



Cooling Water Intake Structures—CWA §316(b)

Share

[Recent Additions](#) | [Contact Us](#)

Search:

☐ All EPA ☒ This Area

Go

You are here: [EPA Home](#) » [Water](#) » [Water Science](#) » [Industrial Water Pollution Controls](#) » [CWA §316\(b\)](#) » [Phase II](#) » [Economic and Benefits Analysis for Final Rule](#)

Industrial Water
Pollution Controls
Home

Cooling Water Intake
Structures Home

Basic Information

Phase I—New facilities

Phase II—Large
existing electric
generating plants

Phase III—Certain
existing facilities &
new offshore & gas
extraction facilities

Quarterly Status
Reports

Questionnaires

Public Meetings

Related Documents

Phase II—Large existing electric generating plants

Final Rule, Economic and Benefits Analysis

EPA-821-R-04-005; February 2004

You will need Adobe Reader to view some of the files on this page. See [EPA's PDF page](#) to learn more.

Please [contact us](#) for a section 508 accessible document.

[Cover, Table of Contents \(PDF\)](#) (22 KB)

Part A: Background Information

- [Chapter A1 \(PDF\)](#) (95 K) Introduction and Overview
- [Chapter A2 \(PDF\)](#) (129 K) Need for the Regulation
- [Chapter A3 \(PDF\)](#) (3.0 Mb) Profile of the Electric Power Industry

Part B: Costs and Economic Impacts

- [Chapter B1 \(PDF\)](#) (225 K) Summary of Compliance Costs
- [Chapter B2 \(PDF\)](#) (121 K) Cost Impact Analysis
- [Chapter B3 \(PDF\)](#) (1.2 Mb) Electricity Market Model Analysis
- [Chapter B4 \(PDF\)](#) (137 K) Regulatory Flexibility Analysis
- [Chapter B5 \(PDF\)](#) (117 K) UMRA Analysis
- [Chapter B6 \(PDF\)](#) (132 K) Other Administrative Requirements



Economic and Benefits Analysis for the Final Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facilities Rule

Economic and Benefits Analysis for the Final Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facilities Rule

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Science and Technology
Engineering and Analysis Division**

**Washington, DC 20460
February 2004**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared by the Office of Water staff. The following contractors provided assistance and support in performing the underlying analysis supporting the conclusions detailed in this document.

Abt Associates Inc.
Science Applications International Corporation
Stratus Consulting Inc.
Tetra Tech

The Office of Water has reviewed and approved this document for publication. The Office of Science and Technology directed, managed, and reviewed the work of the contractors in preparing this document. Neither the United States Government nor any of its employees, contractors, subcontractors, or their employees makes any warranty, expressed or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for any third party's use of or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process discussed in this document, or represents that its use by such party would not infringe on privately owned rights.

Table of Contents

PART A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Chapter A1: Introduction and Overview

A1-1	Summary of the Final Rule	A1-1
A1-2	Summary of Alternative Regulatory Options	A1-1
A1-3	Compliance Responses of the Final Rule	A1-1
A1-4	Organization of the EBA Report	A1-2
References	A1-4

Chapter A2: Need for the Regulation

A2-1	Overview of Regulated Facilities	A2-1
A2-1.1	Phase II Sector Information	A2-1
A2-1.2	Phase II Facility Information	A2-2
A2-2	The Need for Section 316(b) Regulation	A2-4
A2-2.1	Low Levels of Protection at Phase II Facilities	A2-5
A2-2.2	Reducing Adverse Environmental Impacts	A2-7
A2-2.3	Addressing Market Imperfections	A2-7
A2-2.4	Reducing Differences Between the States	A2-8
A2-2.5	Reducing Transaction Costs	A2-9
References	A2-10

Chapter A3: Profile of the Electric Power Industry

A3-1	Industry Overview	A3-1
A3-1.1	Industry Sectors	A3-2
A3-1.2	Prime Movers	A3-2
A3-1.3	Ownership	A3-4
A3-2	Domestic Production	A3-6
A3-2.1	Generating Capacity	A3-6
A3-2.2	Electricity Generation	A3-8
A3-2.3	Geographic Distribution	A3-9
A3-3	Plants Subject to Phase II Regulation	A3-12
A3-3.1	Ownership Type	A3-12
A3-3.2	Ownership Size	A3-13
A3-3.3	Plant Size	A3-15
A3-3.4	Geographic Distribution	A3-16
A3-3.5	Waterbody and Cooling System Type	A3-17
A3-4	Industry Outlook	A3-18
A3-4.1	Current Status of Industry Deregulation	A3-18
A3-4.2	Energy Market Model Forecasts	A3-19

Glossary	A3-21
References	A3-23

PART B: COSTS AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS

Chapter B1: Summary of Compliance Costs

B1-1	Unit Costs	B1-1
B1-1.1	Technology Costs	B1-1
B1-1.2	Energy Costs	B1-2
B1-1.3	Administrative Costs	B1-4
B1-2	Assigning Compliance Years to Facilities	B1-8
B1-3	Total Private Compliance Costs	B1-9
B1-3.1	Methodology	B1-9
B1-3.2	Total Private Costs of the Final Rule	B1-11
B1-4	Uncertainties and Limitations	B1-11
References	B1-13

Chapter B2: Cost Impact Analysis

B2-1	Cost-to-Revenue Measure	B2-1
B2-1.1	Facility Analysis	B2-1
B2-1.2	Firm Analysis	B2-3
B2-2	Cost Per Household	B2-4
B2-3	Electricity Price Analysis	B2-6
References	B2-8

Chapter B3: Electricity Market Model Analysis

B3-1	Summary Comparison of Energy Market Models.	B3-1
B3-2	Integrated Planning Model Overview	B3-3
B3-2.1	Modeling Methodology	B3-3
B3-2.2	Specifications for the Section 316(b) Analysis	B3-6
B3-2.3	Model Inputs	B3-7
B3-2.4	Model Outputs	B3-8
B3-3	Economic Impact Analysis Methodology	B3-9
B3-3.1	Market-level Impact Measures	B3-10
B3-3.1	Facility-level Impact Measures	B3-11
B3-4	Analysis Results for the Final Rule	B3-12
B3-4.1	Market Analysis for 2010	B3-12
B3-4.2	Analysis of Phase II Facilities for 2010	B3-18
B3-4.3	Market Analysis for 2008	B3-25
B3-5	Uncertainties and Limitations	B3-30
References	B3-31
Appendix A to Chapter B3	B3-32
Appendix B to Chapter B3	B3-46

Chapter B4: Regulatory Flexibility Analysis

B4-1	Number of In-Scope Facilities Owned by Small Entities	B4-1
B4-1.1	Identification of Domestic Parent Entities	B4-2
B4-1.2	Size Determination of Domestic Parent Entities	B4-2
B4-2	Percent of Small Entities Regulated	B4-4
B4-3	Sales Test for Small Entities	B4-6
B4-4	Summary	B4-7
References	B4-8
Appendix to Chapter B4	B4-9

Chapter B5: UMRA Analysis

B5-1	Analysis of Impacts on Government Entities	B5-1
B5-1.1	Compliance Costs for Government-Owned Facilities	B5-2
B5-1.2	Administrative Costs	B5-2
B5-1.3	Impacts on Small Governments	B5-7
B5-2	Compliance Costs for the Private Sector	B5-8
B5-3	Summary of UMRA Analysis	B5-8
References	B5-9

Chapter B6: Other Administrative Requirements

B6-1	E.O. 12866: Regulatory Planning and Review	B6-1
B6-2	E.O. 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations	B6-1
B6-3	E.O. 13045: Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks	B6-3
B6-4	E.O. 13132: Federalism	B6-4
B6-5	E.O. 13158: Marine Protected Areas	B6-5
B6-6	E.O. 13175: Consultation with Tribal Governments	B6-6
B6-7	E.O. 13211: Energy Effects	B6-6
B6-8	Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995	B6-8
B6-9	National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act	B6-8
References	B6-9

PART C: NATIONAL BENEFITS**Chapter C1: Regional Approach**

C1-1	Definitions of Regions	C1-1
C1-1.1	Coastal Regions	C1-1
C1-1.2	Great Lakes Region	C1-2
C1-1.3	Inland Region	C1-2
C1-2	Development of Regional I&E Estimates	C1-2
C1-3	Development of Regional and National Benefits Estimates	C1-3
References	C1-4

Chapter C2: Summary of Current Losses Due to I&E

C2-1	Summary of I&E Losses	C2-1
C2-2	Summary of Losses: Economic Value	C2-2
References		C2-4
Appendix to Chapter C2		C2-5

Chapter C3: Monetized Benefits

C3-1	Expected Reductions in I&E	C3-1
C3-2	Regional and National Social Benefits	C3-2
References		C3-4
Appendix to Chapter C3		C3-5

PART D: NATIONAL BENEFIT-COST ANALYSIS

Chapter D1: Comparison of Costs and Benefits

D1-1	Social Costs	D1-1
D1-2	Summary of National Benefits and Social Costs	D1-3
D1-3	Regional Comparison of Benefits and Social Costs for the Final Rule	D1-4
D1-3.1	Benefit-Cost Analysis	D1-4
D1-3.2	Cost per Age-One Equivalent Fish Saved – Cost-Effectiveness Analysis	D1-5
D1-3.3	Break-even Analysis	D1-6
Glossary		D1-7
References		D1-8
Appendix to Chapter D1		D1-9

Chapter D1: Comparison of Costs and Benefits

INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes total private costs, develops social costs, and compares total social costs to total monetized benefits of the final rule at the national level. This chapter also presents a comparison of benefits and costs at the regional level.

Table D1-1 shows compliance action assumptions for the final rule based on each facility's currently installed technologies, capacity utilization, waterbody type, annual intake flow, and design intake flow as a percent of source waterbody mean annual flow. *Chapter A1: Introduction and Overview* of this EBA presents additional information on compliance responses under the final rule.

CHAPTER CONTENTS

D1-1 Social Costs	D1-1
D1-2 Summary of National Benefits and Social Costs	D1-3
D1-3 Regional Comparison of Benefits and Social Costs for the Final Rule	D1-4
D1-3.1 Benefit-Cost Analysis	D1-4
D1-3.2 Cost per Age-One Equivalent Fish Saved – Cost-Effectiveness Analysis	D1-5
D1-3.3 Break-Even Analysis	D1-6
Glossary	D1-7
References	D1-8
Appendix to Chapter D1	D1-9

Table D1-1: Number of Facilities by Compliance Action^a

Facility Compliance Action	Final Rule
No compliance action ^b	200
Impingement controls only	149
Impingement and entrainment controls	205
Flow reduction technology	0
Total	554

^a Alternative less stringent requirements based on both costs and benefits are allowed. There is some uncertainty in predicting compliance responses because the number of facilities requesting alternative less stringent requirements based on costs and benefits is unknown.

^b These facilities already meet their compliance requirements. 75 facilities have a cooling tower in the baseline.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

D1-1 SOCIAL COSTS

This section develops EPA's estimates of the costs to society associated with the final rule. The **social costs** of regulatory actions are the **opportunity costs** to society of employing scarce resources in pollution prevention and pollution control activities. The compliance costs used to estimate total social costs differ in their consideration of taxes from those in *Part B: Costs and Economic Impacts*, which were calculated for the purpose of estimating the private costs and impacts of the rule. For the impact analyses, compliance costs are measured as they affect the financial performance of the regulated facilities and

firms. The analyses therefore explicitly consider the tax deductibility of compliance expenditures.¹ In the analysis of costs to society, however, these compliance costs are considered on a pre-tax basis. The costs to society are the full value of the resources used, whether they are paid for by the regulated facilities or by all taxpayers in the form of lost tax revenues.

To assess the economic costs to society of the final regulation, EPA relied first on the estimated costs to facilities for the labor, equipment, material, and other economic resources needed to comply with the final rule. In this analysis, EPA assumes that the market prices for labor, equipment, material, and other compliance resources represent the opportunity costs to society for use of those resources in regulatory compliance. EPA also assumes that the lost revenue from construction outages – which is recognized as a compliance cost – approximates the cost of the replacement energy that would be provided by other generating units. Implicit in this assumption is that the variable production cost of the replacement energy sources is essentially the same as the energy price received, on the margin, for production of the replacement energy. This assumption is consistent with the market equilibrium concept that the variable production cost of the last generating unit to be dispatched will be approximately the same as the price received for the last unit of production. Finally, EPA assumes in its social cost analysis that the regulation does not affect the aggregate quantity of electricity that would be sold to consumers and, thus, that the regulation's social cost will include no loss in consumer and producer surplus from lost electricity sales by the electricity industry in aggregate. Given the very small impact of the regulation on electricity production cost for the total industry, EPA believes this assumption is reasonable for the social cost analysis.

Other components of social costs include costs to federal and state governments of administering the permitting and compliance monitoring activities under the final regulation. *Chapter B5: UMRA Analysis* presents more information on state and federal implementation costs.

EPA's estimate of social costs includes three components:

- ▶ (1) direct costs of compliance incurred by in-scope facilities,
- ▶ (2) administrative costs incurred by state governments, and
- ▶ (3) administrative costs incurred by the federal government.

The estimated after-tax annualized compliance costs incurred by facilities under the final Phase II rule are \$249.5 million, based on a seven percent discount rate (see *Chapter B1: Summary of Compliance Costs*, Table B1-6). The estimated social value of these compliance costs, calculated on a pre-tax basis is \$385.1 million. EPA estimates that state implementation costs for the final rule are \$4.0 million annually and that federal implementation costs are approximately \$64,000. The estimated total social costs of the Final Phase II Existing Facilities Rule are therefore \$389.2 million, based on a seven percent discount rate.

Table D1-2 summarizes the total private and social costs of the final rule, discounted at a seven percent rate. As a sensitivity analysis, the Appendix to this chapter presents total social costs discounted at a three percent discount rate.

¹ Costs incurred by government facilities and cooperatives are not adjusted for taxes, since these facilities are not subject to income taxes.

Table D1-2: Total Private and Social Costs of Compliance by Option (millions; \$2002)					
Option	Total Private Compliance Costs to Facilities (Post-tax)	Social Costs ^a			
		Pre-Tax Compliance Costs to Facilities	State Implementation Costs	Federal Implementation Costs	Total Social Costs
Final Rule <i>Alternative less stringent requirements based on both costs and benefits are allowed.</i>	\$249.5	\$385.1	\$4.0	\$0.06	\$389.2

^a All costs were annualized and discounted using a 7 percent rate.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

D1-2 SUMMARY OF NATIONAL BENEFITS AND SOCIAL COSTS

The summary of national benefit estimates for the final rule is reported in *Chapter C3: Monetized Benefits*. Table D1-3 presents EPA's national social cost and benefit estimates for the final Phase II rule. The benefits estimates in Table D1-3 were discounted using a 3 percent social discount rate (as a sensitivity analysis, the Appendix to this chapter presents total social benefits discounted at a seven percent discount rate). The table shows that estimated use benefits of the final rule are less than the social costs by \$306 million. As noted in Chapter C3, the use benefits estimate includes monetized benefits to commercial and recreational fishing; however, since non-use benefits were estimated only qualitatively, the net benefits estimate presented here does not include non-use benefits. EPA notes that the Agency was not able to directly monetize benefits for 98.2% of the age-one equivalent losses of all commercial, recreational, and forage species for the section 316(b) Phase II regulation. This means that the benefits estimate used in this analysis represents the benefits associated with less than 2% of the total age-one equivalents lost due to impingement and entrainment by cooling water intake structures (CWIS) and should be interpreted with caution.

Table D1-3: Total National Social Costs, Benefits, and Net Benefits by Option (millions; \$2002) ^a					
Option	Total Social Benefits ^b			Total Social Costs	Net Benefits Based on Use Benefits ^c
	Use Benefits	Non-use Benefits	Total Benefits		
Final Rule <i>Alternative less stringent requirements based on both costs and benefits are allowed.</i>	\$82.9	n/a	n/a	\$389.2	(\$306.3)

^a Benefits were discounted using a 3 percent social discount rate; costs were annualized and discounted using a 7 percent rate.

^b Use benefits presented in this table include commercial and recreational use benefits. Because EPA did not estimate non-use benefits quantitatively, the monetary value of total benefits could not be calculated.

^c The net benefits measure presented in this table is calculated by subtracting total social costs from total use benefits. This calculation is based on a comparison of a partial measure of social benefits with a complete measure of social costs and should be interpreted with caution.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

D1-3 REGIONAL COMPARISON OF BENEFITS AND SOCIAL COSTS FOR THE FINAL RULE

This section presents three measures that compare the monetized benefits and costs of the final rule at the regional level: (1) a benefit-cost analysis, including net benefits and benefit-cost ratio; (2) an analysis of the costs per age-one equivalent fish saved (equivalent to a cost-effectiveness analysis); and (3) a break-even analysis of the minimum non-use benefits required for total annual benefits to equal total annualized costs, on a per household basis. For each measure, benefits were discounted using a 3 percent social discount rate, while costs were annualized and discounted using the OMB Circular rate of 7 percent. EPA also conducted a sensitivity analysis, using a 7 percent discount rate for benefits and a 3 percent discount rate for costs, which is presented in the Appendix to this chapter. Each comparison measure is presented by study region.

D1-3.1 Benefit-Cost Analysis

The benefit-cost analysis compares total annualized monetized use benefits of the final rule to total social costs. The cost estimates include costs of compliance to facilities subject to the final rule as well as administrative costs incurred by state and local governments and by the federal government. As mentioned above, the benefits estimates include monetized benefits to commercial and recreational fishing, but do not include non-use benefits, which may be large (see Chapter C3 of this document for detailed benefits results). Thus, this analysis involves a comparison of a partial measure of social benefits with a complete measure of social costs and should be interpreted with caution. Table D1-4 below summarizes the benefits and costs of the final rule and presents the net benefits and the benefit-cost ratios, by study region.

Table D1-4: Summary of Annualized Social Benefits and Costs (millions; \$2002) ^a						
Study Region ^b	Total Social Benefits ^c			Total Social Costs ^d	Net Benefits (Based on Use Benefits) ^e	Benefit-Cost Ratio (Based on Use Benefits) ^e
	Use Benefits	Non-use Benefits	Total Benefits			
California	\$3.0	n/a	n/a	\$31.7	(\$28.7)	0.09
North Atlantic	\$1.4	n/a	n/a	\$13.3	(\$11.9)	0.11
Mid-Atlantic	\$45.0	n/a	n/a	\$62.6	(\$17.5)	0.72
South Atlantic	\$7.1	n/a	n/a	\$9.0	(\$1.9)	0.79
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.9	n/a	n/a	\$22.8	(\$15.9)	0.30
Great Lakes	\$14.1	n/a	n/a	\$58.7	(\$44.6)	0.24
Inland	\$3.0	n/a	n/a	\$170.1	(\$167.2)	0.02
U.S. Total	\$82.9	n/a	n/a	\$389.2	(\$306.3)	0.21

^a Benefits were discounted using a 3 percent social discount rate; costs were annualized and discounted using a 7 percent rate.

^b Regional benefit and cost estimates are unweighted; total national estimates are sample-weighted and include costs and benefits for Hawaii.

^c Use benefits presented in this table include commercial and recreational use benefits. Because EPA did not estimate non-use benefits quantitatively, the monetary value of total benefits could not be calculated.

^d U.S. total annualized costs include \$4.0 million in State and local administrative costs, and \$0.06 in Federal administrative costs, that cannot be attributed to individual study regions.

^e The net benefits measure presented in this table is calculated by subtracting total social costs from total use benefits. The benefit-cost ratio is calculated by dividing total use benefits by total social costs. These calculations are based on a comparison of a partial measure of social benefits with a complete measure of social costs and should be interpreted with caution.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

Table D1-4 shows that the estimated total use benefits of the final rule are not projected to exceed total social costs in any of the regions. Without accounting for non-use values, the net social costs of the final rule are smallest in the South Atlantic region (\$1.9 million) and largest in the Inland region (\$167.2 million). Benefit-cost ratios are highest in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic regions (0.7 and 0.8, respectively) and lowest in the Inland, California, and North Atlantic regions (0.02, 0.09, and 0.11 respectively). At the national level, EPA projects total social costs to exceed total use benefits, resulting in net benefits of -\$306.3 million and a benefit-cost ratio of 0.2.

The Agency points out that EPA has produced a comparison of complete costs and incomplete benefits in the benefits cost analysis of the final section 316(b) regulation. A **comparison of complete costs and incomplete benefits does not provide an accurate picture of net benefits to society**. The regulation is expected to provide many benefits that were not accounted for in the benefits analysis by reducing impingement and entrainment (I&E) losses of fish, shellfish, and other aquatic organisms and, as a result, increase the numbers of individuals present, increase local and regional fishery populations (a subset of which was accounted for in the benefits analysis), and ultimately contribute to the enhanced environmental functioning of affected waterbodies (rivers, lakes, estuaries, and oceans) and associated ecosystems (see Chapter A9 of the Regional Case Study document for a detailed description of the ecological benefits from reduced I&E). The Agency believes that the economic welfare of human populations is expected to increase as a consequence of the improvements in fisheries and associated aquatic ecosystem functioning due to the final section 316(b) Phase II regulation.

D1-3.2 Cost per Age-One Equivalent Fish Saved - Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

EPA also analyzed the cost per organism saved as a result of compliance with the final rule. This analysis estimates the cost-effectiveness of the rule, by study region. Organisms saved are measured as “age-one equivalents” (the number of individuals of different ages impinged and entrained by facility intakes expressed as age-one). The costs used in this comparison are the annualized social costs of the final rule.

Table D1-5 below shows that the estimated cost per age-one equivalent ranges from seven cents in the Mid Atlantic region to \$1.46 in the Inland region. At the national level, the estimated cost is 27 cents per age-one equivalent saved.²

Study Region^a	Total Social Costs (millions; \$2002)	Age-One Equivalents (millions)	Cost/Age-One Equivalent
California	\$31.7	66.4	\$0.48
North Atlantic	\$13.3	19.3	\$0.69
Mid-Atlantic	\$62.6	846.4	\$0.07
South Atlantic	\$9.0	76.7	\$0.12
Gulf of Mexico	\$22.8	89.5	\$0.25
Great Lakes	\$58.7	159.5	\$0.37
Inland	\$170.1	116.8	\$1.46
U.S. Total	\$389.2	1,420	\$0.27

^a Regional benefit and cost estimates are unweighted; total national estimates are sample-weighted and include Hawaii.

^b U.S. total annualized costs include \$4.0 million in State and local administrative costs, and \$0.06 in Federal administrative costs, that cannot be attributed to individual study regions.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

² It should be noted that the national numbers include costs for the three facilities in Hawaii but do not include any benefits that may result from their compliance with the final rule.

D1-3.3 Break-Even Analysis

Estimating non-use values is an extremely challenging and uncertain exercise, particularly when primary research using stated preference methods is not a feasible option (as is the case for this rulemaking). In Chapter A12 of the *Regional Analysis Document for the Final Section 316(b) Existing Facilities Rule* (U.S. EPA, 2004), EPA described possible alternative approaches for developing non-use benefit estimates based on benefits transfer and associated methods. Due to the uncertainties of providing estimates of the magnitude of non-use values associated with the final rule, this section provides an alternative approach of evaluating the potential magnitude of non-use values. The approach used here applies a “break-even” analysis to identify what non-use values would have to be in order for the final rule to have benefits that are equal to costs.

The break-even approach uses EPA’s estimated commercial and recreational use benefits for the rule and subtracts them from the estimated annual compliance costs incurred by facilities subject to the final rule. The resulting value enables one to work backwards to estimate what non-use values would need to be (in terms of willingness to pay per household per year) in order for total annual benefits to equal annualized costs. Table D1-6 below provides this assessment for the seven study regions.

Study Region^b	Use Benefits	Total Social Costs^c	Non-use Benefits Necessary to Break Even^d	Number of Households^e	Break-Even WTP per Household
California	\$3.0	\$31.7	\$28.7	8,093,185	\$3.55
North Atlantic	\$1.4	\$13.3	\$11.9	3,932,827	\$3.02
Mid-Atlantic	\$45.0	\$62.6	\$17.5	9,626,354	\$1.82
South Atlantic	\$7.1	\$9.0	\$1.9	3,817,567	\$0.50
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.9	\$22.8	\$15.9	5,421,104	\$2.92
Great Lakes	\$14.1	\$58.7	\$44.6	8,628,825	\$5.17
Inland	\$3.0	\$170.1	\$167.2	20,908,109	\$8.01
U.S. Total	\$82.9	\$389.2	\$306.3	60,427,971	\$5.07

^a Benefits were discounted using a 3 percent social discount rate; costs were annualized and discounted using a 7 percent rate.

^b Regional benefit and cost estimates are unweighted; total national estimates are sample-weighted.

^c U.S. total annualized costs include \$4.0 million in State and local administrative costs, and \$0.06 in Federal administrative costs, that cannot be attributed to individual study regions.

^d The non-use benefits category in this table may include some categories of use values that were not taken into account by the recreation and commercial fishing analyses.

^e Includes anglers fishing in the region and households in abutting counties (BLS, 2000).

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

As shown in Table D1-6 above, for total annual benefits to equal total annualized costs, non-use values per household would have to be between \$0.50 in the Gulf of Mexico region and \$8.01 in the Inland region. This estimate assumes that only anglers fishing in the region and households in abutting counties have non-use values for the affected resources. At the national level, the annual non-use willingness to pay per household would have to be \$5.07 for total annual benefits to equal total annualized costs.

GLOSSARY

opportunity cost: The lost value of alternative uses of resources (capital, labor, and raw materials) used in pollution control activities.

social costs: The costs incurred by society as a whole as a result of the final rule. Social costs do not include costs that are transfers among parties but that do not represent a net cost overall.

REFERENCES

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). 2000. “Summary File 1.” <http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/2001/sumfile1.html>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 2004. *Regional Studies for the Final Section 316(b) Phase II Existing Facilities Rule*. EPA-821-R-04-006. February 2004.

Appendix to Chapter D1

This appendix presents the results of the benefit-cost analysis (Section D1-3.1 above) and the break-even analysis (Section D1-3.2 above) but using a seven percent discount rate for benefits, instead of a three percent rate, and using a three percent discount rate for costs, instead of seven percent. The results of this sensitivity analysis are presented in the following tables. In the portions of this sensitivity analysis that present a three percent rate for costs, EPA discounted the total costs of the rule at three percent but annualized them at seven percent. The three percent rate is the social discount rate that is used to determine the total present value to society of the regulatory costs and benefits incurred in the future. The seven percent annualization rate reflects the real cost of capital to complying facilities.

Table D1-A-1: Summary of Annualized Social Benefits and Costs (millions; \$2002)						
Study Region ^a	Total Social Benefits ^b			Total Social Costs ^c	Net Benefits (Based on Use Benefits) ^d	Benefit-Cost Ratio (Based on Use Benefits) ^d
	Use Benefits	Non-use Benefits	Total Benefits			
Benefits discounted at 3 percent; costs discounted at 3 percent.						
California	\$3.0	n/a	n/a	\$33.1	(\$30.1)	0.09
North Atlantic	\$1.4	n/a	n/a	\$14.9	(\$13.5)	0.10
Mid-Atlantic	\$45.0	n/a	n/a	\$69.1	(\$24.0)	0.65
South Atlantic	\$7.1	n/a	n/a	\$10.1	(\$3.0)	0.70
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.9	n/a	n/a	\$25.4	(\$18.5)	0.27
Great Lakes	\$14.1	n/a	n/a	\$66.1	(\$51.9)	0.21
Inland	\$3.0	n/a	n/a	\$183.7	(\$180.7)	0.02
U.S. Total	\$82.9	n/a	n/a	\$426.0	(\$343.1)	0.19
Benefits discounted at 7 percent; costs discounted at 7 percent.						
California	\$2.3	n/a	n/a	\$31.7	(\$29.4)	0.07
North Atlantic	\$1.2	n/a	n/a	\$13.3	(\$12.1)	0.09
Mid-Atlantic	\$39.9	n/a	n/a	\$62.6	(\$22.6)	0.64
South Atlantic	\$6.4	n/a	n/a	\$9.0	(\$2.6)	0.71
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.2	n/a	n/a	\$22.8	(\$16.6)	0.27
Great Lakes	\$12.4	n/a	n/a	\$58.7	(\$46.4)	0.21
Inland	\$2.6	n/a	n/a	\$170.1	(\$167.6)	0.02
U.S. Total	\$72.9	n/a	n/a	\$389.2	(\$316.2)	0.19

^a Regional benefit and cost estimates are unweighted; total national estimates are sample-weighted and include costs and benefits for Hawaii.

^b Use benefits presented in this table include commercial and recreational use benefits. Because EPA did not estimate non-use benefits quantitatively, the monetary value of total benefits could not be calculated.

^c U.S. total annualized costs include \$4.0 million in State and local administrative costs, and \$0.06 in Federal administrative costs, that cannot be attributed to individual study regions.

^d The net benefits measure presented in this table is calculated by subtracting total social costs from total use benefits. The benefit-cost ratio is calculated by dividing use benefits by total social costs. These calculations are based on a comparison of a partial measure of social benefits with a complete measure of social costs and should be interpreted with caution.

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

Table D1-A-2: Implicit Uncaptured Benefits - Break-Even Analysis (millions; \$2002)^a					
Study Region^a	Use Benefits	Annualized Social Costs^b	Uncaptured Benefits Necessary to Break Even	Number of Households^c	Break-Even WTP per Household
Benefits discounted at 3 percent; costs discounted at 3 percent.					
California	\$3.0	\$33.1	\$30.1	8,093,185	\$3.72
North Atlantic	\$1.4	\$14.9	\$13.5	3,932,827	\$3.43
Mid-Atlantic	\$45.0	\$69.1	\$24.0	9,626,354	\$2.50
South Atlantic	\$7.1	\$10.1	\$3.0	3,817,567	\$0.80
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.9	\$25.4	\$18.5	5,421,104	\$3.42
Great Lakes	\$14.1	\$66.1	\$51.9	8,628,825	\$6.02
Inland	\$3.0	\$183.7	\$180.7	20,908,109	\$8.64
U.S. Total	\$82.9	\$426.0	\$343.1	60,427,971	\$5.68
Benefits discounted at 7 percent; costs discounted at 7 percent.					
California	\$2.3	\$31.7	\$29.4	8,093,185	\$3.63
North Atlantic	\$1.2	\$13.3	\$12.1	3,932,827	\$3.08
Mid-Atlantic	\$39.9	\$62.6	\$22.6	9,626,354	\$2.35
South Atlantic	\$6.4	\$9.0	\$2.6	3,817,567	\$0.68
Gulf of Mexico	\$6.2	\$22.8	\$16.6	5,421,104	\$3.06
Great Lakes	\$12.4	\$58.7	\$46.4	8,628,825	\$5.37
Inland	\$2.6	\$170.1	\$167.6	20,908,109	\$8.01
U.S. Total	\$72.9	\$389.2	\$316.2	60,427,971	\$5.23

^a Regional benefit and cost estimates are unweighted; total national estimates are sample-weighted.

^b U.S. total annualized costs include \$4.0 million in State and local administrative costs, and \$0.06 in Federal administrative costs, that cannot be attributed to individual study regions.

^c Includes anglers fishing in the region and households in abutting counties (BLS, 2000).

Source: U.S. EPA analysis, 2004.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK