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ABSTRACT: Current methods of estimating the public health effects of emissions are computationally too expensive or do not fully address complex atmospheric processes, frequently limiting their applications to policy research. Using a reduced-form model derived from tagged chemical transport model (CTM) simulations, we present PM$_{2.5}$ mortality costs per tonne of inorganic air pollutants with the 36 km $\times$ 36 km spatial resolution of source location in the United States, providing the most comprehensive set of such estimates comparable to CTM-based estimates. Our estimates vary by 2 orders of magnitude. Emission-weighted seasonal averages were estimated at $88,000−130,000/t PM_{2.5}$ (inert primary), $14,000−24,000/t SO_2$,$3,800−14,000/t NO_2$, and $23,000−66,000/t NH_3$. The aggregate social costs for year 2005 emissions were estimated at $1.0 trillion dollars. Compared to other studies, our estimates have similar magnitudes and spatial distributions for primary PM$_{2.5}$ but substantially different spatial patterns for precursor species where secondary chemistry is important. For example, differences of more than a factor of 10 were found in many areas of Texas, New Mexico, and New England states for NO$_x$ and of California, Texas, and Maine for NH$_3$. Our method allows for updates as emissions inventories and CTMs improve, enhancing the potential to link policy research to up-to-date atmospheric science.

INTRODUCTION

Estimating the social costs of air pollution, i.e. the damages imposed on human health and the natural environment, plays an important role in policy research, such as benefit-cost analyses of air quality laws,†‡ and regulations,§∥ and climate and energy technology assessments.**−**‡ PM$_{2.5}$ particulate matter having a diameter of 2.5 $\mu$m or less, is especially important because PM$_{2.5}$ is strongly associated with premature mortality,**−**§ and accounts for more than 90% of the monetized social costs.**‡ PM$_{2.5}$ is a complex mixture of various chemical compounds, sizes, and shapes. There are active research efforts to understand where PM$_{2.5}$ toxicity comes from.**−**‡ Nevertheless, PM$_{2.5}$ is currently regulated on a mass concentration basis by the U.S. EPA because other metrics do not have sufficient epidemiological and toxicological evidence to support regulatory rule-making.**

A standard method of estimating the social cost of emissions is using an impact pathway analysis.**‡ First, an air quality model estimates changes in PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations by comparing a simulation with baseline emissions and another with perturbed emissions. Next, changes in mortality rate are estimated using concentration–response relations reported by epidemiological studies. Then, the number of premature deaths is estimated by applying the changed mortality rates to exposed population. U.S. EPA usually publishes two separate mortality estimates using two landmark series of epidemiological studies, one from the American Cancer Society (ACS) studies,** and the other from the Harvard Six Cities (H6C) studies‡ due to pros and cons of the two series.** Finally, the premature deaths are monetized with the value of statistical life (VSL), or people’s willingness-to-pay to avoid the mortality risk. U.S. EPA recommends** using 8 M USD (in 2010 USD) for VSL after adjusting it for income growth.

Marginal social cost ($/t$), the social cost per tonne of air pollutant emitted, is a useful metric because policy research often deals with “marginal” changes in emissions and the social cost of emissions can be conveniently estimated by multiplying the amount of emissions by the marginal social cost. However, one should be cautious when applying such estimates outside of designed marginal ranges because nonlinear chemistry may result in substantial errors.** Intake fraction (ppm) is another impact metric,** defined as the mass fraction of the air pollutant or its precursors emitted that are inhaled by an exposed population.
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Concentrations, software tools such as BenMAP assist with understanding of atmospheric science as well as to inform air quality policies.

For example, even when sulfate (SO$_4^{2-}$) is a major component of PM$_{2.5}$, SO$_2$ reductions may have little impact on PM$_{2.5}$ due to a sulfate-nitrate substitution phenomenon, a scenario common enough to have regulatory significance. Organic compounds (VOCs) are also major precursors of organic PM$_{2.5}$, the understanding of which is relatively poor but has substantially advanced in recent years.

Current tools for linking changes in emissions to ambient PM$_{2.5}$ levels and, therefore, health effects often find limited utility in policy research because they are either computationally too expensive, too simplified, or too specific. Table 1 summarizes current methods.

Table 1. Tools for Estimating the Social Costs of Air Pollutant Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chemical transport models</th>
<th>dispersion models (e.g., CRDM)</th>
<th>chemical transport models</th>
<th>EASIUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>air quality modeling</td>
<td>state-of-the-art</td>
<td>simplified</td>
<td>similar to state-of-the-art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computational cost</td>
<td>very high</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial resolution</td>
<td>detailed, flexible (typically 4–36 km)</td>
<td>county-level</td>
<td>subject to underlying CTM simulations; typically, limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal resolution</td>
<td>detailed, flexible (typically ≤15 min)</td>
<td>annual</td>
<td>subject to underlying CTM simulations; typically, annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user interface</td>
<td>FORTRAN/UNIX environment, additional work needed for exposure/valuation analysis</td>
<td>graphical user interface, county-based lookup tables, regression equations</td>
<td>spatial lookup tables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the major challenges in estimating social costs is to address properly the complex atmospheric processes of chemical reactions, transport, and removal associated with PM$_{2.5}$ and precursor gases, which determine population exposures over hundreds or more from an emissions source.

Primary PM$_{2.5}$ species directly emitted as inert particulate matter such as elemental carbon (EC) and fugitive dust, poses a substantial public health burden. However, secondary PM$_{2.5}$ species produced through photochemical processes in the atmosphere from gaseous precursors, usually accounts for a dominant (>80%) fraction of ambient PM$_{2.5}$. Inorganic gases—sulfur dioxide (SO$_2$), nitrogen oxides (NO$_x$), and ammonia (NH$_3$)—are important precursors that form PM$_{2.5}$ by well-understood but nonlinear thermodynamic interactions. For example, even when sulfate (SO$_4^{2-}$) is a major component of PM$_{2.5}$, NO$_x$ reductions may have little impact on PM$_{2.5}$ due to a sulfate-nitrate substitution phenomenon, a scenario common enough to have regulatory significance. Certain volatile organic compounds (VOCs) are also major precursors of organic PM$_{2.5}$, the understanding of which is relatively poor but has substantially advanced in recent years.

Current tools for linking changes in emissions to ambient PM$_{2.5}$ levels and, therefore, health effects often find limited utility in policy research because they are either computationally too expensive, too simplified, or too specific. Table 1 summarizes current methods. One is to use a state-of-the-science chemical transport model (CTM) which divides the atmosphere into a three-dimensional grid and calculates complex atmospheric processes in each box at a high time resolution (typically, ~15 min). Built in order to advance the understanding of atmospheric science as well as to inform air quality policy-making, CTMs are the most sophisticated tools to simulate air quality. Once CTMs estimate pollutant concentrations, software tools such as BenMAP assist with population exposure estimation and valuation. However, running CTMs is computationally too expensive for many applications. Therefore, CTMs are usually run only for limited numbers of emissions scenarios and remain virtually out of reach to a large research community that wants to explore many policy and technological scenarios, perform rigorous uncertainty analyses (e.g., Monte Carlo), and so on.

To overcome the limitations of CTMs, reduced form models have been built using dispersion models such as the Climatological Regional Dispersion Model (CRDM). CRDM translates emissions from one source county to PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations at each downwind (or receptor) county using annual and seasonal average meteorology and emissions. Using CRDM, the Air Pollution Emissions Experiments and Policy (APEEP) model and an updated version AP2 provide per-ton social costs of six major pollutants for all (about 3100) U.S. counties. It would require about 6000 CPU-y of computing to generate comparable spatial detail with a CTM using brute force approaches (assuming 500 min per a simulation day). However, CRDM’s Gaussian dispersion approach may have limitations for predicting the dispersion of long-range transport pollutants like PM$_{2.5}$ and precursors because it assumes a Gaussian plume shape. Furthermore, because the size of county varies substantially across the nation, CRDM’s county-based spatial resolution may be spatially inconsistent and too coarse in some cases.

Another group is reduced form models built using CTMs. Although their predictions should be comparable to their parent CTMs, their parent CTM’s high computational costs have typically limited the results in terms of resolution in source sectors and source locations. For example, U.S. EPA’s Response Surface Model (RSM) is such a model built using a multidimensional kriging method based on CMAQ outputs. The estimates derived from RSM are limited to 9 urban areas and 1 nationwide average and to 12 emission sectors. Another set of per-ton damages estimated by U.S. EPA using a CTM with tagging is limited to national averages for 17 emission sectors.

In order to overcome the limitations of current reduced-form models, we recently developed a method that provides county-scale impact metrics similar to CRDM or APEEP but derived from a state-of-the-art CTM. Built from tagged CTM simulations and generalized via regressions, this method, called the Estimating Air Quality Social Impacts Using Regression (EASIUR) model, predicts marginal social costs and intake fractions accurately like a CTM but at trivial computational costs.
In this paper, we present marginal and aggregate public health costs estimated by EASIUR, compare to other estimates, and discuss uncertainties and their implications.

**METHOD**

**Reduced-Form Model Built From Tagged CTM Simulation and Regression.** The EASIUR model is summarized here; a full description can be found elsewhere. First, we select two sets of 50 random locations, one for model building and the other for out-of-sample evaluations, in a 148 × 112 grid covering the contiguous United States. Next, we run a CTM, Comprehensive Air Quality Model with extensions (CAMx) version 5.41, with 2005 emissions and meteorological inputs developed and evaluated for a regulatory impact analysis. Then, marginal social costs and intake fractions for emissions at the 100 source locations were calculated by a standard method used by U.S. EPA using a concentration–response relation from a recent ACS study. $8.6$ M (in 2010 USD) for VSL (U.S. EPA’s recommended value adjusted to 2005 income level), and population and baseline mortality in 2005 derived from BenMAP. Although we based the chosen concentration–response relation, VSL, and population, we provide an easy method to adjust our estimates for these factors over reasonable ranges. Finally, we derived regression models with one set of 50 locations and did out-of-sample evaluations against the other set of 50 locations. The models were built for three different emission heights: ground-level, 150 m, and 300 m. Regression models parametrize marginal social cost or intake fraction with population and atmospheric variables such as temperature and atmospheric pressure. We developed an “average plume method” to address the challenge of describing population exposure to PM2.5 occurring in downwind areas over hundreds of kilometers. An average plume is a spatial distribution of downwind impacts empirically derived by normalizing averaged PM2.5 concentrations predicted by CAMx for our 50 training locations. Exposed population for any given emissions species and source location is expressed in regressions by convoluting the surrounding map of population with the spatial distribution of this average plume, essentially producing a population estimate weighted by proximity to the pollution source.

**Marginal and Aggregate Public Health Effects of Primary PM2.5, SO2, NOx, and NH3.** We estimated marginal social costs and intake fractions at every cell of the 148 × 112 grid using the EASIUR models. In our analysis, primary PM2.5 indicates only inert primary species (mainly, elemental carbon and fugitive dust) but not primary organic PM2.5, which is not inert although it has been treated inert in most CTMs until recently.

In order to explore the magnitude of air quality public health burden of the United States, we estimated social costs for 11 emissions categories, using 2005 emissions inventory (Emissions and detailed definitions of sectors are summarized in Table S1): EGU (electric generating units); non-EGU (non-EGU point sources and aircraft emissions); on-road (on-road gasoline and diesel vehicles); other transportation (locomotive, and marine vessel); nonroad (nonroad engines); foreign (Mexico and Canada); area emissions (relatively small sources that are not categorized as EGU or non-EGU); fugitive dust; agriculture; fire (wild and prescribed fire); and biogenic emissions. Height-specific marginal costs, which were interpolated from EASIUR’s three elevations, were used for elevated point emissions. Note that the size of emissions used in estimating aggregate social costs is beyond the range where we tested to find our marginal social costs stay constant and, therefore, the estimates may result in some bias for secondary species. However, they provide useful first-order estimates and the associated uncertainties would be less than a factor of 2 (see the Discussion).

**RESULTS**

**Average Plumes.** Here we present the average plumes that represent a generic distribution of downwind impacts. Although these are primarily an intermediate step in the EASIUR method for estimating social costs, it is informative for users to be able to visualize these distributions; many users are surprised at the long-range impacts of PM2.5 emissions and precursor gases. These plumes describe the expected spatial features of an air pollutant’s dispersion and chemical conversion. To provide a sense of scale, the average plumes are plotted in Figure 1 on a map as if the emissions were originating from Pittsburgh and prevailing winds were west to east. The weights indicate the relative amount of the ambient PM2.5 mass created by emissions in downwind grid cells; the sum across all grid cells is one. The impacts of all four species are highly regional, easily spanning more than 1000 km; the dashed lines encompass the region that accounts for 80% of the resulting PM2.5. SO2 and NOx emissions lead to more widely distributed impacts than primary PM2.5 because they must be oxidized before forming PM2.5, a process with a time scale on the order of hours or days. NH3 emissions also require chemical transformation to form PM2.5, but do so faster than SO2 or NO2, therefore, their impacts are distributed only somewhat more broadly than primary PM2.5. Consistent with findings from other studies, these spatial distributions provide partial justification for EASIUR’s 36 km × 36 km resolution.
Marginal Social Costs and Intake Fractions. Marginal social costs and intake fractions estimated by the EASIUR models are presented in Figures 2 and S1, respectively. Seasonal-average estimates, weighted by the amount of emissions in the 2005 emissions inventory, are presented in Figures 3a and S2a, which are $88,000–130,000/t PM$_{2.5}$, $14,000–24,000/t SO$_2$, $3,800–14,000/t NO$_x$ and $23,000–66,000/t NH$_3$. The average intake fractions are 1.2–1.7 ppm for PM$_{2.5}$, 0.18–0.32 ppm for SO$_2$, 0.05–0.17 ppm for NO$_x$, and 0.31–0.85 ppm for NH$_3$.

The maps show that spatial variability largely depends on the population of the surrounding region. The effects of SO$_2$ and NO$_x$ emissions show less spatial variability than primary PM$_{2.5}$ and NH$_3$ because, having impacts that span broader regions, they effectively average out more of the variability in population. NH$_3$ and primary PM$_{2.5}$ impacts, in contrast, more closely reflect smaller-scale variations in population density. Seasonal variability is also distinct species by species. Wintertime emissions generally have higher values because air pollutants are less diluted vertically due to cold temperature. Wintertime marginal effects are especially large for NO$_x$ and NH$_3$ because NO$_x$ and NH$_3$ form ammonium nitrate PM$_{2.5}$ more readily under cold temperatures. Though SO$_2$ also shows higher values in cold seasons in some areas, it generally shows higher values in summer, since oxidation of SO$_2$ to sulfate PM$_{2.5}$ is controlled by sunlight-driven photochemistry.

The rank ordering of the social costs and intake fractions directly corresponds to the efficiency with which an emitted species forms PM$_{2.5}$. Recall that current epidemiology and valuation do not distinguish some PM$_{2.5}$ components as more toxic than others. Primary PM$_{2.5}$ emissions, by definition, directly enhance PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations and, therefore, have the highest social costs. In contrast, SO$_2$, NO$_x$, and NH$_3$ are all PM$_{2.5}$ precursors and must undergo one or more steps before forming PM$_{2.5}$. Therefore, the efficiency with which they form PM$_{2.5}$ depends on the fraction of SO$_2$ and NO$_x$ that oxidizes to sulfuric acid and nitric acid, respectively. For NO$_x$ and NH$_3$, thermodynamics also plays a role as one is generally limiting for ammonium nitrate formation. Lastly, because ammonia has a low molecular weight and is often the limiting factor for ammonium nitrate formation, the social cost expressed on a per ton basis is high.

Figure S3 presents the comparisons among three emissions heights: ground-level, 150 m high, and 300 m high. Generally, if emissions are released at a higher elevation nearby densely populated areas, marginal social costs become lower, which indicates that air pollutants impact nearby population areas less strongly. However, marginal social costs are not much lower in sparsely populated areas; in some remote locations, elevated emissions have higher social costs than ground-level when elevation enhances the transport of the pollutant to distant urban areas. Because the lifetime of PM$_{2.5}$ (several days) is longer than the vertical mixing time scale for the planetary boundary layer (~1 day), vertical differences would generally...
were harmonized to the best of our knowledge to account for

Figure 3. Marginal and aggregate social costs of inorganic air pollutants in 2005. PM$_{2.5}$ consists of inert primary PM$_{2.5}$ species (mainly, fugitive dust and elemental carbon), which does not include organic species.

smooth out relatively quickly on the regional scales under consideration, resulting in social costs, especially for SO$_2$ and NO$_x$, that are not very strong functions of emissions height.

National Air Quality Burden. Seasonal aggregate social costs by species are presented in Figure 3b. Aggregate social costs were $330 billion for primary PM$_{2.5}$ (not including primary organic PM), $320 billion for SO$_2$, $210 billion for NO$_x$, and $160 billion for NH$_3$. Intake fractions are compared in Figure S2b. Although wintertime NH$_3$ emissions are much smaller than in other seasons (agriculture is the dominant source of NH$_3$), wintertime social costs are the largest due to higher wintertime sensitivity of PM$_{2.5}$. The sum of the social costs of the four species is $1.0 trillion.

Sectoral social costs are presented in Figure 3c and broken down by species. The top 81% comes from six sectors: 25% from EGU, 14% from on-road, 12% from area sources, 11% from agricultural ammonia, 9.8% from non-EGU, and 8.4% from fugitive dust. Emissions from Mexico and Canada represent 7.7% of the total.

Comparison to Other Studies. EASIUR estimates are compared to those from three other studies in Figure 4 (numeric values are presented in Tables S3–S5). In order to isolate differences to air quality modeling, social cost estimates were harmonized to the best of our knowledge to account for differences in factors such as VSL, concentration–response relation, emissions unit (metric ton), population year, and PM$_{2.5}$ lag effects using methods described elsewhere. Intake fractions are compared in Figure S4 with recommended values from Humbert et al.

In Figures 4a and b, EASIUR is compared with AP2, an updated version of APEEP by county-by-county for ground-level emissions. We chose AP2 reported using 2005 emissions and population. Averaged over many locations, there is little net bias between EASIUR and AP2 for SO$_2$ and NO$_x$, but we frequently predict higher impacts stemming from primary PM$_{2.5}$ and ammonia. The high Pearson correlation coefficient (0.81) for primary PM$_{2.5}$ suggests that CRDM on which AP2 is based predicts net exposures that are comparable to a full CTM when averaged over long time periods and all downwind locations. However, comparisons for secondary species show much lower correlations, when the subsequent atmospheric chemistry is more complex. For NO$_x$ which is affected by both gas-phase oxidation and thermodynamic phase partitioning, the correlation between EASIUR and AP2 results is quite low, only 0.085, indicating very little agreement between the two models as to which counties emissions tend to result in higher impacts. Spatial comparisons presented in Figure 4b show that the differences between EASIUR and AP2 are not randomly distributed but have differing patterns in different regions. For example, AP2 estimates social costs for NO$_x$ emissions that are an order of magnitude lower than EASIUR in throughout the New England states.

Figure 4c presents similar comparisons between EASIUR and the work of Fann et al. Running CAMx with the same emissions and meteorology as EASIUR, they reported per-ton estimates for 17 sectoral emissions for three species (primary PM$_{2.5}$, SO$_2$, and NO$_x$). Due to limited sectoral resolution in our emissions inventory, we regrouped their 17 sectors into 7 sectors: 5 sectors have the same definitions; our “area sources” include residential wood combustion additionally; and “other sources” include 11 industrial sectors. Emissions-weighted averages are compared in Figure 4c, showing our 11 sectoral-average estimates are mostly within a factor of 2. EASIUR’s estimates were about 20% smaller for PM$_{2.5}$. For SO$_2$, EASIUR produced 30% smaller on average but less variability among sectors. For NO$_x$, the most difficult species, EASIUR is generally about 2 times larger but up to 3 times for nonroad mobile sources.

Lastly, in Figure 4d, EASIUR is compared to marginal social costs for one nationwide and nine urban areas from U.S. EPA’s RSM. Although RSM was derived running CMAQ with 2015 emissions projected from the 2001 National Emissions Inventory and 2001 meteorology, the two methods show similar national average estimates except for PM$_{2.5}$: for PM$_{2.5}$, RSM’s estimate is 2–3 times larger than EASIUR’s average; for SO$_2$, 10% to 90%; for NO$_x$, 48% to 20%; and for NH$_3$, 52% to 24%. However, individual urban areas generally show large differences for all species. RSM-based estimates for some specific urban areas seem counterintuitive. For example, the RSM estimate is 4.5 times larger for area source carbon and 11 times for industrial SO$_2$ in Phoenix than in the combined New York and Philadelphia (NY/Phi) area, although NY/Phi has 6 times larger population than Phoenix. This may be related with the limitation of RSM design that cannot completely separate the effects of emissions from one area on others.

Uncertainties in EASIUR Estimates. There are three major sources of uncertainty associated with EASIUR: air
quality modeling, concentration–response relations, and VSL. We present the uncertainties in Table S6, showing that air quality modeling introduces generally similar or smaller uncertainties than the other two factors, but it is larger for some cases. The uncertainties are quantified and discussed as follows.

Air quality modeling requires a detailed discussion about two sources of uncertainty: errors in CAMx compared to reality and errors in the regressions compared to CAMx. Although CTM’s uncertainties are largely associated with key inputs such as emissions and meteorology and less significantly with atmospheric algorithms (at least for inorganic PM$_{2.5}$), it is not feasible to quantify formally uncertainties surrounding those factors due to measurement coverage and the sheer number of parameters in CTMs. Instead, CTMs are generally evaluated against ambient measurements, which are also uncertain due to factors associated with measurement accuracy and frequency. U.S. EPA’s evaluation reports fractional biases.
and fractional errors, common evaluation metrics for CTMs,\textsuperscript{65,66} that are averaged over regional areas (of 5–10 states) on a seasonal basis. CTMs may have less biases and errors for predicting PM\textsubscript{2.5} changes from “additional” emissions than predicting total PM\textsubscript{2.5} concentrations from all emissions.\textsuperscript{67,68}

Turning to the statistical regressions used by EASIUR, we report both confidence intervals (CIs) and prediction intervals (PIs) from the fitting procedures.\textsuperscript{51} Since CIs quantify errors in the social cost when averaged over many locations, they are appropriate for applications that are regional to national in scale (e.g., covering 5–10 states). On the other hand, some applications will require an uncertainty estimate for damages from emissions in one specific location (or cluster of nearby locations such as a metropolitan statistical area), which are better represented by PIs.

Lacking a formal method, we suggested the uncertainties in Table S6 based on our best judgment. Assuming the two sources of uncertainty are independent, we combined them. For regional-scale applications (covering emissions sources in four or more states, or in areas covering 500 000 km\textsuperscript{2} or larger), we averaged the absolute values of fractional biases (weighted by the number of observations) reported in the CAMx evaluation\textsuperscript{52} to represent the uncertainty of CAMx as percent error. For the uncertainty introduced by regressions, we calculated percent errors using the average upper bounds of the 95th CIs relative to mean estimates in EASIUR regressions.\textsuperscript{51} We combined both errors as if they are combined as standard deviations and used the combined errors to express upper bounds of uncertainty. For lower bounds, we calculated by taking the same fraction relative to 100%; for example, a +25% upper bound produces a lower bound of −20%. Similarly, for subregional analyses (covering less than 500 000 km\textsuperscript{2}), we used the average of fractional errors (weighted by the number of observations) and the average upper bounds of the 95th PIs relative to mean estimates. For primary PM\textsubscript{2.5}, we used only 50% of fractional biases and fractional errors for elemental carbon, our proxy species for all inert primary PM\textsubscript{2.5} because the biases and errors are considered to be overpredicted due to errors in emissions inventory\textsuperscript{50} rather than CTM itself. Although this method is our judgment rather than formal quantification, we believe that suggested values would sufficiently represent the uncertainty.

For concentration–response relation, we suggest the range of uncertainty that covers the 95% CIs of PM\textsubscript{2.5} relative risks from two land-mark epidemiological studies: the ACS studies\textsuperscript{14} and the H6C studies H6C\textsuperscript{15} due to pros and cons of population errors in emissions inventory\textsuperscript{69} rather than CTM itself.

**DISCUSSION**

We presented marginal social costs and intake fractions for four major inorganic air pollutants in the United States: inert primary PM\textsubscript{2.5}, SO\textsubscript{2}, NO\textsubscript{x}, and NH\textsubscript{3}. These two metrics were estimated using the EASIUR model, which were built using regression on a data set generated by a CTM. The EASIUR estimates are the most comprehensive set of marginal health costs and intake fractions, having a spatial resolution of 36 km × 36 km for source location, a temporal resolution of four seasons, and three emission elevations (ground-level, 150 m high, and 300 m high). Because the EASIUR model can be rederived as CTMs and input data change in the future, it offers a streamlined approach for incorporating up-to-date air quality science into policy research.

Because EASIUR estimates are derived based on emissions and meteorology in 2005, there are caveats to consider when EASIUR is used for different years. First, the emissions baseline matters to the marginal costs of SO\textsubscript{2}, NO\textsubscript{x}, and NH\textsubscript{3} because the availability of coreactants influences the formation of secondary inorganic PM\textsubscript{2.5}.\textsuperscript{27,31} In this context, it is important to note that SO\textsubscript{2} and NO\textsubscript{x} emissions have been rapidly decreasing in recent years (e.g., from 2005 to 2014, SO\textsubscript{2} emissions decreased by 66% and NO\textsubscript{x} by 39%)\textsuperscript{50} and are expected to further decrease in coming years. Holt et al.\textsuperscript{59} showed that changed emissions from 2005 to 2012 would result in 23–42% larger sensitivity for SO\textsubscript{2} (due to more active aqueous oxidation), 37–200% larger for NO\textsubscript{x} depending on location (due to more nitrate PM formation in winter), and 28–38% smaller for NH\textsubscript{3} (due to less acidic atmosphere). Pinder et al.\textsuperscript{71} showed NH\textsubscript{3} sensitivity would decrease by up to 30% in winter over the period of 2001–2020. A quantitative assessment can also be inferred from the work of Fann et al.,\textsuperscript{50} which reported per-ton benefits of emissions reductions for 17 sectors for 2 periods, 2005 and 2016. After adjusting differences in population and income level between two periods, changed emissions from 2005 to 2016 resulted in 7% increase of marginal benefits for SO\textsubscript{2} and 26% increase for NO\textsubscript{x} on emissions-weighted average. These studies suggest that social cost estimates may change by up to a factor of 2, but usually less, even for fairly large changes in baseline emissions. Considering other uncertainties, the effect of changing emissions baseline is not prohibitive but is worth noting.

Interannual variability in meteorology should have a minor influence on these results, affecting seasonal or annual marginal health effects generally less than 10%.\textsuperscript{72–74} Studies\textsuperscript{11,75–77} suggest that the influence of climate change on PM\textsubscript{2.5} concentrations is negligible in short-term assessments and relatively small even in the long term.

An important group of species, primary and secondary organic PM\textsubscript{2.5}, which roughly account for a half of ambient PM\textsubscript{2.5}, is not modeled for EASIUR due to “structural” uncertainty of current CTMs. Although primary organic PM\textsubscript{2.5} has been treated inert in most CTMs so far,\textsuperscript{76,78} one needs to be careful when applying our primary PM\textsubscript{2.5} estimates to primary organic PM\textsubscript{2.5} because most primary organic species were found to evaporate and undergo chemical reactions.\textsuperscript{33} Current CTMs also underpredict secondary PM\textsubscript{2.5} by an order of magnitude,\textsuperscript{78} suggesting a possibility of large biases in social cost estimates of VOCs (e.g., those from RSM\textsuperscript{62} and APEEP/ AP\textsubscript{x}\textsuperscript{43,61}). Recent advancements in the understanding of organic PM\textsubscript{2.5} are being introduced to CTMs,\textsuperscript{33,80–82} and we plan to do a separate study dedicated to modeling EASIUR for organic species.

Though current reduced-form models including EASIUR showed relatively good agreement for aggregate estimates (e.g., national or sectoral averages), our comparisons in Figure 4 show that they can produce substantial differences in assessments dealing with secondary species like NO\textsubscript{x} and NH\textsubscript{3} and/or with a small spatial domain. Such assessments would require a careful sensitivity analysis using multiple models as a “conservative” way of exploring uncertainty for air quality modeling beyond suggested EASIUR uncertainties. Our
systematic comparisons in Figure 4 would be able to show in what areas the community has large discrepancies.
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