

Table VI-16b.— Incremental Net Benefits by Rule Alternative—Traditional COI
(Annualized Present Value, \$millions, 2000\$)

Data Set	Rule Alternative	Annual Costs	Annual Benefits	Incremental Costs[1]	Incremental Benefits	Incremental Net Benefits
		A	B	C	D	E=D-C
3 Percent Discount Rate						
ICR	A4	\$ 58	\$ 907	\$ 58	\$ 907	\$ 848
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 111	\$ 967	\$ 52	\$ 60	\$ 8
	A2	\$ 134	\$ 977	\$ 23	\$ 10	\$ -14
	A1	\$ 361	\$ 989	\$ 227	\$ 13	\$ -214
ICRSSL	A4	\$ 37	\$ 225	\$ 37	\$ 225	\$ 188
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 73	\$ 253	\$ 37	\$ 29	\$ -8
	A2	\$ 100	\$ 268	\$ 26	\$ 15	\$ -11
	A1	\$ 361	\$ 305	\$ 261	\$ 37	\$ -225
ICRSSM	A4	\$ 44	\$ 432	\$ 44	\$ 432	\$ 388
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 86	\$ 481	\$ 42	\$ 50	\$ 7
	A2	\$ 113	\$ 498	\$ 26	\$ 17	\$ -10
	A1	\$ 361	\$ 531	\$ 248	\$ 33	\$ -215
7 Percent Discount Rate						
ICR	A4	\$ 65	\$ 775	\$ 65	\$ 775	\$ 710
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 121	\$ 826	\$ 56	\$ 51	\$ -5
	A2	\$ 145	\$ 834	\$ 25	\$ 8	\$ -16
	A1	\$ 388	\$ 845	\$ 242	\$ 11	\$ -231
ICRSSL	A4	\$ 41	\$ 192	\$ 41	\$ 192	\$ 151
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 81	\$ 216	\$ 40	\$ 24	\$ -16
	A2	\$ 108	\$ 229	\$ 27	\$ 12	\$ -15
	A1	\$ 388	\$ 260	\$ 279	\$ 31	\$ -248
ICRSSM	A4	\$ 48	\$ 369	\$ 48	\$ 369	\$ 321
	A3 - Preferred	\$ 94	\$ 411	\$ 47	\$ 42	\$ -4
	A2	\$ 122	\$ 425	\$ 28	\$ 14	\$ -14
	A1	\$ 388	\$ 454	\$ 265	\$ 28	\$ -237

¹The traditional COI only includes valuation for medical costs and lost work time (including some portion of unpaid household production). The enhanced COI also factors in valuations for lost personal time (non-worktime) such as child care and homemaking (to the extent not covered by the traditional COI), time with family, and recreation, and lost productivity at work on days when workers are ill but go to work anyway. Source: Chapter 8 of the *LT2ESWTR Economic Analysis* (USEPA 2003a)

BILLING CODE 6560-50-C

G. Are There Benefits From the Reduction of Co-Occurring Contaminants?

This section presents information on the unquantified benefits that will accrue from removal of other contaminants, primarily pathogens, due to improved control of *Cryptosporidium*. While the benefits analysis for the LT2ESWTR only includes reductions in illness and mortality attributable to

Cryptosporidium, the LT2ESWTR is expected to reduce exposure to other parasitic protozoans that EPA regulates, or is considering for future regulation. For example, it is expected that the LT2ESWTR will improve control of *Giardia lamblia*, *Cyclospora* sp. and members of the Microsporididae class, seven genera (10 species) of which have been recovered in humans (Mota *et al.*, 2000). In addition, greater *Cryptosporidium* control may improve control of the pathogenic bacteria and

viruses. Chemical contaminants such as arsenic, DBPs and atrazine may also be controlled, in part, by control of *Cryptosporidium*, depending on the technologies selected.

Giardia lamblia and *Cyclospora* sp. are larger than *Cryptosporidium*, while Microsporididae, bacteria, and the viruses are smaller than *Cryptosporidium*. The expected removal of co-occurring microorganisms can often be predicted for those treatment unit processes whose removal efficiency