7	F
9	SACRAMENTO	CA	1,374,724	362,210	151,043	33,613	76,326	42,383	17,447	325,142	74,607	20.5	F
10	WAYNE	MI	1,971,853	540,672	229,421	50,174	135,600	61,865	26,673	488,251	112,146	17.0	F
11	BALTIMORE CITY	MD	631,366	156,522	76,639	14,525	41,752	20,297	8,682	159,419	36,569	16.7	F
12	LANE	OR	337,870	69,407	47,140	6,441	26,191	11,694	5,190	93,986	21,543	16.0	F
13	SAN BERNARDINO	CA	1,999,332	594,264	162,012	55,148	104,080	56,618	21,114	409,388	94,247	15.5	F
14	ORANGE	CA	3,002,048	790,483	323,452	73,357	167,648	93,117	38,360	714,617	164,166	15.0	F
15	UTAH	UT	464,760	162,860	30,491	15,113	25,529	11,464	3,855	78,138	17,935	13.8	F
16	COOK	IL	5,288,655	1,357,756	617,749	126,000	325,805	167,028	70,605	1,302,314	298,808	13.7	F
16	UNION	NJ	531,088	133,705	66,633	12,408	30,347	17,246	7,544	137,345	31,515	13.7	F
18	CUYAHOGA	OH	1,314,241	320,716	198,458	29,762	95,075	44,424	20,803	369,393	84,525	13.3	F
19	SANTA CLARA	CA	1,731,281	431,737	181,904	40,065	98,498	54,554	22,180	415,324	95,503	13.0	F
20	KINGS	CA	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406	28,207	6,483	11.0	F
21	MARION	IN	865,504	232,607	94,263	21,586	53,195	26,791	11,140	206,781	47,503	10.7	F
21	NEW HAVEN	CT	845,244	195,321	115,929	18,126	59,858	28,275	12,590	227,710	52,161	10.7	F
21	TULARE	CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	86,913	19,945	10.7	F
21	WASHINGTON	PA	206,432	42,415	35,223	3,936	14,134	7,418	3,571	62,792	14,348	10.7	F
25	CUMBERLAND	PA	226,117	46,055	33,969	4,274	15,696	7,893	3,588	64,400	14,736	10.3	F

Notes:

- (1) Counties are ranked by weighted average. See note 11 below.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations in counties with PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitors.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) **CV disease** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census). CV disease includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.
- (9) **Diabetes** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (10) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.
- (11) The **Weighted Average** was derived by counting the number of days in each unhealthy range (orange, red, purple, maroon) in each year (2004-2006), multiplying the total in each range by the assigned standard weights (i.e., 1 for orange, 1.5 for red, 2.0 for purple, 2.5 for maroon), and calculating the average.
- (12) **Grade** is assigned by weighted average as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.

**Table 3a: People at Risk In 25 Counties Most Polluted by Long-term Particle Pollution (Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>)**

2008 Rank	County	ST	Total Population <sup>2</sup>	At-Risk Groups								PM <sub>2.5</sub> Annual, 2004-2006	
				Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,10</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,10</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,10</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,10</sup>	CV Disease <sup>8</sup>	Diabetes <sup>9</sup>	Design Value <sup>11</sup>	Pass/Fail <sup>12</sup>
1	RIVERSIDE	CA	2,026,803	558,015	227,387	51,784	108,629	60,147	24,481	458,324	104,810	20.6	FAIL
2	ALLEGHENY	PA	1,223,411	260,084	208,070	24,136	82,980	43,618	21,048	369,779	84,488	20.4	FAIL
3	SAN BERNARDINO	CA	1,999,332	594,264	162,012	55,148	104,080	56,618	21,114	409,388	94,247	19.4	FAIL
4	KERN	CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	161,673	37,147	18.9	FAIL
5	JEFFERSON	AL	656,700	160,016	88,032	14,849	43,602	21,773	9,736	175,808	40,310	18.6	FAIL
6	TULARE	CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	86,913	19,945	18.2	FAIL
7	LOS ANGELES	CA	9,948,081	2,680,206	1,013,531	248,723	546,345	301,816	121,319	2,282,052	524,249	17.9	FAIL
8	FULTON	GA	960,009	242,854	77,072	22,537	57,171	29,712	11,266	216,904	50,154	17.6	FAIL
9	HAMILTON	OH	822,596	206,309	110,796	19,145	59,408	27,026	12,134	218,783	50,142	17.4	FAIL
10	FRESNO	CA	891,756	269,100	85,720	24,972	46,386	25,537	10,107	191,302	43,908	17.2	FAIL
10	KINGS	CA	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406	28,207	6,483	17.2	FAIL
10	WAYNE	MI	1,971,853	540,672	229,421	50,174	135,600	61,865	26,673	488,251	112,146	17.2	FAIL
10	CUYAHOGA	OH	1,314,241	320,716	198,458	29,762	95,075	44,424	20,803	369,393	84,525	17.2	FAIL
14	BIBB	GA	154,903	42,130	19,712	3,910	8,948	4,905	2,172	39,372	9,024	16.8	FAIL
15	CLAYTON	GA	271,240	81,630	18,080	7,575	15,129	7,606	2,714	53,602	12,391	16.7	FAIL
16	MADISON	IL	265,303	61,579	36,877	5,715	16,877	8,840	3,944	71,281	16,316	16.6	FAIL
17	GWINNETT	GA	757,104	215,360	44,825	19,985	43,263	21,850	7,657	152,370	35,344	16.4	FAIL
17	BROOKE	WV	24,132	4,668	4,563	433	1,671	897	448	7,781	1,776	16.4	FAIL
17	KANAWHA	WV	192,419	41,265	31,648	3,829	12,938	6,878	3,302	58,111	13,298	16.4	FAIL
20	JEFFERSON	OH	70,125	14,124	13,077	1,311	5,294	2,573	1,281	22,267	5,081	16.3	FAIL
20	BEAVER	PA	175,736	36,819	31,854	3,417	11,912	6,369	3,151	54,876	12,527	16.3	FAIL
20	LANCASTER	PA	494,486	124,995	70,706	11,600	32,198	16,215	7,405	132,700	30,353	16.3	FAIL
20	YORK	PA	416,322	94,921	56,154	8,809	27,996	14,080	6,270	113,393	26,009	16.3	FAIL
24	CLARK	IN	103,569	24,373	12,865	2,262	6,644	3,413	1,473	26,951	6,186	16.2	FAIL
25	COBB	GA	679,325	179,373	54,874	16,646	39,849	20,858	8,002	153,327	35,459	16.1	FAIL
25	FLOYD	GA	95,322	23,599	13,394	2,190	5,686	3,102	1,392	25,105	5,739	16.1	FAIL
25	CABELL	WV	93,904	19,357	15,251	1,796	6,347	3,279	1,528	27,186	6,206	16.1	FAIL

Notes:

- (1) Counties are ranked by design value. See note 11 below.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations in counties with PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitors.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) **CV disease** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census). CV disease includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.
- (9) **Diabetes** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (10) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.
- (11) The **Design Value** is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.
- (12) **Grades** are based on EPA's determination of meeting or failure to meet the NAAQS for annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels during 2004-2006. Counties meeting the NAAQS received grades of Pass; counties not meeting the NAAQS received grades of Fail.

**Table 3b: People at Risk in 25 Most Ozone-Polluted Counties**

2008 Rank <sup>1</sup>	County	ST	At-Risk Groups							High Ozone Days in Unhealthy Ranges 2004-2006	
			Total Population <sup>2</sup>	Under 18 <sup>3</sup>	65 and Over <sup>3</sup>	Pediatric Asthma <sup>4,8</sup>	Adult Asthma <sup>5,8</sup>	Chronic Bronchitis <sup>6,8</sup>	Emphysema <sup>7,8</sup>	Weighted Avg. <sup>9</sup>	Grade <sup>10</sup>
1	SAN BERNARDINO	CA	1,999,332	594,264	162,012	55,148	104,080	56,618	21,114	90.3	F
2	KERN	CA	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	83.3	F
3	RIVERSIDE	CA	2,026,803	558,015	227,387	51,784	108,629	60,147	24,481	76.8	F
4	TULARE	CA	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	67.8	F
5	LOS ANGELES	CA	9,948,081	2,680,206	1,013,531	248,723	546,345	301,816	121,319	64.7	F
6	HARRIS	TX	3,886,207	1,124,974	297,691	104,398	198,772	113,022	42,306	36.0	F
7	FRESNO	CA	891,756	269,100	85,720	24,972	46,386	25,537	10,107	34.0	F
8	PLACER	CA	326,242	71,679	46,616	6,652	19,423	10,983	4,892	25.2	F
9	EL DORADO	CA	178,066	39,130	20,011	3,631	10,832	6,057	2,566	22.7	F
10	TARRANT	TX	1,671,295	466,165	139,685	43,260	86,968	49,475	18,858	22.0	F
11	SACRAMENTO	CA	1,374,724	362,210	151,043	33,613	76,326	42,383	17,447	21.5	F
12	NEVADA	CA	98,764	18,649	16,844	1,731	6,355	3,670	1,771	20.7	F
13	DENTON	TX	584,238	156,494	31,916	14,523	30,400	16,817	5,601	16.5	F
14	BRAZORIA	TX	287,898	78,398	25,582	7,275	15,157	8,681	3,379	15.8	F
15	VENTURA	CA	799,720	212,956	86,816	19,762	44,895	25,020	10,456	15.0	F
16	DALLAS	TX	2,345,815	670,778	195,320	62,248	120,807	68,194	25,789	13.0	F
17	FAIRFIELD	CT	900,440	226,859	116,628	21,053	62,135	29,651	13,225	12.2	F
18	HARFORD	MD	241,402	60,433	26,413	5,608	15,951	7,777	3,263	11.2	F
19	FAIRFAX	VA	1,010,443	253,542	92,711	23,529	63,006	32,930	13,465	10.8	F
19	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH	LA	429,073	107,217	45,592	9,950	18,974	13,504	5,503	10.8	F
21	COLLIN	TX	698,851	190,388	45,215	17,668	36,347	20,401	7,191	10.7	F
22	OCEAN	NJ	562,335	127,136	116,577	11,798	33,026	19,734	10,171	10.2	F
23	CAMDEN	NJ	517,001	129,114	62,724	11,982	29,648	16,725	7,211	10.0	F
24	ROWAN	NC	136,254	32,437	19,049	3,010	7,036	4,534	2,040	9.0	F
24	SAN DIEGO	CA	2,941,454	745,182	327,369	69,153	164,778	91,371	37,390	9.0	F
24	FULTON	GA	960,009	242,854	77,072	22,537	57,171	29,712	11,266	9.0	F

Notes:

- (1) Counties are ranked by weighted average. See note 10 below.
- (2) **Total Population** represents the at-risk populations in counties with ozone monitors.
- (3) Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to ozone and are, therefore, included. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
- (4) **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (5) **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (6) **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed in 2006, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (7) **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime, based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (U.S. Census).
- (8) Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates, e.g., summing pediatric and adult asthma and/or emphysema and chronic bronchitis.
- (9) The **Weighted Average** was derived by counting the number of days in each unhealthy range (orange, red, purple) in each year (2004-2006), multiplying the total in each range by the assigned standard weights (i.e., 1 for orange, 1.5 for red, 2.0 for purple), and calculating the average.
- (10) **Grade** is assigned by weighted average as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.

**Table 4:** *Counties with the Worst Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-Hour and Annual Averages) in Each State*

County	ST <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	24-HOUR		ANNUAL	
			WGT. AVG. <sup>2</sup>	GRADE <sup>3</sup>	DESIGN VALUE <sup>4</sup>	PASS/FAIL <sup>5</sup>
FAIRBANKS NORTH STAR BOROUGH	AK	Fairbanks, AK	7.7	F		INC
JUNEAU BOROUGH	AK	Juneau, AK	1.7	C	7.8	PASS
JEFFERSON	AL	Birmingham-Hoover-Cullman, AL	32.7	F	18.6	FAIL
PULASKI	AR	Little Rock-North Little Rock-Pine Bluff, AR	6.0	F	14.0	PASS
MARICOPA	AZ	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	2.8	D	12.5	PASS
SANTA CRUZ	AZ	Nogales, AZ	1.8	C	13.4	PASS
RIVERSIDE	CA	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	46.7	F	20.6	FAIL
ADAMS	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	0.7	B	9.9	PASS
DENVER	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	3.7	F	9.1	PASS
FAIRFIELD	CT	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	4.7	F	13.2	PASS
NEW HAVEN	CT	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	10.7	F	13.1	PASS
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DC	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	9.5	F	14.5	PASS
NEW CASTLE	DE	Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD	9.0	F	14.8	PASS
ESCAMBIA	FL	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	3.7	F	11.9	PASS
LEON	FL	Tallahassee, FL	0.7	B	12.8	PASS
FULTON	GA	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL	7.0	F	17.6	FAIL
HONOLULU	HI	Honolulu, HI	2.2	D	4.9	PASS
MUSCATINE	IA	Muscatine, IA	2.7	D	12.5	PASS
SCOTT	IA	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	5.0	F	11.5	PASS
FRANKLIN	ID	Logan, UT-ID	9.0	F		INC
SHOSHONE	ID		3.0	D	12.1	PASS
COOK	IL	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	13.7	F	15.6	FAIL
MADISON	IL	St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	7.3	F	16.6	FAIL
CLARK	IN	Louisville-Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN	3.0	D	16.2	FAIL
MARION	IN	Indianapolis-Anderson-Columbus, IN	10.7	F	15.7	FAIL
WYANDOTTE	KS	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	2.0	C	12.5	PASS
JEFFERSON	KY	Louisville-Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN	10.0	F	15.4	FAIL
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH	LA	Baton Rouge-Pierre Part, LA	2.3	D	13.6	PASS
JEFFERSON PARISH	LA	New Orleans-Metairie-Bogalusa, LA	2.7	D	11.7	PASS
WEST BATON ROUGE PARISH	LA	Baton Rouge-Pierre Part, LA	1.3	C	13.6	PASS
SUFFOLK	MA	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH	3.7	F	13.1	PASS
BALTIMORE CITY	MD	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	16.7	F	15.9	FAIL
WAYNE	MI	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	17.0	F	17.2	FAIL
RAMSEY	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	1.5	C	11.2	PASS
ST LOUIS CITY	MO	St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	8.0	F	14.4	PASS
HARRISON	MS	Gulfport-Biloxi-Pascagoula, MS	4.3	F	12.3	PASS
JONES	MS	Laurel, MS	0.3	B	14.2	PASS
LINCOLN	MT		6.2	F	15.0	PASS
CATAWBA	NC	Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	2.3	D	15.4	FAIL
MECKLENBURG	NC	Charlotte-Gastonia-Salisbury, NC-SC	5.0	F	14.9	PASS
DOUGLAS	NE	Omaha-Council Bluffs-Fremont, NE-IA	3.0	D	9.8	PASS
CHESHIRE	NH	Keene, NH	0.0	A	11.5	PASS
HILLSBOROUGH	NH	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH	1.0	C		INC
UNION	NJ	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	13.7	F	14.8	PASS
DONA ANA	NM	Las Cruces, NM	2.0	C	9.8	PASS
CLARK	NV	Las Vegas-Paradise-Pahrump, NV	1.0	C	8.3	PASS
WASHOE	NV	Reno-Sparks-Fernley, NV	1.3	C	8.1	PASS
NEW YORK	NY	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	5.0	F	15.7	FAIL
BRONX	NY	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	9.7	F	15.1	FAIL
CUYAHOGA	OH	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH	13.3	F	17.2	FAIL
HAMILTON	OH	Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington, OH-KY-IN	7.0	F	17.4	FAIL
MUSKOGEE	OK	Muskogee, OK	0.7	B	11.6	PASS
SEQUOYAH	OK	Fort Smith, AR-OK	1.3	C		INC
TULSA	OK	Tulsa-Bartlesville, OK	1.3	C	11.0	PASS

**Table 4: (continued) Counties with the Worst Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub> 24-Hour and Annual Averages) in Each State**

County	ST <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	24-HOUR		ANNUAL	
			WGT. AVG. <sup>2</sup>	GRADE <sup>3</sup>	DESIGN VALUE <sup>4</sup>	PASS/FAIL <sup>5</sup>
LANE	OR	Eugene-Springfield, OR	16.0	F	12.0	PASS
ALLEGHENY	PA	Pittsburgh-New Castle, PA	62.0	F	20.4	FAIL
PROVIDENCE	RI	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH	2.3	D	12.0	PASS
GREENVILLE	SC	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	5.0	F	15.9	FAIL
KNOX	TN	Knoxville-Sevierville-La Follette, TN	4.3	F	15.6	FAIL
SHELBY	TN	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	6.3	F	13.6	PASS
HARRIS	TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	2.3	D	15.4	FAIL
EL PASO	TX	El Paso, TX	3.0	D		INC
CACHE	UT	Logan, UT-ID	31.0	F	12.2	PASS
FAIRFAX	VA	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	6.7	F	13.9	PASS
ROANOKE CITY	VA	Roanoke, VA	1.3	C	14.3	PASS
RUTLAND	VT	Rutland, VT	1.3	C	11.1	PASS
CHITTENDEN	VT	Burlington-South Burlington, VT	1.7	C	9.2	PASS
PIERCE	WA	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA	4.8	F	10.6	PASS
WAUKESHA	WI	Milwaukee-Racine-Waukesha, WI	4.3	F	13.9	PASS
MILWAUKEE	WI	Milwaukee-Racine-Waukesha, WI	5.3	F	13.5	PASS
BROOKE	WV	Weirton-Steubenville, WV-OH	8.0	F	16.4	FAIL
KANAWHA	WV	Charleston, WV	6.0	F	16.4	FAIL
SHERIDAN	WY	Sheridan, WY	2.0	C	9.7	PASS

Notes:

- (1) States were not included if all monitored counties got a grade of B or better for the 24-hour standard and a Passing grade for the annual standard.
- (2) The **Weighted Average** was derived by counting the number of days in each unhealthful range (orange, red, purple, maroon) in each year (2004-2006), multiplying the total in each range by the assigned standard weights (i.e., 1 for orange, 1.5 for red, 2.0 for purple, 2.5 for maroon), and calculating the average.
- (3) **Grades** are assigned by weighted average as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.
- (4) The **Design Value** is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.
- (5) Grades are based on EPA's determination of meeting or failure to meet the NAAQS for annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels during 2004-2006. Counties meeting the NAAQS received grades of Pass; counties not meeting received grades of Fail. "INC" indicates incomplete monitoring of data.

**Table 4a: Counties with the Worst Ozone Air Pollution in Each State**

County	ST <sup>1</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	OZONE	
			WGT. AVG. <sup>2</sup>	GRADE <sup>3</sup>
JEFFERSON	AL	Birmingham-Hoover-Cullman, AL	7.5	F
CRITTENDEN	AR	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	4.2	F
MARICOPA	AZ	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	8.0	F
SAN BERNARDINO	CA	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Riverside, CA	90.3	F
JEFFERSON	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	2.7	D
FAIRFIELD	CT	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	12.2	F
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	DC	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	6.0	F
NEW CASTLE	DE	Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD	4.5	F
SUSSEX	DE	Seaford, DE	4.5	F
ESCAMBIA	FL	Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL	2.3	D
HILLSBOROUGH	FL	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL	2.3	D
FULTON	GA	Atlanta-Sandy Springs-Gainesville, GA-AL	9.0	F
COOK	IL	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	5.0	F
LAKE	IN	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	3.0	D
WYANDOTTE	KS	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	1.5	C
CAMPBELL	KY	Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington, OH-KY-IN	3.2	D
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH	LA	Baton Rouge-Pierre Part, LA	10.8	F
HAMPSHIRE	MA	Springfield, MA	5.2	F
HARFORD	MD	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	11.2	F
HANCOCK	ME		1.7	C
ALLEGAN	MI	Grand Rapids-Muskegon-Holland, MI	5.8	F
ST CHARLES	MO	St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	8.7	F
DESOTO	MS	Memphis, TN-MS-AR	2.7	D
HARRISON	MS	Gulfport-Biloxi-Pascagoula, MS	2.7	D
ROWAN	NC	Charlotte-Gastonia-Salisbury, NC-SC	9.0	F
HILLSBOROUGH	NH	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH	3.0	D
OCEAN	NJ	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	10.2	F
CLARK	NV	Las Vegas-Paradise-Pahrump, NV	6.8	F
RICHMOND	NY	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA	6.3	F
LAKE	OH	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria, OH	5.2	F
OKLAHOMA	OK	Oklahoma City-Shawnee, OK	4.3	F
TULSA	OK	Tulsa-Bartlesville, OK	4.3	F
PHILADELPHIA	PA	Philadelphia-Camden-Vineland, PA-NJ-DE-MD	6.3	F
WASHINGTON	RI	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH	4.5	F
RICHLAND	SC	Columbia-Newberry, SC	4.3	F
BLOUNT	TN	Knoxville-Sevierville-La Follette, TN	5.0	F
HARRIS	TX	Houston-Baytown-Huntsville, TX	36.0	F
DAVIS	UT	Salt Lake City-Ogden-Clearfield, UT	3.5	F
FAIRFAX	VA	Washington-Baltimore-Northern Virginia, DC-MD-VA-WV	10.8	F
KING	WA	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA	2.0	C
OZAUKEE	WI	Milwaukee-Waukesha-West Allis, WI	6.0	F
KENOSHA	WI	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI	6.0	F
OHIO	WV	Wheeling, WV-OH	2.3	D

Notes:

(1) States were not included if all monitored counties got a grade of B or higher.

(2) The **Weighted Average** was derived by counting the number of days in each unhealthful range (orange, red, purple) in each year (2004-2006), multiplying the total in each range by the assigned standard weights (i.e., 1 for orange, 1.5 for red, 2.0 for purple), and calculating the average.

(3) **Grade** is assigned by weighted average as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.

**Table 5:** *Cleanest U.S. Cities for Short-term Particle Pollution (24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)<sup>1</sup>*

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>Population</b>
Alexandria, LA	150,080
Amarillo, TX	241,515
Bismarck, ND	101,138
Brownsville-Harlingen-Raymondville, TX	408,362
Cheyenne, WY	85,384
Colorado Springs, CO	599,127
Corpus Christi-Kingsville, TX	446,565
Fargo-Wahpeton, ND-MN	210,523
Farmington, NM	126,473
Flagstaff, AZ	124,953
Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	276,253
Great Falls, MT	79,385
Longview-Marshall, TX	267,186
Midland-Odessa, TX	251,842
Pueblo, CO	152,912
Redding, CA	179,951
Salinas, CA	410,206
San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	257,005
Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	400,335
Santa Fe-Espanola, NM	183,356
Sioux Falls, SD	212,911
Tucson, AZ	946,362
Valdosta, GA	126,305

Note:

(1) This list represents cities with the lowest levels of short-term PM<sub>2.5</sub> air pollution. Monitors in these cities reported no days with unhealthy PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels.

**Table 5a: Top 25 Cleanest U.S. Cities for Long-term Particle Pollution  
(Annual  $PM_{2.5}$ )<sup>1</sup>**

Rank <sup>2</sup>	Design Value <sup>3</sup>	Metropolitan Statistical Area	Population
1	4.5	Cheyenne, WY	85,384
2	4.7	Santa Fe-Espanola, NM	183,356
3	4.9	Honolulu, HI	909,863
4	5.3	Great Falls, MT	79,385
5	5.9	Farmington, NM	126,473
6	6.0	Tucson, AZ	946,362
7	6.5	Bismarck, ND	101,138
7	6.5	Flagstaff, AZ	124,953
9	6.7	Anchorage, AK	359,180
10	6.9	Salinas, CA	410,206
11	7.3	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	276,253
12	7.4	Duluth, MN-WI	274,244
13	7.5	Pueblo, CO	152,912
14	7.6	Midland-Odessa, TX	251,842
15	7.7	Pocatello, ID	86,357
15	7.7	Redding, CA	179,951
17	7.8	Fargo-Wahpeton, ND-MN	210,523
17	7.8	Albuquerque, NM	816,811
19	8.0	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	257,005
20	8.1	Reno-Sparks-Fernley, NV	451,791
20	8.1	Colorado Springs, CO	599,127
22	8.3	Las Vegas-Paradise-Pahrump, NV	1,820,232
23	8.4	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	571,344
24	8.6	Boise City-Nampa, ID	567,640
24	8.6	Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL	534,359

Notes:

(1) This list represents cities with the lowest levels of annual  $PM_{2.5}$  air pollution.

(2) Cities are ranked by using the highest Design Value for any county within that metropolitan area.

(3) The **Design Value** is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.

**Table 5b: Cleanest U.S. Cities for Ozone Air Pollution<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>Population</b>
Albuquerque, NM	816,811	Lafayette-Frankfort, IN	219,962
Ames-Boone, IA	106,729	Laredo, TX	231,470
Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI	377,906	Lexington-Fayette--Frankfort--Richmond, KY	645,006
Austin-Round Rock, TX	1,513,565	Lincoln, NE	283,970
Bangor, ME	147,180	Logan, UT-ID	111,156
Bellingham, WA	185,953	Medford, OR	197,071
Bloomington, IN	178,714	Montgomery-Alexander City, AL	413,802
Bloomington-Normal, IL	161,202	Naples-Marco Island, FL	314,649
Bowling Green, KY	113,320	Ocala, FL	316,183
Brunswick, GA	100,613	Omaha-Council Bluffs-Fremont, NE-IA	858,720
Burlington-South Burlington, VT	206,007	Peoria-Canton, IL	407,572
Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	571,344	Port St. Lucie-Sebastian-Vero Beach, FL	522,217
Carson City, NV	55,289	Rapid City, SD	118,763
Cedar Rapids, IA	249,320	Reno-Sparks-Fernley, NV	451,791
Champaign-Urbana, IL	216,581	Roanoke, VA	295,050
Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL	377,291	Rochester, MN	179,573
Decatur, IL	109,309	Rochester-Batavia-Seneca Falls, NY	1,128,989
Des Moines-Newton-Pella, IA	604,626	Rockford-Freeport-Rochelle, IL	450,466
Duluth, MN-WI	274,244	Salinas, CA	410,206
Elmira, NY	88,641	Savannah-Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA	394,036
Eugene-Springfield, OR	337,870	Sioux Falls, SD	212,911
Fargo-Wahpeton, ND-MN	210,523	Spokane, WA	446,706
Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL	142,657	Springfield, IL	206,112
Gadsden, AL	103,362	Utica-Rome, NY	297,286
Gainesville, FL	243,985	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA	162,263
Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	359,856	Wilmington, NC	326,166
Honolulu, HI	909,863	Yuma, AZ	187,555

Note:

(1) This list represents cities with no monitored ozone air pollution in unhealthy ranges using the Air Quality Index based on the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 0.08 ppm..

**Table 6: Cleanest Counties for Short-term Particle Pollution  
(24-Hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)<sup>1</sup>**

<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>MSAs and Respective CMSA<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>MSAs and Respective CMSA<sup>2</sup></b>
BALDWIN	AL	Mobile-Daphne-Fairhope, AL	CASS	MO	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS
POLK	AR		CEDAR	MO	
COCHISE	AZ	Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ	CASCADE	MT	Great Falls, MT
COCONINO	AZ	Flagstaff, AZ	SANDERS	MT	
GILA	AZ	Payson, AZ	CHATHAM	NC	Raleigh-Durham-Cary, NC
PIMA	AZ	Tucson, AZ	DUPLIN	NC	
PINAL	AZ	Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ	HAYWOOD	NC	Asheville-Brevard, NC
CALAVERAS	CA		JACKSON	NC	
HUMBOLDT	CA	Eureka-Arcata-Fortuna, CA	MITCHELL	NC	
LAKE	CA	Clearlake, CA	SWAIN	NC	
MENDOCINO	CA	Ukiah, CA	BILLINGS	ND	Dickinson, ND
MONTEREY	CA	Salinas, CA	BURLEIGH	ND	Bismarck, ND
NEVADA	CA	Sacramento-Arden-Arcade-Yuba City, CA-NV	CASS	ND	Fargo-Wahpeton, ND-MN
SAN LUIS OBISPO	CA	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles, CA	MC KENZIE	ND	
SANTA BARBARA	CA	Santa Barbara-Santa Maria-Goleta, CA	MERCER	ND	
SANTA CRUZ	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	HALL	NE	Grand Island, NE
SHASTA	CA	Redding, CA	SCOTTS BLUFF	NE	Scottsbluff, NE
ARCHULETA	CO		CHESHIRE	NH	Keene, NH
BOULDER	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	GRAFTON	NH	Claremont-Lebanon, NH-VT
DELTA	CO		CHAVES	NM	Roswell, NM
EL PASO	CO	Colorado Springs, CO	GRANT	NM	Silver City, NM
ELBERT	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	LEA	NM	Hobbs, NM
GUNNISON	CO		SAN JUAN	NM	Farmington, NM
LARIMER	CO	Fort Collins-Loveland, CO	SANTA FE	NM	Santa Fe-Espanola, NM
PUEBLO	CO	Pueblo, CO	OKLAHOMA	OK	Oklahoma City-Shawnee, OK
SAN MIGUEL	CO		JOSEPHINE	OR	Grants Pass, OR
BROWARD	FL	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	BROOKINGS	SD	Brookings, SD
PALM BEACH	FL	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL	BROWN	SD	Aberdeen, SD
HOUSTON	GA	Macon-Warner Robins-Fort Valley, GA	JACKSON	SD	
LOWNDES	GA	Valdosta, GA	MINNEHAHA	SD	Sioux Falls, SD
MAUI	HI	Kahului-Wailuku, HI	ROANE	TN	Knoxville-Sevierville-La Follette, TN
RANDOLPH	IL		BREWSTER	TX	
JOHNSON	KS	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	CAMERON	TX	Brownsville-Harlingen-Raymondville, TX
LINN	KS	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	ECTOR	TX	Midland-Odessa, TX
BELL	KY	Middlesborough, KY	HARRISON	TX	Longview-Marshall, TX
EDMONSON	KY	Bowling Green, KY	NUECES	TX	Corpus Christi-Kingsville, TX
PERRY	KY		POTTER	TX	Amarillo, TX
CONCORDIA PARISH	LA	Natchez, MS-LA	ASHLAND	WI	
RAPIDES PARISH	LA	Alexandria, LA	FOREST	WI	
CUMBERLAND	ME	Portland-Lewiston-South Portland, ME	TAYLOR	WI	
HANCOCK	ME		VILAS	WI	
KENNEBEC	ME	Augusta-Waterville, ME	CAMPBELL	WY	Gillette, WY
MISSAUKEE	MI	Cadillac, MI	CONVERSE	WY	
CASS	MN	Brainerd, MN	LARAMIE	WY	Cheyenne, WY

Note:

(1) This list represents counties with the lowest levels of short term PM<sub>2.5</sub> air pollution. Monitors in these counties reported no days with unhealthy PM<sub>2.5</sub> levels

(2) MSA and CSA are terms used by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget for statistical purposes. MSA stands for Metropolitan Statistical Area. CSA stands for Combined Statistical Area, which may include multiple metropolitan statistical areas and individual counties.

**Table 6a: Top 25 Cleanest Counties for Long-term Particle Pollution**  
*(Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>)<sup>1</sup>*

2008 Rank <sup>2</sup>	County	ST	Design Value <sup>3</sup>
1	CONVERSE	WY	3.5
2	GALLATIN	MT	4.2
3	ELBERT	CO	4.3
4	SAN MIGUEL	CO	4.5
4	BILLINGS	ND	4.5
4	LARAMIE	WY	4.5
7	MAUI	HI	4.6
8	SANTA FE	NM	4.7
9	LAKE	CA	4.8
10	HONOLULU	HI	4.9
10	MC KENZIE	ND	4.9
12	CAMPBELL	WY	5.2
13	INYO	CA	5.3
13	CASCADE	MT	5.3
13	JACKSON	SD	5.3
16	HANCOCK	ME	5.6
17	CASS	MN	5.8
17	MERCER	ND	5.8
19	SAN JUAN	NM	5.9
20	PIMA	AZ	6.0
20	ESSEX	NY	6.0
20	ASHLAND	WI	6.0
23	MILLE LACS	MN	6.4
24	COCONINO	AZ	6.5
24	BURLEIGH	ND	6.5
24	CHAVES	NM	6.5

Notes:

(1) This list represents counties with the lowest levels of monitored long-term PM<sub>2.5</sub> air pollution.

(2) Counties are ranked by Design Value.

(3) The **Design Value** is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.

**Table 6b: Cleanest Counties for Ozone Air Pollution<sup>1</sup>**

<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>
YUKON-KOYUKUK BOROUGH	AK		PALM BEACH	FL	Miami-Fort Lauderdale-Pompano Beach, FL
CLAY	AL		ST. LUCIE	FL	Port St. Lucie-Sebastian-Vero Beach, FL
COLBERT	AL	Florence-Muscle Shoals, AL	VOLUSIA	FL	Orlando-Deltona-Daytona Beach, FL
ELMORE	AL	Montgomery-Alexander City, AL	WAKULLA	FL	Tallahassee, FL
ETOWAH	AL	Gadsden, AL	CHATHAM	GA	Savannah-Hinesville-Fort Stewart, GA
LAWRENCE	AL	Huntsville-Decatur, AL	GLYNN	GA	Brunswick, GA
MONTGOMERY	AL	Montgomery-Alexander City, AL	HONOLULU	HI	Honolulu, HI
MORGAN	AL	Huntsville-Decatur, AL	BREMER	IA	Waterloo-Cedar Falls, IA
SUMTER	AL		HARRISON	IA	Omaha-Council Bluffs-Fremont, NE-IA
NEWTON	AR	Harrison, AR	LINN	IA	Cedar Rapids, IA
POLK	AR		MONTGOMERY	IA	
COCHISE	AZ	Sierra Vista-Douglas, AZ	PALO ALTO	IA	
YUMA	AZ	Yuma, AZ	POLK	IA	Des Moines-Newton-Pella, IA
COLUSA	CA		SCOTT	IA	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL
GLENN	CA		STORY	IA	Ames-Boone, IA
LAKE	CA	Clearlake, CA	VAN BUREN	IA	
MARIN	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	WARREN	IA	Des Moines-Newton-Pella, IA
MENDOCINO	CA	Ukiah, CA	BUTTE	ID	
MONTEREY	CA	Salinas, CA	CANYON	ID	Boise City-Nampa, ID
NAPA	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	ADAMS	IL	Quincy, IL-MO
PLUMAS	CA		CHAMPAIGN	IL	Champaign-Urbana, IL
SAN FRANCISCO	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	CLARK	IL	
SAN MATEO	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	EFFINGHAM	IL	Effingham, IL
SANTA CRUZ	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	HAMILTON	IL	Mount Vernon, IL
SISKIYOU	CA		MACON	IL	Decatur, IL
SONOMA	CA	San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland, CA	MCLEAN	IL	Bloomington-Normal, IL
ADAMS	CO	Denver-Aurora-Boulder, CO	PEORIA	IL	Peoria-Canton, IL
LA PLATA	CO	Durango, CO	RANDOLPH	IL	
MONTEZUMA	CO		ROCK ISLAND	IL	Davenport-Moline-Rock Island, IA-IL
ALACHUA	FL	Gainesville, FL	SANGAMON	IL	Springfield, IL
BAKER	FL	Jacksonville, FL	WILL	IL	Chicago-Naperville-Michigan City, IL-IN-WI
COLLIER	FL	Naples-Marco Island, FL	WINNEBAGO	IL	Rockford-Freeport-Rochelle, IL
COLUMBIA	FL	Lake City, FL	CARROLL	IN	Lafayette-Frankfort, IN
HIGHLANDS	FL	Sebring, FL	GREENE	IN	Bloomington, IN
LEE	FL	Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL	HUNTINGTON	IN	Fort Wayne-Huntington-Auburn, IN
MARION	FL	Ocala, FL	MORGAN	IN	Indianapolis-Anderson-Columbus, IN
OSCEOLA	FL	Orlando-Deltona-Daytona Beach, FL	SHELBY	IN	Indianapolis-Anderson-Columbus, IN

Note:

(1) This list represents counties no monitored ozone air pollution in unhealthy ranges using the Air Quality Index based on the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 0.08 ppm.

**Table 6b: (continued) Cleanest Counties for Ozone Air Pollution<sup>1</sup>**

<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>
LINN	KS	Kansas City-Overland Park-Kansas City, MO-KS	CALDWELL	NC	Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC
SEDGWICK	KS	Wichita-Winfield, KS	CASWELL	NC	
TREGO	KS		CHATHAM	NC	Raleigh-Durham-Cary, NC
BELL	KY	Middlesborough, KY	NEW HANOVER	NC	Wilmington, NC
BOONE	KY	Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington, OH-KY-IN	SWAIN	NC	
EDMONSON	KY	Bowling Green, KY	BILLINGS	ND	Dickinson, ND
FAYETTE	KY	Lexington-Fayette--Frankfort--Richmond, KY	BURKE	ND	
HARDIN	KY	Louisville-Jefferson County-Elizabethtown-Scottsburg, KY-IN	CASS	ND	Fargo-Wahpeton, ND-MN
HENDERSON	KY	Evansville, IN-KY	DUNN	ND	
JESSAMINE	KY	Lexington-Fayette--Frankfort--Richmond, KY	MC KENZIE	ND	
MCCRACKEN	KY	Paducah-Mayfield, KY-IL	MERCER	ND	
PERRY	KY		OLIVER	ND	
PIKE	KY		DOUGLAS	NE	Omaha-Council Bluffs-Fremont, NE-IA
PULASKI	KY	Somerset, KY	LANCASTER	NE	Lincoln, NE
TRIGG	KY	Clarksville, TN-KY	BELKNAP	NH	Boston-Worcester-Manchester, MA-RI-NH
WARREN	KY	Bowling Green, KY	CHESHIRE	NH	Keene, NH
CUMBERLAND	ME	Portland-Lewiston-South Portland, ME	GRAFTON	NH	Claremont-Lebanon, NH-VT
KENNEBEC	ME	Augusta-Waterville, ME	BERNALILLO	NM	Albuquerque, NM
OXFORD	ME		EDDY	NM	Carlsbad-Artesia, NM
PENOBSCOT	ME	Bangor, ME	LEA	NM	Hobbs, NM
CLINTON	MI	Lansing-East Lansing-Owosso, MI	SANDOVAL	NM	Albuquerque, NM
OAKLAND	MI	Detroit-Warren-Flint, MI	CARSON CITY	NV	Carson City, NV
ANOKA	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	WASHOE	NV	Reno-Sparks-Fernley, NV
CARLTON	MN	Duluth, MN-WI	WHITE PINE	NV	
CROW WING	MN	Brainerd, MN	CHEMUNG	NY	Elmira, NY
GOODHUE	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	HERKIMER	NY	Utica-Rome, NY
LAKE	MN		MADISON	NY	Syracuse-Auburn, NY
OLMSTED	MN	Rochester, MN	MONROE	NY	Rochester-Batavia-Seneca Falls, NY
ST LOUIS	MN	Duluth, MN-WI	ONEIDA	NY	Utica-Rome, NY
STEARNS	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	SCHENECTADY	NY	Albany-Schenectady-Amsterdam, NY
WASHINGTON	MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul-St. Cloud, MN-WI	ULSTER	NY	New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA
ADAMS	MS	Natchez, MS-LA	WAYNE	NY	Rochester-Batavia-Seneca Falls, NY
BOLIVAR	MS	Cleveland, MS	CLEVELAND	OK	Oklahoma City-Shawnee, OK
LEE	MS	Tupelo, MS	PITTSBURG	OK	McAlester, OK
FLATHEAD	MT	Kalispell, MT	COLUMBIA	OR	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA
ALEXANDER	NC	Hickory-Lenoir-Morganton, NC	JACKSON	OR	Medford, OR
AVERY	NC		LANE	OR	Eugene-Springfield, OR

Note:

(1) This list represents counties no monitored ozone air pollution in unhealthy ranges using the Air Quality Index based on the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 0.08 ppm . .

**Table 6b: (continued) *Cleanest Counties for Ozone Air Pollution*<sup>1</sup>**

<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>ST</b>	<b>Metropolitan Statistical Area</b>
MULTNOMAH	OR	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA	CHITTENDEN	VT	Burlington-South Burlington, VT
FRANKLIN	PA	Chambersburg, PA	CLALLAM	WA	Port Angeles, WA
TIOGA	PA		CLARK	WA	Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA
AIKEN	SC	Augusta-Richmond County, GA-SC	KLICKITAT	WA	
ANDERSON	SC	Greenville-Spartanburg-Anderson, SC	SKAGIT	WA	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA
BARNWELL	SC		SPOKANE	WA	Spokane, WA
BERKELEY	SC	Charleston-North Charleston, SC	THURSTON	WA	Seattle-Tacoma-Olympia, WA
COLLETON	SC	Walterboro, SC	WHATCOM	WA	Bellingham, WA
WILLIAMSBURG	SC		ASHLAND	WI	
JACKSON	SD		DANE	WI	Madison-Baraboo, WI
MINNEHAHA	SD	Sioux Falls, SD	FLORENCE	WI	Iron Mountain, MI-WI
PENNINGTON	SD	Rapid City, SD	FOREST	WI	
BREWSTER	TX		ONEIDA	WI	
HAYS	TX	Austin-Round Rock, TX	OUTAGAMIE	WI	Appleton-Oshkosh-Neenah, WI
WEBB	TX	Laredo, TX	SAUK	WI	Madison-Baraboo, WI
CACHE	UT	Logan, UT-ID	VILAS	WI	
SAN JUAN	UT		WASHINGTON	WI	Milwaukee-Racine-Waukesha, WI
PAGE	VA		GREENBRIER	WV	
ROANOKE	VA	Roanoke, VA	CAMPBELL	WY	Gillette, WY
ROCKBRIDGE	VA		TETON	WY	Jackson, WY-ID
WYTHE	VA				

Note:

(1) This list represents counties no monitored ozone air pollution in unhealthful ranges using the Air Quality Index based on the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard of 0.08 ppm. .



## *Health Effects of Ozone and Particle Pollution*

**O**zone and particle pollution are the most widespread air pollutants—and among the most dangerous. Recent research has revealed new insights into how they can harm the body—including taking the lives of infants and altering the lungs of children. All in all, the evidence shows that the risks are greater than we once thought.

Two types of air pollution dominate the problem in the U.S.: ozone and particle pollution.

### **What Is Ozone?**

Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) is an extremely reactive gas molecule composed of three oxygen atoms. It is the primary ingredient of smog air pollution and is very harmful to breathe. Ozone attacks lung tissue by reacting with it chemically.

News about ozone can be confusing. Some days you hear that ozone levels are too high and other days that we need to prevent ozone depletion. Basically, the ozone layer found high in the upper atmosphere (the stratosphere) is beneficial because it shields us from much of the sun's ultraviolet radiation. However, ozone air pollution at ground level where we can breathe it (in the troposphere) is harmful. It causes serious health problems.

### ***Where Does Ozone Come From?***

What you see coming out of the tailpipe on a car or a truck isn't ozone, but the raw ingredients for making ozone. Ozone is formed by chemical reactions in the atmosphere from two raw gases that do come out of tailpipes, smokestacks and many other sources. These essential raw ingredients for ozone are nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and hydrocarbons, also called volatile organic compounds (VOCs). They are produced primarily when fossil fuels like gasoline, oil or coal are burned or when some chemicals, like paints, evaporate. When NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs come in contact with both heat and sunlight, they combine and form ozone smog. NO<sub>x</sub> is emitted from power plants, motor vehicles and other sources of high-heat combustion. VOCs are emitted from motor vehicles, chemical plants, refineries, factories, gas stations, paint and other sources. The formula for ozone is simple, and like any formula, the ingredients must all be present and in the right proportions to make the final product:



You may have wondered why “ozone action day” warnings are sometimes followed by recommendations to avoid activities such as mowing your lawn or

refilling your gas tank during daylight hours. Lawn mower exhaust and gasoline vapors are VOCs that could turn into ozone in the heat and sun. Take away the sunlight and ozone doesn't form, so refilling your gas tank after dark is better on high ozone days. Since we can't control sunlight and heat, we must reduce the chemical raw ingredients if we want to reduce ozone.

### ***Who is at Risk from Breathing Ozone?***

Five groups of people are especially vulnerable to the effects of breathing ozone:

- children and teens
- anyone 65 and older
- people who work or exercise outdoors
- people with existing lung diseases, such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (also known as COPD, which includes emphysema and chronic bronchitis)
- “responders” who are otherwise healthy but for some reason react more strongly to ozone.

The impact on your health can depend on many factors, however, not just whether you are part of one of these groups. For example, the risks would be greater if ozone levels are higher, if you are breathing faster because you're working outdoors or if you spend more time outdoors.

### ***How Ozone Pollution Harms Your Health***

Scientists have studied the effects of ozone on health for decades. Hundreds of research studies have confirmed that ozone harms people at levels currently found in the United States. In the last few years, we've learned that it can also be deadly.

**Breathing ozone may shorten your life.** Strong evidence arrived late in 2004, when two large multi-city investigations documented that short-term exposure to ozone can shorten lives, building on numerous earlier studies. One of them looked at 95 cities across the United States over a 14-year period. That study compared the impact of ozone on death patterns during several days after the ozone measurements. Even on days when ozone levels were low, the researchers found that the risk of premature death increased with higher levels of ozone. They estimated that over 3,700 deaths annually could be attributed to a 10-parts-per-billion increase in ozone levels.<sup>1</sup> Another study, published the same week, looked at 23 European cities and found similar effects on mortality from short-term exposure to ozone.<sup>2</sup>

Confirmation came in the summer of 2005. Three groups of researchers working independently reviewed and analyzed the research around deaths associated with short-term exposures to ozone. The three teams—at Harvard, Johns Hopkins and New York University—used different approaches but all came to similar conclusions. All three studies report a small, but robust association between daily ozone

levels and increased deaths.<sup>3</sup> Writing a commentary on these reviews, David Bates, MD, explained how these premature deaths could occur:

*“Ozone is capable of causing inflammation in the lung at lower concentrations than any other gas. Such an effect would be a hazard to anyone with heart failure and pulmonary congestion, and would worsen the function of anyone with advanced lung disease.”<sup>4</sup>*

**Other immediate risks from breathing high levels of ozone.** Many areas in the United States produce enough ground-level ozone during the summer months to cause health problems that can be felt right away. Immediate problems—in addition to increased risk of premature death—include:

- shortness of breath;
- chest pain when inhaling;
- wheezing and coughing;
- asthma attacks;
- increased susceptibility to respiratory infections;
- pulmonary inflammation; and
- increased need for people with lung diseases, like asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), to receive medical treatment and to go to the hospital.<sup>5</sup>

**Breathing ozone for longer periods can alter the lungs’ ability to function.**

Two studies published in 2005 explored ozone’s ability to reduce the lung’s ability to work efficiently, a term called “lung function.” Each study looked at otherwise healthy groups who were exposed to ozone for long periods: outdoor postal workers in Taiwan and college freshmen who were lifelong residents of Los Angeles or the San Francisco Bay area. Both studies found that the long exposure to elevated ozone levels had decreased their lung function.<sup>6</sup>

**Other effects of long-term exposure to ozone.** Short-term exposure to ozone also appears to worsen COPD.<sup>7</sup> Repeated inflammation due to exposure to ozone over a period of years can lead to a chronic “stiffening” of the lungs.

Inhaling ozone may affect the heart as well as the lungs. One new study linked exposures to high ozone levels for as little as one hour to a particular type of cardiac arrhythmia that itself increases the risk of premature death and stroke.<sup>8</sup> A French study found that exposure to elevated ozone levels for one to two days increased the risk of heart attacks for middle-aged adults without heart disease.<sup>9</sup>

Breathing other pollutants in the air may make your lungs more responsive to ozone—and breathing ozone may increase your body’s response to other pollutants. For example, research warns that breathing sulfur dioxide and nitrogen

oxide—two pollutants common in the eastern United States—can make the lungs react more strongly than to just breathing ozone alone. Breathing ozone may also increase the response to allergens in people with allergies.<sup>10</sup>

### **Particle Pollution**

Ever look at dirty truck exhaust?

The dirty, smoky part of that stream of exhaust is made of particle pollution. More new evidence shows that the particle pollution—like that coming from the exhaust smoke—can lead to shorter lives, heart disease, lung cancer and asthma attacks and can interfere with the growth and work of the lungs.

#### ***What Is Particle Pollution?***

Particle pollution refers to a mix of very tiny solid and liquid particles that are in the air we breathe. But nothing about particle pollution is simple. First of all, the particles themselves are different sizes. Some are one-tenth the diameter of a strand of hair. Many are even tinier; some are so small they can only be seen with an electron microscope. Because of their size, you can't see the individual particles. You can only see the haze that forms when millions of particles blur the spread of sunlight. You may not be able to tell when you're breathing particle pollution. Yet it is so dangerous it can shorten your life.

The differences in size make a big difference in how they affect us. Our natural defenses help us to cough or sneeze larger particles out of our bodies. But those defenses don't keep out smaller particles, those that are smaller than 10 microns (or micrometers) in diameter, or about one-seventh the diameter of a single human hair. These particles get trapped in the lungs, while the smallest are so minute that they can pass through the lungs into the blood stream, just like the essential oxygen molecules we need to survive.

Researchers categorize particles according to size, grouping them as coarse, fine and ultrafine. Coarse particles fall between 2.5 microns and 10 microns in diameter and are called PM<sub>10-2.5</sub>. Fine particles are 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller and are called PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Ultrafine particles are smaller than 0.1 micron in diameter<sup>11</sup> and are small enough to pass through the lung tissue into the blood stream, circulating like the oxygen molecules themselves. No matter what the size, particles can be harmful to your health.

Because particles are formed in so many different ways, they also can be composed of many different compounds. Although we often think of particles as solids, not all are. Some are completely liquid; some are solids suspended in liquids. As the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency puts it, particles are really “a mixture of mixtures.”<sup>12</sup> The mixtures differ between the eastern and western United States. For example, the eastern states have more sulfate particles than the west, largely due to the high levels of sulfur dioxide emitted by large, coal-fired power plants. By contrast, in Southern California, nitrate particles from motor vehicle exhaust form a larger proportion of the unhealthy mix.<sup>13</sup>

### ***Where Does Particle Pollution Come From?***

Particle pollution is produced through two separate processes—mechanical and chemical.

Mechanical processes break down bigger bits into smaller bits with the material remaining essentially the same, only becoming smaller. Mechanical processes primarily create coarse particles.<sup>14</sup> Dust storms, construction and demolition, mining operations, agriculture, and coal and oil combustion are among the activities that produce coarse particles.

By contrast, chemical processes in the atmosphere create most of the tiniest fine and ultrafine particles. Combustion sources burn fuels and emit gases. These gases can vaporize and then condense to become a particle of the same chemical compound. Or, they can react with other gases or particles in the atmosphere to form a particle of a different chemical compound. Particles formed by this latter process come from the reaction of elemental carbon (soot), heavy metals, sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and volatile organic compounds with water and other compounds in the atmosphere.<sup>15</sup> Burning fossil fuels in factories, power plants, steel mills, smelters, diesel- and gasoline-powered motor vehicles (cars and trucks) and equipment generate a large part of the raw materials for fine particles. So does burning wood in residential fireplaces and wood stoves or burning agricultural fields or forests.

### ***What Can Particles Do to Your Health?***

Studies showing the dangers of particle pollution are pouring in by the thousands. The new studies validate earlier research showing a strong relationship between particle pollution and illness, hospitalization and premature death.<sup>16</sup>

Researchers these days are exploring possible differences in health effects of the three sizes of particles and particles from different sources, such as diesel particles from trucks and buses or sulfates from coal-fired power plants. So far, the evidence remains clear that all particles from all sources are dangerous.<sup>17</sup>

Particle pollution can damage the body in ways similar to cigarette smoking. A recent review of the research on how particles cause harm found that the body responds to particles in similar ways to its response to cigarette smoke. These findings help explain why particle pollution can cause heart attacks and strokes.<sup>18</sup>

### ***Short-term Exposure Can Be Deadly***

First and foremost, short-term exposure to particle pollution can kill. Deaths can occur on the very day that particle levels are high, or within one to two months afterward. Particle pollution does not just make people die a few days earlier than they might otherwise—these are deaths that would not have occurred if the air were cleaner.<sup>19</sup> Particle pollution also diminishes lung function, causes greater use of asthma medications and increased rates of school absenteeism, emergency room visits and hospital admissions. Other adverse effects can be coughing, wheezing, cardiac arrhythmias and heart attacks. According to the findings from

some of the latest studies, short-term increases in particle pollution have been linked to:

- death from respiratory and cardiovascular causes, including strokes;<sup>20,21,22,23</sup>
- increased mortality in infants and young children;<sup>24</sup>
- increased numbers of heart attacks, especially among the elderly and in people with heart conditions;<sup>25</sup>
- inflammation of lung tissue in young, healthy adults;<sup>26</sup>
- increased hospitalization for cardiovascular disease, including strokes and congestive heart failure;<sup>27,28,29</sup>
- increased emergency room visits for patients suffering from acute respiratory ailments;<sup>30</sup>
- increased hospitalization for asthma among children; and<sup>31,32,33</sup>
- increased severity of asthma attacks in children.<sup>34</sup>

### ***Year-Round Exposure***

Breathing high levels of particle pollution day in and day out also can be deadly, as landmark studies in the 1990s showed conclusively.<sup>35</sup> Chronic exposure to particle pollution can shorten life by one to three years.<sup>36</sup> Other impacts range from premature births to serious respiratory disorders, even when the particle levels are very low.

Year-round exposure to particle pollution has also been linked to:

- increased hospitalization for asthma attacks for children living near roads with heavy truck or trailer traffic;<sup>37,38</sup>
- slowed lung function growth in children and teenagers;<sup>39,40</sup>
- significant damage to the small airways of the lungs;<sup>41</sup>
- increased risk of dying from lung cancer; and<sup>42</sup>
- increased risk of death from cardiovascular disease.<sup>43</sup>

Alarming, the risks may be even greater than previously thought. Earlier studies of the long-term health risks of air pollution relied on estimates of the average exposure to people in the community. New evidence from studies published since 2005 suggests that those estimates may be far too low. Tracking 23,000 residents of Los Angeles and looking at data from monitors nearest to them, researchers found that the risk of premature death from fine particle pollution may be *three times higher* than previously reported.<sup>44</sup> New research into risks to the health of 65,000 women over age 50 found that those who lived in areas with higher levels of particle pollution faced a much greater risk of dying from heart disease than had been previously estimated. Even women who lived within the same city faced dif-

fering risks depending on the annual levels of pollution in their neighborhood.<sup>45</sup>

### ***Who Is at Risk?***

Anyone living in an area with a high level of particle pollution is at risk (you can take a look at levels in your state in this report). People at the greatest risk from particle pollution exposure include those with lung disease such as asthma and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), which includes chronic bronchitis and emphysema; people with sensitive airways, where exposure to particle pollution can cause wheezing, coughing and respiratory irritation; the elderly; people with heart disease; and children. New research points to ever-larger groups at higher risk, including diabetics, and most recently, women over 50.<sup>46</sup>

### **Focusing on Children's Health**

Children may look like miniature adults, but they're not. Air pollution is especially dangerous to them because their lungs are growing and because they are so active.

Just like the arms and legs, the largest portion of a child's lungs will grow long after he or she is born. Eighty percent of their tiny air sacs develop after birth. Those sacs, called the alveoli, are where the life-sustaining transfer of oxygen to the blood takes place. The lungs and their alveoli aren't fully grown until children become adults.<sup>47</sup> In addition, the body's defenses that help adults fight off infections are still developing in young bodies.<sup>48</sup> Children have more respiratory infections than adults, which also seems to increase their susceptibility to air pollution.<sup>49</sup>

Furthermore, children don't behave like adults, which also affects their vulnerability. They are outside for longer periods and are usually more active when outdoors. Consequently, they inhale more polluted outdoor air than adults typically do.<sup>50</sup>

### ***Major Reviews Confirm Harm to Children***

Two major analyses recently concluded that air pollution is especially harmful to children. They found that air pollution is so dangerous that it can even threaten children's lives.

The World Health Organization (WHO) published an in-depth look at the research on children's health and air pollution. Most importantly, the scientists concluded that particle pollution caused infant deaths. In addition, they found that air pollution caused a host of harmful effects on children, including:

- short-term and long-term decreased lung function rates and lower lung function levels, critical measures of how well the child will breathe throughout his or her life (due primarily to exposure to particle pollution and traffic-related pollution);
- worsening of asthma (from exposure to particle as well as ozone pollution);
- increased prevalence and incidence of cough and bronchitis (primarily from particle pollution); and
- increased risk of upper and lower respiratory infections.<sup>51</sup>

The American Academy of Pediatrics issued a statement on the dangers of outdoor air pollution on children's health, pointing out the special differences for children.<sup>52</sup> The Academy reported many of the health effects cited by the WHO study, but also focused on the sources common to many children. Both the WHO monograph and the Academy statement highlighted recent studies showing how children living near highly traveled highways appear to be particularly harmed by traffic-related pollution. The Academy statement highlighted the specific concern over diesel school buses, citing a pilot study that showed children riding inside a school bus may be exposed to four times more diesel exhaust than if they were riding in a car.<sup>53</sup>

#### ***Research on Prenatal Exposure to Air Pollution***

Several studies published in 2005 found prenatal exposure to air pollution can harm children. A study of pregnant women in four Pennsylvania counties found an increased risk of preterm births linked to chronic exposure to high levels of air pollution during the last six weeks of pregnancy.<sup>54</sup> A study of three low-income neighborhoods in New York City found that infants born to nonsmoking mothers faced a possible increased risk of cancer from living in areas with elevated urban area air pollutants.<sup>55</sup> A third study in the Czech Republic found evidence that the mother's exposure to air pollution may even alter the immune systems of the fetus.<sup>56</sup>

#### ***Air Pollution Linked to Increased Risk to Newborns and Infants***

As the World Health Organization concluded, evidence shows that air pollution, especially particle pollution, increases the risk of infant death. Earlier this year researchers published a study looking at the infant deaths in the U.S. from 1999 to 2002. They confirmed the risk from particle pollution and found evidence that ozone may also increase the risk of sudden infant death syndrome, or SIDS.<sup>57</sup>

Researchers from Yale University looked at the records of over 350,000 babies born in Connecticut and Massachusetts with low birth weights to see if they could identify any relationships with outdoor air pollutants. The researchers concluded that air pollution may increase the risk of babies being born with low birth weight, even though almost all the air pollutants were at levels that were officially listed as safe by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.<sup>58</sup>

#### ***Air Pollution Linked to Asthma Attacks, New Onset of Asthma***

A 2003 study followed children with asthma by having their mothers track their symptoms on a daily basis. The study found that children with asthma were particularly vulnerable to ozone even at levels then officially considered safe.<sup>59</sup> An accompanying editorial warned, "Air pollution is one of the most under-appreciated contributors to asthma exacerbation."<sup>60</sup>

A recent study suggests that year-round exposure to ozone may be associated with an increased risk of the development of asthma. While more research is needed to confirm this finding, researchers tracking 3,500 students in Southern California found an increased onset of asthma in children who were taking part in three or more outdoor activities in communities with high levels of ozone.<sup>61</sup>

### ***Air Pollution Increases Risk of Underdeveloped Lungs***

Another finding from the Southern California Children's Health study looked at the long-term effects of particle pollution on teenagers. Tracking 1,759 children between ages 10 and 18, researchers found that those who grew up in more polluted areas face the increased risk of having underdeveloped lungs, which may never recover to their full capacity. The average drop in lung function was 20 percent below what was expected for the child's age, similar to the impact of growing up in a home with parents who smoked.<sup>62</sup>

Community health studies are pointing to less obvious, but serious effects from year-round exposure to ozone, especially for children. Scientists followed 500 Yale University students and determined that living just four years in a region with high levels of ozone and related co-pollutants was associated with diminished lung function and frequent reports of respiratory symptoms.<sup>63</sup> A much larger study of 3,300 school children in Southern California found reduced lung function in girls with asthma and boys who spent more time outdoors in areas with high levels of ozone.<sup>64</sup>

### ***Cleaning Up Pollution Can Reduce Risk to Children***

There is also real-world evidence that reducing air pollution can help protect children. Two new studies published in 2005 added more weight to the argument.

Changes in air pollution from the reunification of Germany proved a real-life laboratory. Both East and West Germany had different levels and sources of particles. Outdoor particle levels were much higher in East Germany, where they came from factories and homes. West Germany had higher concentrations of traffic-generated particles. After reunification, emissions from the factories and homes dropped, but traffic increased. A German study explored the impact on the lungs of six-year olds from both East and West Germany. Total lung capacity improved with the lower particle levels. However, for those children living near busy roads, the increased pollution from the increased traffic kept them from benefiting from the overall cleaner air.<sup>65</sup>

In Switzerland, particle pollution dropped during a period in the 1990s. Researchers there tracked 9,000 children over a nine-year period, following their respiratory symptoms. After taking other factors such as family characteristics and indoor air pollution into account, the researchers noted that during the years with less pollution, the children had fewer episodes of chronic cough, bronchitis, common cold, and conjunctivitis symptoms.<sup>66</sup>

In this country, the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta, Georgia remains one of the most interesting cases. Atlanta is a prime example of an urban area with a history of serious ozone problems. The determined efforts of the city to reduce traffic during the Olympics succeeded in not just reducing congestion, but in improving the health of children with asthma. Concerned with an expected traffic nightmare, the city brought in more buses, more subway cars, and encouraged ridesharing and telecommuting during the Summer Olympic Games. These measures created a

prolonged period of low ozone pollution that resulted in significantly lower rates of childhood asthma events for children aged 1 to 16. The number of asthma acute care events (e.g., treatment and hospitalization) decreased 42 percent in the Georgia Medicaid claims files. Pediatric emergency departments also saw significant reductions, as did the Georgia Hospital Discharge Database and a health maintenance organization database. It is important to note researchers determined that weather was not the determining factor in the reduced ozone levels.<sup>67</sup>

### ***Living Near Highways May Be Especially Dangerous***

Being in heavy traffic, or living near a road may be even more dangerous than being in other places in a community. Several studies have found that the vehicle emissions coming directly from those highways may be higher than in the community as a whole, increasing the risk of harm to people who live or work near busy roads.

Children and teenagers are among the most vulnerable—though not the only ones at risk. A new European study found infants and young children exposed to air pollution from traffic faced a greater risk of wheezing.<sup>68</sup> In Southern California, a 2007 study found that air pollution can limit the capacity of the lungs in 10- to 18-year-olds who live within about one-third of a mile of a freeway. Changes such as that can reduce their capacity to breathe for the rest of their lives and increase their risk of serious lung diseases. Other recent research found that children who live near freeways had higher risk of being diagnosed with asthma.<sup>69,70</sup> However, children are certainly not the only ones at risk. Studies have found increased risk of premature death from living near a major highway or an urban road.<sup>71</sup> Another study found an increase in risk of heart attacks from being in traffic, whether driving or taking public transportation.<sup>72</sup>

### ***How to Protect Yourself from Ozone and Particle Pollution***

To minimize your exposure to ozone and particle pollution:

- Pay attention to forecasts for high air pollution days to know when to take precautions;
- Avoid exercising near high-traffic areas;
- Avoid exercising outdoors when pollution levels are high, or substitute an activity that requires less exertion;
- Eliminate indoor smoking; and
- Reduce the use of fireplaces and wood-burning stoves.

Bottom line: Help yourself and everyone else breathe easier. Support national, state and local efforts to clean up sources of pollution. Your life and the life of someone you love may depend on it.

1. Bell ML, McDermott A, Zeger SL, Samet JM, Dominici F. Ozone and short-term mortality in 95 US urban communities, 1987-2000. *JAMA* 2004; 292:2372-2378.
2. Gryparis A, Forsberg B, Katsouyanni K et al. Acute Effects of Ozone on Mortality from the "Air Pollution and Health: a European approach" project. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2004; 170: 1080-1087.
3. Bell ML, Dominici F, and Samet JM. A Meta-Analysis of Time-Series Studies of Ozone and Mortality with Comparison to the National Morbidity, Mortality, and Air Pollution Study. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:436-445. Levy JI, Chermerynski SM, Samat JA. Ozone Exposure and Mortality: an empiric Bayes metaregression analysis. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:458-468. Ito K, De Leon SF, Lippmann M. Associations Between Ozone and Daily Mortality: analysis and meta-analysis. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:446-429.
4. Bates DV. Ambient Ozone and Mortality. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:427-429.
5. Gent JF, Triche EW, Holford TR, Belanger K, Bracken MB, Beckett WS, Leaderer BP. Association of Low-Level Ozone and Fine Particles with Respiratory Symptoms in Children with Asthma. *JAMA* 2003; 290:1859-1867. Desqueyroux H, Pujet JC, Prosper M, Squinazi F, Momas I. Short-Term Effects of Low-Level Air Pollution on Respiratory Health of Adults Suffering from Moderate to Severe Asthma. *Environ Res* 2002;89:29-37; Burnett RT, Brook JR, Yung WT, Dales RE, Krewski D. Association between Ozone and Hospitalization for Respiratory Diseases in 16 Canadian Cities. *Environ Res* 1997;72:24-31. Medina-Ramón M, Zanobetti A, Schwartz J. The Effect of Ozone and PM10 on Hospital Admissions for Pneumonia and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: a national multicity study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006; 163(6):579-588.
6. Chan C-C, Wu T-H. Effects of Ambient Ozone Exposure on Mail Carriers' Peak Expiratory Flow Rates. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005; 113:735-738. Tager IB, Balmes, Lurmann F, Ngo L, Alcorn S, and Küenzli. Chronic Exposure to Ambient Ozone and Lung Function in Young Adults. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:751-759.
7. Desqueyroux H, Pujet JC, Prosper M, Le Moullec Y, Momas I. Effects of Air Pollution on Adults with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. *Arch Environ Health* 2002;57:554-560. Höpfe P, Peters A, Rabe G, Praml G, Lindner J, Jakobi G, Fruhmann G, Nowak D. Environmental Ozone Effects in Different Population Subgroups. *Int J Hyg Environ Health* 2003; 206:505-516.
8. Rich DQ, Mittleman MA, Link MS, Schwartz J, Luttmann-Gibson H, Catalano PJ, Speizer FE, Gold DR, and Dockery DW. Increased Risk of Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation Episodes Associated with Acute Increases in Ambient Air Pollution. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006; 114:120-123.
9. Ruidavets J-B, Courmont M, Cassadou S, Giroux M, Meybeck M, Ferrières. Ozone Air Pollution is Associated with Acute Myocardial Infarction. *Circulation* 2005; 111:563-569.
10. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter, October 2004
11. U.S. EPA. Air Quality Criteria, 2004
12. U.S. EPA. Air Quality Criteria, 2004.
13. U.S. EPA. *The Particle Pollution Report: current understanding of air quality and emissions through 2003*. 2004. p. 3.
14. U.S. EPA. Air Quality Criteria, 2004.
15. U.S. EPA. Air Quality Criteria, 2004.
16. Pope CA III, Dockery DW. Health Effects of Fine Particulate Air Pollution: Lines that Connect. *J Air Waste Manage Assoc* 2006; 56:709-742.
17. Pope and Dockery, 2006.
18. van Eeden SF, Yeung A, Quinlan K, and Hogg JC. Systemic Response to Ambient Particulate Matter: relevance to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *Proc Am Thorac Soc* 2005; 2:61-67.
19. Zanobetti A, Schwartz J, Samoli E, Gryparis A, Tuolumi G, Peacock J, Anderson RH, Le Tertre A, Bobros J, Celko M, Goren A, Forsberg B, Michelozzi P, Rabczenko D, Perez Hoyos S, Wichmann HE, Katsouyanni K. The Temporal Pattern of Respiratory and Heart Disease Mortality in Response to Air Pollution. *Environ Health Perspect* 2003;111:1188-1193. Dominici F, McDermott A, Zeger SL, Samet JM. Airborne Particulate Matter and Mortality: timescale effects in four US cities. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003; 157:1055-1065.
20. Dominici F, McDermott A, Zeger SL, Samet JM. On the Use of Generalized Additive Models in Time-Series Studies of Air Pollution and Health. *Am J Epidemiol* 2002; 156:193-203.
21. Hong, Y.-C., Lee J.-T., Kim, H., Ha, E.-H., Schwartz, J., and Christiani, D.C. Effects of Air Pollutants on Acute Stroke Mortality. *Environ Health Perspect* 2002; 110:187-191.
22. Tsai SS, Goggins WB, Chiu HF, Yang CY. Evidence for an Association Between Air Pollution and Daily Stroke Admissions in Kaohsiung, Taiwan. *Stroke* 2003; 34: 2612-6.
23. Wellenius GA, Schwartz J, Mittleman MA. Air Pollution and Hospital Admissions for Ischemic and Hemorrhagic Stroke Among Medicare Beneficiaries. *Stroke* 2005; 36:2549-2553.
24. Pope and Dockery, 2006.
25. D'ippoliti D, Forastiere F, Ancona C, Agabity N, Fusco D, Michelozzi P, Perucci CA. Air Pollution and Myocardial Infarction in Rome: a case-crossover analysis. *Epidemiology* 2003;14:528-535. Zanobetti A, Schwartz J. The Effect of Particulate Air Pollution on Emergency Admissions for Myocardial Infarction: a multicity case-crossover analysis. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005; 113:978-982.
26. Ghio AJ, Kim C, Devlin RB. Concentrated Ambient Air Particles Induce Mild Pulmonary Inflammation in Healthy Human Volunteers. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2000; 162(3 Pt 1):981-988.
27. Metzger KB, Tolbert PE, Klein M, Peel JL, Flanders WD, Todd K, Mulholland JA, Ryan PB, Frumkin H. Ambient Air Pollution and Cardiovascular Emergency Department Visits in Atlanta, Georgia, 1993-2000. *Epidemiology* 2004; 15: 46-56.
28. Tsai, 2003.
29. Wellenius GA, Schwartz J, and Mittleman MA. Particulate Air Pollution and Hospital Admissions for Congestive Heart Failure in Seven United States Cities. *Am J Cardiol* 2006; 97 (3):404-408. Wellenius GA, Bateson TF, Mittleman MA, Schwartz J. Particulate Air Pollution and the Rate of Hospitalization for Congestive Heart Failure among Medicare Beneficiaries in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. *Am J Epidem* 2005; 161:1030-1036.
30. Van Den Eeden SK, Quesenberry CP Jr, Shan J, Lurmann F. Particulate Air Pollution and Morbidity in the California Central Valley: a high particulate pollution region. Final Report to the California Air Resources Board, 2002.
31. Lin M, Chen Y, Burnett RT, Villeneuve PJ, Kerwski D. The Influence of Ambient Coarse Particulate Matter on Asthma Hospitalization in Children: case-crossover and time-series analyses. *Environ Health Perspect* 2002; 110:575-581.
32. Norris G, YoungPong SN, Koenig JQ, Larson TV, Sheppard L, Stout JW. An Association Between Fine Particles and Asthma Emergency Department Visits for Children in Seattle. *Environ Health Perspect* 1999;107:489-493.
33. Tolbert PE, Mulholland JA, MacIntosh DD, Xu F, Daniels D, Devine OJ, Carlin BP, Klein M, Dorley J, Butler AJ, Norden-

- berg DF, Frumkin H, Ryan PB, White MC. Air Quality and Pediatric Emergency Room Visits for Asthma in Atlanta, Georgia. *Am J Epidemiol* 2000; 151:798-810.
34. Slaughter JC, Lumley T, Sheppard L, Koenig JQ, Shapiro, GG. Effects of Ambient Air Pollution on Symptom Severity and Medication Use in Children with Asthma. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 2003; 91:346-353.
35. Dockery DW, Pope CA III, Xu X, Spengler JD, Ware JH, Fay ME, Ferris BG, Speizer FE. An Association Between Air Pollution and Mortality in Six U.S. Cities. *NEJM* 1993; 329:1753-1759. Pope CA, Thun MJ, Namboodiri MM, Dockery DW, Evans JS, Speizer FE, Heath CW. Particulate Air Pollution as a Predictor of Mortality in a Prospective Study of U.S. Adults. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1995; 151:669-674.
36. Pope CA III. Epidemiology of Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Human Health: biological mechanisms and who's at risk? *Environ Health Perspect* 2000;108: 713-723.
37. Lin S, Munsie JP, Hwang SA, Fitzgerald E, Cayo MR. Childhood Asthma Hospitalization and Residential Exposure to State Route Traffic. *Environ Res* 2002; 88:73-81.
38. Gauderman WJ, Vora H, McConnell R, Berhane K, Gilliland GF, Thomas D, Lurmann F, Avol E, Kuenzli N, Jarrett M, Peters J. Effect of Exposure to Traffic on Lung Development from 10 to 18 Years of Age: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2007; 369:571-577.
39. Gauderman WJ, Gilliland GF, Vora H, Avol E, Stram D, McConnell R, Thomas D, Lurmann F, Margolis HG, Rappaport EB, Berhane K, Peters JM. Association between Air Pollution and Lung Function Growth in Southern California Children: results from a second cohort. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2002;166:76-84.
40. Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Gilliland F, Vora H, Thomas D, Berhane K, McConnell R, Kuenzli N, Lurmann F, Rappaport E, Margolis H, Bates D, Peters J. The effect of air pollution on lung development from 10 to 18 years of age. *NEJM* 2004; 351:1057-1067.
41. Churg, A Brauer, M, Avila-Casado, MdC, Fortoul TI, Wright JL. Chronic Exposure to High Levels of Particulate Air Pollution and Small Airway Remodeling. *Environ Health Perspect* 2003; 111: 714-718.
42. Pope CA III, Burnett RT, Thun MJ, Calle EE, Krewski D, Ito K, Thurston GD. Lung Cancer, Cardiopulmonary Mortality, and Long-Term Exposure to Fine Particulate Air Pollution, *JAMA* 2002; 287(9):1132-1141.
43. Pope CA III, Burnett RT, Thurston GD, Thun MJ, Calle EE, Krewski D, Godleski JJ. Cardiovascular Mortality and Year-round Exposure to Particulate Air Pollution: epidemiological evidence of general pathophysiological pathways of disease. *Circulation* 2004; 109:71-77.
44. Jerrett M, Burnett RT, Ma R, Pope CA III, Kerewski D, Newbold KB, Thurston G, Shi Y, Finkelstein N, Calle EE, Thun MJ. Spatial Analysis of Air Pollution and Mortality in Los Angeles. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:727-736.
45. Miller KA, Siscovick DS, Shepard L, Shepherd K, Sullivan JH, Anderson GL, Kaufman JD. Long-Term Exposure to Air Pollution and Incidence of Cardiovascular Events in Women. *NEJM* 2007; 356: 447-458.
46. Miller, O'Neill MS, Veves A, Zanobetti A, Sarnat JA, Gold DR, Economides PA, Horton ES, Schwartz J. Diabetes Enhances Vulnerability to Particulate Air Pollution-Associated Impairment in Vascular Reactivity and Endothelial Function. *Circulation* 2005; 111:2913-2920. Zanobetti, A., and Schwartz, J. Are Diabetics More Susceptible to the Health Effects of Airborne Particles? *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2001; 164: 831-833. National Research Council, National Academies of Science. *Research Priorities for Airborne Particulate Matter: IV. Continuing Research Progress* 2004.
47. Dietert RR, Etzel RA, Chen D, et al. Workshop to Identify Critical Windows of Exposure for Children's Health: immune and respiratory systems workgroup summary. *Environ Health Perspect* 2000; 108 (supp 3); 483-490.
48. World Health Organization: The Effects of Air Pollution on Children's Health and Development: a review of the evidence E86575. 2005. Available at <http://www.euro.who.int/document/E86575.pdf> .
49. WHO, 2005.
50. American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Environmental Health, Ambient Air Pollution: health hazards to children. *Pediatrics* 2004; 114: 1699-1707.
51. WHO, 2005.
52. American Academy of Pediatrics, 2004.
53. American Academy of Pediatrics, 2004.
54. Sagiv SK, Mendola P, Loomis D, Herring AH, Neas LM, Savitz DA, Poole C. A Time Series Analysis of Air Pollution and Preterm Birth in Pennsylvania, 1997-2001. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005; 113:602-606.
55. Bocskay KA, Orjuela MA, Dang D, Liu X, Warburton, DP, Perera FP. Chromosomal Aberrations in Cord Blood Are Associated with Prenatal Exposure to Carcinogenic Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers & Prevention* 2005; 14:506-511.
56. Hertz-Picciotto I, Herr CEW, Yap P-S, Dostal M, Shumway RH, Ashwood P, Lipsett M, Joad JP, Šrám, RJ. Air Pollution and Lymphocyte Phenotype Proportions in Cord Blood. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005; 113(10):1391-1398.
57. Woodruff TJ, Darrow LA, and Parker JD. Air Pollution and Postneonatal Infant Mortality in the United States, 1999-2002. *Environ Health Perspect* 2008; 118:110-115.
58. Bell ML, Ebisu K, and Belanger K. Ambient Air Pollution and Low Birth Weight in Connecticut and Massachusetts. *Environ Health Perspect* 2007; 115:1118-1125.
59. Gent JF, Triche EW, Holford TR, Belanger K, Bracken MB, Beckett WS, Leaderer BP. Association of Low-Level Ozone and Fine Particles with Respiratory Symptoms in Children with Asthma. *JAMA* 2003; 290:1859-1867.
60. Thurston GD, Bates DV. Air Pollution as an Underappreciated Cause of Asthma Symptoms. *JAMA* 2003; 290:1915-1917.
61. McConnell R, Berhane K Gilliland F, London SJ, Islam T, Gauderman WJ, Avol E, Margolis HG, Peters JM. Asthma in Exercising Children Exposed to Ozone. *Lancet* 2002; 359:386-391.
62. Gauderman, *NEJM* 2004.
63. Galizia A, Kinney PL. Year-round Residence in Areas of High Ozone: association with respiratory health in a nationwide sample of nonsmoking young adults. *Environ Health Perspect* 1999;107:675-679.
64. Peters JM, Avol E, Gauderman WJ, Linn WS, Navidi W, London SJ, Margolis H, Rappaport E, Vora H, Gong H, Thomas DC. A Study of Twelve Southern California Communities with Differing Levels and Types of Air Pollution. II. Effects on Pulmonary Function. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 1999; 159:768-775.
65. Sugiri D, Ranft U, Schikowski T, Krämer U. The Influence of Large Scale Airborne Particle Decline and Traffic Related Exposure on Children's Lung Function. *Environ Health Perspect* 2006; 114: 282-288.
66. Bayer-Oglesby L, Grize L, Gassner M, Takken-Sahli K, Sennhauser FH, Neu U, Schindler C, Braun-Fahrlander C. Decline of Ambient Air Pollution Levels and Improved Respiratory Health in Swiss Children. *Environ Health Perspect* 2005; 113:1632-1637.

67. Friedman MS, Powell KE, Hutwagner L, Graham LM, Teague WG. Impact of Changes in Transportation and Commuting Behaviors During the 1996 Summer Olympic Games in Atlanta on Air Quality and Childhood Asthma. *JAMA* 2001; 285:897-905.
68. Andersen ZJ, Loft S, Ketzel M, Stage M, Scheike T, Mette MN, and Bisgaard H. Ambient Air Pollution Triggers Wheezing Symptoms in Infants. *Thorax*, 2008, published online doi.10.1136/thx.2007.085480.
69. Kim JJ, Smorodinsky S, Lipsett M, Singer BC, Hodgson AT, Ostro B. Traffic-related air pollution near busy roads. *Amer J Resp Crit Care Med* 2004; 170:520-526.
70. Gauderman WJ, Avol A, Lurmann F, Kuenzli N, Gilliland F, Peters J, McConnell R. Childhood Asthma and Exposure to Traffic and Nitrogen Dioxide. *Epidemiology* 2005; 16:737-743.
71. Finklestein MM, Jerrett M., Sears M.R. Traffic Air Pollution and Mortality Rate Advancement Periods. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004; 160:173-177; Hoek G, Brunekreef B, Goldbohn S, Fischer P, van den Brandt. Associations between mortality and indicators of traffic-related air pollution in the Netherlands: a cohort study. *Lancet* 2002; 360: 1203-1209.
72. Peters A, von Klot S, Heier M, Trentinaglia I, Cyrys J, Hormann A, Hauptmann M, Wichmann HE, Lowel H. Exposure to Traffic and the Onset of Myocardial Infarction. *NEJM*; 351: 1721-1730.



## *Description of Methodology*

### **Statistical Methodology: The Air Quality Data**

#### *Data Sources*

The data on air quality throughout the United States were obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Air Quality System (AQS), formerly called Aerometric Information Retrieval System (AIRS) database. The American Lung Association contracted with Dr. Allen S. Lefohn, A.S.L. & Associates, Helena, Montana, to characterize the hourly averaged ozone concentration information and the 24-hour averaged PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration information for the 3-year period for 2004-2006 for each monitoring site.

Design values for the annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations by county were collected from data previously summarized by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and were used as received from the EPA on October 31, 2007 in personal correspondence from Mr. Mark Schmidt, EPA.

#### *Ozone Data Analysis*

The 2004, 2005, and 2006 AQS hourly ozone data were used to calculate the daily 8-hour maximum concentration for each ozone-monitoring site. The data were considered for a 3-year period for the same reason that the EPA uses 3 years of data to determine compliance with the ozone: to prevent a situation in any single year, where anomalies of weather or other factors create air pollution levels, which inaccurately reflect the normal conditions. The highest 8-hour daily maximum concentration in each county for 2004, 2005, and 2006, based on the EPA-defined ozone season, was identified.

Using these results, A.S.L. & Associates prepared a table by county that summarized, for each of the 3 years, the number of days the ozone level was within the ranges identified by the EPA based on the EPA Air Quality Index. The Air Quality Index then in place used the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard set at 0.084 ppm. Those ranges are:

0.000 – 0.064 ppm	Good (Green)
0.065 – 0.084 ppm	Moderate (Yellow)
0.085 – 0.104 ppm	Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (Orange)
0.105 – 0.124 ppm	Unhealthy (Red)
0.125 – 0.374 ppm	Very Unhealthy (Purple)

No data capture criteria were used to eliminate monitoring sites. All data within the ozone season were used in the analysis because it was the goal to identify the number of days that 8-hour daily maximum concentrations occurred within the defined ranges.

Following receipt of the above information, the American Lung Association identified the number of days each county, with at least one ozone monitor, experienced air quality designated as orange, red, or purple.

#### ***Short-term Particle Pollution Data Analysis***

A.S.L. & Associates identified the maximum daily 24-hour AQS PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration for each county in 2004, 2005, and 2006 with monitoring information. Using these results, A.S.L. & Associates prepared a table by county that summarized, for each of the 3 years, the number of days the maximum of the *daily* PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration was within the ranges identified by EPA based on the EPA Air Quality Index, adjusted by the American Lung Association as discussed below:

from 0.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 15.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Good (Green)
from 15.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 35.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Moderate (Yellow)
from 35.1 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 65.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups (Orange)
from 65.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 150.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Unhealthy (Red)
from 150.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 250.4 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Very Unhealthy (Purple)
greater than or equal to 250.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Hazardous (Maroon)

On September 21, 2006, the EPA announced a revised 24-hour National Ambient Air Quality standard for PM<sub>2.5</sub>, changing the standard from 65 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 35 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. The EPA has not yet announced changes to the Air Quality Index based on the new standard. However, the Lung Association adjusted the level of the category “Unhealthy for Sensitive Groups” to include the new standard, making that category range from 35.1 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 65.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup>.

No data capture criteria were used to eliminate monitoring sites. All data were used in the analysis because it was the goal to identify the number of days that the maximum in each county of the daily AIRS PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration occurred within the defined ranges. Only 24-h averaged PM data were used. Included in the analysis are data collected using only FRM and FEM methods, which reported 24-h averaged data. As instructed by the Lung Association, A.S.L. & Associates included the exceptional and natural events that were identified in the database and identified for the Lung Association the dates and monitoring sites that experienced such events.

Following receipt of the above information, the American Lung Association identified the number of days each county, with at least one PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitor, experienced air quality designated as orange, red, purple or maroon.

#### **Description of County Grading System**

##### ***Ozone and Short-term Particle Pollution (24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>)***

The grades for ozone and short-term particle pollution (24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>) were based on a weighted average for each county calculated using the Air Quality Index as noted above. The number of orange days experienced by each county was assigned a factor of 1, red days a factor of 1.5, purple days a factor of 2 and maroon days a factor of 2.5. By multiplying the total number of days within each category

by their assigned factor, a total was determined. Because the monitoring data were collected over a three-year period, the total was divided by three to determine the weighted average. Each county's grade was determined using the weighted average. Counties were ranked by weighted average. Metropolitan areas were ranked by the highest weighted average among the counties in the defined Metropolitan Statistical Area. In 2006, the White House Office of Management and Budget published revised definitions for the nation's Metropolitan Statistical Areas. Therefore, comparisons between MSAs of the *State of the Air 2008* report and earlier *State of the Air* reports should be made with caution.

All counties with a weighted average of zero (corresponding to no exceedances of the 8-hour standard over the three year period) were given a grade of "A." Counties with a weighted average of 0.3 to 0.9 (corresponding to 1 to 2 orange days) received a "B." Counties receiving a "C" had only 3 to 6 days over the standard, including at most one red day, and scored a weighted average of 1.0 to 2.0. Counties received a "D" if they had a weighted average of 2.1 to 3.2, which meant they had 7 to 9 days over the standard. Counties with weighted averages of 3.3 or higher (corresponding to approximately the 8-hour standard) received an "F." These counties generally had at least 10 orange days or 9 days over the standard with at least one or more days in the red or purple or maroon category. The number of days for an "F" grade was set to roughly correlate with the number of days that would place a county in nonattainment for the ozone standard. For short-term particle pollution, the number of days required for an F would roughly approximate a 99th percentile form of the PM<sub>2.5</sub>, a form the American Lung Association supports.

<b>Grading System</b>		
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Weighted Average</b>	<b>Approximate Number of Allowable Orange/Red/Purple/Maroon days</b>
A	0.0	None
B	0.3 to 0.9	1 to 2 orange days with no red
C	1.0 to 2.0	3 to 6 days over the standard: 3 to 5 orange with no more than 1 red OR 6 orange with no red
D	2.1 to 3.2	7 to 9 days over the standard: 7 total (including up to 2 red) to 9 orange with no red
F	3.3 or higher	9 days or more over the standard: 10 orange days or 9 total including at least 1 or more red or purple

Weighted averages allow comparisons to be drawn based on severity of air pollution. For example, if one county had 9 orange days and 0 red days, it would earn a weighted average of 3.0 and a D grade. However, another county which had only 8 orange days, but also had 2 red days, which signify days with more serious air pollution, would receive an F. That second county would have a weighted average of 3.7.

Note that this system differs significantly from the methodology the EPA uses to determine violations of both the ozone standard and the 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The EPA determines whether a county violates the standard based on the 4<sup>th</sup> maximum daily 8-hour ozone reading each year averaged over three years. Multiple days of unhealthy air beyond the highest four in each year are not considered. By con-

trast, the system used in this report recognizes when a community's air quality repeatedly results in unhealthy air throughout the three years. Consequently, some counties will receive grades of "F" in this report showing repeated instances of unhealthy air, while still meeting the EPA's 1997 ozone standard or the 1-hour ozone standard set in 1979. The EPA adopted a new ozone standard on March 12, 2008. This grading system has not been adjusted to reflect the new standard.

#### ***Year-round particle pollution (Annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>)***

Since no comparable Air Quality Index exists for year-round particle pollution (annual PM<sub>2.5</sub>), the grading was based on the EPA's determination of violations of the national ambient air quality standard for annual PM<sub>2.5</sub> of 15 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, as reported October 31, 2007 in personal correspondence from Mark Schmidt, EPA. Counties that the EPA listed as being in attainment of the standard were given grades of "Pass." Counties that the EPA listed as being in nonattainment were given grades of "Fail." Where insufficient data existed for the EPA to determine attainment or nonattainment, those counties received a grade of "Incomplete." Counties were ranked by design value. Metropolitan areas were ranked by the design value among the counties in the Metropolitan Statistical Area as of 2006 as defined by the White House Office of Management and Budget. The design value is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by the EPA to determine whether or not the air quality in a county meets the standard.

The Lung Association received critical assistance from members of the National Association of Clean Air Administrators, formerly known as the State and Territorial Air Pollution Control Administrators and the Association of Local Air Pollution Control Administrators. With their assistance, all state and local agencies were provided the opportunity to review and comment on the data in draft tabular form. The Lung Association reviewed all discrepancies with the agencies and, if needed, with Dr. Lefohn at A.S.L. and Associates. Questions about the annual PM design values were referred to Mr. Schmidt of the EPA, who reviewed and had final decision on those determinations. The American Lung Association wishes to express its continued appreciation to the state and local air directors and to Mr. Schmidt of the EPA for their willingness to assist in ensuring that the characterized data used in this report are correct.

#### **Calculations of Populations-at-Risk**

Presently county-specific measurements of the number of persons with chronic lung disease and other chronic conditions are not generally available. (The primary exception to this is asthma, as state-specific estimates for adult asthma are available through one national survey discussed below.) In order to assess the magnitude of lung disease and other chronic conditions at the state and county levels, we have employed a synthetic estimation technique originally developed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. This method uses age-specific national estimates of self-reported lung disease and other conditions to project the prevalence of disease by county.

### *Population Estimates*

The U.S. Census Bureau estimated data on the total population of each county in the United States for 2006. The Census Bureau also estimated the age-specific breakdown of the population by county.

### *Prevalence Estimates*

**Chronic Bronchitis, Emphysema, Pediatric Asthma and Cardiovascular Disease.** In 2006, the National Health Interview Survey (NHIS) estimated the nationwide annual prevalence of diagnosed chronic bronchitis at 9.5 million; the nationwide lifetime prevalence of emphysema was estimated at 4.1 million. The NHIS estimates the prevalence of diagnosed pediatric asthma to be over 6.8 million under age 18. The NHIS estimates the prevalence of cardiovascular disease (CV) at 74.6 million among adults age 18 years and over, which includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.

Due to the revision of the Health Interview Survey questionnaire, prevalence estimates from the *American Lung Association State of the Air 2000* cannot be compared to later publications. Estimates for chronic bronchitis and emphysema can be compared to the *State of the Air* reports for 2001 through 2008. Furthermore, estimates for chronic bronchitis and emphysema cannot be summed since they represent different types of prevalence estimates.

Pediatric asthma prevalence estimates from this year's report can only be compared to those in the *State of the Air* reports since 2004 and not the *State of the Air* reports from 2000 through 2003 due to a change to the National Health Interview Survey.

Local area prevalence of chronic bronchitis, emphysema, pediatric asthma and CV disease are estimated by applying age-specific national prevalence rates from the 2006 NHIS to age-specific county-level resident populations obtained from the U.S. Bureaus of the Census web site. Prevalence estimates for chronic bronchitis, emphysema and CV disease are calculated for those 18 to 44, 45 to 64 and 65+. The prevalence estimate for pediatric asthma is calculated for those under age 18.

**Adult Asthma.** In 2006, the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey indicated that approximately 8.5% of adults residing in the United States reported currently having asthma. The information on adult asthma obtained from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System survey cannot be compared with pediatric asthma estimates that are derived from the National Health Interview Survey.

The prevalence estimate for adult asthma is calculated for those 18 to 44, 45 to 64 and 65+. Local area prevalence of adult asthma is estimated by applying age-specific state prevalence rates from the 2006 BRFSS to age-specific county-level resident populations obtained from the U.S. Bureaus of the Census web site.

**Diabetes Estimates.** In 2006, the National Health Interview Survey estimated the nationwide lifetime prevalence of diabetes at 17.1 million. Local area prevalence of diabetes is estimated by applying age-specific national prevalence rates from the 2006 NHIS to age-specific county-level resident populations obtained from the U.S. Bureaus of the Census web site. Prevalence estimates for diabetes are calculated for those 18 to 44, 45 to 64 and 65+.

**Limitations of Estimates.** Since the statistics presented by the NHIS and the BRFSS are based on a sample, they will differ (due to random sampling variability) from figures that would be derived from a complete census, or case registry of people in the United States with these diseases. The results are also subject to reporting, non-response and processing errors. These types of errors are kept to a minimum by methods built into the survey.

Additionally, a major limitation of both surveys is that the information collected represents self-reports of medically diagnosed conditions, which may underestimate disease prevalence since not all individuals with these conditions have been properly diagnosed. However, the NHIS is the best available source that depicts the magnitude of chronic disease on the national level and the BRFSS is the best available source for state-specific adult asthma information. The conditions covered in the survey may vary considerably in the accuracy and completeness with which they are reported.

Local estimates of chronic diseases are scaled in direct proportion to the base population of the county and its age distribution. No adjustments are made for other factors that may affect local prevalence (e.g. local prevalence of cigarette smokers or occupational exposures) since the health surveys that obtain such data are rarely conducted on the county level. Because the estimates do not account for geographic differences in the prevalence of chronic and acute diseases, the sum of the estimates for each of the counties in the United States may not exactly reflect the national estimate derived by the NHIS or state estimates derived by the BRFSS.

## REFERENCES

Irwin, R. Guide to Local Area Populations U.S. Bureau of the Census Technical Paper Number 39 (1972).

National Center for Health Statistics. Raw Data from the National Health Interview Survey, United States, 2006. Calculations by the American Lung Association Research and Program Services Division using SPSS and SUDAAN software.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2006.

Population Estimates Branch, U.S. Bureau of the Census. County Resident Population Estimates, by Age, Sex, and Race: July 1, 2006.

Office of Management and Budget. Update of Statistical Areas Definitions and Guidance on Their Uses. OMB Bulletin 07-01 December 18, 2006.

## *Notes for State Data Table*

1. **Total Population** is based on 2006 US Census and represents the at-risk populations in counties with ozone or PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollution monitors; it does not represent the entire state's sensitive populations.
2. Those **18 & under** and **65 & over** are vulnerable to ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. They should not be used as population denominators for disease estimates.
3. **Pediatric asthma** estimates are for those under 18 years of age and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma in 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (US Census).
4. **Adult asthma** estimates are for those 18 years and older and represent the estimated number of people who had asthma during 2006 based on state rates (BRFSS) applied to county population estimates (US Census).
5. **Chronic bronchitis** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed within 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (US Census).
6. **Emphysema** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (US Census).
7. **CV disease** estimates are for adults 18 and over who had been diagnosed within 2006 based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (US Census). CV disease includes coronary heart disease, hypertension, stroke, angina pectoris and heart attack.
8. **Diabetes** estimates are for adults 18 and over who have been diagnosed within their lifetime based on national rates (NHIS) applied to county population estimates (US Census).
9. Adding across rows does not produce valid estimates. For example, because of differences in the surveys used to gather the information, adding pediatric and adult asthma does not produce an accurate estimate of total population with asthma. Adding emphysema and chronic bronchitis will double count people with both diseases.
10. Changes to the county grades and monitoring from those found in the 2007 report are noted on the last page of each state's section.

## AT-RISK GROUPS

County	Total Population	Under 18	65 & Over	Lung Diseases				CV Disease	Diabetes
				Pediatric Asthma	Adult Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema		
ALAMEDA CO	1,457,426	354,996	154,857	32,944	84,103	46,678	19,149	357,283	82,216
AMADOR CO	38,941	6,569	7,036	610	2,507	1,444	691	12,177	2,778
BUTTE CO	215,881	46,257	32,177	4,293	12,832	7,261	3,245	58,624	13,379
CALAVERAS CO	47,722	8,793	8,182	816	3,063	1,765	846	14,898	3,408
COLUSA CO	21,272	6,097	2,459	566	1,142	637	269	4,963	1,136
CONTRA COSTA CO	1,024,319	255,392	118,122	23,700	59,407	33,277	14,216	261,124	60,060
EL DORADO CO	178,066	39,130	20,011	3,631	10,832	6,057	2,566	47,285	10,903
FRESNO CO	891,756	269,100	85,720	24,972	46,386	25,537	10,107	191,302	43,908
GLENN CO	28,061	7,834	3,415	727	1,534	860	371	6,789	1,554
HUMBOLDT CO	128,330	26,672	16,194	2,475	7,771	4,351	1,857	34,129	7,833
IMPERIAL CO	160,301	47,295	16,478	4,389	8,365	4,614	1,844	34,768	7,963
INYO CO	17,980	3,869	3,039	359	1,115	644	312	5,479	1,253
KERN CO	780,117	231,876	68,328	21,518	40,509	22,115	8,401	161,673	37,147
KINGS CO	146,153	40,276	10,847	3,738	7,621	4,083	1,406	28,207	6,483
LAKE CO	65,933	14,464	10,504	1,342	4,007	2,298	1,081	19,164	4,381
LOS ANGELES CO	9,948,081	2,680,206	1,013,531	248,723	546,345	301,816	121,319	2,282,052	524,249
MADERA CO	146,345	40,510	14,954	3,759	7,865	4,334	1,724	32,562	7,467
MARIN CO	248,742	49,251	36,968	4,570	15,930	9,120	4,255	75,640	17,386

**HIGH OZONE DAYS 2004-2006**

County	Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade
ALAMEDA CO	6	0	0	2.0	C
AMADOR CO	10	0	0	3.3	F
BUTTE CO	11	0	0	3.7	F
CALAVERAS CO	25	1	0	8.8	F
COLUSA CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
CONTRA COSTA CO	4	0	0	1.3	C
EL DORADO CO	65	2	0	22.7	F
FRESNO CO	96	4	0	34.0	F
GLENN CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
HUMBOLDT CO	*	*	*	*	*
IMPERIAL CO	25	0	0	8.3	F
INYO CO	6	0	0	2.0	C
KERN CO	191	38	1	83.3	F
KINGS CO	18	0	0	6.0	F
LAKE CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
LOS ANGELES CO	141	26	7	64.7	F
MADERA CO	1	0	0	0.3	B
MARIN CO	0	0	0	0.0	A

**PARTICLE POLLUTION DAYS 2004-2006**

24-Hour					Annual	
Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade	Design Value	Pass/Fail
6	0	0	2.0	C	9.7	PASS
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
13	2	0	5.3	F	13.5	PASS
0	0	0	0.0	A	7.7	PASS
3	0	0	1.0	C	7.4	PASS
21	1	0	7.5	F	9.7	PASS
*	*	*	*	*	*	INC
99	15	0	40.5	F	17.2	FAIL
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
0	0	0	0.0	A	*	INC
7	3	0	3.8	F	12.5	PASS
0	1	1	1.2	C	5.3	PASS
95	17	0	40.2	F	18.9	FAIL
27	4	0	11.0	F	17.2	FAIL
0	0	0	0.0	A	4.8	PASS
94	8	0	35.3	F	17.9	FAIL
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC

Notes:

(1) The weighted average was derived by adding the three years of individual level data (2004-2006), multiplying the sums of each level by the assigned standard weights, i.e. 1=orange, 1.5=red, 2.0=purple and calculating the average. (2) Asterisk (\*) indicates incomplete monitoring data for all three years. Therefore, those counties are excluded from the grade analysis or received an Incomplete. (3) DNC indicates that data on that particular pollutant is not collected in that county. (4) Grades are as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.  
 (2) The Design Value is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.

## AT-RISK GROUPS

County	Total Population	Under 18	65 & Over	Lung Diseases				CV Disease	Diabetes
				Pediatric Asthma	Adult Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema		
MARIPOSA CO	18,401	3,324	3,208	308	1,173	675	322	5,682	1,298
MENDOCINO CO	88,109	20,128	12,447	1,868	5,324	3,031	1,384	24,802	5,690
MERCED CO	245,658	77,953	22,559	7,234	12,393	6,797	2,643	50,379	11,557
MONO CO	12,754	2,648	1,335	246	776	430	175	3,274	755
MONTEREY CO	410,206	114,711	40,852	10,645	22,100	12,184	4,853	91,624	21,039
NAPA CO	133,522	30,301	18,977	2,812	7,953	4,510	2,031	36,576	8,374
NEVADA CO	98,764	18,649	16,844	1,731	6,355	3,670	1,771	31,111	7,123
ORANGE CO	3,002,048	790,483	323,452	73,357	167,648	93,117	38,360	714,617	164,166
PLACER CO	326,242	71,679	46,616	6,652	19,423	10,983	4,892	88,478	20,233
PLUMAS CO	21,263	3,906	3,933	362	1,384	805	400	6,957	1,591
RIVERSIDE CO	2,026,803	558,015	227,387	51,784	108,629	60,147	24,481	458,324	104,810
SACRAMENTO CO	1,374,724	362,210	151,043	33,613	76,326	42,383	17,447	325,142	74,607
SAN BENITO CO	55,842	16,714	4,699	1,551	2,965	1,628	634	12,074	2,785
SAN BERNARDINO CO	1,999,332	594,264	162,012	55,148	104,080	56,618	21,114	409,388	94,247
SAN DIEGO CO	2,941,454	745,182	327,369	69,153	164,778	91,371	37,390	698,437	160,168
SAN FRANCISCO CO	744,041	110,485	110,338	10,253	47,769	26,822	11,607	212,216	48,517
SAN JOAQUIN CO	673,170	194,067	65,317	18,009	35,789	19,707	7,804	147,680	33,915

**HIGH OZONE DAYS 2004-2006**

County	Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade
MARIPOSA CO	18	2	0	7.0	F
MENDOCINO CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
MERCED CO	24	1	0	8.5	F
MONO CO	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
MONTEREY CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
NAPA CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
NEVADA CO	56	4	0	20.7	F
ORANGE CO	18	2	0	7.0	F
PLACER CO	65	7	0	25.2	F
PLUMAS CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
RIVERSIDE CO	159	45	2	76.8	F
SACRAMENTO CO	54	7	0	21.5	F
SAN BENITO CO	3	0	0	1.0	C
SAN BERNARDINO CO	167	52	13	90.3	F
SAN DIEGO CO	27	0	0	9.0	F
SAN FRANCISCO CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
SAN JOAQUIN CO	11	0	0	3.7	F

**PARTICLE POLLUTION DAYS 2004-2006**

24-Hour					Annual	
Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade	Design Value	Pass/Fail
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
0	0	0	0.0	A	6.7	PASS
24	0	0	8.0	F	14.7	PASS
*	*	*	*	*	*	INC
0	0	0	0.0	A	6.9	PASS
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
0	0	0	0.0	A	6.7	PASS
45	0	0	15.0	F	15.2	FAIL
4	0	0	1.3	C	10.2	PASS
5	0	0	1.7	C	11.1	PASS
125	10	0	46.7	F	20.6	FAIL
51	7	0	20.5	F	12	PASS
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
39	5	0	15.5	F	19.4	FAIL
22	1	0	7.8	F	13.3	PASS
13	0	0	4.3	F	9.7	PASS
15	0	0	5.0	F	12.9	PASS

Notes:

(1) The weighted average was derived by adding the three years of individual level data (2004-2006), multiplying the sums of each level by the assigned standard weights, i.e. 1=orange, 1.5=red, 2.0=purple and calculating the average. (2) Asterisk (\*) indicates incomplete monitoring data for all three years. Therefore, those counties are excluded from the grade analysis or received an Incomplete. (3) DNC indicates that data on that particular pollutant is not collected in that county. (4) Grades are as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.

(2) The Design Value is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.

## AT-RISK GROUPS

County	Total Population	Under 18	65 & Over	Lung Diseases				CV Disease	Diabetes
				Pediatric Asthma	Adult Asthma	Chronic Bronchitis	Emphysema		
SAN LUIS OBISPO CO	257,005	49,613	37,014	4,604	15,833	8,936	3,949	71,633	16,393
SAN MATEO CO	705,499	163,742	91,765	15,195	42,045	23,740	10,492	190,279	43,688
SANTA BARBARA CO	400,335	97,613	51,534	9,058	22,817	12,788	5,490	100,679	23,029
SANTA CLARA CO	1,731,281	431,737	181,904	40,065	98,498	54,554	22,180	415,324	95,503
SANTA CRUZ CO	249,705	55,995	25,802	5,196	14,939	8,290	3,395	63,386	14,622
SHASTA CO	179,951	40,445	26,883	3,753	10,767	6,131	2,808	50,272	11,498
SISKIYOU CO	45,091	9,085	8,226	843	2,852	1,658	822	14,305	3,267
SOLANO CO	411,680	108,126	43,256	10,034	23,156	12,863	5,298	98,702	22,705
SONOMA CO	466,891	106,856	59,337	9,916	28,002	15,789	6,936	126,063	28,971
STANISLAUS CO	512,138	147,599	51,201	13,697	27,284	15,060	6,033	113,645	26,088
SUTTER CO	91,410	24,151	11,001	2,241	5,063	2,828	1,197	22,067	5,052
TEHAMA CO	61,686	14,834	9,200	1,377	3,577	2,035	929	16,646	3,800
TULARE CO	419,909	134,299	38,836	12,463	21,210	11,657	4,577	86,913	19,945
TUOLUMNE CO	56,855	10,033	10,575	931	3,650	2,113	1,030	18,034	4,113
VENTURA CO	799,720	212,956	86,816	19,762	44,895	25,020	10,456	193,699	44,537
YOLO CO	188,085	44,006	18,085	4,084	10,575	5,764	2,173	41,954	9,629
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>36,295,000</b>	<b>9,494,396</b>	<b>3,912,645</b>	<b>881,080</b>	<b>2,021,365</b>	<b>1,120,995</b>	<b>458,734</b>	<b>8,568,481</b>	<b>1,967,221</b>

**HIGH OZONE DAYS 2004-2006**

County	Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade
SAN LUIS OBISPO CO	8	0	0	2.7	D
SAN MATEO CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
SANTA BARBARA CO	2	0	0	0.7	B
SANTA CLARA CO	8	1	0	3.2	D
SANTA CRUZ CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
SHASTA CO	6	0	0	2.0	C
SISKIYOU CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
SOLANO CO	4	0	0	1.3	C
SONOMA CO	0	0	0	0.0	A
STANISLAUS CO	23	0	0	7.7	F
SUTTER CO	8	0	0	2.7	D
TEHAMA CO	14	0	0	4.7	F
TULARE CO	193	7	0	67.8	F
TUOLUMNE CO	1	0	0	0.3	B
VENTURA CO	45	0	0	15.0	F
YOLO CO	6	0	0	2.0	C

**PARTICLE POLLUTION DAYS 2004-2006**

24-Hour					Annual	
Orange	Red	Purple	Wgt. Avg	Grade	Design Value	Pass/Fail
0	0	0	0.0	A	8	PASS
1	1	0	0.8	B	9.2	PASS
0	0	0	0.0	A	10.6	PASS
39	0	0	13.0	F	11.4	PASS
0	0	0	0.0	A	*	INC
0	0	0	0.0	A	7.7	PASS
*	*	*	*	*	*	INC
9	0	0	3.0	D	10.2	PASS
1	0	0	0.3	B	8.3	PASS
25	2	0	9.3	F	14.1	PASS
7	0	0	2.3	D	10.3	PASS
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
29	2	0	10.7	F	18.2	FAIL
DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC	DNC
5	0	0	1.7	C	11.4	PASS
5	0	0	1.7	C	9.4	PASS

**Ozone**

- Amador County and Tehama County each dropped their grade from a D to an F.
- Contra Costa, Solano County and Yolo County each dropped their grade from a B to a C.
- Madera County's grade improved from an F to a B.
- San Joaquin County's grade dropped from a C to an F.
- San Luis Obispo County's grade dropped from a B to a D.
- Santa Barbara County and Tuolumne County improved their grades from a D to a B.
- Shasta County's grade improved from an F to a C.
- Humboldt County now has ozone monitors, but not enough data to grade.

**PM**

- Colusa County, Inyo County, Placer County and Yolo County dropped their grades from a B to a C.
- Humboldt County's grade improved from a B to an A.
- Imperial County's grade dropped from a D to an F.
- Mono County no longer has sufficient data to receive a grade.
- Plumas County's grade improved from a D to a C.
- Sutter County's grade dropped from a C to a D.
- Ventura County's grade improved from a D to a C.
- Contra Costa County now has sufficient data to grade their annual levels.
- Modoc County no longer has PM monitors.

**Notes:**

(1) The weighted average was derived by adding the three years of individual level data (2004-2006), multiplying the sums of each level by the assigned standard weights, i.e. 1=orange, 1.5=red, 2.0=purple and calculating the average. (2) Asterisk (\*) indicates incomplete monitoring data for all three years. Therefore, those counties are excluded from the grade analysis or received an Incomplete. (3) DNC indicates that data on that particular pollutant is not collected in that county. (4) Grades are as follows: A=0.0, B=0.3-0.9, C=1.0-2.0, D=2.1-3.2, F=3.3+.

(2) The Design Value is the calculated concentration of a pollutant based on the form of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard, and is used by EPA to determine whether the air quality in a county meets the standard. The source for the Design Values is EPA, communication from the Office of Air Quality Planning & Standards, Mark Schmidt, October 31, 2007.

---

*Beginning our second century, the American Lung Association works to prevent lung disease and promote lung health. Asthma is the leading serious chronic childhood illness. Lung diseases and breathing problems are the primary causes of infant deaths in the United States today. Smoking remains the nation's number one preventable cause of chronic illness. Lung disease death rates continue to increase while other major causes of death have declined.*

*The American Lung Association has long funded vital research to discover the causes and seek improved treatments for those suffering with lung disease. We are the foremost defender of the Clean Air Act and laws that protect citizens from secondhand smoke. The Lung Association teaches children the dangers of tobacco use and helps teenage and adult smokers overcome addiction. We help children and adults living with lung disease to improve their quality of life. With your generous support, the American Lung Association is "Improving life, one breath at a time."*

*For more information about the American Lung Association  
or to support the work we do, call  
**1-800-LUNG-USA (1-800-586-4872)**  
or log on to [www.lungusa.org](http://www.lungusa.org).*

 **AMERICAN LUNG ASSOCIATION®**  
*Improving Life, One Breath at a Time*