

Interactive comment on “Impacts of aircraft emissions on the air quality near the ground” by H. Lee et al.

E. Wood

ezrawood@schoolph.umass.edu

Received and published: 31 January 2013

Lee et al present an interesting study on the impact of aircraft emissions on air quality at the ground with an excellent approach and interesting results. There are a few items that seem in need of further explanation or re-investigation:

1. More than once the authors claim that if perturbations in pollutant levels result in concentrations that are below regulatory air quality standards such as those promulgated by the WHO or the EPA (e.g., the EPA’s national ambient air quality standards), then the public health impacts are negligible. For example:

“...ground as suggested in Barrett et al. (2010). In addition, it is the frequent occurrence of higher aerosol concentration than the regulation standards, e.g., $35 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

as a daily average in the US (EPA, 2012), that most affects human health, rather than a slight increase in background PM. For example, the World Health Organization provides $25 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ of daily mean PM_{2.5} as an acceptable guideline for minimizing health effects. . .”

and

“...more in January than in July. The largest O₃ increases in January are shown in the Eastern US (more than 2 ppb), East Asia (1.1 ppb) and Europe (1 ppb). However, considering the low background O₃ concentration in winter relative to the EPA guideline (75 ppbv as daily 8 h maximum average concentration), these perturbations are not important for local air quality.”

The epidemiological literature is rich in evidence to the contrary and shows that there is no threshold concentrations for ozone or PM_{2.5} below which there are no adverse health impacts (regardless of the regulatory standard values). For example, for short-term exposure there is a 0.41% increase in daily mortality per 10 ppb increase in 1-hour maximum O₃ exposure (Levy, Chemerynski, and Sarnat, 2005), and approximately a 1% increase in daily mortality for every $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in PM_{2.5} levels (Pope and Dockery 2006), but for neither pollutant is there a “safe” concentration below which variations do not have a health effect. This is also true for long-term exposure: The Harvard Six Cities Study showed that residents subject to long-term exposure to PM_{2.5} levels of $21 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ had almost a 20% higher mortality risk than those exposed to $11 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (Laden et al 2006, Pope and Dockery 2006). It’s worth noting that $21 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ is lower than the WHO standard of $35 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ (mentioned in this ACPD paper), but greater than the current EPA air quality standard of $12 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

It is certainly useful to compare modeled and measured pollutant concentrations to air quality standards, but determining the health impacts of air pollution requires a much more sophisticated approach than comparison to regulatory standards.

A few other comments:

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

pg 692, line 25: “Nitrous oxide is not included in NO_y because of its long atmospheric lifetime.” HONO does not have a long atmospheric lifetime – its main fate is to photodissociate to OH and NO. It has traditionally been included in NO_y and there is no reason to exclude it.

pg 693, line 1: “. . . et al. (1997) has shown that during wintertime, in regions of high NO_x, increased NO_x emissions actually decrease O₃ as there is more titration of O₃ with NO_x than production of O₃. We evaluate whether this holds for the added NO_x emissions from aviation. . .” The cause of this titration is the reaction of NO with O₃, and of course only happens if the NO_x is emitted as NO, which is true for most NO_x sources (power plants, on-road vehicles, etc). Aircraft NO_x emissions are somewhat unique, however, since a large portion is actually emitted directly as NO₂. At low engine thrust (e.g., during idle/taxi and approach aloft), the NO_x is emitted mostly as NO₂, whereas at high engine thrust it is mostly emitted as NO. Thus the speciation of NO_x is a key input into the model. What speciation of NO/NO₂ was used? See for example Wormhoudt et al 2007, Wood et al 2008, and Timko et al 2010a.

pg 693, line 18: “The aviation emissions data used in this study were provided by Steven Baughcum of the Boeing Company (Baughcum et al., 1998 and personal communication, 2008).” More information on these emissions would be useful. Do they account for the wealth of knowledge regarding aircraft emissions acquired in the last 10 years? e.g., those shown in Timko et al 2010a and Timko et al 2010b.

pt 699, line12: “This O₃ perturbation can also result in the small NO_x or NO_y perturbation in the boundary layer by changing the equilibrium among O₃, hydrocarbon and NO_x.” There is a photostationary state among O₃, NO, and NO₂, but it is not an equilibrium, and while hydrocarbons affect the NO_x-O₃ photostationary state through their contribution to RO₂ radicals, they themselves are not in equilibrium either.

Does the model’s chemistry reflect that found in aging experiments of aircraft exhaust? (e.g., Miracolo 2011).

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

The conclusions of this paper are quite interesting, but would be much more strongly supported by the text if the points above were addressed!

Ezra Wood Research Assistant Professor Environmental Health Sciences
Department of Public Health University of Massachusetts, Amherst ezra-
wood@schoolph.umass.edu

References

Laden, F., J. Schwartz, F. E. Speizer and D. W. Dockery (2006). "Reduction in Fine Particulate Air Pollution and Mortality: Extended Follow-up of the Harvard Six Cities Study." *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 173: 667-672.

Pope, C. A. I. and D. W. Dockery (2006). "Health Effects of Fine Particulate Air Pollution: Lines that Connect." *Journal of the Air & Waste Management Association* 56(6): 709 - 742.

Levy, J. I., S. M. Chemerynski and J. A. Sarnat (2005). "Ozone exposure and mortality: an empiric bayes metaregression analysis." *Epidemiology* 16(4): 458.

Wormhoudt, J., S. C. Herndon, P. E. Yelvington, R. C. Miake-Lye and C. Wey (2007). "Nitrogen Oxide (NO/NO₂/HONO) Emissions Measurements in Aircraft Exhausts." *Journal of Propulsion and Power* 23(5): 906-911.

Wood, E. C., S. C. Herndon, M. T. Timko, P. E. Yelvington and R. C. Miake-Lye (2008). "Speciation and Chemical Evolution of Nitrogen Oxides in Aircraft Exhaust near Airports." *Environ Sci Technol* 42: 1884-1891.

Timko, M. T., S. C. Herndon, E. C. Wood, T. Onasch, M. Northway, J. Jayne, M. Canagaratna, R. C. Miake-Lye and W. B. Knighton (2010). "Gas Turbine Engine Emissions - Part 1: Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides." *J. Eng. Gas Turb. Power* 132.

Timko, M. T., T. Onasch, M. Northway, J. Jayne, M. Canagaratna, S. Herndon, E. C.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Wood and R. Miake-Lye (2010). "Gas Turbine Engine Emissions - Part 2: Chemical Properties of Particulate Matter." J. Eng. Gas Turb. Power 132.

Miracolo, M. A., C. J. Hennigan, M. Ranjan, N. T. Nguyen, T. D. Gordon, E. M. Lipsky, A. A. Presto, N. M. Donahue and A. L. Robinson (2011). "Secondary aerosol formation from photochemical aging of aircraft exhaust in a smog chamber." Atmos. Chem. Phys 11: 4135-4147.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 13, 689, 2013.

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

