

Ultrafine Particles Downwind of Los Angeles International Airport:

Implications for Exposure Assessment

N. Hudda Tufts University & University of Southern California

AIRPORTS: AN UNDERESTIMATED LOCAL Source of ultrafine particles

- * Aviation emissions impact local, regional and global air quality.
- * Until recently, the focus was on few hundred meters or several kilometers from the airport complex.
 - Dodson et al. 20094 (Warwick, RI): aviation emissions contributed 24– 28% of the total black carbon (BC) measured at five sites 0.16– 3.7 km from the airport.
 - *Fanning et al.* 2007 (LAX): measured particle numbers concentrations in the 10–100 nm range and found significant increases above background at 1.9, 2.7, and 3.3 km
 - Several other studies estimated contribution to NOx (*Carslaw et al. 2006*) and SO2 (*Yu et al. 2004*) emissions.

AIRPORTS: AN UNDERESTIMATED LOCAL SOURCE OF ULTRAFINE PARTICLES

- Two recent studies have refined our understanding of aviation emission impacts on local air quality, particularly, in the context of particle number concentrations.
 - * Hudda et al. 2014, Env. Sc. & Tech
 - * Keuken et al. 2015, Atmos Environ.

LAX: Los Angeles International Airport













Locations of highest baseline PN concentrations on all transects

- align to the prevailing winds, and
- the incoming flight trajectory

IMPACT OCCURS REGULARLY Most hours of the day - all monitoring runs pattern reflects the day's meteorological conditions

0830-1530 hours

IMPACT OCCURS REGULARLY Most hours of the day - all monitoring runs pattern reflects the day's meteorological conditions

August 16, 2013 0945-2050 hours

IMPACT OCCURS REGULARLY Most hours of the day - all monitoring runs pattern reflects the day's meteorological conditions

SUMMARY OF RECENT STUDIES: HUDDA ET AL. 2014

LargeImpactArea

Local =
 15 -20 km

SUMMARY OF RECENT STUDIES: HUDDA ET AL. 2014

- Large Impact Magnitude
- * LAX Impact $\approx 1/4$ of that from LA freeways

SUMMARY OF RECENT STUDIES: KEUKEN ET AL. 2015

2-3 times
 higher PN
 when wind
 is blowing
 over the
 airport

SUMMARY OF RECENT STUDIES: KEUKEN ET AL. 2015

 Impact on PN concentration can be detected at a site 40 km from Schiphol - 20% higher

THE WIND DIRECTION CONSIDERATION

(c) Dec 09, 2013, 1830-0000 (a) Dec 03, 2013, 2000-2224 (b) Dec 03, 2013, 2224-0000 Km Km Km 0 2.5 0 2.5 0 2.5 10 10 10 Major Roads Freeway Runways 65 dB Contour Ocean • 21.5 - 40.5 (c) • 31.0 - 35.0 • 66.5 - 85.0 • 3.0 - 3.5 • 33.0-46.5 (b) (a) 6.5-10.0 < 2.0 • 3.5 - 5.5 • 40.5 - 53.5 8.0 - 23.5 • 25.0 - 42.5 • 85.0 - 106 • 10.0-14.5 • 46.5-54.0 < 2.5 2.0 - 2.5 = 5.5 - 10.5 = 53.523.5 - 28.5 • 42.5 - 49.0 • > 106 2.5-4.5 • 14.5-23.5 • >54.0 2.5 - 3.0 28.0 - 31.0 • 49.0 - 66.5 4.5-6.5 • 23.5-33.0

THE WIND DIRECTION CONSIDERATION

THE WIND DIRECTION CONSIDERATION

- Variable wind direction makes detection of the signal challenging but the signal can be detected
 - A network of sites and longer sampling campaigns needed
 - Mobile monitoring is an efficient alternative

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT - I PHYSICAL PROPERTIES

Regarding physical properties:

- * Elevated PN are mostly comprised of ultrafine particles.
 - *Keuken et al.* found that 10-20 nm particles dominate size distribution at a site that was 7 km
 - *Hudda et al.* are looking at the spatial pattern of physical properties of this aerosol over the large area
- * 5-10% higher deposition efficiency over urban ultrafine aerosol
- Significant impact in terms of number concentration or other expressions for assessing ultrafine exposure, like, surface area.

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT - II CHEMICAL PROPERTIES, MULTIPOLLUTANT MIXTURE

- Is this a unique ultra fine particulate matter mix?
 Sulphur content is not regulated in aviation like in automobile fuel (600ppm vs 15ppm)
 - *Characterize a "aviation signature" that includes other pollutants at long downwind distances
 - Signal easily detected in PN concentration; signal-to-noise ratio low in other pollutants, or ?
 - Emission profile different for landing, take-offs, idling need to quantify contribution of each activity to this impact?
 - *Is there a signature mix does it vary by distance to the source what are the most important components of the mix from exposure point of view at a large community wide level?

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT - II NOISE

* Residential exposure to aircraft noise has been studied

- * Association with hospitalization, CVD (Correia et al. 2013)
 - Considered PM2.5 and Ozone as confounders
- Association with risk of stroke, coronary heart disease, and cardiovascular disease (Hansell et al. 2013)
 - * Considered PM10 and road traffic noise as confounders
- *Both found a significant increase in risk
- Should ultrafine be considered a confounder in future airport studies or is it an opportunity to study health risks of ultrafine?

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT - III ULTRAFINE RISK

- An opportunity to study ultrafine health risk
 - Large subject population
 - Chronic exposure possible cohort
 - Relatively stable acute exposures
- Consider airport-related emissions as an explanatory variable for past studies and improve previous models

IMPLICATIONS FOR EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT - IV modelling exposure

- Inclusion in Land Use Regression models
 - Distance to airports, Deviation of prevailing wind direction from azimuth to the airport/active runway, Flight Activity, etc.
 - * A combination of several variables required to truly capture the impact
 - * Example, Weichenthal et al. 2015.
 - Included distance from Pearson airport in Toronto; R2 was 0.22, 0.26 for single predictor model
 - "suggests that airports have a measurable impact on ambient UFPs after adjusting for other factors, including proximity to highways and major roads."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was funded by National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) Grant 1K25ES019224-01 and 5P30ES007048 to the University of Southern California and by US EPA Grant RD-83479601-0.

Colleagues at USC and Tufts Univ.

Special Mention: **Dr. Scott Fruin at USC**

