

Comparing individual exposure to air and noise pollution in Montreal during rush hours according to the mode of transportation used

Philippe Apparicio ^a, Mathieu Carrier ^a, Anne-Marie Séguin ^a, Jérémy Gelb ^a, Marie-Ève Mathieu ^b, Simon Kingham ^c

^a Environmental Equity Laboratory, INRS Urbanisation Culture Société, Montreal, Canada
 ^b Physical Activity and Health Laboratory, Department of Kinesiology, University of Montreal, Canada
 ^c GeoHealth Laboratory, Department of Geography, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand



Background

Benefits of urban cycling

- Increasing physical activity
 - Reducing chronic diseases (diabetes, cadiovascular diseases, certain types of cancer) (Hamer et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2003; Sato et al., 2007; Gordon-Larsen et al., 2009; Woodcock et al., 2009)
- Reducing air pollutant emissions (Hatzopoulou et al., 2013; Rojas-Rueda et al., 2011) •

Health risks of urban cycling

- Traffic incidents (injuries and mortality) (Skic et al., 2009; Morency et al., 2011)
- Exposure to air pollution (CO, NO_2 , NO_x , $PM_{2.5}$, PM_{10})

 - Development of asthma (Jerrett et al., 2008; McConnell et al., 2006)
 Potential risk to cardiovascular health (Brugge et al., 2007; Rioux et al., 2010)
- Prolonged exposure to road traffic noise
 - Psychological stress (Passchier-Vermeer and Passchier, 2000)
 - High blood pressure (Bluhm et al., 2007)
 - Development of cardiovascular disease (Babisch, 2006)
 - Hearing loss (Seto et al., 2007)

Differences in air pollution and inhaled doses according to the modes of transportation used

- Systematic review of 39 studies (Cepeda et al., 2017)

 - Car commuters: higher exposure to air pollutants
 Active commuters: higher inhaled doses than car commuters



Three Research Objectives



Data Collection

Real-time measurement of noise exposure

Brüel & Kjaer - Personal Noise Dosimeter Type 4448

- Average value of dB(A) every minute (Laeq 1 min.)
- Calibration of the device once a day using the Sound Calibrator Type 4231

Real-time measurement of NO₂ exposure

Aeroqual Series 500 (Portable Air Quality Sensor)

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) sensor
- Temperature and humidity sensor
- Average value of NO₂ logged every minute

B Garmin Forerunner 920 XT

- Multisport GPS Watch
- Heart rate monitor

4) Garmin VIRB XE

- Action camera
- GPS





Garmin Forerunner 920 XT Garmin VIRB XE



Data Collection

Collection period

2016-06-16 to 2016-06-30 (dry weekdays)

Participants

8 master's students and 1 urban studies professor

- 3 teams of 3 people each
 - One person by car 🚘
 - One person by bicycle 💦
 - One person by public transit

Trips during rush hours (N = 99)

8 am: from an outlying Montreal neighbourhood to the downtown area

5 pm: in the opposite direction

INRS



Temperature (Celsius / Fahrenheit)

Min. = 10 / 50 Max. = 39 / 102 Mean = 28 / 82

Methodology: Estimating Ventilation and Inhaled Dose of NO₂

Test for each participant
 Marie-Eve Mathieu
 Department of Kinesiology
 Physical Activity and Health Lab.
 University of Montreal





INRS



2. Individualized equation between heart rate (Garmin) and ventilation (Moxus) Polynomial function /ENTILATION = 0.0028 HeartRate² + 0.4329HeartRate - 41.917 $R^2 = 0.9685$ 100 120 140 160 180 Heart Rate

3. Estimation of the ventilation per minute based on heart rate values measured by the multisport Garmin watch during the trip

- **4.** Estimation of the dose of NO₂ inhaled per minute during the trip $\mu g NO_2 = (V / 1000) * P$ with
 - V = Ventilation (liters per min.); $P = NO_2$ value

Results: Comparing Travel Times



		50	
1 st Quartile	25.8	28.7	31.0
Median	34.0	34.6	40.2
Mean	37.5	38.8	41.7
3 rd Quartile	49.8	45.5	50.0

Travel time differences from 🔂 (min.)

	ోం	
1 st Quartile	-5.1	-2.4
Median	0.3	4.5
Mean	1.3	4.1
3 rd Quartile	7.6	9.1

* Note: Differences in mean values are not significant at P=0.05 (Kruskal-Wallis test and Tukey Test).



Results: Comparing Levels of Exposure to Road Traffic Noise

LAEQ.





* Significant difference at P=0.01 (Tukey Test)



Mapping the Results: A Web-Atlas

Comparing individual exposure to air and noise pollution in Montreal according to the mode transportation used

METHODOLOGY TRIPS -



Comparison of the three trips

	Ō	600	•))	v	00	<i>i</i> 1
9 ోం	29"38	111	69	127	59	3060
2	31"21	115	69	67	13	832
9 🚍	39"1	72	78	92	19	1140

Equity Laboratory

н



Concluding Remarks

INRS



- Inhaled dose: three times higher for cyclists than for car users
- Importance of measuring noise and the inhaled dose of air pollutant for cyclists, especially in cities with high levels of noise and air pollution

Future Work

Improvements in the methodological approach

- Biometric T-Shirt (Hexoskin)
 - Heart Rate & Breathing Rate & Minute Ventilation

Planned activities (2016-2017)

- Cyclists' exposure to air and noise pollution
 - Mexico City (March 2016): 201 km collected
 - Saigon (Vietnam) (July 2017)
 - Lyon (France) (October 2017)
 - Auckland & Christchurch (New Zealand) (???)





Acknowledgements





Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada

INNOVATION.CA

Chaires Canada de recherche Research du Canada Chairs

Canada









LAEQ INRES
 UNVERSITÉ DE RECHERCHE

Results: Comparing Travel Times



