

health assessment to estimate the number of reduced incidences of illnesses, hospitalizations, and premature fatalities associated with this scenario and estimate the total economic value of these health benefits. The standards we are proposing in this rulemaking, however, are slightly different in the amount of emission reductions expected to be achieved in 2020 and 2030 relative to the modeled scenario. Thus, in phase two of the analysis we apportion the results of the phase one analysis to the underlying NO_x, SO₃, and PM emission reductions and scale the apportioned benefits to reflect differences in emissions reductions between the modeled preliminary control option and the proposed standards. The sum of the scaled benefits for the PM, SO₃, and NO_x emission reductions provide us with the total benefits of the rule.

The benefit estimates derived from the modeled preliminary control option in phase one of our analysis uses an analytical structure and sequence similar to that used in the benefits analyses for the Heavy Duty Engine/Diesel Fuel final rule and in the "section 812 studies" to estimate the total benefits and costs of the full Clean Air Act.²⁹² We used many of the same models and assumptions used in the Heavy Duty Engine/Diesel Fuel analysis as well as other Regulatory Impact Analyses (RIAs) prepared by the Office of Air and Radiation. By adopting the major design elements, models, and assumptions developed for the section 812 studies and other RIAs, we have largely relied on methods which have already received extensive review by the independent Science Advisory Board (SAB), by the public, and by other federal agencies. In addition, we will be working through the next section 812 study process to enhance our methods.²⁹³ Interested parties will therefore be able to obtain further information from the section 812 study on the kinds of methods we are likely to use for estimating benefits and costs in the final nonroad diesel rule.

The benefits transfer method used in phase two of the analysis is similar to

that used to estimate benefits in the recent analysis of the Nonroad Large Spark-Ignition Engines and Recreational Engines standards (67 FR 68241, November 8, 2002). A similar method has also been used in recent benefits analyses for the proposed Industrial Boilers and Process Heaters NESHAP and the Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines NESHAP.

On September 26, 2002, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) released a report on its review of the Agency's methodology for analyzing the health benefits of measures taken to reduce air pollution. The report focused on EPA's approach for estimating the health benefits of regulations designed to reduce concentrations of airborne particulate matter (PM).

In its report, the NAS said that EPA has generally used a reasonable framework for analyzing the health benefits of PM-control measures. It recommended, however, that the Agency take a number of steps to improve its benefits analysis. In particular, the NAS stated that the Agency should:

- Include benefits estimates for a range of regulatory options;
- Estimate benefits for intervals, such as every five years, rather than a single year;
- Clearly state the projected baseline statistics used in estimating health benefits, including those for air emissions, air quality, and health outcomes;
- Examine whether implementation of proposed regulations might cause unintended impacts on human health or the environment;
- When appropriate, use data from non-U.S. studies to broaden age ranges to which current estimates apply and to include more types of relevant health outcomes;
- Begin to move the assessment of uncertainties from its ancillary analyses into its Base analyses by conducting probabilistic, multiple-source uncertainty analyses. This assessment should be based on available data and expert judgment.

Although the NAS made a number of recommendations for improvement in EPA's approach, it found that the studies selected by EPA for use in its benefits analysis were generally reasonable choices. In particular, the NAS agreed with EPA's decision to use cohort studies to derive benefits estimates. It also concluded that the Agency's selection of the American Cancer Society (ACS) study for the evaluation of PM-related premature mortality was reasonable, although it noted the publication of new cohort

studies that should be evaluated by the Agency.

EPA has addressed many of the NAS comments in our analysis of the proposed rule. We provide benefits estimates for each year over the rule implementation period for a wide range of regulatory alternatives, in addition to our proposed emission control program. We use the estimated time path of benefits and costs to calculate the net present value of benefits of the rule. In the RIA, we provide baseline statistics for air emissions, air quality, population, and health outcomes. We have examined how our benefits estimates might be impacted by expanding the age ranges to which epidemiological studies are applied, and we have added several new health endpoints, including non-fatal heart attacks, which are supported by both U.S. studies and studies conducted in Europe. We have also improved the documentation of our methods and provided additional details about model assumptions.

Several of the NAS recommendations addressed the issue of uncertainty and how the Agency can better analyze and communicate the uncertainties associated with its benefits assessments. In particular, the Committee expressed concern about the Agency's reliance on a single value from its analysis and suggested that EPA develop a probabilistic approach for analyzing the health benefits of proposed regulatory actions. The Agency agrees with this suggestion and is working to develop such an approach for use in future rulemakings. EPA plans to hold a meeting of its Science Advisory Board (SAB) in early Summer 2003 to review its plans for addressing uncertainty in its analyses. Our likely approach will incorporate short-term elements intended to provide interim methods in time for the final Nonroad rule to address uncertainty in important analytical parameters such as the concentration-response relationship for PM-related premature mortality. Our approach will also include longer-term elements intended to provide scientifically sound, peer-reviewed characterizations of the uncertainty surrounding a broader set of analytical parameters and assumptions, including but not limited to emissions and air quality modeling, demographic projections, population health status, concentration-response functions, and valuation estimates.

3. What Are the Significant Limitations of the Benefit-Cost Analysis?

Every benefit-cost analysis examining the potential effects of a change in

²⁹² The section 812 studies include: (1) US EPA, Report to Congress: The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act, 1970 to 1990, October 1997 (also known as the "Section 812 Retrospective Report"); and (2) the first in the ongoing series of prospective studies estimating the total costs and benefits of the Clean Air Act (see EPA report number: EPA-410-R-99-001, November 1999). See Docket A-99-06, Document II-A-21.

²⁹³ We anticipate a public SAB meeting June 11-13, 2003, in Washington, DC, regarding components of our analytical blueprint. Interested parties may want to consult the Web page: <http://www.epa.gov/science1>.