


The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act, 1970 to 1990

*Prepared for
U.S. Congress*

*by
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*

October 1997

Abstract

Section 812 of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to periodically assess the effect of the Clean Air Act on the “public health, economy, and environment of the United States,” and to report the findings and results of its assessments to the Congress. Section 812 further directs EPA to evaluate the benefits and costs of the Clean Air Act’s implementation, taking into consideration the Act’s effects on public health, economic growth, the environment, employment, productivity, and the economy as a whole. This EPA Report to Congress presents the results and conclusions of the first section 812 assessment, a retrospective analysis of the benefits and costs of the Clean Air Act from 1970 to 1990. Future reports will detail the findings of prospective analyses of the benefits and costs of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, as required by section 812.

This retrospective analysis evaluates the benefits and costs of emissions controls imposed by the Clean Air Act and associated regulations. The focus is primarily on the criteria pollutants sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, carbon monoxide, particulate matter, ozone, and lead since essential data were lacking for air toxics. To determine the range and magnitude of effects of these pollutant emission reductions, EPA compared and contrasted two regulatory scenarios. The “control scenario” reflects the actual conditions resulting from the historical implementation of the 1970 and 1977 Clean Air Acts. In contrast, the “no-control” scenario reflects expected conditions under the assumption that, absent the passage of the 1970 Clean Air Act, the scope, form, and stringency of air pollution control programs would have remained as they were in 1970. The no-control scenario represents a hypothesized “baseline” against which to measure the effects of the Clean Air Act. The differences between the public health, air quality, and economic and environmental conditions resulting from these two scenarios represent the benefits and costs of the Act’s implementation from 1970 to 1990.

To identify and quantify the various public health, economic, and environmental differences between the control and no-control scenarios, EPA employed a sequence of complex modeling and analytical procedures. Data for direct compliance costs were used in a general equilibrium macroeconomic model to estimate the effect of the Clean Air Act on the mix of economic and industrial activity comprising the nation’s economy. These differences in economic activity were used to model the corresponding changes in pollutant emissions, which in turn provided the basis for modeling resulting differences in air quality conditions. Through the use of concentration-response functions derived from the scientific literature, changes in air quality provided the basis for calculating differences in physical effects between the two scenarios (e.g., reductions in the incidence of a specific adverse health effect, improvements in visibility, or changes in acid deposition rates). Many of the changes in physical effects were assigned an economic value on the basis of a thorough review and analysis of relevant studies from the economics, health effects, and air quality literature. The final analytical step involved aggregating these individual economic values and assessing the related uncertainties to generate a range of overall benefits estimates.

Comparison of emissions modeling results for the control and no-control scenarios indicates that the Clean Air Act has yielded significant pollutant emission reductions. The installation of stack gas scrubbers and the use of fuels with lower sulfur content produced a 40 percent reduction in 1990 sulfur dioxide emissions from electric utilities; total suspended particulate emissions were 75 percent lower as a result of controls on industrial and utility smokestacks. Motor vehicle pollution controls adopted under the Act were largely responsible for a 50 percent reduction in carbon monoxide emissions, a 30 percent reduction in emissions of nitrogen oxides, a 45

percent reduction in emissions of volatile organic compounds, and a near elimination of lead emissions. Several of these pollutants (primarily sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds) are precursors for the formation of ozone, particulates, or acidic aerosols; thus, emissions reductions have also yielded air quality benefits beyond those directly associated with reduced concentrations of the individual pollutants themselves.

The direct benefits of the Clean Air Act from 1970 to 1990 include reduced incidence of a number of adverse human health effects, improvements in visibility, and avoided damage to agricultural crops. Based on the assumptions employed, the estimated economic value of these benefits ranges from \$5.6 to \$49.4 trillion, in 1990 dollars, with a mean, or central tendency estimate, of \$22.2 trillion. These estimates do not include a number of other potentially important benefits which could not be readily quantified, such as ecosystem changes and air toxics-related human health effects. The estimates are based on the assumption that correlations between increased air pollution exposures and adverse health outcomes found by epidemiological studies indicate causal relationships between the pollutant exposures and the adverse health effects.

The direct costs of implementing the Clean Air Act from 1970 to 1990, including annual compliance expenditures in the private sector and program implementation costs in the public sector, totaled \$523 billion in 1990 dollars. This point estimate of direct costs does not reflect several potentially important uncertainties, such as the degree of accuracy of private sector cost survey results, that could not be readily quantified. The estimate also does not include several potentially important indirect costs which could not be readily quantified, such as the possible adverse effects of Clean Air Act implementation on capital formation and technological innovation.

Thus, the retrospective analysis of the benefits and costs of implementing the Clean Air Act from 1970 to 1990 indicates that the mean estimate of total benefits over the period exceeded total costs by more than a factor of 42. Taking into account the aggregate uncertainty in the estimates, the ratio of benefits to costs ranges from 10.7 to 94.5.

The assumptions and data limitations imposed by the current state of the art in each phase of the modeling and analytical procedure, and by the state of current research on air pollution's effects, necessarily introduce some uncertainties in this result. Given the magnitude of difference between the estimated benefits and costs, however, it is extremely unlikely that eliminating these uncertainties would invalidate the fundamental conclusion that the Clean Air Act's benefits to society have greatly exceeded its costs. Nonetheless, these uncertainties do serve to highlight the need for additional research into the public health, economic, and environmental effects of air pollution to reduce potential uncertainties in future prospective analyses of the benefits and costs of further pollution controls mandated by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Contents

<i>Tables</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Figures</i>	<i>xv</i>
<i>Acronyms and Abbreviations</i>	<i>xvii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxiii</i>
Executive Summary	ES-1
Purpose of the Study	ES-1
Study Design	ES-1
Study Review	ES-1
Summary of Results	ES-2
Direct Costs	ES-2
Emissions	ES-2
Air Quality	ES-3
Physical Effects	ES-5
Economic Valuation	ES-7
Monetized Benefits and Costs	ES-8
Alternative Results	ES-9
Conclusions and Future Directions	ES-9
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background and Purpose	1
Clean Air Act Requirements, 1970 to 1990	1
Section 812 of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990	2
Analytical Design and Review	2
Target Variable	2
Key Assumptions	2
Analytic Sequence	3
Review Process	6
Report Organization	6
Chapter 2: Cost and Macroeconomic Effects	7
Direct Compliance Costs	7
Indirect Effects of the CAA	9
Sectoral Impacts	9
Aggregate Effects	9
Uncertainties and Sensitivities in the Cost and Macroeconomic Analysis	10
Productivity and Technical Change	10
Discount Rates	11
Exclusion of Health Benefits from the Macroeconomic Model	12

Chapter 3: Emissions	13
Sector-Specific Approach	15
Summary of Results	15
Uncertainty in the Emissions Estimates	17
Chapter 4: Air Quality	19
General Methodology	20
Sample Results	21
Carbon Monoxide	21
Sulfur Dioxide	22
Nitrogen Dioxide	22
Particulate Matter	23
Ozone	23
Urban Ozone	23
Rural Ozone	24
Acid Deposition	24
Visibility	25
Uncertainty in the Air Quality Estimates	25
Chapter 5: Physical Effects	29
Human Health and Welfare Effects Modeling Approach	29
Air Quality	29
Population	29
Health and Welfare Effects	29
Key Analytical Assumptions	30
Mapping Populations to Monitors	32
Choice of Study	33
Variance Within Studies	33
PM-Related Mortality	34
Short-Term Exposure Studies	34
Long-Term Exposure Studies	35
Health Effects Modeling Results	37
Avoided Premature Mortality Estimates	37
Non-Fatal Health Impacts	37
Other Physical Effects	38
Ecological Effects	38
Aquatic and Forest Effects	38
Quantified Agricultural Effects	39
Effects of Air Toxics	39
Uncertainty in the Physical Effects Estimates	41
Chapter 6: Economic Valuation	43
Methods for Valuation of Health and Welfare Effects	43
Mortality	44
Survey-Based Values	45
Chronic Bronchitis	45
Respiratory-Related Ailments	46
Minor Restricted Activity Days	46
Visibility	46
Avoided Cost Estimates	46
Hypertension and Hospital Admissions	46
Household Soiling	47

Other Valuation Estimates	47
Changes in Children’s IQ	47
Work Loss Days and Worker Productivity	48
Agricultural Benefits	48
Valuation Uncertainties	48
Mortuity Risk Benefits Transfer	48
Chapter 7: Results and Uncertainty	51
Quantified Uncertainty in the Benefits Analysis	51
Aggregate Monetized Benefits	52
Comparison of Monetized Benefits and Costs	55
Major Sources of Uncertainty	56
Alternative Results	57
PM Mortality Valuation Based on Life-Years Lost	57
Alternative Discount Rates	58
Appendix A: Cost and Macroeconomic Modeling	A-1
Introduction	A-1
Macroeconomic Modeling	A-1
Choice of Macroeconomic Model	A-2
Overview of the Jorgenson-Wilcoxon Model	A-2
Structure of the Jorgenson-Wilcoxon Model	A-3
The Business Sector	A-4
The Household Sector	A-4
The Government Sector	A-5
The Rest-of-the-World Sector	A-5
Environmental Regulation, Investment, and Capital Formation	A-5
The General Equilibrium	A-5
Configuration of the No-control Scenario	A-6
Elimination of Compliance Costs in the No-Control Case	A-7
Capital Costs - Stationary Sources	A-7
Operating and Maintenance Costs - Stationary Sources	A-8
Capital Costs - Mobile Sources	A-8
Operating and Maintenance - Mobile Sources	A-8
Direct Compliance Expenditures Data	A-8
Sources of Cost Data	A-8
Cost of Clean Data	A-8
EPA Data	A-8
Commerce Data	A-9
Stationary Source Cost Data	A-9
Capital Expenditures Data	A-9
Operation and Maintenance Expenditures Data	A-10
Recovered Costs	A-10
Mobile Source Cost Data	A-11
Capital Expenditures Data	A-11
Operation and Maintenance Expenditures Data	A-11
Fuel Price Penalty	A-11
Fuel Economy Penalty	A-12
Inspection and Maintenance Programs	A-13
Maintenance Credits	A-13
Fuel Density Credits	A-13
Other Direct Cost Data	A-13

Assessment Results	A-14
Compliance Expenditures and Costs	A-14
Annualization Method	A-16
Discounting Costs and Expenditures	A-19
Indirect Economic Effects of the CAA	A-20
GNP and Personal Consumption	A-20
Prices	A-23
Sectoral Effects: Changes in Prices and Output by Industry	A-23
Changes in Employment Across Industries	A-25
Uncertainties in the Cost Analysis	A-26
Potential Sources of Error in the Cost Data	A-26
Mobile Source Costs	A-28
Stationary Source Cost Estimate Revisions	A-29
Endogenous Productivity Growth in the Macro Model	A-29
Amortization Period for Stationary Source Plant and Equipment	A-30
Cost and Macroeconomic Modeling References	A-31

Appendix B: Emissions Modeling	B-1
Introduction	B-1
Comparison of Emissions Projections with Other EPA Data	B-1
Control Scenario Projections Versus EPA Trends Projections	B-1
No-Control Scenario Projections Versus Historical EPA Trends Data	B-3
Industrial Boilers and Processes	B-4
Overview of Approach	B-4
Industrial Boilers	B-4
Industrial Processes and In-Process Fuel Combustion	B-4
Establishment of Control Scenario Emissions	B-5
Control Scenario Boiler Emissions	B-5
Control Scenario Industrial Process Emissions	B-7
Development of Economic Driver Data	
for the Control Scenario - Industrial Boilers and Processes	B-7
Economic Driver Data for Industrial Boiler Approach	B-7
Economic Driver Data for the Industrial Process Approach	B-8
No-control Scenario Emissions	B-8
Industrial Boiler Emissions of SO ₂ , NO _x , and TSP	B-8
Industrial Boiler Emissions of CO and VOC	B-9
Industrial Process Emissions	B-9
Lead Emissions	B-9
Off-Highway Vehicles	B-10
Overview of Approach	B-10
Development of Control Scenario	B-11
No-control Scenario Emissions Estimates	B-11
National and State-Level Off-Highway Emission Estimates	B-11
On-Highway	B-12
Overview of Approach	B-13
Personal Travel	B-13
Iterative Proportional Fitting (IPF)	B-13
Vehicle Ownership Projection (VOP)	B-14
Projection of Vehicle Fleet Composition	B-14
Activity/Energy Computation	B-14
Goods Movement	B-15
Other Transportation Activities	B-15
Lead Emissions	B-15
Estimation of No-control Scenario Emissions	B-15
Development of Emission Factors	B-15
Allocation of Highway Activity to States	B-16

Development of Highway Pollutant Estimates	B-16
Control Scenario Emissions Calculation	B-16
No-control Scenario Emissions	B-21
Utilities	B-24
Overview of Approach.....	B-24
Establishment of Control Scenario Emissions	B-24
Key Assumptions in the Development of the ICF Analysis.....	B-24
ARGUS Modeling Assumptions	B-26
No-control Scenario Emissions	B-27
ICF Estimates of SO ₂ , TSP, and NO _x Emissions in the No-control Scenario	B-27
ARGUS No-control Scenario	B-29
Estimation of Lead Emissions from Utilities	B-29
CEUM Sensitivity Case	B-30
Commercial/Residential	B-30
Control Scenario Emissions.....	B-31
Emissions Data	B-32
Energy Data	B-33
Economic/Demographic Data	B-33
No-control Scenario Emissions	B-34
Emissions Data	B-34
Energy Data	B-34
Economic/Demographic Data	B-35
Emissions Modeling References	B-39

Appendix C: Air Quality Modeling **C-1**

Introduction	C-1
Carbon Monoxide	C-1
Control scenario carbon monoxide profiles	C-1
No-control scenario carbon monoxide profiles	C-2
Summary differences in carbon monoxide air quality	C-4
Key caveats and uncertainties for carbon monoxide	C-4
Sulfur Dioxide	C-5
Control scenario sulfur dioxide profiles	C-5
No-control scenario sulfur dioxide profiles	C-5
Summary differences in sulfur dioxide air quality	C-6
Key caveats and uncertainties for sulfur dioxide	C-6
Nitrogen Oxides	C-6
Control scenario nitrogen oxides profiles	C-7
No-control scenario nitrogen oxides profiles	C-8
Summary differences in nitrogen oxides air quality	C-8
Key caveats and uncertainties for nitrogen oxides	C-8
Acid Deposition	C-8
Control scenario acid deposition profiles	C-9
No-control scenario acid deposition profiles	C-11
Summary differences in acid deposition	C-12
Key caveats and uncertainties for acid deposition	C-12
Particulate Matter	C-13
Control scenario particulate matter profiles	C-14
No-control scenario particulate matter profiles	C-15
Summary differences in particulate matter air quality	C-16
Key caveats and uncertainties for particulate matter	C-16
Ozone	C-18
Control scenario ozone profiles	C-21
No-control scenario ozone profiles	C-21
Summary differences in ozone air quality	C-23
Key caveats and uncertainties for ozone	C-24

Visibility	C-25
Control scenario visibility	C-25
No-control scenario visibility	C-26
Summary differences in visibility	C-26
DeciView Haze Index	C-26
Modeling Results	C-28
Key caveats and uncertainties for visibility	C-28
Air Quality Modeling References	C-30

Appendix D: Human Health and Welfare Effects of Criteria Pollutants D-1

Introduction	D-1
Principles for the Section 812 Benefits Analysis	D-1
General Modeling Approach	D-2
Quantifying Changes in Pollutant Exposures	D-2
Air Quality	D-2
Population Distribution	D-3
Census Data	D-3
Gridding U.S. Population	D-4
Allocating Exposure Estimates to the Population	D-4
Method One	D-4
Method Two	D-4
Estimating Human Health Effects of Exposure	D-5
Types of Health Studies	D-5
Epidemiological Studies	D-6
Human Clinical Studies	D-7
Issues in Selecting Studies To Estimate Health Effects	D-9
Peer-Review of Research	D-9
Confounding Factors	D-9
Uncertainty	D-10
Magnitude of Exposure	D-11
Duration of Exposure	D-11
Thresholds	D-11
Target Population	D-11
Statistical Significance of Exposure-Response Relationships	D-12
Relative Risks	D-12
Baseline Incidence Data	D-12
Estimating Mortality Effects	D-13
Using PM as an Indicator	D-13
Estimating the Relationship Between PM and Premature Mortality	D-13
Prematurity of Mortality: Life-Years Lost as a Unit of Measure	D-16
Estimating Morbidity Effects	D-19
Overlapping Health Effects	D-19
Studies Requiring Adjustments	D-19
Concentration-Response Functions: Health Effects	D-19
Particulate Matter	D-19
Ozone	D-26
Nitrogen Oxides	D-34
Carbon Monoxide	D-36
Sulfur Dioxide	D-38
Estimating Welfare Effects of Exposure	D-40
Agricultural Effects	D-40
Materials Damage	D-41
Visibility	D-41
Worker Productivity	D-41
Ecological Effects	D-41
Modeling Results	D-44
Human Health and Welfare Effects References	D-48

Appendix E: Ecological Effects of Criteria Pollutants.....	E-1
Introduction	E-1
Benefits From Avoidance of Damages to Aquatic Ecosystems	E-1
Acid Deposition	E-2
Background	E-2
Current Impacts of Acid Deposition	E-2
Effects on Water Chemistry	E-2
Effects on Fish Habitat Quality	E-4
Economic Damages to Recreational Fishing	E-5
Benefits From Acid Deposition Avoidance Under the CAA	E-5
Recreational Fishing	E-5
Eutrophication	E-6
Atmospheric Deposition and Eutrophication	E-7
Valuing Potential Benefits from Eutrophication Avoidance Under the CAA	E-7
Mercury	E-8
Benefits from Avoided Damages to Wetland Ecosystems	E-9
Introduction	E-9
Effects of Acidification	E-9
Effects of Nutrient Loading	E-10
Summary of Wetland Ecosystem Effects	E-11
Benefits from Avoided Damages to Forests	E-11
Introduction	E-11
Current Air Pollutant Effects on Forests	E-12
Acid Deposition Impacts	E-12
Ozone Impacts	E-12
Experimental Evidence	E-12
Observational Evidence	E-13
Endangered species	E-14
Valuation of Benefits From CAA-Avoided Damages to Forests	E-14
Background	E-14
Commercial Timber Harvesting	E-15
Non-marketed Forest Services	E-16
Ecosystem Effects References	E-18
Appendix F: Effects of Criteria Pollutants on Agriculture	F-1
Introduction	F-1
Ozone Concentration Data	F-1
Control and No-control Scenario Ozone Concentration Data	F-2
Calculation of the W126 Statistic	F-2
Aggregating Ozone Data to the County Level	F-3
Yield Change Estimates	F-3
Exposure-Response Functions	F-3
Minimum/Maximum Exposure-Response Functions	F-4
Calculation of Ozone Indices	F-4
Calculations of County Weights	F-5
Calculation of Percent Change in Yield	F-5
Economic Impact Estimates	F-5
Agricultural Simulation Model (AGSIM)	F-5
Conclusions	F-9
Agricultural Effects References	F-10
Appendix G: Lead Benefits Analysis	G-1
Introduction	G-1
Methods Used to Measure and Value Health Effects	G-2
Health Benefits to Children	G-2

Changes in IQ	G-2
Quantifying the Relationship Between Blood Lead Levels and IQ	G-2
Valuing Changes in Children’s Intelligence	G-3
Children with IQs Less Than 70	G-7
Quantifying the Number of Children with IQs Less than 70	G-7
Valuing the Reduction in Number of Children with IQs less than 70	G-8
Changes in Neonatal Mortality	G-8
Quantifying the relationship between PbB levels and neonatal mortality	G-8
Valuing changes in neonatal mortality	G-8
Health Benefits to Men	G-8
Hypertension	G-9
Quantifying the relationship between PbB levels and hypertension	G-9
Valuing reductions in hypertension	G-9
Quantifying the relationship between blood lead and blood pressure	G-9
Changes In Coronary Heart Disease	G-10
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and coronary heart disease	G-10
Valuing reductions in CHD events	G-11
Changes in Initial Cerebrovascular Accidents and Initial Atherothrombotic Brain Infarctions	G-12
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and first-time stroke	G-12
Valuing reductions in strokes	G-12
Changes in Premature Mortality	G-13
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and premature mortality	G-13
Valuing reductions in premature mortality	G-13
Health Benefits to Women	G-13
Changes in Coronary Heart Disease	G-14
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and coronary heart disease	G-14
Valuing reductions in CHD events	G-14
Changes in Atherothrombotic Brain Infarctions and Initial Cerebrovascular Accidents ..	G-14
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and first-time stroke	G-14
Valuing reductions in strokes	G-15
Changes in Premature Mortality	G-15
Quantifying the relationship between blood pressure and premature mortality	G-15
Quantifying Uncertainty	G-15
Characterizing Uncertainty Surrounding the Dose-Response Relationships	G-15
Characterizing Uncertainty Surrounding the Valuation Estimates	G-15
Industrial Processes and Boilers and Electric Utilities	G-16
Methods Used to Determine Changes in Lead Emissions from Industrial Processes from 1970 to 1990	G-16
TRI Data	G-16
Derivation of Industrial Process Emissions Differentials 1970-1990	G-17
Data sources	G-17
Estimates of industrial process emissions in the control scenario	G-17
Estimates of industrial process emissions in the no-control scenario	G-18
Matching TRI Data to Industrial Process Emissions Differentials	G-18
Methods Used to Determine Changes in Lead Emissions from Industrial Boilers from 1970 to 1990	G-19
TRI Data	G-19
Derivation of Industrial Combustion Emissions 1970-1990	G-20
Estimates of combustion emissions under the control scenario	G-20
Estimates of combustion emissions under the no-control scenario	G-20
Matching TRI Data to Industrial Combustion Emissions Data	G-21
Methods Used to Determine Changes in Lead Emissions from Electric Utilities from 1975 to 1990	G-21
Coal-Use Data	G-21
The EPA Interim Emissions Inventory	G-21
Matching the Coal-Use Data to the Interim Emissions Inventory	G-22
Emissions Factors and Control Efficiencies	G-22

Use of Air Dispersion Modeling to Estimate Ambient Air Lead Levels	G-23
Determination of Blood Lead Levels from Air Lead Concentrations	G-23
Relationship Between Air Lead Concentrations and Blood Lead Levels	G-23
Children	G-25
Adults	G-25
Individuals with initial blood lead levels of 30 µg/dL and greater	G-26
Estimates of Initial Blood Lead Concentrations	G-26
Combination of Air Concentration Estimates with Population Data	G-27
Results	G-28
Reduction in Health Effects Attributable to Gasoline Lead Reductions	G-31
Estimating Changes in Amount of Lead in Gasoline from 1970 to 1990	G-31
Estimating the Change in Blood Lead Levels	
from the Change in the Amount of Lead in Gasoline	G-31
1970-Forward and 1990-Backward Approaches	G-32
Relating Blood Lead Levels to Population Health Effects	G-32
Changes in Leaded Gasoline Emissions	
and Resulting Decreased Blood Lead Levels and Health Effects	G-32
Lead Benefits Analysis References	G-36

Appendix H: Air Toxics H-1

Introduction	H-1
Limited Scope of this Assessment	H-1
History of Air Toxics Standards under the Clean Air Act of 1970	H-2
Quantifiable Stationary Source Air Toxics Benefits	H-3
EPA Analyses of Cancer Risks from Selected Air Toxic Pollutants	H-3
Cancer Risk Estimates from NESHAP Risk Assessments	H-4
Non-utility Stationary Source Cancer Incidence Reductions	H-4
PES Study	H-5
Methodology	H-5
Findings	H-6
ICF Re-analysis	H-7
Methodology	H-7
Findings	H-8
Mobile Source HAP Exposure Reductions	H-9
Methodology	H-10
Results	H-10
Non-Cancer Health Effects	H-11
Ecological Effects	H-11
Conclusions — Research Needs	H-12
Health Effects	H-12
Exposure Assessment	H-13
Ecosystem Effects	H-13
Economic Valuation	H-13
Air Toxics References	H-14

Appendix I: Valuation of Human Health and Welfare Effects of Criteria Pollutants I-1

Methods Used to Value Health and Welfare Effects	I-1
Valuation of Specific Health Endpoints	I-3
Valuation of Premature Mortality Avoided	I-3
Valuation of Hospital Admissions Avoided	I-3
Valuation of Chronic Bronchitis Avoided	I-4
Valuation of Other Morbidity Endpoints Avoided	I-6
Valuation of Welfare Effects	I-6
Visibility Valuation	I-6
Results of Valuation of Health and Welfare Effects	I-16

Uncertainties	I-16
The Effect of Discount Rates	I-20
The Relative Importance of Different Components of Uncertainty	I-20
Economic Benefits Associated with Reducing Premature Mortality	I-21
Economic Valuation References	I-27
Appendix J: Future Directions	J-1
Research Implications	J-1
Research Topics to Reduce Uncertainty	J-1
Research Topics to Improve Comprehensiveness	J-3
Future Section 812 Analyses	J-4

Tables

Table ES-1	Criteria Pollutant Health Benefits - Distributions of 1990 Incidences of Avoided Health Effects (In Thousands of Incidences Reduced) for 48 State Population.	ES-4
Table ES-2	Major Nonmonetized, Adverse Effects Reduced by the Clean Air Act.	ES-5
Table ES-3	Central Estimates of Economic Value per Unit of Avoided Effect (In 1990 Dollars).	ES-6
Table ES-4	Total Monetized Benefits by Endpoint Category for 48 State Population for 1970 to 1990 Period (In Billions of 1990 Dollars)	ES-7
Table ES-5	Alternative Mortality Benefits Mean Estimates for 1970 to 1990 (In Trillions of 1990 Dollars) Compared to Total 1970 to 1990 Compliance Costs	ES-9
Table 1	Estimated Annual CAA Compliance Costs (\$Billions).	8
Table 2	Compliance Cost, GNP, and Consumption Impacts Discounted to 1990 (\$1990 Billions).....	11
Table 3	Summary of Sector-Specific Emission Modeling Approaches.	14
Table 4	Uncertainties Associated with Emissions Modeling.	18
Table 5	Key Uncertainties Associated with Air Quality Modeling.	26
Table 6	Human Health Effects of Criteria Pollutants.	31
Table 7	Selected Welfare Effects of Criteria Pollutants.	32
Table 8	Percent of Population (of the Continental US) Within 50km of a Monitor (Or in a County with PM monitors), 1970-1990.	33
Table 9	Criteria Pollutants Health Benefits — Distributions of 1990 Avoided Premature Mortalities (Thousands of Cases Reduced) for 48 State Population	37
Table 10	Criteria Pollutants Health Benefits — Distributions of 1990 Non-Fatal Avoided Incidence (Thousands of Cases Reduced) for 48 State Population.....	38
Table 11.	Health and Welfare Effects of Hazardous Air Pollutants.	40
Table 12	Uncertainties Associated with Physical Effects Modeling.	42
Table 13	Health and Welfare Effects Unit Valuation (1990 Dollars).	44
Table 14	Summary of Mortality Valuation Estimates (Millions of \$1990).....	45
Table 15	Estimating Mortality Risk Based on Wage-Risk Studies: Potential Sources and Likely Direction of Bias.	50
Table 16	Present Value of 1970 to 1990 Monetized Benefits by Endpoint Category for 48 State Population (Billions of \$1990, Discounted to 1990 at 5 Percent)	52
Table 17	Total Monetized Benefits for 48 State Population (Present Value in Billions of 1990 Dollars, Discounted to 1990 at 5 Percent)	53
Table 18	Quantified Uncertainty Ranges for Monetized Annual Benefits and Benefit/Cost Ratios, 1970-1990 (In Billions of 1990-Value Dollars).	55
Table 19	Alternative Mortality Benefits Mean Estimates for 1970 to 1990 (in Trillions of 1990 Dollars, Discounted at 5 percent) Compared to Total 1970 to 1990 Compliance Costs.....	57
Table 20	Effect of Alternative Discount Rates on Present Value of Total Monetized Benefits/Costs for 1970 to 1990 (In Trillions of 1990 Dollars).	57
Table A-1	Key Distinguishing Characteristics of the Jorgenson-Wilcoxon Model.	A-3
Table A-2	Definitions of Industries Within the J/W Model.	A-4
Table A-3	Estimated Capital and O&M Expenditures for Stationary Source Air Pollution Control (Millions of Current Dollars).	A-10
Table A-4	Estimated Recovered Costs for Stationary Source Air Pollution Control (Millions of Current Dollars).	A-11
Table A-5	Estimated Capital and Operation and Maintenance Expenditures for Mobile Source Air Pollution Control (Millions of Current Dollars).	A-12

Table A-6	O&M Costs and Credits (Millions of Current Dollars)	A-12
Table A-7	Other Air Pollution Control Expenditures (Millions of Current Dollars).....	A-14
Table A-8	Summary of Expenditures and Conversion to 1990 Dollars (Millions of Dollars)	A-15
Table A-9	Annualized Costs, 1973-1990 (Millions of 1990 Dollars; Capital Expenditures Annualized at 5 Percent)	A-16
Table A-10	Amortization of Capital Expenditures for Stationary Sources (Millions of 1990 Dollars)	A-17
Table A-11	Amortization of Capital Expenditures for Mobile Sources (Millions of 1990 Dollars)	A-18
Table A-12	Compliance Expenditures and Annualized Costs, 1973 to 1990 (\$1990 millions)	A-19
Table A-13	Costs Discounted to 1990 (\$1990 Millions)	A-20
Table A-14	Differences in Gross National Product Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios	A-20
Table A-15	Difference in Personal Consumption Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios	A-21
Table A-16	GNP and Consumption Impacts Discounted to 1990 (\$1990 Billions)	A-21
Table A-17	Percentage Difference in Energy Prices Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios.	A-23
Table A-18	Potential Sources of Error and Their Effect on Total Costs of Compliance.	A-26
Table A-19	Stationary Source O&M Expenditures as a Percentage of Capital Stock (Millions of 1990 Dollars)	A-27
Table A-20	Comparison of EPA and BEA Stationary Source Expenditure Estimates (Millions of Current Dollars)	A-28
Table A-21	BEA Estimates of Mobile Source Costs.	A-29
Table A-22	Annualized Costs Assuming 40-Year Stationary Source Capital Amortization Period, 1973 to 1990 (\$1990 Millions).	A-30
Table A-23	Effect of Amortization Periods on Annualized Costs Discounted to 1990 (Billions of \$1990)	A-30
Table B-1	Correspondence Between Process Emissions Categories Used by MSCET, <i>Trends</i> , and J/W Industrial Sectors and Identifier Codes.	B-6
Table B-2	Fuel Use Changes Between Control and No-control Scenarios.	B-9
Table B-3	Difference in Control and No-control Scenario Off-Highway Mobile Source Emissions.	B-12
Table B-4	Sources of Data for Transportation Sector Control Scenario Activity Projection.	B-17
Table B-5	Distribution of Households by Demographic Attributes for Control Scenario.	B-18
Table B-6	Economic and Vehicle Usage Data for Vehicle Ownership Projection Control Scenario.	B-19
Table B-7	Control Scenario Personal Characteristics.	B-20
Table B-8	Distribution of Households by Income Class for No-Control Scenario.	B-21
Table B-9	Economic and Vehicle Usage Data for Vehicle Ownership Projection No-Control Scenario	B-22
Table B-10	Percent Changes in Key Vehicle Characteristics Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios.	B-23
Table B-11	J/W Estimates of Percentage Increases in National Electricity Generation Under No-Control Scenario.	B-29
Table B-12	<i>Trends</i> Source Categories and (1975 to 1985) Scaling Factors for TSP and CO.	B-33
Table B-13	Percentage Change in Real Energy Demand by Households from Control to No-Control Scenario.	B-34
Table B-14	Percentage Change in Commercial Energy Demand from Control to No-Control Scenario.	B-35
Table B-15	J/W Percent Differential in Economic Variables Used in CRESS.	B-35
Table B-16	TSP Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).	B-36
Table B-17	SO ₂ Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).	B-36

Table B-18	NO _x Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).....	B-37
Table B-19	VOC Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).....	B-37
Table B-20	CO Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).....	B-38
Table B-21	Lead (Pb) Emissions Under the Control and No-Control Scenarios by Target Year (In Thousands of Short Tons).....	B-38
Table C-1	Summary of CO Monitoring Data.....	C-2
Table C-2	Format of Air Quality Profile Databases	C-3
Table C-3	Summary of SO ₂ Monitoring Data.	C-5
Table C-4	Summary of NO ₂ Monitoring Data.	C-7
Table C-5	Summary of NO Monitoring Data.	C-7
Table C-6	Summary of TSP Monitoring Data	C-14
Table C-7	Summary of PM ₁₀ Monitoring Data	C-15
Table C-8	Fine Particle (PM _{2.5}) Chemical Composition by U.S. Region.	C-16
Table C-9	Coarse Particle (PM _{2.5} to PM ₁₀) Chemical Composition by U.S. Region.	C-17
Table C-10	PM Control Scenario Air Quality Profile Filenames.	C-17
Table C-11	PM No-Control Scenario Air Quality Profile Filenames.	C-18
Table C-12	Urban Areas Modeled with OZIPM4.	C-19
Table C-13	Summary of Ozone Monitoring Data.	C-21
Table C-14	Apportionment of Emissions Inventories for SAQM Runs.	C-22
Table C-15	1990 Control Scenario Visibility Conditions for 30 Southwestern U.S. Cities.	C-27
Table C-16	1990 No-control Scenario Visibility Conditions for 30 Southwestern U.S. Cities.	C-27
Table C-17	Summary of Relative Change in Visual Range and DeciView Between 1990 Control and No-Control Scenario Visibility Conditions for 30 Southwestern U.S. Cities.	C-29
Table D-1	Criteria Air Pollutant Monitors in the U.S., 1970 - 1990.	D-3
Table D-2	Population Coverage in the “Within 50 km” Model Runs (Percent of Continental U.S. Population).	D-4
Table D-3	Population Coverage for “Extrapolated to All U.S.” Model Runs (Percent of Continental U.S. Population).	D-5
Table D-4	Human Health Effects of Criteria Pollutants.	D-6
Table D-5	PM _{2.5} /PM ₁₀ Ratios Used to Estimate PM _{2.5} Data Used With Pope et al. (1995) Mortality Relationship	D-16
Table D-6	Summary of Concentration-Response Functions for Particulate Matter	D-20
Table D-7	Summary of Concentration-Response Functions for Ozone	D-27
Table D-8	Summary of Concentration-Response Functions for NO ₂	D-35
Table D-9	Summary of Concentration-Response Functions for Carbon Monoxide	D-37
Table D-10	Summary of Concentration-Response Functions for Sulfur Dioxide	D-39
Table D-11	Selected Welfare Effects of Criteria Pollutants	D-40
Table D-12	Summary of Functions Quantifying Welfare Benefits	D-42
Table D-13	Criteria Pollutants Health Effects — Extrapolated to 48 State U.S. Population (Cases Per Year-Mean Estimates).....	D-45
Table D-14	Mortality Distribution by Age: Proportion of PM- and Pb-related Premature Mortalities and Associated Life Expectancies	D-46
Table D-15	Quantified Benefits Which Could Not Be Monetized — Extrapolated to the Entire 48 State Population.	D-47
Table E-1	Summary of Biological Changes with Surface Water Acidification.	E-3
Table E-2	Comparison of Population of Acidic National Surface Water Survey (NSWS) by Chemical Category	E-4
Table E-3	Results from Benefits Assessments of Aquatic Ecosystem Use Values from Acid Deposition Avoidance	E-6

Table F-1	Agriculture Exposure-Response Functions.	F-4
Table F-2	Relative No-Control to Control Percent Yield Change (harvested acres) for the Minimum Scenario.	F-6
Table F-3	Relative No-Control to Control Percent Yield Change (harvested acres) for the Maximum Scenario.	F-6
Table F-4	Change in Farm Program Payments, Net Crop Income, Consumer Surplus, and Net Surplus Due to the CAA (Millions 1990 \$).	F-8
Table G-1	Quantified and Unquantified Health Effects of Lead.	G-1
Table G-2	Uncertainty Analysis: Distributions Associated With Dose-Response Coefficients Used to Estimate Lead Health Effects	G-16
Table G-3	Air Modeling Parameters.	G-24
Table G-4	Estimated Indirect Intake Slopes: Increment of Blood Lead Concentration (in µg/dL) per Unit of Air Lead Concentration (µg/m ³).	G-26
Table G-5	Estimated Lead Emissions from Electric Utilities, Industrial Processes, and Industrial Combustion (in Tons).	G-28
Table G-6	Yearly Differences in Number of Health Effects Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios: Industrial Processes, Boilers, and Electric Utilities (Holding Other Lead Sources at Constant 1970 Levels)	G-29
Table G-7	Yearly Differences in Number of Health Effects Between the Controlled and Uncontrolled Scenarios: Industrial Processes, Boilers, and Electric Utilities (Holding Other Lead Sources at Constant 1990 Levels)	G-30
Table G-8	Lead Burned in Gasoline (In Tons).	G-33
Table G-9	Yearly Differences in Number of Health Effects Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios: Lead in Gasoline only (Holding Other Lead Sources at Constant 1970 Levels).	G-34
Table G-10	Yearly Differences in Number of Health Effects Between the Control and No-Control Scenarios: Lead in Gasoline only (Holding Other Lead Sources at Constant 1990 Levels).	G-35
Table H-1	Health and Welfare Effects of Hazardous Air Pollutants.	H-2
Table H-2	Cancer Incidence Reductions and Monetized Benefits for NESHAPs.	H-5
Table I-1	Summary of Mortality Valuation Estimates (Millions of 1990 Dollars)	I-3
Table I-2	Unit Values Used for Economically Valuing Health and Welfare Endpoints	I-8
Table I-3	Criteria Pollutants Health and Welfare Benefits — Extrapolated to Entire 48 State Population Present Value (In 1990 Using 5% Discount Rate) of Benefits from 1970-1990 (In Billions of 1990 Dollars).	I-17
Table I-4	Present Value of 1970 to 1990 Monetized Benefits by Endpoint Category for 48 State Population (Billions of 1990 Dollars, Discounted to 1990 at 5 Percent)	I-18
Table I-5	Monte Carlo Simulation Model Results for Target Years, Plus Present Value in 1990 Terms of Total Monetized Benefits for Entire 1970 to 1990 Period (In Billions of 1990-Value Dollars).	I-18
Table I-6	Comparison of 1990 (Single Year) Monetized Benefits by Endpoint for 48 State Population and Monitored Areas (In Millions of 1990 Dollars).	I-19
Table I-7	Effect of Alternative Discount Rates on Present Value of Total Monetized Benefits for 1970 to 1990 (In Trillions of 1990 Dollars).	I-20
Table I-8	Alternative Estimates of the Present Value of Mortality Associated With PM (Based on Pope et al., 1996, in Trillions of 1990 Dollars).	I-25

Figures

Figure ES-1	Total Direct Compliance Costs of the CAA (in billions of inflation-adjusted dollars.)	ES-1
Figure ES-2	1990 Control and No-control Scenario Emissions (in millions of short tons).	ES-2
Figure ES-3	Total Direct Costs and Monetized Direct Benefits of the Clean Air Act, 1970 to 1990 (in trillions of 1990 dollars).	ES-8
Figure 1	Summary of Analytical Sequence and Modeled versus Historical Data Basis.	4
Figure 2	Control and No-control Scenario Total SO ₂ Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 3	Control and No-control Scenario Total NO _x Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 4	Control and No-control Scenario Total VOC Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 5	Control and No-control Scenario Total CO Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 6	Control and No-control Scenario Total TSP Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 7	Control and No-control Scenario Total Pb Emission Estimates.	16
Figure 8	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average CO Concentrations, by Monitor.	21
Figure 9	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average SO ₂ Concentrations, by Monitor.	22
Figure 10	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average NO ₂ Concentrations, by Monitor.	23
Figure 11	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Annual Mean TSP Concentrations, by Monitored County.	23
Figure 12	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control OZIPM4 Simulated 1-Hour Peak Ozone Concentrations, by Urban Area.	23
Figure 13	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control SAQM Simulated Daytime Average Ozone Concentrations, by SAQM Monitor.	24
Figure 14	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control RADM Simulated Daytime Average Ozone Concentrations, by RADM Grid Cell.	24
Figure 15	RADM-Predicted Percent Increase in Total Sulfur Deposition (Wet + Dry) Under the No-control Scenario.	24
Figure 16	RADM-Predicted Percent Increase in Total Nitrogen Deposition (Wet + Dry) Under the No-control Scenario.	25
Figure 17	RADM-Predicted Increase in Visibility Degradation, Expressed in DeciViews, for Poor Visibility Conditions (90th Percentile) Under the No-control Scenario.	25
Figure 18	Monte Carlo Simulation Model Results for Target Years (in billions of 1990 dollars)	54
Figure 19	Distribution of 1990 Monetized Benefits of CAA (in billions of 1990 dollars)	54
Figure 20	Uncertainty Ranges Deriving From Individual Uncertainty Factors	55
Figure A-1	Percent Difference in Real Investment Between Control and No-control Scenarios.	A-22
Figure A-2	Percent Difference in Price of Output by Sector Between Control and No-control Scenario for 1990.	A-22
Figure A-3	Percent Difference in Quantity of Output by Sector Between Control and No-control Scenario for 1990.	A-24
Figure A-4	Percent Difference in Employment by Sector Between Control and No-control Scenario for 1990.	A-24
Figure B-1	Comparison of Control, No-control, and <i>Trends</i> SO ₂ Emission Estimates.	B-2
Figure B-2	Comparison of Control, No-control, and <i>Trends</i> NO _x Emission Estimates.	B-2
Figure B-3	Comparison of Control, No-control, and <i>Trends</i> VOC Emission Estimates.	B-2
Figure B-4	Comparison of Control, No-control, and <i>Trends</i> CO Emission Estimates.	B-2
Figure B-5	Comparison of Control, No-control, and <i>Trends</i> TSP Emission Estimates	B-2

Figure C-1	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-Control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average CO Concentrations, by Monitor	C-4
Figure C-2	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average SO ₂ Concentrations, by Monitor.	C-6
Figure C-3	Frequency Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control Scenario 95th Percentile 1-Hour Average NO ₂ Concentrations, by Monitor.	C-8
Figure C-4	Location of the High Resolution RADM 20-km Grid Nested Inside the 80-km RADM Domain.	C-9
Figure C-5	RADM-Predicted 1990 Total Sulfur Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the Control Scenario.	C-10
Figure C-6	RADM-Predicted 1990 Total Nitrogen Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the Control Scenario.	C-10
Figure C-7	RADM-Predicted 1990 Total Sulfur Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the No-control Scenario.	C-11
Figure C-8	RADM-Predicted 1990 Total Nitrogen Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the No-control Scenario.	C-11
Figure C-9	RADM-Predicted Percent Increase in Total Sulfur Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the No-control Scenario.	C-12
Figure C-10	RADM-Predicted Percent Increase in Total Nitrogen Deposition (Wet + Dry; in kg/ha) Under the No-control Scenario.	C-12
Figure C-11	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-Control Annual Mean TSP Concentrations, by Monitored County.	C-18
Figure C-12	RADM and SAQM Modeling Domains, with Rural Ozone Monitor Locations.	C-20
Figure C-13	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control OZIPM4 Simulated 1-Hour Peak Ozone Concentrations, by Urban Area.	C-23
Figure C-14	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control RADM-Simulated Daytime Average Rural Ozone Concentrations, by RADM Grid Cell.	C-23
Figure C-15	Distribution of Estimated Ratios for 1990 Control to No-control SAQM-Simulated Daytime Average Ozone Concentrations, by SAQM Monitor.	C-23
Figure C-16	RADM-Predicted Visibility Degradation, Expressed in Annual Average DeciView, for Poor Visibility Conditions (90th Percentile) Under the Control Scenario.	C-26
Figure C-17	RADM-Predicted Visibility Degradation, Expressed in Annual Average DeciView, for Poor Visibility Conditions (90th Percentile) Under the No-Control Scenario.	C-26
Figure C-18	RADM-Predicted Increase in Visibility Degradation, Expressed in Annual Average DeciView, for Poor Visibility Conditions (90th Percentile) Under the No-Control Scenario.	C-28
Figure H-1	PES Estimated Reductions in HAP-Related Cancer Cases.	H-7
Figure H-2	ICF Estimated Reductions in Total HAP-Related Cancer Cases Using Upper Bound Asbestos Incidence and Lower Bound Non-Asbestos HAP Incidence.	H-8
Figure H-3	ICF Estimated Reduction in Total HAP-Related Cancer Cases Using Upper Bound Incidence for All HAPs.	H-8
Figure H-4	National Annual Average Motor Vehicle HAP Exposures (µg/m ³).	H-11
Figure I-1	Monte Carlo Simulation Model Results for Target Years (in billions of 1990 dollars)	I-19
Figure I-2	Uncertainty Ranges Deriving From Individual Uncertainty Factors	I-21

Acronyms and Abbreviations

$\mu\text{eq/L}$	microequivalents per liter
$\mu\text{g/m}^3$	micrograms per cubic meter
μg	micrograms
μm	micrometers, also referred to as microns
ACCACAPERS	SAB Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis Physical Effects Review Subcommittee
AGSIM	AGricultural SIMulation Model
AIRS	EPA Aerometric Information Retrieval System
Al^{3+}	aluminum
ANC	acid neutralizing capacity
ANL	Argonne National Laboratories
APPI	Argonne Power Plant Inventory
AQCR	Air Quality Control Region
ARGUS	Argonne Utility Simulation Model
ASI	Acid Stress Index
ATERIS	Air Toxic Exposure and Risk Information System
ATLAS	Aggregate Timberland Assessment System
AUSM	Advanced Utility Simulation Model
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
b_{ext}	total light extinction
BG/ED	Block Group / Enumeration District
BI	atherothrombotic brain infarction
BID	Background Information Document
BP	blood pressure
BTU	British Thermal Unit
c.i.	confidence interval
CA	cerebrovascular accident
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA90	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAPMS	EPA's Criteria Air Pollutant Modeling System
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CASAC	SAB Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee
CDC	Centers for Disease Control (now CDCP, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention)
CERL	EPA/ORD Corvallis Environmental Research Laboratory (old name; see NERL)
CEUM	ICF Coal and Electric Utility Model
CHD	coronary heart disease
CIPP	changes in production processes
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
COH	coefficient of haze
COHb	blood level of carboxyhemoglobin
COPD	chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
Council	SAB Advisory Council on Clean Air Compliance Analysis
CPUE	catch per unit effort

CR	concentration-response
CRESS	Commercial and Residential Simulation System model
CSTM	Coal Supply and Transportation Model
CTG	Control Techniques Guidelines
CV	contingent valuation
CVM	contingent valuation method
D.C.	District of Columbia
DBP	diastolic blood pressure
DDE	dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DDT	dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DFEV ₁	decrement of forced expiratory volume (in one second)
dL	deciliter
DOC	Department of Commerce
DOE	Department of Energy
DOI	Department of Interior
DRI	Data Resources Incorporated
dV	DeciView Haze Index
DVSAM	Disaggregate Vehicle Stock Allocation Model
EC	extinction coefficient
EDB	ethylene dibromide
EDC	ethylene dichloride
EFI	Electronic Fuel Injection
EI	Electronic Ignition
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EKMA	Empirical Kinetics Modeling Approach
ELI	Environmental Law Institute
EOL	end-of-line
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EPRI	Electric Power Research Institute
ESEERCO	Empire State Electric Energy Research Corporation
ESP	electrostatic precipitator
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FEV ₁	forced expiratory volume (in one second)
FGD	flue gas desulfurization
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIFRA	Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act
FIP	Federal Information Processing System
FR	Federal Register
FRP	Forest Response Program
GDP	gross domestic product
GEMS	Graphical Exposure Modeling System
GM	geometric mean
GNP	Gross National Product
GSD	geometric standard deviation
H ₂ SO ₄	sulfuric acid
ha	hectares
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
HAPEM-MS	Hazardous Air Pollutant Exposure Model - Mobile Source
HNO ₃	nitric acid
hp	horsepower
HTCM	Hedonic Travel-Cost Model
ICARUS	Investigation of Costs and Reliability in Utility Systems

ICD-9	International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Version (1975 Revision)
ICE	Industrial Combustion Emissions model
IEc	Industrial Economics, Incorporated
IEUBK	EPA's Integrated Exposure Uptake Biokinetic model
IMS	Integrated Model Set
IPF	iterative proportional fitting
IQ	intelligence quotient
ISCLT	Industrial Source Complex Long Term air quality model
J/W	Jorgenson / Wilcoxon
kg	kilograms
km	kilometers
lbs	pounds
LRI	lower respiratory illness
m/s	meters per second
m	meters
m ³	cubic meters
Mm	megameters
MMBTU	million BTU
MOBILE5a	EPA's mobile source emission factor model
mpg	miles per gallon
MRAD	minor restricted activity day
MSCET	Month and State Current Emission Trends
MTD	metric tons per day
MVATS	EPA's Motor Vehicle-Related Air Toxics Study
MVMA	Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association
Mwe	megawatt equivalent
N	nitrogen
NA	not available
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standard
NAPAP	National Acid Precipitation Assessment Program
NARSTO	North American Research Strategy for Tropospheric Ozone
NATICH	National Air Toxics Information Clearinghouse
NCLAN	National Crop Loss Assessment Network
NEA	National Energy Accounts
NERA	National Economic Research Associates
NERC	North American Electric Reliability Council
NERL	EPA/ORD National Exposure Research Laboratory (new name for CERL)
NESHAP	National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NHANES	First National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
NHANES II	Second National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey
NIPA	National Income and Product Accounts
NMOCs	nonmethane organic compounds
NO	nitric oxide
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide
NO ₃ ⁻	nitrate ion
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPTS	Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSWS	National Surface Water Survey
O&M	operating and maintenance
O ₃	ozone

OAQPS	EPA/OAR Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards
OAR	EPA Office of Air and Radiation
OMS	EPA/OAR Office of Mobile Sources
OPAR	EPA/OAR Office of Policy Analysis and Review
OPPE	EPA Office of Policy Planning and Evaluation
ORD	EPA Office of Research and Development
OZIPM4	Ozone Isopleth Plotting with Optional Mechanism-IV
PACE	Pollution Abatement Costs and Expenditures survey
PAN	peroxyacetyl nitrate
PAPE	Pollution Abatement Plant and Equipment survey
Pb	lead
PbB	blood lead level
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PES	Pacific Environmental Services
pH	the logarithm of the reciprocal of hydrogen ion concentration, a measure of acidity
PIC	product of incomplete combustion
PM ₁₀	particulates less than or equal to 10 microns in aerometric diameter
PM _{2.5}	particulates less than or equal to 2.5 microns in aerometric diameter
POP	population
Pop _{mild}	exposed population of exercising mild asthmatics
Pop _{mod}	exposed population of exercising moderate asthmatics
ppb	parts per billion
PPH	people per household
pphm	parts per hundred million
ppm	parts per million
PPRG	Pooling Project Research Group
PRYL	percentage relative yield loss
PURHAPS	PURchased Heat And Power
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
r ²	statistical correlation coefficient, squared
RAD	restricted activity day
RADM	Regional Acid Deposition Model
RADM/EM	RADM Engineering Model
RAMC	Resource Allocation and Mine Costing model
RfD	reference dose
RIA	Regulatory Impact Analysis
ROM	Regional Oxidant Model
RRAD	respiratory restricted activity day
RUM	Random Utility Model
s.e.	standard error
SAB	Science Advisory Board
SAI	Systems Applications International
SAQM	SARMAP Air Quality Model
SARA	Superfund Amendment Reauthorization Act
SARMAP	SJVAQS/AUSPEX Regional Modeling Adaptation Project
SCC	Source Classification Code
SEDS	State Energy Data System
SIC	Standard Industrial Classification
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SJVAQS	San Joaquin Valley Air Quality Study
SMSA	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area

SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SO ₄ ²⁻	sulfate ion
SOS/T	State of Science and Technology (refers to a series of NAPAP reports)
SRaw	Specific Airway Resistance
STAR	Stability Array weather database
TAMM90	Timber Assessment Market Model (revised version)
TEEMS	Transportation Energy and Emissions Modeling System
TIUS	Truck Inventory and Use Surveys
TRI	Toxic Release Inventory
TSP	total suspended particulate
U.S.	United States
UAM	Urban Airshed Model
URI	upper respiratory illness
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
VC	vinyl chloride
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compounds
VOP	Vehicle Ownership Projection
VR	visual range
W126	index of peak weighted average of cumulative ozone concentrations
WLD	Work Loss Day
WTP	willingness to pay

Acknowledgments

This project is managed under the direction of Robert D. Brenner, Director of the U.S. EPA Office of Air and Radiation/Office of Policy Analysis and Review and Richard D. Morgenstern, Associate Assistant Administrator for Policy Planning and Evaluation, U.S. EPA (currently on leave as Visiting Scholar, Resources for the Future). The principal project managers are Jim DeMocker, EPA/OAR/OPAR; Al McGartland, Director, EPA/OPPE/OEE; and Tom Gillis, EPA/OPPE/OEE.

Many EPA staff contributed or reviewed portions of this draft document, including Joel Schwartz, Michael Shapiro, Peter Preuss, Tracey Woodruff, Diane DeWitt, Dan Axelrad, Joel Scheraga, Anne Grambsch, Jenny Weinberger, Allyson Siwik, Richard Scheffe, Vasu Kilaru, Amy Vasu, Kathy Kaufmann, Mary Ann Stewart, Eric Smith, Dennis J. Kotchmar, Warren Freas, Tom Braverman, Bruce Polkowsky, David Mobley, Sharon Nizich, David Meisenheimer, Fred Dimmick, Harvey Richmond, John Haines, John Bachmann, Ron Evans, Tom McMullen, Bill Vataavuk, Larry Sorrels, Dave McKee, Susan Stone, Melissa McCullough, Rosalina Rodriguez, Vickie Boothe, Tom Walton, Michele McKeever, Vicki Atwell, Kelly Rimer, Bob Fegley, Aparna Koppikar, Les Grant, Judy Graham, Robin Dennis, Dennis Leaf, Ann Watkins, Penny Carey, Joe Somers, Pam Brodowicz, Byron Bunger, Allen Basala, David Lee, Bill O'Neill, Susan Herrod, and Susan Stendebach. Allyson Siwik of EPA/OAR/OAQPS and Bob Fegley of EPA/ORD/OSPRE played particularly important roles in coordinating substantive and review contributions from their respective offices.

A number of contractors developed key elements of the analysis and supporting documents. These contractors include Bob Unsworth, Jim Neumann, Mike Hester, and Jon Discher of Industrial Economics, Incorporated (IEC); Leland Deck, Ellen Post, Lisa Akeson, Brad Firlie, Susan Keane, Kathleen Cunningham, and John Voyzey of Abt Associates; Bruce Braine, Patricia Kim, Sandeep Kohli, Anne Button, Barry Galef, Cynde Sears, and Tony Bansal of ICF Resources; John Langstaff, Michelle Woolfolk, Shelly Eberly, Chris Emery, Till Stoekenius, and Andy Gray of ICF/Systems Applications International (ICF/SAI); Dale Jorgenson, Peter Wilcoxon, and Richard Goettle of Jorgenson Associates; Jim Lockhart of the Environmental Law Institute (ELI); Beverly Goodrich, Rehan Aziz, Noel Roberts, and Lucille Bender of Computer Sciences Corporation; Margaret Sexsmith of Analytical Sciences, Incorporated; Ken Meardon of Pacific Environmental Services (PES); David South, Gale Boyd, Melanie Tomkins, and K. Guziel of Argonne National Laboratory (ANL); Don Garner; Rex Brown and Jacob Ulvila of Decision Science Consortium; and Jim Wilson and Dianne P. Crocker of Pechan Associates. John Pitcher and H. Glenn Court of STRA managed the technical production of an earlier version of the draft document. The SARMAP AQM runs were provided by Carol Bohnenkamp of EPA Region 9 and Saffet Tanrikulu of the California Air Resources Board.

Science Advisory Board review of this report is supervised by Donald G. Barnes, Director of the SAB Staff. SAB staff coordinating the reviews have included Jack Fowle, Jack Kooyoomjian, Sam Rondberg, Fred Talcott, and Randall Bond. Diana Pozun provided administrative support.

The SAB Council was chaired by Richard Schmalensee of MIT throughout the development of the present study. The Council is now chaired by Maureen Cropper of the World Bank as the Council's focus shifts to the upcoming prospective studies. Members who have participated in the review of this draft report include Morton Lippmann of New York University Medical Center, William Nordhaus of Yale University, Paul Portney of Resources for the Future, Kip Viscusi of Harvard University, A. Myrick Freeman of Bowdoin College, Maureen Cropper, Ronald Cummings of Georgia State University, Daniel Dudek of the Environmental Defense Fund, Robert Mendelsohn of Yale University, Wayne Kachel of MELE Associates, William Cooper of Michigan State University, Thomas Tietenberg of Colby College, Paul Lioy of the Robert Wood Johnson School of Medicine, Roger McClellan of the Chemical Industry Institute of Toxicology, George T. Wolff of General Motors, Richard Conway of Union Carbide Corporation, and Wallace Oates of the University of Maryland.

The SAB Council Physical Effects Review Subcommittee was chaired by Morton Lippmann. Members who have participated in the review include David V. Bates of the University of British Columbia, A. Myrick Freeman of Bowdoin College, Gardner Brown, Jr. of the University of Washington, Timothy Larson of the University of Washington, Lester Lave of Carnegie Mellon University, Joseph Meyer of the University of Wyoming, Robert Rowe of Hagler Bailly, Incorporated, George Taylor of the University of Nevada, Bernard Weiss of the University of Rochester Medical Center, and George Wolff of the General Motors Research Laboratory.

The SAB Council Air Quality Subcommittee was chaired by George Wolff. Members who have participated in the review include Benjamin Liu of the University of Minnesota, Peter Mueller of the Electric Power Research Institute, Warren White of Washington University, Joe Mauderly of the Lovelace Biomedical & Environmental Research Institute, Philip Hopke of Clarkson University, Paulette Middleton of Science Policy Associates, James H. Price, Jr. of the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, and Harvey Jeffries of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

This report could not have been produced without the support of key administrative support staff. The project managers are grateful to Catrice Jefferson, Nona Smoke, Carolyn Hicks, Eunice Javis, Gloria Booker, Thelma Butler, Wanda Farrar, Ladonya Langston, Michelle Olawuyi, and Eileen Pritchard for their timely and tireless support on this project.