medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Mobile monitoring of traffic-related air pollution for a prospective cohort study in the greater Seattle area

Magali N. Blanco,[a] Amanda Gassett,[a] Timothy Gould,[b] Annie Doubleday,[a] David L. Slager,[a] Elena Austin,[a] Edmund Seto,[a] Timothy Larson,[a,b] Julian Marshall,[b] Lianne Sheppard[a,c]

[a]Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Hans Rosling Center for Population Health, 3980 15th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98195

[b]Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering, University of Washington, 201 More Hall, Box 352700, Seattle, WA 98195

[c]Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Hans Rosling Center for Population Health, 3980 15th Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98195

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Growing evidence links traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) to adverse health effects. Previous air pollution studies focused on a few commonly measured pollutants with poor spatial resolution. Well-designed mobile monitoring studies may address this limitation. We designed an extensive mobile monitoring campaign to characterize TRAP exposure levels for a Seattle-based cohort, the Adult Changes in Thought (ACT) study. The campaign measured particulate matter ≤ 2.5 µm in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$), ultrafine particulates (UFP), black carbon (BC), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) and carbon dioxide (CO_2) at 309 stop locations representative of the cohort. We collected about 29 two-minute measures at each location during all seasons, days of the week, and most times of day for a one-year period. Annual average concentrations of UFPs had similar degrees of spatial variability as BC and NO_2 but higher degrees of variability as CO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$. UFPs had less temporal variability than other pollutants. Validation showed good agreement between our BC, NO_2, and $PM_{2.5}$ measurements and regulatory monitoring sites. The results from this campaign will be used to assess TRAP exposure in the ACT cohort.

Synopsis: We assessed annual-average traffic-pollutant levels with high spatial resolution at locations representative of participant residences using a temporally balanced short-term mobile monitoring campaign.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



38

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1 Introduction

An extensive body of evidence has linked air pollution to adverse health effects including respiratory, cardiovascular and mortality outcomes.[1] Recent evidence has begun to link traffic-related air pollution (TRAP) exposure to cognitive function among various populations, including the elderly.[2–4] While TRAP is a complex mixture that varies over time and space, pollutants include ultrafine particles (UFP; typically defined as aerodynamic diameter ≤ 100 nm), black carbon (BC), oxides of nitrogen including nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), and carbon dioxide (CO_2).[5] UFPs are increasingly associated with important health outcomes including more neurotoxicity and systemic inflammation than larger particles.[6–12]

To date, however, much of the epidemiology air pollution research has been limited to the federally defined criteria air pollutants, monitored nationwide through the EPA's regulatory Air Quality System (AQS) monitoring network. This network has monitored criteria pollutant levels throughout the US since the 1990s, and none specifically include UFPs.[13] Furthermore, this network is spatially sparse and thus fails to capture the spatial variability of more quickly decaying pollutants, including many TRAPs.[14] The Seattle Census Urbanized Area, for example, averages about 1 monitor every 174 km^2 (~14 active monitors within a land area of about 2,440 km^2), most of which measure fine particulate matter with diameter of less than 2.5 µm ($PM_{2.5}$) and BC.[15,16]

Mobile monitoring campaigns for assessing air pollution exposure have been used since at least the 1970s and have become increasingly common in recent years in an effort to address the limitations of traditional fixed site monitoring approaches.[4317–23] Typically, a vehicle is equipped with air monitors capable of measuring pollutants with high temporal resolution. Short-term sampling repeatedly occurs with this platform at predefined locations. Past work has shown

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

that repeated short-term air pollution samples can be used to calculate unbiased long-term averages, thus reducing the need for continuous fixed-site monitoring.[17,18] Because the sampling duration at individual locations can be quite short, campaigns can increase their spatial coverage with a single platform, thus making this approach more time- and cost- efficient than traditional fixed-site monitoring.

Still, the designs of past mobile monitoring campaigns have arguably limited their epidemiologic application. Importantly, most campaigns have sampled during limited time periods, for example, weekday business hours during one to three seasons.[19,24–26] We previously showed that these limited sampling campaigns likely result in biased long-term human exposure estimates because they do not capture the high temporal variability of many TRAPs, and that the exact degree of bias varies (is not consistent) across site.[27] Additionally, many campaigns have sampled along non-residential areas such as highways and industrial areas where air pollution levels may be much higher than the levels that most people are exposed to. Furthermore, most have collected non-stationary (mobile) on-road samples rather than stationary samples along the side of the road closer to participant residences. While non-stationary designs increase spatial coverage, further work is needed to demonstrate whether these are representative of residential human exposure levels.[19,28]

To address the limitations of past campaigns, we designed an extensive, multi-pollutant mobile monitoring campaign to characterize TRAP exposure levels for the Adult Changes in Thought (ACT) study cohort. ACT is a long-standing, prospective cohort study that has been investigating aging and brain health in the greater Seattle area since 1995.[29] The campaign measured TRAP at locations representative of the cohort including 309 stops and thousands of miles worth of on-road measurements in a temporally balanced approach throughout the course

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

of a year. The goal of this paper is to describe the mobile monitoring design's sampling methodology and to summarize the TRAP measures and spatial covariates associated with TRAP in our study region. To the best of our knowledge, this is one of the most extensive mobile monitoring campaigns conducted in terms of the pollutants measured, the spatial coverage and resolution, and the campaign duration and sampling frequency. This campaign will support future epidemiologic investigations of TRAP exposure in the ACT cohort.

2 Methods

Briefly, multiple pollutants including UFP, BC, $PM_{2.5}$, NO_2 and CO_2 were simultaneously measured with high quality instrumentation at 309 stationary (stop) locations along the side of the road. Locations were representative of the cohort's large spatial and geographical distribution throughout the greater Seattle area. Fixed driving routes were developed to additionally collect thousands of miles of non-stationary, on-road measurements between stop locations. A temporally balanced, year-long driving schedule that measured TRAP during all seasons, days of the week, and most times of the day enabled us to estimate unbiased annual average estimates at the site level. Details are described below.

2.1 Spatial Compatibility of the Selected Stop Locations and the ACT Cohort

We selected a mobile monitoring region in the greater Seattle, WA area that was roughly 1,200 land km^2 (463 mi^2; Figure 1). The monitoring region was composed of Census Tracts where the majority of the ACT cohort had historically resided between 1989-2018 (87% =

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

10,330/11,904 locations). This large region fell in western King County and southwest Snohomish County, and it included a variety of urban and rural areas with various land uses including residential, industrial, commercial, and downtown areas. We used the Location-Allocation tool in ArcMap (ArcGIS v. 10.5.1)[30] to select 304 sampling locations within the monitoring region that were representative of the ACT cohort (approximately one monitoring location per 33 participant locations; see Supplementary Information [SI] Note S1 for details). Stops were selected to maximize the spatial coverage within the monitoring region while minimizing the distance between sampled stops and cohort locations. Five additional stops were collocations at nearby regulatory air quality monitoring sites measuring pollutants similar to our platform (see below). In total, there were 309 stops. The average (SD) distance between a cohort location and the nearest monitoring stop was 611 (397) m. To ensure that the monitoring stops and cohort locations were spatially compatible, we compared the distribution of various TRAP-related covariates at these locations (Figure 2).[31]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Mobile monitoring routes (n=309 stops along 9 routes) and jittered ACT cohort locations (n=10,330 unique locations). Inset map shows the monitoring location within Washington (WA) state.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Covariate distributions of mobile monitoring stops (n=309) and ACT cohort locations (n=10,330)

2.2 Fixed Routes

We used ArcMap's Network Analyst New Route tool[30] and Google Maps[32] to develop nine fixed routes based on the 309 stop monitoring locations (SI Note S1). Each route ranged from 75-168 km (47-104 miles) in length and had 28-40 stops (SI Table S1). All routes started and ended at the University of Washington and were intended to maximize residential driving

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

coverage (i.e., reduce highway driving and driving on the same roads). Routes were downloaded from Google Maps to a smart phone and Garmin GPS Navigation System and navigation was set to replicate the same route each time regardless of traffic conditions. SI Figure S1 shows the distribution of various TRAP-related covariates on 100 m on-road segments and cohort locations. As before with the stop locations (Figure 2), road segments had similar geocovariate distributions as ACT cohort locations, indicating that these were spatially compatible.

2.3 Sampling Schedule

Sampling was planned to cover an entire year and was conducted from March 2019 through March 2020 during all seasons and days of the week between the hours of 4 AM and 11 PM. Our previous work has shown that this balanced but slightly reduced sampling schedule taking driver safety and operational logistics into consideration should still generally produce unbiased annual averages.[27] To increase temporal coverage, routes were started at different times of the day and driven in both clockwise and counterclockwise directions. A single route was driven each day (~4-8 drive hours). Make-up routes were conducted throughout the study to resample sites with missing readings (i.e., due to instrumentation or driver errors). Make-up routes occurred during similar times as the originally scheduled sampling time (i.e., season, day of the week, general time of day).

Twenty-eight two-minute samples were scheduled to be collected at each location while the vehicle was parked along the side of the road. This design choice was justified by our additional analyses of one-minute data from a near-road and a background regulatory site in Seattle. These analyses showed that at least 25 two-minute samples were sufficient to produce

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

annual average estimates with a low average percent error (See SI Figure S2). Furthermore, there was only a negligible improvement in annual average estimates when the sampling duration was extended from 2 to 60 minutes.

2.4 Data Collection

We equipped a Toyota Prius hybrid vehicle with fast-response (1-60 sec), high-quality instrumentation that measured various particle and gas pollutants. Pollutants included UFPs of various size ranges (see Table 1 for size details; instruments were: TSI NanoScan 3910, TSI P-TRAK 8525 with and without a diffusion screen, and Testo DiSCmini), BC (AethLabs MA200), $PM_{2.5}$ (Radiance Research M903 nephelometer), NO_2 (Aerodyne Research Inc. CAPS) and CO_2 (Li-Cor LI-850). SI Table S2 for instrumentation details. Note that we refer to "UFP" counts even though instruments measured particles larger than 100 nm in diameter since most particles by count are smaller than 100 nm. Carbon monoxide (CO) was also collected, but measurements did not meet our quality standards and were not subsequently used. The platform additionally collected temperature, relative humidity, and global positioning with real-time tracking. We had duplicates (back-ups) of every instrument type that were periodically collocated for quality assurance purposes (see Quality Assurance and Quality Control section below). Instruments were in the back of the vehicle where they were powered by two rechargeable batteries and connected to gas- or particle- specific manifolds (SI Figure S3-S4). These were connected to a rooftop inlet facing the front of the car used to collect ambient air samples. Instrument clocks were all synchronized at the beginning of each drive within ~2 seconds. Instruments were started within an hour before the start of each drive and continuously run until the end of the route.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Drivers were instructed to follow the specific Google Map route directions and to take notes of any field anomalies (e.g., sampling behind a school bus or next to a construction site).

Instrument data files were uploaded to a secure data management system (MySQL) after each drive using standardized naming conventions to automate data uploads and the generation of daily data reports (see SI Note S2 for further details).

2.5 Summary Measures

We calculated the median pollutant concentrations for each two-minute site visit. While means can be highly influenced by large concentration deviations (which may be important in some settings), medians are more robust to outliers and may better capture the typical values of skewed data.

We estimated UFP concentrations for particles 20-36 nm in diameter by calculating the difference between the unscreened (20-1,000 nm) and screened (36-1,000 nm) P-TRAK readings.

We estimated $PM_{2.5}$ concentrations from nephelometer readings using a calibration curve fit to regulatory monitoring data between 1998-2017 (SI Equation S1). Nephelometer light scattering is strongly correlated with $PM_{2.5}$ and has been used in the Puget Sound region to monitor air quality since 1967.[33] We fit the model using daily average measurements from nine non-industrial regulatory air monitoring sites in the region where both $PM_{2.5}$ (using federal reference methods) and nephelometer light scattering data were collected. We excluded the years 2008-2009 due to nephelometer instrumentation issues noted by the local regulatory agency. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

model's leave-one-site-out cross-validated R^2 and root mean square error (RMSE) were 0.92 and 1.97 μg/m^3, respectively.

To gain an overall assessment of the relative importance of the three types of particles and two gases, we scaled pollutant concentrations based on each pollutant's distribution (score = [value-median]/interquartile range) and aggregated at each site (the sum of scores) to characterize overall spatial air pollution trends. In addition to the $PM_{2.5}$ and BC particle measures, with multiple UFP instrument data available in our study, we focused our analysis on total UFP as measured by one of the instruments, the P-TRAK (20-1,000 nm particles).

We used Lasso regression to characterize the geographic covariates most strongly associated with pollutant concentrations. Cross-validation was used to select the tuning parameter, lambda. Covariates included various indicators of land use, population density, green space, built environment and others (see SI Table S10 for details). There were 835 initial geographic covariates (geocovariates) that were reduced to 183 as follows.[34] First, we excluded variables if they lacked variability (less than 20% of the data were different from the most common value) since these were not likely to improve, and could even worsen, the model fit. Next, we excluded all land use proportion variables where the maximum proportion observed in the data was less than 10%. Low values for these variables indicated that these land use types made up a small fraction of the land relative to other land use variables and would not likely have a meaningful impact on observed pollutant concentrations. We dropped variables if their distribution at monitoring sites was very different than their distribution at ACT cohort locations in an effort to reduce model extrapolation later on. This included variables where the standard deviation (SD) in the ACT cohort was more than five times the SD of the mobile monitoring data. We dropped variables if too many outliers were observed in the data (>2% of the total

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

data). Finally, we log-transformed proximity variables to better model pollutant exponential decay with increasing source distance.

2.6 Quality Assurance and Quality Control

We conducted various quality assurance and quality control (QAQC) activities throughout the study period to ensure the reliability and integrity of our data. Activities included calibrating gas instruments; checking particle instruments for zero concentration responses; assessing collocated instruments for agreement; inspecting time series data for concentration pattern anomalies; and dropping readings associated with instrument error codes or those outside the instrument measurement range. SI Note S2 has additional details. Site visit medians (~2 min) and annual averages for BC, NO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ estimated from these data were additionally compared against estimates from the five regulatory air monitoring collocation sites.

Computing details are in SI Note S3.

3 Results

3.1 Data Collected

In total, the campaign collected about 1,367 hours of data (driving and stopped) along approximately 34,335 km (21,347 mi), or 6,786 100 m road segments along non-A1 roads (SI

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S1). Each route was driven on 30-35 different occasions. After dropping stop concentrations that did not meet the quality assurance standards (0.61%), the final analyses included over 70,000 two-minute median stop samples (almost 9,000 samples per instrument) collected over the course of 288 drive days from 309 monitoring sites (Table S7).

Sites were sampled an average of 29 times, ranging from 26 to 35 times. Due to the logistical constraints of sampling 309 sites with one platform, some locations were visited fewer times of the day than other locations, though sampling times were still well distributed throughout the day (e.g., morning [e.g., 7 AM], afternoon [e.g., 3 PM] and evening [e.g., 8 PM]; see SI Figure S7).

3.2 Stop Visits

SI Table S6 shows the distribution of median site visit pollutant concentrations for all of the two-minute visits (N = 309 sites x ~29 visits/site). As a result of UFP particle size distributions, instruments that captured smaller particles more efficiently typically reported higher total concentrations. Ratios of the 95th to 5th quantile concentrations ("Q95/Q05") show that BC, NO_2 and UFPs saw the greatest concentration variability across sites and visits, while CO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ had relatively lower variability. All UFP measures had relatively high variability, though there were some differences associated with different instruments.

The SI shows the pollutant measurements collected during each visit by site (~29 visits/site; Table S8, Figure S8-S9). There was a high degree of variability within most sites, between sites, and for different pollutants. UFP instruments measuring smaller particles were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

more likely to report higher readings and thus higher levels of within-site variability. Once again, UFPs, BC and NO_2 had more within-site variability (see "Min/Max" IQR ratio in SI Table S8).

As expected, pollutant concentrations varied temporally throughout the study period (SI Figure S10-S13). Fall, for example, generally had relatively higher pollutant concentrations than summer and winter. Weekends generally had lower concentrations than weekdays. Midday hours generally had lower concentrations than surrounding hours.

Pollutant-specific Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) models of visit concentrations (SI Table S9) indicated most of the variability seen occurred within sites, rather than across sites or over time. UFPs had the highest within-site variability (~86-90% of the total) while NO_2 had the least (~67%). Relatively speaking, NO_2 and UFP visit concentrations had the most spatial variability, while $PM_{2.5}$ had the least. NO_2 and BC had the most daily variability, while $PM_{2.5}$ once again had the least. CO_2 and NO_2 had the most hourly variability, while UFPs had the least. Finally, CO_2 had the most seasonal variability while UFPs had the least.

3.3 Annual Averages

Estimated annual average pollutant concentrations across all monitoring sites are shown in Table 1 and Figure S14. There was roughly a 5- to 9- fold difference between the lowest and highest UFP site concentrations. On the other hand, NO_2 and BC concentrations had a 6-fold difference across sites, $PM_{2.5}$ had a 2-fold difference, while CO_2 varied little across sites. The IQR to median ratio similarly indicated that UFPs, BC and NO_2 had the highest relative annual average variability across site, while $PM_{2.5}$ and CO_2 had the lowest variability.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Distribution of annual average pollutant concentrations across monitoring sites (N = 309).

Pollutant	Instrument	Min	Q05	Q25	Median	Q75	Q95	Max	Max/Min
BC (ng/m^3)	MA200	270	359	456	571	666	878	1,494	5.5
CO_2 (ppm)	SenseAir	417	421	427	431	435	441	455	1.1
NO_2 (ppb)	CAPS	3.8	5.9	7.4	8.7	10	14	22	5.7
$PM_{2.5}$ (ug/m^3)	M903	3.4	3.8	4.4	4.7	5.2	5.8	7.2	2.1
UFP (pt/cm^3) 10-420 nm	NanoScan	5,613	6,791	8,691	10,110	11,663	17,434	29,530	5.3
UFP (pt/cm^3) 10-700 nm	DiSCmini	4,872	5,813	7,348	8,711	10,540	18,902	41,403	8.5

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

UFP (pt/cm^3) 20-1,000 nm	P-TRAK	3,998	4,734	5,843	6,866	8,197	12,993	24,205	6.1
UFP (pt/cm^3) 36-1,000 nm	P-TRAK, Screen	1,844	2,126	2,656	3,149	3,641	4,913	9,125	4.9

Pearson correlation coefficients for annual average concentrations across pollutants at the 309 monitoring sites ranged from as low as 0.27, indicating poor linear association, to 0.95, indicating very high linear association (SI Figure S15). $PM_{2.5}$ and CO_2 were generally poorly correlated with most other pollutants; BC and NO_2 had moderate correlations with other pollutants; while individual UFP measures were strongly correlated with other UFP measures, moderately correlated with BC and NO_2, and poorly correlated with $PM_{2.5}$ and CO_2.

The highest levels of overall air pollution (sum of the scores) were generally between north Seattle and the Seattle-Tacoma (Sea-Tac) International Airport, while the lowest levels were generally in the northeast (e.g., Woodinville, Bellevue) and southwest (West Seattle to Federal Way coastline) parts of the monitoring region (Figure 3 - Figure 4, SI Figure S16). Sites with high overall air pollution levels near downtown Seattle were generally driven by elevated BC and NO_2 levels, while high concentration sites between Seattle and the Sea-Tac International Airport were generally driven by UFPs (SI Figure S17).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Annual average $PM_{2.5}$, BC, NO_2 and CO_2 concentrations at monitoring sites (N=309).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Annual average UFP concentrations (total and by bin size in nm) at monitoring sites (N=309), as reported by P-TRAK instruments.

Lasso regression models indicated that the covariate most strongly associated with UFPs was proximity to the Sea-Tac International Airport, followed by proximity to major roadways (see SI Figure S18). BC was most strongly associated with rail yard proximity; while $PM_{2.5}$ was associated with major road, airports and coastline proximity. NO_2 was most associated with proximity to rail yards, large ports and coastlines. Finally, CO2 was most strongly associated with proximity to rail yards, medium ports, and major roadways.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

3.4 Collocations at Regulatory Monitoring Sites

Median two-minute BC, NO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ measurements from mobile monitoring stops were generally in agreement with measurements from regulatory sites (SI Figure S19). Annual average estimates from our mobile monitoring campaign measurements were similar to annual average estimates from comparable two-minute samples at regulatory monitoring sites used as collocations (SI Figure S20). These were in moderate agreement with true annual average concentrations at those sites (based on all of the available data during the study period).

4 Discussion

In this paper, we describe the design of an innovative mobile monitoring campaign specifically developed to estimate unbiased, highly spatially resolved, long-term TRAP exposures in an epidemiologic cohort. To date, this is one of the most extensive multi-pollutant mobile monitoring campaigns conducted in terms of spatial coverage (~1,200 land km^2), sampling density (309 monitoring locations along 9 routes, or 1 monitor every 3.9 land km^2), and sampling frequency (7 days a week; 288 days over a one-year period) and duration (~5 driving hours per day between the hours of 4 AM – 11 PM). The spatial resolution achieved by this campaign was significantly greater than would be expected from fixed regulatory monitoring approaches. We had one monitor per 3.9 km^2 of land area rather than 183 km^2 (6 regulatory sites in the monitoring area), almost a 50-fold increase. The average (SD) monitoring distance from an ACT cohort location was 611 (397) m rather than 5,805 (2,805) m, almost a ten-fold difference. Monitor proximity to prediction (i.e., cohort) locations is an important determinant of accurate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

exposure assessment. Additionally, we previously showed that the extensive temporal sampling of this campaign across hours, days of the week and seasons is expected to produce more accurate and unbiased annual average estimates as compared to more common campaigns with reduced sampling.[27]

A unique aspect of this campaign was the collection of stationary samples along the side of the road. While most other campaigns have only collected non-stationary, on-road samples, various studies have shown that mobile samples are generally higher in concentration than stationary samples.[19,35–38] The completion of our stationary and non-stationary campaign positions us to conduct future work on how non-stationary data may be used responsibly for epidemiologic applications. Among the relatively few campaigns that have collected stationary rather than mobile samples alone, most have sampled for longer than two minutes (about 15-60 minutes per stop).[39]Our analyses indicated that shorter sampling periods produce comparably good estimates without adding excessive amounts of time to mobile monitoring campaigns (See SI Figure S2). Our use of a hybrid vehicle meant that the vehicle's engine was off and running off battery during stop sampling periods, thus reducing the possibility of self-contamination.

ANOVA model results indicate differences across pollutants in terms of their spatial and temporal variability. This finding is particularly relevant for short-term mobile monitoring campaigns, which could design their campaigns to adequately capture the variability of the pollutants of interest. These findings suggest that repeated sampling at any given site is crucial since most of the variability for all measured pollutants was seen within sites. We observed a spatial variability for UFPs that was similar to that of NO_2 but higher than more commonly measured pollutants including BC, CO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$. UFPs also had less temporal variability than all other measured pollutants. These findings suggest that UFP monitoring may benefit from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

higher than normal spatial coverage even if the temporal coverage is reduced as a result. The implementation of these principles for epidemiologic exposure assessment should translate to reduced exposure misclassification. Overall, these results are in line with past literature that has shown differing spatial and temporal contrasts across pollutants,[40,41] though our work increases the robustness of these findings using a more spatially resolved, multi-pollutant dataset that includes less commonly measured UFPs.

The findings from this campaign demonstrate the region's generally low air pollution levels. The range of concentrations across sites for $PM_{2.5}$ (3.4-7.2 μg/m^3) and NO_2 (3.8-22 ppb) were well below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) annual average levels of 15 μg/m^3 and 53 ppb, respectively.[42] Median UFP (~3,000-10,000 pt/cm^3) and BC (~600 ng/m^3) site concentrations were lower than what others have reported in cities throughout the world where mean study values range from roughly 6,000-64,000 UFP pt/cm^3 and 400-14,000 BC ng/m^3 (UFP[19,36,37,43–57]; BC[17,19,37,46,47,52,57–69]). While CO_2 site concentrations (417-455 ppm) were above the 2019 global average of 412 ppb,[70] they were in line with past work noting elevated carbon footprint levels in dense, high-income cities and affluent suburbs.[71,72] Still, the high concentration variability seen across sites for pollutants like UPF, BC and NO_2 (Table 1) suggest that future epidemiological analyses may have more power to observe health effects from these pollutants than those that are less variable, for example $PM_{2.5}$ and CO_2.

The similarity between BC, NO_2 and $PM_{2.5}$ measurements from our campaign and collocated regulatory monitoring sites (see SI Figure S19-S20) confirms that our campaign estimates were accurate. Some of the discrepancies between the two monitoring approaches may be due to differences in the sampling instrumentation, the exact sampling location, and quality assurance and quality control procedures. While we were unable to compare CO_2 or UFP

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

measurements to regulatory observations, duplicate instrument collocations generally showed good agreement. Additionally, CO_2 instruments were regularly calibrated, and different UFP instruments were well correlated with each other.

As expected, we observed elevated annual average pollutant levels near aircraft, railroad, marine, and automobile sources. These findings are in line with past work.[17–19,23,48,55,73–78] Interestingly, major roadway covariates were associated with all of the pollutants, but they were not the most significant predictor for any of the pollutants. This observed correlation in the data is likely because larger roadways have greater vehicle volumes and greater numbers of high emitter vehicles (e.g., medium and heavy-duty diesel trucks) compared to smaller roadways. Still, these results highlight the critical role that non-automobile source emissions play on the region's air pollution levels. Discrepancies in the covariates most strongly associated with each pollutant (e.g., airport vs. rail yard proximity) reflect important regional sources and unique spatial patterns of these pollutants. UFPs, for example, were distinguished from other pollutants in that levels were strikingly elevated near the Sea-Tac International Airport. While other pollutants like BC, NO_2 and CO_2 all had elevated levels near rail yards, they each had additional geographic covariates that further characterized their spatial patterns. These findings reinforce the uniqueness of each pollutant and the importance of monitoring for each. This is particularly true for UFPs given the limited monitoring data available and their unique spatial and temporal patterns.

While UFPs are generally characterized as particles under 100 nm in diameter, this definition is not standardly defined and varies from study to study. In fact, much of the existing and accessible instrumentation does not efficiently measure particles below 10-20 nm, and it often includes particles above 100 nm. This concern was echoed by the EPA's 2019 Integrated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Science Assessment for Particulate Matter, where they noted the different size cuts used to define UFPs as an important limitation in their ability to synthesize findings from the literature.[79] Since most particles by count are in the smaller size range with few above 100 nm, instruments that effectively measure smaller particles sizes measure total UFP counts more accurately. In our data, for example, instruments that measured particles as small as 10 nm in diameter (i.e., the NanoScan and DiSCmini) showed sharp spikes in UFP concentrations near the airport and downtown Seattle. Note that differences in UFP readings between the NanoScan and DiSCmini is likely related to the NanoScan being an optical and condensation particle counter (CPC) whereas the DiSCmini is an electrical mobility analyzer. CPCs can detect very small particles more efficiently than mobility analyzers.[80] UFP measures from P-TRAKS, on the other hand, excluded particles smaller than 20 nm in diameter and reported attenuated spike concentrations. In fact, P-TRAK readings were generally lower than those from NanoScan and DiSCmini instruments, despite having a much higher upper size bound (420 and 700 nm vs 1,000 nm) because they missed a large number of small particles with diameters between 10-20 nm. Nonetheless, UFP measures from different instruments were strongly correlated with each other. This strengthens our confidence in the quality of our measurements and suggests that the use of different UFP instrumentation across studies could still produce useful exposure assessments.

Furthermore, the characterization of size-resolved UFP counts from multiple instruments is unique. We observed, for example, elevated levels of relatively smaller UFPs (approximately 20-36 nm) almost exclusively near the airport. Past work has similarly linked elevated levels of these smaller UFPs, which contribute greatly to total UFP concentrations, to airport activity.[74,81] We are well-positioned to further explore UFP sources as well as size-specific exposure effects on epidemiological outcomes in future work.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Notably, other than different UFP measures, most pollutants were moderately or weakly correlated with one another. $PM_{2.5}$ and CO_2, in particular, were poorly correlated with other measures of more spatially variable, traffic-related air pollutants including BC, UFPs and NO_2. Though UFPs were more strongly correlated with NO_2 and BC than with $PM_{2.5}$ levels, there were some deviations, for example, near the airport. These results highlight the importance of collecting long-term measurements of traffic-related air pollutants using exposure assessment designs with higher spatial resolutions than the designs typically used for more common pollutants, such as studies that rely on $PM_{2.5}$ from regulatory monitoring sites. This may be particularly relevant for urban or other areas characterized by major emission sources such as airports or railroad systems, which may be important contributors to local and/or regional air pollution levels within an airshed. The differential spatial variability between these pollutants reinforces our interest in multi-pollutant exposure assessment. This is growing interest in the field of air pollution epidemiology,[40,82–85] and something that we are positioned to make a meaningful contribution to in future work.

A feature of mobile monitoring campaigns is their reliance on repeated, short-term samples in order to achieve increased spatial coverage when compared to traditional long-term monitoring approaches. Since we collected about 29 two-minute samples per site (about an hour of data), we recognize that the resulting annual average site estimates are noisy. ANOVA models, for example, showed that most of the variability observed in the two-minute measurements occurred within sites rather than across sites or over time. Still, our work suggests that our annual average estimates should be within a 20-30% error on average (See SI Figure S2). Furthermore, mobile monitoring campaigns may benefit from calculating weighted annual averages (e.g., weights for weekday samples = 5/7, weekend samples = 2/7) given the generally

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

small number of visits achieved per site, and since sampling may not be completely balanced despite efforts to do so.

Future mobile monitoring campaigns aiming to assess long-term estimates may be guided by the design and findings from this study, though we acknowledge that the unique geographical, meteorological and source characteristics of a given airshed may produce somewhat different results.

Finally, campaigns aiming to assess health outcomes with exposure periods of interest longer than a year should consider conducting longer or repeated campaigns to better characterize changing air pollution levels over time. Such monitoring, for example, may better capture natural disasters such as large wildfires, which are becoming increasingly important predictors of air quality during fire season.[86–90] These did not meaningfully impact regional air quality during this study's monitoring period, however.

The multi-pollutant approach of this campaign, which included multiple UFP measures, showed that the air pollution mixture varies throughout the region, with different pollutants dominating air pollution levels in different areas. While automobiles were important predictors of elevated air pollution levels, non-traffic sources such as the Sea-Tac International Airport and rail yards were also important sources in the region. UFP's relatively low concentration variability by season, hour of day, and day of week with higher relative variability within- and between- sites distinguishes this infrequently characterized pollutant from more commonly measured pollutants such as $PM_{2.5}$ or BC. Furthermore, while UFP readings from multiple instruments were well correlated, the variability in average levels across instruments suggests that a standardized UFP measurement approach would improve the consistency across studies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

For example, a standardized measurement approach would benefit from the inclusion of particle sizes below 20 nm given their meaningful contribution to particle counts.

These results demonstrates that the design of this campaign captured spatial and temporal pollutant variations that can be explained by sensible land use features, including those related to traffic, along with seasonal and diurnal effects. These data will thereby be useful for assessing representative TRAP exposures in the ACT cohort. Next steps for this work include developing exposure prediction models with these data for the cohort and greater Seattle area. The rich dataset from this extensive campaign will additionally allow us to investigate the role of study design in terms of spatial and temporal coverage (e.g., number of sites, number of site visits) on exposure prediction models and subsequent epidemiologic studies.

5 Acknowledgements

We are grateful to our two drivers, Jim Sullivan and Dave Hardie, for all of their efforts collecting these data, and to Brian High for building and supporting the database.

This work was funded by the Adult Changes in Thought – Air Pollution (ACT-AP) Study (National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences [NIEHS], National Institute on Aging [NIA], R01ES026187), BEBTEH: Biostatistics, Epidemiologic & Bioinformatic Training in Environmental Health (NIEHS, T32ES015459), and the University of Washington Interdisciplinary Center for Exposure, Disease, Genomics & Environment (NIEHS, 2P30 ES007033-26). Research described in this article was conducted in part under contract to the Health Effects Institute (HEI), an organization jointly funded by the United States Environmental

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Protection Agency (EPA) (Assistance Award No. CR-83998101) and certain motor vehicle and engine manufacturers. The contents of this article do not necessarily reflect the views of HEI, or its sponsors, nor do they necessarily reflect the views and policies of the EPA or motor vehicle and engine manufacturers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

6 References

1. Brunekreef B, Holgate ST. Air pollution and health. *The Lancet*. Published online 2002. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)11274-8

2. Allen JL, Klocke C, Morris-Schaffer K, Conrad K, Sobolewski M, Cory-Slechta DA. *Cognitive Effects of Air Pollution Exposures and Potential Mechanistic Underpinnings.*; 2017. doi:10.1007/s40572-017-0134-3

3. Kilian J, Kitazawa M. The emerging risk of exposure to air pollution on cognitive decline and Alzheimer's disease - Evidence from epidemiological and animal studies. *Biomed J*. 2018;41(3):141-162. doi:10.1016/j.bj.2018.06.001

4. Power MC, Adar SD, Yanosky JD, Weuve J. Exposure to air pollution as a potential contributor to cognitive function, cognitive decline, brain imaging, and dementia: A systematic review of epidemiologic research. *NeuroToxicology*. 2016;56:235-253. doi:10.1016/j.neuro.2016.06.004

5. Karner AA, Eisinger DS, Niemeier DA. Near-roadway air quality: Synthesizing the findings from real-world data. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2010;44(14):5334-5344. doi:10.1021/es100008x

6. Seaton A, Godden D, MacNee W, Donaldson K. Particulate air pollution and acute health effects. *The Lancet*. 1995;345(8943):176-178. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(95)90173-6

7. Lundborg M, Johard U, Låstbom L, Gerde P, Camner P. Human Alveolar Macrophage Phagocytic Function is Impaired by Aggregates of Ultrafine Carbon Particles. *Environ Res*. 2001;86(3):244-253. doi:10.1006/enrs.2001.4269

8. Oberdorster G, Ferin J, Lehnert BE. Correlation between particle size, in vivo particle persistence, and lung injury. In: *Environmental Health Perspectives*. ; 1994.

9. Stone V, Tuinman M, Vamvakopoulos JE, et al. Increased calcium influx in a monocytic cell line on exposure to ultrafine carbon black. *Eur Respir J*. 2000;15(2):297-303.

10. Li N, Sioutas C, Cho A, et al. Ultrafine particulate pollutants induce oxidative stress and mitochondrial damage. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2003;111(4):455-460. doi:10.1289/ehp.6000

11. Donaldson K. Ultrafine particles. *Occup Environ Med*. 2001;58(3):211-216. doi:10.1136/oem.58.3.211

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

12. Brown DM, Wilson MR, MacNee W, Stone V, Donaldson K. Size-dependent proinflammatory effects of ultrafine polystyrene particles: A role for surface area and oxidative stress in the enhanced activity of ultrafines. *Toxicol Appl Pharmacol*. 2001;175(3):191-199. doi:10.1006/taap.2001.9240

13. US EPA. Overview of the Clean Air Act and Air Pollution. *U S Environ Prot Agency US EPA*. Published online 2020. https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview

14. Li HZ, Gu P, Ye Q, et al. Spatially dense air pollutant sampling: Implications of spatial variability on the representativeness of stationary air pollutant monitors. *Atmospheric Environ X*. 2019;2:100012. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aeaoa.2019.100012

15. US Census. TIGER/Line Shapefile, 2017, 2010 nation, U.S., 2010 Census Urban Area National. Published online 2021. Accessed April 29, 2021. https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/tiger-line-shapefile-2017-2010-nation-u-s-2010-census-urban-area-national

16. US EPA. *AirData Pre-Generated Data Files*.; 2019. Accessed December 7, 2019. https://aqs.epa.gov/aqsweb/airdata/download_files.html

17. Apte JS, Messier KP, Gani S, et al. High-Resolution Air Pollution Mapping with Google Street View Cars: Exploiting Big Data. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(12):6999-7008. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b00891

18. Hatzopoulou M, Valois MF, Levy I, et al. Robustness of Land-Use Regression Models Developed from Mobile Air Pollutant Measurements. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(7):3938-3947. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b00366

19. Kerckhoffs J, Hoek G, Messier KP, et al. Comparison of ultrafine particle and black carbon concentration predictions from a mobile and short-term stationary land-use regression model. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2016;50(23):12894-12902. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b03476

20. Patton AP, Perkins J, Zamore W, Levy JI, Brugge D, Durant JL. Spatial and temporal differences in traffic-related air pollution in three urban neighborhoods near an interstate highway. *Atmos Environ*. Published online 2014. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.09.072

21. Van den Bossche J, Peters J, Verwaeren J, Botteldooren D, Theunis J, De Baets B. Mobile monitoring for mapping spatial variation in urban air quality: Development and validation of a methodology based on an extensive dataset. *Atmos Environ*. Published online 2015. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.01.017

22. Whitby KT, Clark WE, Marple VA, et al. Characterization of California aerosols—I. Size distributions of freeway aerosol. *Atmospheric Environ 1967*. 1975;9(5):463-482. doi:10.1016/0004-6981(75)90107-9

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

23. Xie X, Semanjski I, Gautama S, et al. A Review of Urban Air Pollution Monitoring and Exposure Assessment Methods. *ISPRS Int J Geo-Inf*. 2017;6(12). doi:10.3390/ijgi6120389

24. Klompmaker JO, Montagne DR, Meliefste K, Hoek G, Brunekreef B. Spatial variation of ultrafine particles and black carbon in two cities: Results from a short-term measurement campaign. *Sci Total Environ*. 2015;508:266-275. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.11.088

25. Montagne DR, Hoek G, Klompmaker JO, Wang M, Meliefste K, Brunekreef B. Land Use Regression Models for Ultrafine Particles and Black Carbon Based on Short-Term Monitoring Predict Past Spatial Variation. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(14):8712-8720. doi:10.1021/es505791g

26. Riley EA, Banks L, Fintzi J, et al. Multi-pollutant mobile platform measurements of air pollutants adjacent to a major roadway. *Atmos Environ*. 2014;98:492-499. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.09.018

27. Blanco MN, Doubleday A, Austin E, et al. Design and evaluation of mobile monitoring campaigns for air pollution exposure assessment in epidemiologic cohorts. *medRxiv*. Published online January 1, 2021:2021.04.21.21255641. doi:10.1101/2021.04.21.21255641

28. Alexeeff SE, Roy A, Shan J, et al. High-resolution mapping of traffic related air pollution with Google street view cars and incidence of cardiovascular events within neighborhoods in Oakland, CA. *Environ Health*. 2018;17(38):1-13.

29. Kukull WA, Higdon R, Bowen JD, et al. Dementia and Alzheimer disease incidence: A prospective cohort study. *Arch Neurol*. 2002;59(11):1737-1746. doi:10.1001/archneur.59.11.1737

30. Esri. *ArcGIS Desktop*. Esri; 2019. https://www.esri.com/about/newsroom/overview/?rmedium=NewsFallback&rsource=blogs.esri.com/Support/blogs/mappingcenter/archive/2010/12/03/using-and-citing-esri-data.aspx

31. Szpiro AA, Paciorek CJ. Measurement error in two-stage analyses, with application to air pollution epidemiology. *Environmetrics*. Published online 2013. doi:10.1002/env.2233

32. Google. *Google Maps*. Google Inc.; 2019. https://www.maps.google.com

33. PSCAA. *Air Quality Data. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA).*; 2020. Accessed April 6, 2020. https://pscleanair.gov/154/Air-Quality-Data

34. Keller JP, Olives C, Kim SY, et al. A unified spatiotemporal modeling approach for predicting concentrations of multiple air pollutants in the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis and air pollution. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2015;123(4):301-309. doi:10.1289/ehp.1408145

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

35. Kerckhoffs J, Hoek G, Portengen L, Brunekreef B, Vermeulen RCH. Performance of Prediction Algorithms for Modeling Outdoor Air Pollution Spatial Surfaces. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2019;53(3):1413-1421. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b06038

36. Kerckhoffs J, Hoek G, Gehring U, Vermeulen R. Modelling nationwide spatial variation of ultrafine particles based on mobile monitoring. *Environ Int*. 2021;154:106569. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2021.106569

37. Minet L, Liu R, Valois MF, Xu J, Weichenthal S, Hatzopoulou M. Development and Comparison of Air Pollution Exposure Surfaces Derived from On-Road Mobile Monitoring and Short-Term Stationary Sidewalk Measurements. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018;52(6):3512-3519. doi:10.1021/acs.est.7b05059

38. Simon MC, Hudda N, Naumova EN, Levy JI, Brugge D, Durant JL. Comparisons of Traffic-Related Ultrafine Particle Number Concentrations Measured in Two Urban Areas by Central, Residential, and Mobile Monitoring. *Atmospheric Environ Oxf Engl 1994*. 2017;169:113-127. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.09.003

39. Saha PK, Li HZ, Apte JS, Robinson AL, Presto AA. Urban Ultrafine Particle Exposure Assessment with Land-Use Regression: Influence of Sampling Strategy. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2019;53:7326-7336. doi:10.1021/acs.est.9b02086

40. Levy I, Mihele C, Lu G, Narayan J, Brook JR. Evaluating multipollutant exposure and urban air quality: pollutant interrelationships, neighborhood variability, and nitrogen dioxide as a proxy pollutant. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2014;122(1):65-72.

41. Levy I, Mihele C, Lu G, Narayan J, Hilker N, Brook JR. Elucidating multipollutant exposure across a complex metropolitan area by systematic deployment of a mobile laboratory. *Atmospheric Chem Phys*. Published online 2014. doi:10.5194/acp-14-7173-2014

42. US EPA. NAAQS Table. *U S Environ Prot Agency US EPA*. Published online February 10, 2021. Accessed July 7, 2021. https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants/naaqs-table

43. Abernethy RC, Allen RW, McKendry IG, Brauer M. A land use regression model for ultrafine particles in Vancouver, Canada. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2013;47(10):5217-5225.

44. Farrell W, Weichenthal S, Goldberg M, Valois M-F, Shekarrizfard M, Hatzopoulou M. Near roadway air pollution across a spatially extensive road and cycling network. *Environ Pollut*. 2016;212:498-507. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.02.041

45. Hankey S, Marshall JD. On-bicycle exposure to particulate air pollution: Particle number, black carbon, PM2.5, and particle size. *Atmos Environ*. 2015;122:65-73. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2015.09.025

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

46. Kerckhoffs J, Hoek G, Vlaanderen J, et al. Robustness of intra urban land-use regression models for ultrafine particles and black carbon based on mobile monitoring. *Environ Res*. 2017;159(May):500-508. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.08.040

47. Montagne DR, Hoek G, Klompmaker JO, Wang M, Meliefste K, Brunekreef B. Land Use Regression Models for Ultrafine Particles and Black Carbon Based on Short-Term Monitoring Predict Past Spatial Variation. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(14):8712-8720. doi:10.1021/es505791g

48. Patton AP, Zamore W, Naumova EN, Levy JI, Brugge D, Durant JL. Transferability and generalizability of regression models of ultrafine particles in urban neighborhoods in the boston area. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(10):6051-6060. doi:10.1021/es5061676

49. Ragettli MS, Ducret-Stich RE, Foraster M, et al. Spatio-temporal variation of urban ultrafine particle number concentrations. *Atmos Environ*. 2014;96:275-283. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2014.07.049

50. Rivera M, Basagaña X, Aguilera I, et al. Spatial distribution of ultrafine particles in urban settings: A land use regression model. *Atmos Environ*. 2012;54:657-666. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2012.01.058

51. Saha PK, Zimmerman N, Malings C, et al. Quantifying high-resolution spatial variations and local source impacts of urban ultrafine particle concentrations. *Sci Total Environ*. 2019;655:473-481. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.197

52. Saraswat A, Apte JS, Kandlikar M, Brauer M, Henderson SB, Marshall JD. Spatiotemporal land use regression models of fine, ultrafine, and black carbon particulate matter in New Delhi, India. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2013;47(22):12903-12911. doi:10.1021/es401489h

53. Simon MC, Patton AP, Naumova EN, et al. Combining Measurements from Mobile Monitoring and a Reference Site to Develop Models of Ambient Ultrafine Particle Number Concentration at Residences. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2018;52(12):6985-6995. doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b00292

54. van Nunen E, Vermeulen R, Tsai M-Y, et al. Land use regression models for ultrafine particles in six European areas. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(6):3336-3345.

55. Weichenthal S, Ryswyk K Van, Goldstein A, Bagg S, Shekkarizfard M, Hatzopoulou M. A land use regression model for ambient ultrafine particles in Montreal, Canada: A comparison of linear regression and a machine learning approach. *Environ Res*. 2016;146:65-72. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2015.12.016

56. Weichenthal S, Van Ryswyk K, Goldstein A, Shekarrizfard M, Hatzopoulou M. Characterizing the spatial distribution of ambient ultrafine particles in Toronto, Canada: A land use regression model. *Environ Pollut*. Published online 2016. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.04.011

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

57. Yu CH, Fan Z, Lioy PJ, Baptista A, Greenberg M, Laumbach RJ. A novel mobile monitoring approach to characterize spatial and temporal variation in traffic-related air pollutants in an urban community. *Atmos Environ*. 2016;141:161-173. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2016.06.044

58. Beelen R, Hoek G, Fischer P, van den Brandt PA, Brunekreef B. Estimated long-term outdoor air pollution concentrations in a cohort study. *Atmospheric Environ 1994*. 2007;41(26):1343-1358.

59. Brauer M, Hoek G, Vliet P van, et al. Estimating Long-Term Average Particulate Air Pollution Concentrations: Application of Traffic Indicators and Geographic Information Systems. *Epidemiol Camb Mass*. 2003;14(2):228-239. doi:10.1097/01.EDE.0000041910.49046.9B

60. Carr D, von Ehrenstein O, Weiland S, et al. Modeling annual benzene, toluene, NO2, and soot concentrations on the basis of road traffic characteristics. *Environ Res*. 2002;90(2):111-118. doi:10.1006/enrs.2002.4393

61. Dodson RE, Houseman EA, Morin B, Levy JI. An analysis of continuous black carbon concentrations in proximity to an airport and major roadways. *Atmos Environ*. 2009;43(24):3764-3773.

62. Hankey S, Marshall JD. Land Use Regression Models of On-Road Particulate Air Pollution (Particle Number, Black Carbon, PM2.5, Particle Size) Using Mobile Monitoring. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2015;49(15):9194-9202. doi:10.1021/acs.est.5b01209

63. Henderson SB, Beckerman B, Jerrett M, Brauer M. Application of Land Use Regression to Estimate Long-Term Concentrations of Traffic-Related Nitrogen Oxides and Fine Particulate Matter. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2007;41(7):2422-2428. doi:10.1021/es0606780

64. Hochadel M, Heinrich J, Gehring U, et al. Predicting long-term average concentrations of traffic-related air pollutants using GIS-based information. *Atmospheric Environ 1994*. 2006;40(3):542-553. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2005.09.067

65. Larson T, Su J, Baribeau A-M, Buzzelli M, Setton E, Brauer M. A spatial model of urban winter woodsmoke concentrations. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2007;41(7):2429-2436.

66. Larson T, Henderson SB, Brauer M. Mobile monitoring of particle light absorption coefficient in an urban area as a basis for land use regression. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2009;43(13):4672-4678. doi:10.1021/es803068e

67. Morgenstern V, Zutavern A, Cyrys J, et al. Respiratory health and individual estimated exposure to traffic-related air pollutants in a cohort of young children. *Occup Environ Med*. 2007;64(1):8-16. doi:10.1136/oem.2006.028241

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

68. Ryan PH, LeMasters GK, Biswas P, et al. A Comparison of Proximity and Land Use Regression Traffic Exposure Models and Wheezing in Infants. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2007;115(2):278-284. doi:10.1289/ehp.9480

69. Su JG, Allen G, Miller PJ, Brauer M. Spatial modeling of residential woodsmoke across a non-urban upstate New York region. *Air Qual Atmosphere Health*. 2013;6(1):85-94. doi:10.1007/s11869-011-0148-1

70. NOAA. NOAA Climate.gov. *Natl Ocean Atmospheric Adm NOAA*. Published online 2021. Accessed July 7, 2021. https://www.climate.gov

71. Moran D, Kanemoto K, Jiborn M, Wood R, Többen J, Seto KC. Carbon footprints of 13 000 cities. *Environ Res Lett*. 2018;13(6):064041. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/aac72a

72. Moran D, Kanemoto K, Wood R, Tobben J, Seto K. Global Gridded Model of Carbon Footprints (GGMCF). Published 2021. Accessed July 7, 2021. http://citycarbonfootprints.info

73. Abhijith K V, Kumar P, Gallagher J, et al. Air pollution abatement performances of green infrastructure in open road and built-up street canyon environments – A review. *Atmos Environ*. 2017;162:71-86. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2017.05.014

74. Austin E, Xiang J, Gould TR, et al. Distinct Ultrafine Particle Profiles Associated with Aircraft and Roadway Traffic. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2021;55(5):2847-2858. doi:10.1021/acs.est.0c05933

75. Hoek G, Beelen R, de Hoogh K, et al. A review of land-use regression models to assess spatial variation of outdoor air pollution. *Atmos Environ*. 2008;42(33):7561-7578. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2008.05.057

76. Lane KJ, Levy JI, Scammell MK, et al. Association of modeled long-term personal exposure to ultrafine particles with inflammatory and coagulation biomarkers. *Environ Int*. 2016;92-93:173-182. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2016.03.013

77. Patton AP, Collins C, Naumova EN, Zamore W, Brugge D, Durant JL. An hourly regression model for ultrafine particles in a near-highway urban area. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2014;48(6):3272-3280. doi:10.1021/es404838k

78. Saha PK, Li HZ, Apte JS, Robinson AL, Presto AA. Urban Ultrafine Particle Exposure Assessment with Land-Use Regression: Influence of Sampling Strategy. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2019;53:7326-7336. doi:10.1021/acs.est.9b02086

79. US EPA. Integrated science assessment (ISA) for particulate matter (final report, Dec 2019). *US Environ Prot Agency*. Published online 2019. https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncea/isa/recordisplay.cfm?deid=347534

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

80. Welker RW. Chapter 4 - Size Analysis and Identification of Particles. In: Kohli R, Mittal KL, eds. *Developments in Surface Contamination and Cleaning*. William Andrew Publishing; 2012:179-213. doi:10.1016/B978-1-4377-7883-0.00004-3

81. Stacey B. Measurement of ultrafine particles at airports: A review. *Atmos Environ*. 2019;198:463-477. doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2018.10.041

82. Billionnet C, Sherrill D, Annesi-Maesano I. Estimating the Health Effects of Exposure to Multi-Pollutant Mixture. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2012;22(2):126-141. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2011.11.004

83. Dominici F, Peng RD, Barr CD, Bell ML. Protecting human health from air pollution: shifting from a single-pollutant to a multipollutant approach. *Epidemiol Camb Mass*. 2010;21(2):187-194. doi:10.1097/EDE.0b013e3181cc86e8

84. Oakes M, Baxter L, Long TC. Evaluating the application of multipollutant exposure metrics in air pollution health studies. *Environ Int*. 2014;69:90-99. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2014.03.030

85. Stafoggia M, Breitner S, Hampel R, Basagaña X. Statistical Approaches to Address Multi-Pollutant Mixtures and Multiple Exposures: the State of the Science. *Curr Environ Health Rep*. 2017;4(4):481-490. doi:10.1007/s40572-017-0162-z

86. Doubleday A, Schulte J, Sheppard L, et al. Mortality associated with wildfire smoke exposure in Washington state, 2006–2017: a case-crossover study. *Environ Health*. 2020;19(1):4. doi:10.1186/s12940-020-0559-2

87. Landguth EL, Holden ZA, Graham J, et al. The delayed effect of wildfire season particulate matter on subsequent influenza season in a mountain west region of the USA. *Environ Int*. 2020;139:105668. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105668

88. Rappold AG, Reyes J, Pouliot G, Cascio WE, Diaz-Sanchez D. Community Vulnerability to Health Impacts of Wildland Fire Smoke Exposure. *Environ Sci Technol*. 2017;51(12):6674-6682. doi:10.1021/acs.est.6b06200

89. Reid Colleen E., Brauer Michael, Johnston Fay H., Jerrett Michael, Balmes John R., Elliott Catherine T. Critical Review of Health Impacts of Wildfire Smoke Exposure. *Environ Health Perspect*. 2016;124(9):1334-1343. doi:10.1289/ehp.1409277

90. Xiang J, Huang C-H, Shirai J, et al. Field measurements of PM2.5 infiltration factor and portable air cleaner effectiveness during wildfire episodes in US residences. *Sci Total Environ*. 2021;773:145642. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2021.145642

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.18.21263522; this version posted September 22, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .