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Mr. Chairman, Ranking member, my name is Homer Boushey and I am a pulmonologist in the Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine at University of California San Francisco. On behalf of the American Thoracic Society I want to thank the Committee for this opportunity to testify regarding H.R. 806 – the Ozone Standards Implementation Act. The American Thoracic Society is a medical professional organization of more than 15,000 professionals and patients dedicated to the prevention, detection, treatment and cure of respiratory disease, critical care illnesses and sleep-disordered breathing. The ATS is testifying today to register our strong concerns with H.R. 806 – the Ozone Standards Implementation Act. If enacted, the legislation would have significant negative impacts on the health of many Americans.

Ozone (O₃) is a potent oxidant that damages the airways and lungs. There are literally hundreds of high quality peer reviewed studies that document the adverse health effects that exposure to ozone pollution has on the lungs and other organ systems.

Recent studies provide several lines of evidence demonstrating dose-response relationships between ozone exposure in the 60 to 80 ppb range and adverse health effects. These effects include hospital admissions and emergency room visits for children with asthma [1-4]. A study of younger, pre-school children in Atlanta has documented an increase in emergency department visits for pneumonia; this study showed that a 3 ppb increase in the three-day average of ozone was associated with an eight percent higher risk of pneumonia [5].

A growing body of evidence suggests that exposure to ozone may also induce the development of asthma in children, in addition to provoking attacks in children who already have the condition. A recent study in California compared children who lived in low ozone communities to children who lived in high ozone communities. Young athletes who participated in three or more outdoor sports, who did not have physician-diagnosed asthma at the beginning of the study, were more likely to develop asthma in high ozone communities than those in low ozone communities [6].

While this well constructed study does not prove that ozone causes asthma, it does add to a growing body of evidence that suggests ozone plays an important role in its development.
Taken together, the data are persuasive that ozone pollution – at levels permissible under the current standard – makes children sick. The EPA has the authority and obligation to set a standard that protects children from the adverse health effects of ozone exposure. But it’s not just children -- adults are also at risk.

Research studies of adults have also shown that as ozone levels increase, so do, severe asthma exacerbations, emergency room visits, and hospitalizations for asthma [4,7,8]. Similar associations have been found for adult admissions for chronic obstructive pulmonary disease [9,10] and pneumonia [10]. Healthy adults are affected as well. A population-based cohort study of generally healthy adults found that FEV$_1$ was lower after days when ambient ozone ranged from 59 ppb to 75 ppb compared to days with levels under 59 ppb [11]. Healthy individuals have normal lung function. Controlled human exposure studies have reaffirmed lung function decrements in healthy adults after exposure to 60 ppb to 70 ppb of ozone [12,13].

Perhaps of greatest concern, there is now stronger evidence of increased mortality in association with higher ozone levels [14-16], particularly among the elderly and those with chronic disease [17,18]. These large, multi-city studies found strong and consistent associations with increased risk of premature death, particularly in the warmer months when ozone levels are higher.

In sum, there is accumulating evidence that ozone pollution – at levels permitted by the current standard – is damaging to human lungs and contributes to disease.

While the evidence on ozone and respiratory effects is comprehensive and compelling, recent studies have shown adverse health effects beyond the lung. The Integrated Science Assessment (ISA) has concluded that, “…the evidence is stronger for most every health endpoint, with causal findings strengthened from ‘suggestive’ to ‘likely causal’ for cardiovascular effects and total mortality from short-term exposures.” In addition, the ISA noted that ozone affects the central nervous system and brain, and comments that a number of recent toxicological studies revealed various changes in neurologic function or histology with long-term exposure to ozone, including changes similar to those observed in neurodegenerative disorders, such as Parkinson disease and Alzheimer disease. The ISA concluded that, “…the toxicological evidence for the impact of O$_3$ on the brain and behavior is strong, and suggestive of a causal relationship between O$_3$ exposure and effects on the central nervous system.” [19]

In summary, recent research only reaffirms and deepens our understanding of the health effects of ozone exposure.

**Reducing Pollution Improves Health**

In the midst of all this concerning research documenting the adverse health effects of air pollution there is good news. The good news is that as pollution is reduced, health improves. We know this from studies around the Atlanta and Beijing Olympics – where the respective host cities took steps to reduce air pollution emissions during the Olympics.

Not only did those efforts result in air pollution reductions, they resulted in improved health as measured by changes in biomarkers (20,21), reduced morbidity and consumption of health resources (22-24).
Studies on Steubenville, OH and Salt Lake City, UT provide other real world examples showing that reduced industrial air pollution emissions lead to measurable improvements in morbidity and mortality (25, 26). Two recent publications based on a 20 year multi-cohort study of children in southern California demonstrated improvements in lung-function development in children as air quality improved. These were observed in girls and boys, in children with and without asthma, and across multiple ethnicities – suggesting all children benefit from improvements in air quality (27, 28).

**Concerns with H.R. 806 the Ozone Standards Implementation Act**

The ATS has several grave concerns with H.R. 806. If enacted the bill would:

**Delay implementation of the EPA ozone standard until 2025** – delaying the ozone pollution reductions called for in the EPA rule. As noted above, the delay in reducing ozone pollution will lead to avoidable adverse health effects, including asthma attacks, COPD exacerbations, missed school and work days, emergency room visits, hospitalizations, and premature death.

**Delay Review and Revision of Other Criteria Pollutants** – in addition to delaying the ozone standard, H.R. 806 would also rewrite current law to delay revision of all the criteria pollutants under the Clean Air Act. Instead of reviewing National Ambient Air Quality Standards every 5 years – as called for under current law – this bill would call for revision of standards every 10 years. This means pollutants like lead, particulate matter and carbon monoxide will remain in the air longer – needlessly exposing the American public to dangerous pollution and their adverse health effects.

Delaying improvements in air quality, be it ozone or another criteria pollutant, is not a trivial matter. In the 10 year review lag called for in this bill, a child will grow from a newborn to a 10 year old. In that time, the lungs, like the rest of the body, will see tremendous changes that will determine life-long health prospects of that child. We know that pre-natal and youth exposure to air pollution creates adverse development of the lungs in ways that impact adult disease. By delaying improvements in air quality, we are literally burdening children with life-long health issues.

**Lastly, the bill fundamentally rewrites the Clean Air Act by directing the EPA Administrator to consider technical feasibility when setting National Ambient Air Quality Standards.** The Clean Air Act currently requires the EPA Administrator to set Clean Air standards to whatever level is necessary to protect the public health. That this should be the sole requirement for setting a standard has been affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in a majority opinion written by the late Justice Scalia.

Mr. Chairman, research shows air pollution is bad for health. More importantly, research shows reducing air pollution improves health. If enacted, this legislation would delay improvements in air quality. The American Thoracic Society respectfully urges the committee to reject H.R. 806.
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