

A 96-54
11-B-09
(tttt)

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
17TH & PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20502



THE OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING

TO: *Slott Matthias - EPA*FAX NUMBER: *919-541-0839**Art Fraas - OMB**202-395-7285*

OFFICE:

TEL NUMBER:

FROM: *Steve Polasky*

FAX NUMBER: (202) 395-6870

ROOM: *319 - OEOB*

TEL NUMBER: (202) 395-5012

NO. OF PAGES (w/cover) *2*DATE: *12-31-98*SUBJECT: *OTAG - RIA Comments*MESSAGE: *[Signature]*

I think table 4.8 is fine and I prefer it to the prior version. My only comment pertains to the new paragraph following Table 4-8. I do not like the last two sentences in the new paragraph. There is no need to assert that the probability of ozone having zero effect on mortality as low as the limiting high case estimate. I have no idea how one would try to substantiate such a statement, but more to the point, these sentences are not necessary and detract from the main point you wish to make in the paragraph. I would favor ending the paragraph after the sentence "Because the probability of this limiting case occurring is relatively low...". Alternatively, you could strike the last three sentences and end with "This would generate a benefits estimate considerably higher than the high estimate in Table 4-8."