

-----Original Message-----

From: Kearns, Siobhan [mailto:Siobhan.Kearns@ottawa.ca]

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2005 12:59 PM

To: Weiner, Joel

Subject: FW: International report Air quality

Hi Joel.

I had one of our Environmental Inspectors read and comment on the Air Quality Report.

I hope I am not too late submitting the comments.

Lovcly to have met you.

Siobhan Kearns
Director
Environment and Health Protection
Ottawa Public Health
City of Ottawa

> -----Original Message-----

Comments

Canada & United States Air Quality Agreement Progress Report

This progress report is an attempt to show how two countries are working together to improve the air quality. I think that this process should continue. However, it would be helpful if the report could include actual data. For instance, on page 3 the report identifies that Canada has “a range of emission control options”. What are the options? It is hard to critique a report when the details are missing. On page 7, Canada is using “continuous improvement” (CI) to improve air quality and address pollutants involved in visibility impairment. The report goes on to say “CI applies to areas with ambient pollutant levels below those of existing standards but still above levels associated with observable health effects”. Shouldn't the existing standards be lowered so the observable health effects disappear? The report should be specific as to what are the remedial and preventive actions that would allow for continuous improvement. The United States (US) has a goal to improve natural visibility in Class 1 areas in 60 years. This seems to be a long time period. This time line does not consider the health impacts (morbidity and mortality) on the community.

On page 9, the report identifies that citizens in Michigan continue to express concerns about pollution from a plant. What concerns do the citizens have? How are citizen complaints dealt with when the issue affects two countries?

On page 29 there are graphs showing emissions for both countries however the actual data is missing. The reader must guess.

On page 37, Health Effects three studies are described in general terms. It would be helpful if actual data was presented. For instance, the report states, "Multiple hypotheses now exist describing the biological mechanisms by which very small concentrations of inhaled PM produce cardiovascular and pulmonary changes...". I think actual references and specifics should be presented. Again, it is hard to critique something without the information.