Charge Questions for Bullet Point Responses

CASAC

December 13, 2018

Charge Question: Executive Summary

- The Executive Summary is intended to provide a concise synopsis of the key findings and conclusions of the PM ISA for a broad range of audiences.
- Please comment on the clarity with which the Executive Summary communicates the key information from the PM ISA.
- Please provide recommendations on information that should be added or information that should be left for discussion in the subsequent chapters of the PM ISA.

- Chapter 1 presents an integrated summary and the overall conclusions from the subsequent detailed chapters of the PM ISA and characterizes available scientific information on policy relevant issues. Please comment on the usefulness and effectiveness of the summary presentation.
- Please provide recommendations on approaches that may improve the communication of key findings to varied audiences and the synthesis of available information across subject areas. What information should be added or is more appropriate to leave for discussion in the subsequent detailed chapters?

- To what extent is the information presented in Chapter 2 regarding sources, chemistry, and measurement and modeling of ambient concentrations of PM clearly and accurately conveyed and appropriately characterized?
- Please comment on the extent to which available information on the spatial and temporal trends of ambient PM concentrations at various scales has been adequately and accurately described.

- Chapter 3 describes scientific information on exposure to ambient PM and implications for epidemiologic studies. To what extent is the discussion on methodological considerations for exposure measurement and modeling clearly and accurately conveyed and appropriately characterized?
- Please comment on the extent to which the discussion regarding exposure assessment and the influence of exposure error on effect estimates in epidemiologic studies of the health effects of PM has been adequately and accurately described.

- Chapter 4 characterizes scientific evidence on the dosimetry of PM.
- To what extent does the discussion clearly and accurately convey the dosimetry of inhaled PM and the processes of deposition, clearance, retention, and translocation?

 Please comment on the identification, evaluation and characterization of the available scientific evidence from epidemiologic, controlled human exposure, toxicological and associated human exposure and atmospheric sciences studies and the application of information from these studies to inform causality determinations for human **health** outcomes.

- Chapters 5 11 present assessments of the health effects associated with short-term and long-term exposure to PM. The discussion is organized by PM size fraction, exposure duration, broad health effects (e.g., asthma, ischemic heart disease, etc.), and scientific discipline.
- Please comment on the characterization of the evidence within these chapters.

 Please comment on the portrayal and discussion of the biological plausibility evidence presented at the outset of Chapters 5 – 11 and the extent to which: (1) the organization adequately captures the current state of the science with respect to potential pathways by which PM could impart health effects, and (2) as currently constructed, inform causality determinations.

Chapter 12

- Chapter 12 evaluates scientific information and presents conclusions on factors that may contribute to specific populations or life stages being at increased risk of a PM-related health effect.
- Please comment on the extent to which the available scientific evidence from epidemiologic, controlled human exposure, and toxicological studies been integrated to inform conclusions on populations and/or lifestages potentially at increased risk of a PM-related health effect.
- Is there information available on other key factors that is not included in the draft PM ISA that inform differential risk that should be added?

Chapter 13

 Please comment on the identification, evaluation and characterization of the available scientific evidence from studies of PM on non-ecological welfare effects of visibility impairment, climate, and materials and the application of information from these studies, as presented in Chapter 13, to inform causality determinations and uncertainty **characterizations** for these welfare outcomes.

- What scientific evidence has been developed since the last review to indicate if the current primary and/or secondary NAAQS need to be revised or if an alternative level or form of these standards is needed to protect public health and/or public welfare?
- Please recommend to the Administrator any new NAAQS or revisions of existing criteria and standards as may be appropriate.
- In providing advice, please consider a range of options for standard setting, in terms of indicators, averaging times, form, and levels for any alternative standards,
- along with a description of the alternative underlying interpretations of the scientific evidence and risk/exposure information that might support such alternative standards and that could be considered by the Administrator in making NAAQS decisions.

- Are there areas in which additional knowledge is required to appraise the adequacy and basis of existing, new, or revised NAAQS?
- Please describe the research efforts necessary to provide the required information

- What is the relative contribution to air pollution concentrations of natural as well as anthropogenic activity?
- In providing advice on any recommended NAAQS levels, please discuss relative proximity to peak background levels.

 Please advise the Administrator of any adverse public health, welfare, social, economic, or energy effects which may result from various strategies for attainment and maintenance of such NAAQS.

- Do key studies, analyses, and assessments
 which may inform the Administrator's decision
 to revise the NAAQS properly address or
 characterize uncertainty and causality?
- Are there appropriate criteria to ensure transparency in the evaluation, assessment, and characterization of key scientific evidence for this review?