

US EPA Science Advisory Board Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPESS) Public Teleconference November 19, 2007, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. (Eastern Daylight Time)

Committee: The SAB Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPESS) (See Roster - Attachment A)

Date and Time: November 19, 2007, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. (Eastern daylight time)

Location: Participation by Telephone Only

Purpose: The purpose of the teleconference is to reach committee consensus on a draft report related to valuing the protection of ecological systems and services. (See Meeting Agenda - Attachment C)

Attendees: Members of the C-VPESS:

Dr. Barton H (Buzz) Thompson (Chair)

Dr. Kathleen Segerson (Vice-Chair)

Dr. William Ascher

Dr. Ann Bostrom

Dr. Terry Daniel

Dr. A. Myrick Freeman

Dr. Dennis Grossman

Dr. Douglas MacLean

Dr. Louis Pitelka

Dr. Mark Sagoff

Dr. V. Kerry Smith

EPA SAB Staff

Dr. Angela Nugent [Designated Federal Officer, DFO)]

Other Members of the Public (see Attachment D)

**Teleconference Summary:**

The teleconference generally followed the meeting agenda (see Meeting Agenda - Attachment C) to continue discussion of the September 2007 C-VPESS draft.

After the DFO opened the meeting and took the roll, the chair reviewed the agenda. He noted that the purpose of the teleconferences on November 19 and 20, 2007 was to continue and finalize review of the draft report dated September 24<sup>th</sup>. He noted that two additional texts were circulated for the meeting: a proposed section 4.1 dated 11/9 and a new proposed section, dated October 10<sup>th</sup> on decision science approaches. He reminded the committee that during its October teleconferences, the committee discussed chapters 1, 2, and 3. He and Dr. Segerson wanted comments on other parts of the report before overall revisions are made. Chapter 7 (Summary of Major Recommendations and

Conclusions) will be redrafted in light of revisions to the other chapters of the report. He noted that the goal is to circulate the revised report in February.

## **Chapter 4 and Appendix B**

Dr. Kathleen Segerson led the discussion of Chapter 4 and Appendix B, which relate to valuation methods. She began with the initial draft text circulated on “Criteria for Choosing Valuation Methods” (Attachment E). She noted that committee members provided suggestions after the October teleconferences and that a draft of this new section was circulated on November 9<sup>th</sup>. She noted that substantive issues associated with written comments received on the draft text (Attachment G) fell into three main categories: 1) distinctions between direct vs. indirect measures; 2) criteria relating to a well informed public; and 3) use of the expression true values. Another member added that he was unable to provide written comments and wanted to add a fourth major issue, relating to the structure of the proposed new section.

The committee addressed that fourth issue first. The committee member emphasized that criteria for methods need to be presented in a context that makes sense to EPA. Legal requirements and executive orders provide overarching constraints for some activities, such as rule making. He noted that the committee could not discuss criteria in a vacuum. The chair noted the importance of this comment and the need to revise section 4.1 to begin with a discussion of the constraints of different contexts. The committee discussed the need for a careful discussion of the extent to which law constrains what methods EPA can use. Another member acknowledged that Executive Order 12291 and circular A-4 call for economic approaches. He observed that this restriction should not be viewed “over-broadly” because the Executive Order and Circular A-4 do not exclude other measures when benefits cannot be fully characterized by economic methods. He also noted that “values” is a term that should be used more broadly. The committee confirmed its understanding of three categories of benefits and value information that could be associated with rulemakings: 1) benefits that can be presented in economic terms; 2) non-economic benefits that can be derived through methods that use other units than dollars as proxies in situations when such proxies best represent benefits; and 3) value measures derived through other methods that can be used to represent “other classes of value” that don’t fit within the economic concept of value but can be considered for decision-making as supplements to benefit cost analysis. The group noted the importance of discussing criteria relating to all the methods for valuation.

A member noted the importance of clarifying language in draft section 4.1. He noted that the criterion relating to transferability was often misunderstood. He noted that the transferability criterion linked to Fischhoff 1997 relates to the function that defines the tradeoff, not the specific number. Another member noted that different methods that are conceptually equivalent should produce same or similar results. Dr. Segerson observed that this second point raises issues similar to the transferability criterion. Dr. Segerson noted that she would circulate draft revised text to economists and psychologists on the committee to address the potentially controversial issue of construct validity.

A committee member emphasized the need to provide a consistent discussion of how methods should relate to public understanding of science within the text drafted for section 4.1 and for the report as a whole. The member noted that the criteria calling for a well informed public could be seen as conflicting with the concluding paragraph. He noted that the views of a well-informed public were important to C-VPESS but that C-VPESS also recognizes the needs to reflect values held by the relevant population. Some categories of the less well informed public need to be addressed. Dr. Segerson noted the need to clarify text in section 4.1 and throughout the report to address the question of methods to address both a well informed public and the values held by the relevant population, who may not be well informed.

The committee next discussed whether a method designed to measure a value directly was preferred to a proxy. Two members emphasized the importance of avoiding language that suggests that values can be measured directly. Dr. Segerson stated that she would confer with Dr. Joseph Arvai to determine if there is a better way to capture his point about direct vs. proxy methods in a way that raises no new problems. A member noted that such a notion would make sense within the context of measuring attributes. Another member noted that Ralph Keeney's research discusses the merits of direct vs. proxy attributes.

A member then noted the importance of the draft text that notes that a valuation method with a transparent theoretical foundation is preferable to a method that elicits something that correlates with valuation results derived through application of a method with a transparent theoretical foundation. He suggested that this text be expanded and highlighted.

Dr. Segerson then turned to the new text developed for Decision Science approaches. She noted that all written comments received should be addressed in revisions to the text. The committee agreed that the new text was over-lengthy for section 4.6 and that much of the detail fit better in Appendix B. Members noted that the text provided one of the best expositions of multi-attribute scaling methods available and was a valuable addition to the report.

Dr. Segerson then turned to general comments received on Chapter 4. Some of the issues related to the construction of the table on page 72, "Introduction to Methods Assessed by the Committee." Members criticized information in column 5, "Who expressed value." A member suggested eliminating two nested columns ("Does method measure observed behavior, etc?" and "Who expresses value?"). Having a single column "sources of Information About Value" would allow an entry to be more general, e.g., "experts may make biodiversity decision, but the value aspect is based on presumption/assessment of people's valuing biodiversity."

The committee then turned to specific issues relating to Habitat Equivalency Analysis. Dr. Segerson noted that HEA was presented within the grouping of methods relating to "Cost as a proxy for value." Another member responded that "costing of

options” was the only link between replacement cost and HEA and characterized HEA in practice as a “methodology for organizing chaos around negotiating trade-offs between changes to ecosystem services.” He noted that HEA sometimes results in negotiations of picnic tables vs. wetlands. He suggested that the discussion on page 83 be revised to provide a more accurate representation of HEA and to discuss implementation issues. Another committee member noted that many ecologists will not provide information for HEA because they do not believe there are equivalencies and because they believe HEA generates an inappropriate set of tradeoffs. Dr. Segerson stated that she would revise the HEA language to address these theoretical and practical considerations.

The committee then turned to a discussion of the placement of mediated modeling within the report. The committee considered four options: 1) the September draft approach, which addressed mediated modeling as a deliberative process in Chapter 2 and included it in Appendix B; 2) create a new section in Chapter 4, similar to the Decision Science section, that could address methods that help identify attributes that matter and how they rank order and scale; 3) expand discussion of mediated modeling in Chapter 2 and create a new appendix for deliberative approaches to incorporate most of the current Appendix B discussions of decision-aiding and mediated modeling ; and 4) create a new section in chapter 5 on deliberative approaches and create a new appendix for deliberative approaches to incorporate most of the current Appendix B discussions of decision-aiding and mediated modeling.

A member advocated creating a new section in Chapter 4, similar to the Decision Science section. This section would include methods that help identify attributes that matter and how they rank order and scale. He viewed this approach as a new section that might help reincorporate mediated modeling as potentially a valuation method. Another member noted that mediated modeling was not a valuation method, but was instead a mechanism for “getting people together to discuss models, values, and ecological effects.” He noted that it more properly fit with deliberative processes. Another member disagreed, stating that the deliberative processes was “both too narrow and too broad” for mediated modeling. Yet another member argued that the “decision science approach creates value; mediated modeling imports value.” Dr. Segerson suggested creating a new appendix for deliberative approaches to incorporate most of the current Appendix B discussions of decision-aiding and mediated modeling, but other members voiced concern that moving all discussion into an appendix would de-emphasize approaches that relate to uncovering and constructing values. The chair concluded the discussion by noting that the most acceptable option is to create a new section in Chapter 5 and a new appendix devoted to deliberative approaches, unless a committee member could quickly draft text that convinces the committee as a whole that mediated modeling and deliberative processes offer an independent valuation approach. Dr. Segerson also noted that Chapter 4 tables will not include references to methods relating to deliberative processes.

The committee then discussed the treatment of focus groups in the September draft report text. The committee confirmed the value of focus groups as a technique to develop surveys and criticized its increasing use as a stand-alone valuation method as

producing an end product for valuation. The committee agreed that discussion of focus groups should remain in Chapter 4. Dr. Segerson stated that she would revise the text to note appropriate caveats for use of focus groups in valuation.

The committee discussed written comments on the emergy method, especially comments from the independent technical reviewer, Dr. James Opaluch, who recommended that the report provide stronger criticism of the methods. The committee agreed that it would focus on the theoretical aspects of emergy as a method, not EPA's current use. Although not all members of the committee were on the call, members noted that no committee member endorsed the use of emergy-based methods from a theoretical perspective. Dr. Segerson stated that she would revise the text to make the committee's criticism stronger and draw on the critical examples Dr. Opaluch provided.

The final chapter 4 issue related to benefit transfer and conservation value methods. Dr. Segerson asked whether the committee should strengthen language relating to the problems associated with excerpting available unit values and applying them to an unrelated context without screening or discussion of how the values are applicable, because those efforts are increasingly common. Members agreed that language should be strengthened without a general criticism of EPA. Dr. Segerson stated that she would revise the language about proper caveats to benefit transfer and would coordinate with Drs. Ascher, Smith, and Polasky on the text. Dr. Segerson stated that she would review Dr. Freeman's comments about conservation value methods with Dr. Grossman, the author of that section.

## **Appendix A**

Dr. Kathleen Segerson noted comments received relating to inclusion of the term "benefit." in Appendix A. The committee endorsed the distinction made throughout the text between use of the term benefit as distinct from the term value. Dr. Segerson agreed to provide a brief discussion of the specialized use of the term benefit in Appendix A and to acknowledge that non-economists use the term more broadly. Such an entry would be consistent with definitions provided on pages p. 14-15 of the draft text.

### Summary of Action Items

1. Dr. Segerson will revise section 4.1 so it begins with a discussion of the constraints of different contexts and how they relate to criteria for choosing methods.
2. Dr. Segerson will revise section 4.,1 to clarify that the transferability criterion linked to Fischhoff 1997 relates to the function that defines the tradeoff, not the specific number.
3. Dr. Segerson will circulate draft revised text to economists and psychologists on the committee to address the potentially controversial issue of construct validity.

4. Committee members will provide final comments on draft materials for October and November teleconferences by November 30<sup>th</sup>.
5. Dr. Segerson will clarify text in section 4.1 and throughout the report to address the question of methods to address both a well-informed public and the values held by the relevant population, who may not be well-informed.
6. Dr. Segerson will confer with Dr. Joseph Arvai to determine if there's a better way to capture his point about direct vs. proxy methods in a way that raises no new problems.
7. Dr. Segerson will expand or highlight draft text that notes that a valuation method with a transparent and theoretical foundation is preferable to a method that elicits something that correlates with valuation results derived through application of a method with a transparent theoretical foundation.
8. Dr. Segerson will work with Dr. Arvai to address written comments received on section 4.6, Decision Science approaches, to shorten the text for the body of the report, and to revise text for inclusion in Appendix B.
9. Dr. Segerson will revise the table on page 72, "Introduction to Methods. Assessed by the Committee" to eliminate the two columns nested within the column titled "Sources of Information About Value" and will revise entries.
10. Dr. Segerson will revise the HEA text to provide the qualifications noted in the November 19<sup>th</sup> teleconference about the theoretical and practical limitations of HEA.
11. Dr. Thompson will create a new section in Chapter 5 and a new appendix devoted to deliberative approaches, unless a committee member can quickly draft text that convinces the committee as a whole that mediated modeling and deliberative processes offer an independent valuation approach, they can draft it up.
12. Dr. Segerson will remove references to methods relating to deliberative processes in Chapter 4 tables.
13. Dr. Segerson will revise Chapter 4 and Appendix B to note appropriate caveats for use of focus groups in valuation.
14. Dr. Segerson will revise the text on emergy to make the committee's criticism stronger, focusing on the theoretical weakness of the approach, and will draw on the critical examples Dr. Opaluch provided.
15. Dr. Segerson will revise the language about proper caveats to benefit transfer and will coordinate with Drs. Ascher, Smith, and Polasky on the text.
16. Dr. Segerson will review Dr. Freeman's comments about conservation value methods with Dr. Grossman, the author of that section.
17. Dr. Segerson will provide a brief discussion of the specialized use of the term benefit in Appendix A, and acknowledge that non-economists use the term more broadly.

Respectfully Submitted:

/s/

---

Angela Nugent  
Designated Federal Official

Certified as True:

/s/

---

Dr. Barton H. (Buzz) Thompson, Jr.  
Chair  
SAB Committee on Valuing the  
Protection of Ecological Systems  
and Services

List of Attachments

Attachment A: Roster of the SAB C-VPES

Attachment B: Federal Register Notice

Attachment C: Meeting Agenda

Attachment D: Attendees from the Public Who Requested or Were Provided Call-in Information

Attachment E: Draft text on Section 4.1 Criteria for Choosing Valuation Methods

Attachment F: Draft text on Decision Science Approaches

Attachment G: Committee Members' Comments for November C-VPES Teleconferences

Attachment H: Compilation of Comments Received from Invited "Informal Reviewers" (Drs. James Opaluch, Roger Kasperson, Dr. Duncan Patten) on September 2007 draft

Attachment I: Compilation of Comments received from C-VPES Members on September 2007 Draft

Attachment J: Draft List of Issues for Discussion at the Teleconference Calls, Drawn from C-VPES Members and Informal Reviewers' Comments

**Attachment A:  
Roster of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Science Advisory Board  
Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and  
Services**

**CHAIR**

**Dr. Barton H. (Buzz) Thompson, Jr.**, Robert E. Paradise Professor of Natural Resources Law, Stanford Law School, and Director, Woods Institute for the Environment, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

**VICE-CHAIR**

**Dr. Kathleen Segerson**, Professor, Department of Economics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT

**MEMBERS**

**Dr. William Louis Ascher**, Donald C. McKenna Professor of Government and Economics, Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, CA

**Dr. Gregory Biddinger**, Coordinator, Natural Land Management Programs, Toxicology and Environmental Sciences, ExxonMobil Biomedical Sciences, Inc, Houston, TX

**Dr. Ann Bostrom**, Associate Professor, School of Public Policy, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA

**Dr. James Boyd**, Senior Fellow, Director, Energy & Natural Resources Division, Resources for the Future, Washington, DC

**Dr. Robert Costanza**, Professor/Director, Gund Institute for Ecological Economics, School of Natural Resources, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT

**Dr. Terry Daniel**, Professor of Psychology and Natural Resources, Department of Psychology, Environmental Perception Laboratory, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ

**Dr. A. Myrick Freeman**, William D. Shipman Professor of Economics Emeritus, Department of Economics, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME

**Dr. Dennis Grossman**, Director, DGO, Vienna, VA

**Dr. Geoffrey Heal**, Paul Garrett Professor of Public Policy and Business Responsibility, Columbia Business School, Columbia University, New York, NY

**Dr. Robert Huggett**, Consultant and Professor Emeritus, College of William and Mary,

Williamsburg, VA

**Dr. Douglas E. MacLean**, Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

**Dr. Harold Mooney**, Paul S. Achilles Professor of Environmental Biology, Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

**Dr. Louis F. Pitelka**, Professor, Appalachian Laboratory, University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science, Frostburg, MD

**Dr. Stephen Polasky**, Fesler-Lampert Professor of Ecological/Environmental Economics, Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN

**Dr. Paul G. Risser**, Chair, University Research Cabinet, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK

**Dr. Holmes Rolston**, University Distinguished Professor, Department of Philosophy, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO

**Dr. Joan Roughgarden**, Professor, Biological Sciences and Evolutionary Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

**Dr. Mark Sagoff**, Senior Research Scholar, Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy, School of Public Affairs, University of Maryland, College Park, MD

**Dr. Paul Slovic**, Professor, Department of Psychology, Decision Research, Eugene, OR

**Dr. V. Kerry Smith**, W.P. Carey Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, W.P. Carey School of Business, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

#### **CONSULTANTS TO THE COMMITTEE**

**Dr. Joseph Arvai**, Professor, Environmental Science and Policy Program, and Department of Community, Agriculture, Resource and Recreation Studies (CARRS), Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI

**Dr. Allyson Holbrook**, Assistant Professor of Public Administration and Psychology, Survey Research Laboratory, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL

**Dr. Jon Krosnick**, Frederic O. Glover Professor in Humanities and Social Sciences, Professor of Communication, Director, Methods of Analysis Program in the Social Sciences, Associate Director, Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA

**SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD STAFF**

**Dr. Angela Nugent**, Designated Federal Officer, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
1400F, Washington, DC, Phone: 202-343-9981, Fax: 202-233-0643,  
(nugent.angela@epa.gov)

## **Attachment B: Federal Register Notice**

Science Advisory Board Staff Office; Notification of Four Public Teleconferences of the Science Advisory Board Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services

[Federal Register: October 31, 2007 (Volume 72, Number 210)]

[Notices]

[Page 61636]

From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]

[DOCID:fr31oc07-62]

-----  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-8489-3]

Science Advisory Board Staff Office; Notification of Four Public Teleconferences of the Science Advisory Board Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

-----  
SUMMARY: The EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) Staff Office announces four public teleconferences of the SAB Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPESS) to discuss components of a draft report related to valuing the protection of ecological systems and services.

DATES: The SAB will conduct four public teleconferences. The public teleconferences will occur on November 19, 2007, November 20, 2007, December 3, 2007, and December 10, 2007. All calls will begin at 1 p.m. and end at 3 p.m. (eastern daylight time).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Any member of the public wishing to obtain general information concerning the public teleconferences may contact Dr. Angela Nugent, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), via telephone at: (202) 343-9981 or e-mail at: [nugent.angela@epa.gov](mailto:nugent.angela@epa.gov). General information concerning the EPA Science Advisory Board can be found on the EPA Web Site at: <http://www.epa.gov/sab>.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The SAB was established by 42 U.S.C. 4365 to provide independent scientific and technical advice, consultation, and recommendations to the EPA Administrator on the technical basis for Agency positions and regulations. The SAB is a Federal Advisory Committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), as

amended, 5 U.S.C., App. The SAB will comply with the provisions of FACA and all appropriate SAB Staff Office procedural policies.

Background: Background on the SAB C-VPES and its charge was provided in 68 FR 11082 (March 7, 2003). The purpose of the teleconferences is for the SAB C-VPES to discuss components of a draft advisory report calling for expanded and integrated approach for valuing the protection of ecological systems and services. These activities are related to the Committee's overall charge: To assess Agency needs and the state of the art and science of valuing protection of ecological systems and services and to identify key areas for improving knowledge, methodologies, practice, and research.

Availability of Meeting Materials: Agendas and materials in support of the teleconferences will be placed on the SAB Web Site at: <http://www.epa.gov/sab/> in advance of each teleconference.

Procedures for Providing Public Input: Interested members of the public may submit relevant written or oral information for the SAB to consider during the public teleconferences. Oral Statements: In general, individuals or groups requesting an oral presentation at a public SAB teleconference will be limited to three minutes per speaker, with no more than a total of one-half hour for all speakers. To be placed on the public speaker list, interested parties should contact Dr. Angela Nugent, DFO, in writing (preferably via e-mail) 5 business days in advance of each teleconference. Written Statements: Written statements should be received in the SAB Staff Office 5 business days in advance of each teleconference above so that the information may be made available to the SAB for their consideration prior to each teleconference. Written statements should be supplied to the DFO in the following formats: One hard copy with original signature, and one electronic copy via e-mail (acceptable file format: Adobe Acrobat PDF, WordPerfect, MS Word, MS PowerPoint, or Rich Text files in IBM-PC/Windows 98/2000/XP format).

Accessibility: For information on access or services for individuals with disabilities, please contact Dr. Angela Nugent at (202) 343-9981 or [nugent.angela@epa.gov](mailto:nugent.angela@epa.gov). To request accommodation of a disability, please contact Dr. Nugent preferably at least ten days prior to the teleconferences to give EPA as much time as possible to process your request.

Dated: October 22, 2007.  
Anthony Maciorowski,  
Deputy Director, EPA Science Advisory Board Staff Office.  
[FR Doc. E7-21450 Filed 10-30-07; 8:45 am]  
BILLING CODE 6560-50-P

## Attachment C: Meeting Agenda

**EPA Science Advisory Board  
Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPES)  
Public Teleconference  
November 19, 2007, 1:00 a.m. - 3:00 p.m. (Eastern Time)**

### Agenda

**Purpose:** The purpose of the teleconference is to reach committee consensus on a draft report related to valuing the protection of ecological systems and services.

1:00 – 1:05	Opening of Teleconference	Dr. Angela Nugent, Designated Federal Officer
1:05 – 1:10	Review of Agenda	Dr. Buzz Thompson, Chair Dr. Kathleen Segerson, Vice-Chair
1:10 – 1:15	Public Comments	TBA
1:15 – 1:55	Chapter 4	Dr. Kathleen Segerson Committee
1:55 – 2:25	Appendix B	Dr. Kathleen Segerson Committee
2:25 – 2:30	Appendix A	Dr. Buzz Thompson Committee
2:25 – 2:55	Chapter 5	Dr. Buzz Thompson Committee
2:55 – 3:00	Summary and Next Steps	Dr. Buzz Thompson Committee
3:00	Adjourn	

**Attachment D: Attendees from the Public Who Requested Call-in Information**

Ashraf Abdul-Mohsen, Ph.D.  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
OW/OST/EAD  
Economics and Environmental Assessment Branch

Adam Ayers  
General Electric  
Corporate Environmental Programs

Patricia Kablach Casano  
Counsel, Environmental Legislative and Regulatory Affairs  
General Electric Company

Sharon Hayes  
EPA, Gulf of Mexico Program Office

Maureen F. Kaplan  
ERG

Suzanne Marcy  
Office of Research and Development

William J. Mates, MS  
Research Scientist/Economics  
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

Kristy Mathews  
Veritas Economics

Wayne Munns  
Office of Research and Development

Steve Newbold  
Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation

## **Attachment E: Draft text on Section 4.1 Criteria for Choosing Valuation Methods**

### **Section 4.1 Criteria for Choosing Valuation Methods**

#### **4.1.1 The Need for Criteria**

In advocating an expanded and integrated approach to valuing the protection of ecological systems and services, the committee has urged the Agency to consider and experiment with the use of a broader set of valuation methods. This chapter provides an overview of the methods that the committee examined, which are discussed in more detail in Appendix B. The methods vary in the degree to which researchers have developed conceptual frameworks for the methods, the degree to which they have been subject to testing, and the degree to which they have been used in actual valuation studies.

The committee's recommendation that EPA consider the use of an expanded set of methods is based on a presumption that any method used by the Agency would need to meet relevant scientific standards. Thus, before relying on any given method in a particular valuation process, it is imperative that the method be evaluated to determine if there is a sound scientific basis for its use in that context. Methods that are in their early stages of development and application to valuation will need to be evaluated both for their scientific merit and for their appropriateness in the given context of interest. Methods that are well-developed and have been extensively used for valuation and validated in other contexts should still be evaluated for their suitability in the specific valuation context at hand. In either case, the evaluation should be based on a common set of criteria developed specifically for this purpose. Because of limited resources and the particular expertise of the committee members and because suitability will generally be context specific, the committee has not developed a full set of criteria for evaluating methods and applied those criteria comprehensively to the methods described here (although some strengths and weaknesses of the methods are discussed in Appendix B). The committee urges EPA to develop a list of criteria and evaluate methods based on that list prior to using them for valuation. Some suggestions for criteria that EPA should consider for inclusion on the list are described briefly below (see Section 4.1.2).

In developing criteria for evaluating valuation methods, a distinction should be made between criteria for evaluating the suitability of a particular method as it might be applied in a given context (i.e., evaluating the scientific merit and suitability of the method *itself*) and criteria for evaluating the manner in which the method is actually applied (i.e., evaluating the *implementation* of the method). For example, the question of whether a survey-based method can appropriately be used to estimate or elicit value(s) in a particular context is a different question (requiring different criteria) than the question of whether a specific survey was properly designed and executed so as to estimate or elicit the intended value(s). If not properly implemented, any method can yield results that are not useful for the intended purpose. For any individual method, criteria can be developed to ensure that the method is carefully implemented, and criteria of this type exist for many of the methods described here (give refs). The committee recommends that the Agency develop a “higher-order” list of criteria designed to evaluate the suitability of specific methods in specific contexts, assuming that if used the method would be implemented according to “best practices” as defined by applicable criteria specific to that method.

#### **4.1.2 Some Suggested Criteria**

While not prescribing the specific criteria that EPA should use to evaluate methods before using them in a specific context, the committee offers here some suggested criteria that might be included. These are based on related discussions in the literature on criteria for evaluating valuation methods (give refs), as well as the committee’s own deliberations.

A primary consideration in the evaluation of a method should be the extent to which the method seeks to elicit or measure a concept of value that has a consistent and transparent theoretical foundation that is appropriate for the intended use. The committee recognizes that different valuation methods are designed to measure different concepts of value, but in order for a method to be appropriate for any valuation context it must seek to measure a concept of value that is well-defined, theoretically consistent, and relevant for the particular valuation context. For example, a method derived from a biodiversity-based theory of value would not be relevant in a context where biodiversity is not

important. Similarly, legal requirements may prescribe a theory of value to be used in a particular valuation context. For example, OMB's Circular A-4 requires use of economic value where possible. Thus, the Agency should consider the theory of value underlying a particular method and its relevance when evaluating the appropriateness of using that method in a specific context.

Given that a method seeks to elicit or measure a well-defined concept of value, another over-arching criterion for evaluation is validity, i.e., how well the method measures, estimates or elicits the true value (Gregory, et al. 1993; Freeman, 2003; Fischhoff 1997). Ideally, a method should measure only what it is supposed to measure. Unfortunately, since true values are typically unobservable, other criteria must be used to assess the extent to which the method is likely to yield a measure, or at least an unbiased estimate, of the true value. Examples of criteria that provide information about the validity of a method include:

- Does the method provide estimates that capture the critical features of the relevant population's values, including how deeply they are held? To the extent that an Agency action has multiple consequences -- for example, both ecological and human health effects -- a method that captures information about values associated with both types of effects will provide a more comprehensive measure of the value of those changes. Similarly, a method that captures multiple sources of value will be more comprehensive than one that focuses on a single source of value, such as biodiversity.
- Is the method designed to measure value directly, or does it instead seek to measure a proxy for value or assess value using a constructed scale? *Ceteris paribus*, methods that seek to estimate or elicit values directly can be expected to have greater validity than those that seek to measure something that is simply correlated with value (i.e., a proxy for value) or that use a constructed scale for expressing values.
- Does the method impose demands on respondents that limit their ability to articulate values in a meaningful way? For example, does the method impose unrealistic cognitive demands on individuals expressing values? Does it allow

- those individuals to engage in the process that they would normally undertake to identify or formulate and then articulate their values?
- Does the method yield value estimates for individuals that those individuals would, if asked, consent to have used in the proposed way? Fischhoff (2000) suggests that this form of implied informed consent can help to ensure the quality of valuation data generated by a given method and to avoid inappropriate use of the resulting value estimates, by ensuring that individuals would “stand behind researchers’ interpretation of their responses” (p. 1439).
  - Does the method ensure that measured or elicited values reflect relevant scientific information? A basic premise of the valuation approach proposed by the committee is that valuation seeks to elicit or measure values that individuals would hold if well-informed about the relevant science. This does not require that all individuals expressing values know as much as scientific experts in the field, but rather that they understand as much of the science as necessary to make informed judgments. For example, they must be aware of the magnitude of the changes in ecosystem services or characteristics that would result from the ecological changes being valued.
  - Does the method yield value estimates that are responsive to changes in variables that the relevant theory suggests should be predictors of value, and invariant to changes in variables that are irrelevant to the determination of value? For example, under an economic theory of value, an increase in the quantity of the good being valued should result in an increase in the magnitude of expressed values. This form of validity has been termed “construct” validity (Freeman, 2003; Fischhoff, 1997).
  - Can value estimates generated by the method be replicated if the valuation were conducted by other researchers, at a different point in time, or in different settings that in theory should produce similar value estimates? The expressions of value should be stable in the sense that they should not change upon further reflection (Fischhoff, 1997) and are not unduly influenced by specific researcher or group characteristics (in the case of methods that involve group processes).

A basic premise of the CVPESS valuation approach is that it seeks to measure the values held by the public. Thus, another criterion for evaluating a method is whether the values that it measures are representative of the values held by the relevant population. Even if a method provides a valid estimate of an individual's values, it will not generate valid information about the values of the public if the estimated values are not representative of the values held by the broader population.

Methods can also be evaluated on the extent to which the resulting value estimates can be transparently communicated in a useful format to those who will use the value information. Decision makers and the public should be able to understand how the value measures relate to and inform the decision that needs to be made.

Finally, given the Agency's time and resource constraints, methods should also be evaluated based on the cost of implementation, including the required personnel, monetary resources, and expertise. For example, *ceteris paribus*, methods that rely on readily available secondary data will be less costly to use than those that require extensive primary data collection or deliberative interactions.

## **Attachment F: Draft text on Decision Science Approaches**

### **1.1. Decision Science Methods**

Recent research and practical work in the decision sciences has focused on ways to help structure and improve the process by which people make environmental, risk, and resource management decisions (e.g., Arvai and Gregory 2003, Failing et al. 2004, Trousdale and Gregory 2004, Gregory et al. 2006, Arvai et al. 2007). Many of these efforts are informed by research in psychology and economics, which suggests that for many unfamiliar and multiattribute decision contexts, people's preferences and preference orders are not well formed. Instead, people's preferences are constructed, rather than revealed, based on how they process certain cues that are apparent or implicit (e.g., given their own conceptualization of a problem) during the elicitation process (Payne et al. 1992, Slovic 1995, Payne et al. 1999). As a result, decision structuring processes focus on helping people to decompose complex problems; these approaches involve working with stakeholders, experts, and decision makers to clarify several steps in the decision making process, often iteratively (Arvai et al. 2001).

There are five basic steps that must be followed in a structured, multiattribute decision making process; these are (1) eliciting and structuring the objectives that will guide the evaluation of alternatives, (2) identifying attributes for each objective and operationalizing these by acquiring data that will characterize the effectiveness of the alternatives in terms of how well they meet stated objectives, (3) establishing a utility function that incorporates all of the objectives, and their related attributes, that will guide the decision, (4) eliciting weights for each attribute in the utility function, and (5) aggregating weights and utility functions in the evaluation of the contending alternatives. The overall goal of this process is to identify the optimal alternative in a set while also recognizing that important objectives will conflict; i.e., it will not be possible to optimize across all of the objectives (Keeney 1992, Keeney and Raiffa 1993).

One of the keys to these multiattribute decisions is the manner in which a decision maker addresses important value tradeoffs. Decision makers and analysts must ask, how much achievement with respect to one objective (e.g., minimizing costs) is one willing to give up in order to obtain a higher level of achievement with respect to another objective

(e.g., improving health)? Answering these kinds of questions for simple decisions may involve the informal weighing of tradeoffs in the mind or, as the complexity of the decision context increases, a more formal and explicit characterization of a value structure applied to all of the contending alternatives. Moreover, there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers to these kinds of questions; tradeoffs, by necessity, require subjective judgment on the part of those individuals or groups that are charged with addressing a given decision problem (Keeney and Raiffa 1993). Rather than focusing on finding the ‘right’ answer, the goal of a structured decision approach is to help people establish their values and preferences about alternatives via a formalized, thoughtful, and defensible process (Gregory et al. 2001).

One of the questions before this committee was to determine how lessons and approaches from multiattribute decision making could be applied to the issue of valuing the protection of ecological systems and services. It is important to note that the committee’s work with respect to answering this question did not include providing guidance about *how* EPA should make decisions. Such advice fell outside the charge of this committee.

In considering only the question of valuation, the committee believed that methods informed by multiattribute decision making could be useful to EPA. In the absence of actually *selecting* a preferred course of action (i.e., decision making), both the quantitative score (via the quantitative assessment of utility functions) and the rank ordering of alternative environmental states could be used by EPA to determine which is most “valuable”. Moreover, multiattribute methods could be applied in three comparative valuation contexts.

First, these methods could be used to help EPA evaluate alternative environmental states from a *prospective* standpoint by determining, for example, which in a range of environmental, risk, or resource management options is most likely to lead to a preferred suite of environmental outcomes. In other words, applying multiattribute methods in this way would help EPA to determine which in a set of alternative environmental states is the most valuable (i.e., *does Management Option A lead to better environmental outcomes—i.e., outcomes that are more valuable to people—than Option B?*). Second, the value of ecological systems and services may be determined *retrospectively* by

comparing attributes associated with ecosystem health or the provision of ecological services that have been realized today with those that were realized at some point in the past (i.e., *is the system being evaluated “better off” —or more valuable—today, at Time 2, than it was in the past, at Time 1?*). Third, value may be determined in a *spatial* comparison by evaluating the attributes associated with ecosystem health or the provision of ecological services in an area of interest relative to those that have been realized elsewhere (i.e., *is System A more valuable than System B?*).

The application of a valuation method that is informed by structured decision making follows the same five steps outlined above. Steps 1 and 2 are used to identify and then operationalize the suite of attributes that will characterize the ecological systems and services that are of interest. For example, people may determine the value of an estuary based on multiple, ecologically-based attributes such as the degree to which it provides nutrient exchange, the re-supply of dissolved oxygen to near-shore habitat, or nursery habitat for anadromous fish species. Similarly, the value of the estuary will also be affected by a wide range of attributes that reflect economic or social interests, such as the degree to which it provides access to commercially important species, opportunities for recreation, and lanes for shipping traffic.

Step 3 involves developing a utility function that integrates the suite of attributes (e.g., for the hypothetical estuary outlined above) and is ultimately used to estimate value associated with an environmental system. While these functions may take many forms—e.g., they may be additive, logarithmic, exponential, etc.; for a complete description, see Keeney and Raiffa (1993)—they all involve the application of a scaling or weighting variable applied to each attribute. It is these weights that help an analyst, or analysts, to address tradeoffs, essentially asking which attributes are more or less important when estimating the overall value of a system.

An analyst next elicits the weights that will be used to determine the relative importance of each attribute in the valuation exercise. Weights can be elicited from both individuals and groups; in either case it is important that weights be elicited *after* the different attributes in the utility function have been operationalized. In other words, weights should only be elicited after an analyst has obtained data that characterizes each attribute present in the utility function for the alternative systems being considered (i.e.,

for alternative plans in a *prospective* context, at all of the sites being considered in a *spatial* comparison, and for all of the times being considered in a *retrospective* analysis).

The rationale for waiting until the attributes have been operationalized is straightforward: It makes little sense to prioritize attributes until one has a sense of the magnitude of the tradeoffs that will need to be made. In many cases, for example, people will state that environmental protection is “worth it” at any price. But if pressed, they will agree that when eliminating 99% of the contaminants at a hypothetical site costs millions and eliminating the *remaining* 1% costs additional billions, the marginal improvements may, in many instances, not be worth the additional cost. Therefore, assigning weights after the attributes of value for the system of interest have been operationalized allows both the analysts and those who will be providing weights to gain a better understanding of what may (or may not) be gained by placing a higher weight on one attribute over another (Keeney 1992, Hammond et al. 1999). Once weights have been elicited, the final step in a valuation method that is informed by structured decision making is to aggregate the weights and utility functions in order to ‘score’ the systems that are being compared.

The different ways that weights may be elicited range from the relatively simple to the more complex. For illustrative purposes, four methods are described briefly here. For all of these methods, respondents are often allowed to adjust their weights across the various attributes as they become more familiar with both the elicitation procedure and the tradeoffs implied by their weights.

First, respondents may simply be asked to assign 100 *importance points* across the various attributes that will be aggregated to establish the value of a system. However, respondents often have difficulty with such tasks because they fail to adequately address the relative weight placed on each attribute. An alternative is to elicit *ratio weights*. Here, respondents are first asked to rank the various attributes from most to least important; then, starting with the least important attribute, respondents are asked to assign a specific low value such as 10. Each of the remaining attributes in the ascending set is then judged against this baseline value as multipliers of 10; e.g., the next most important attribute may be only 10% (or 1.1 times) more important while the

highest ranking attribute may be 1000% (or 10 times) more important (Borcherding et al. 1991).

In *swing weighting* respondents are presented with only the best and the worst consequences associated with each attribute and are told to assume that they are faced with a situation where the system they are evaluating possesses all of the worst consequences. They are then asked to identify which of the attributes they would most want to swing from the worst to the best consequence in order to make the largest improvement to the system. Respondents repeat this procedure for all of the attributes in the set. Once all of the attributes have been ordered in this way, respondents are typically asked to assign 100 points to highest ranking attribute with the others assigned a percentage of this weight. A weight of zero is assigned to swings on attributes from worst to best that are judged to be irrelevant (Clemen 1996, Baron 2000).

A variation on swing weighting is to ask respondents to assign weights by *pricing out* the various attributes (Borcherding et al. 1991, Clemen 1996). As with swing weighting, only the best and worst consequences associated with all of the attributes are shown. Then, respondents are asked to indicate how much they think society ought to pay in order to exchange the worst consequence for the best one. For attributes where the consequences are expressed in monetized units, the payment amounts associated with exchanging the worst consequence for the best are implied and, as a result, respondents are typically not asked to evaluate them. Elicited prices may then be converted to normalized weights prior to using them in a utility function.

In some cases—particularly when one attribute of value involves monetized costs or benefits—it may also be possible for EPA to apply a modified decision structuring approach, one that does not require the computation of a utility function. An analyst would still be required to identify all of the relevant attributes of value for a system and operationalize them. But rather than weighting these attributes in a utility function, they would instead be displayed in a consequence table that compares the consequences associated with each attribute across the systems of interest (i.e., in a prospective, retrospective, or spatial context). An analyst would then ask respondents to swap non-monetized attributes with either monetized benefits or costs.

For example, one could ask which of two water management programs more valuable: A hypothetical EPA program that restricts activities in a watershed by 25% and results in net benefits to users of \$10 million or a different state-run program that restricts activities by 22% and results in net benefits of \$8 million. Here an analyst would focus respondents' attention on the state run program and ask them what level of additional monetary benefits would justify an increase in restrictions from 22% to 25%. An increase in judged benefits of less than \$2 million would imply that the benefits of the state-run program was more valuable to respondents than the EPA program and vice versa. This approach to evaluating tradeoffs, termed *even swaps* (Hammond et al. 1998, Hammond et al. 1999), can—and has been—used when comparing systems with 2 or more attributes.

- Arvai, J. L., and R. Gregory. 2003. Testing alternative decision approaches for identifying cleanup priorities at contaminated sites. *Environmental Science & Technology* **37**:1469-1476.
- Arvai, J. L., R. Gregory, and T. McDaniels. 2001. Testing a structured decision approach: Value-focused thinking for deliberative risk communication. *Risk Analysis* **21**:1065-1076.
- Arvai, J. L., R. Gregory, and M. Zaksek. 2007. Improving wildfire risk management decisions. *in* W. Martin, I. Martin, and C. Raish, editors. *Wildfire and Fuels Management: Human Perceptions and Management Implications*. RFF Press, Washington, DC.
- Baron, J. 2000. Measuring value tradeoffs: problems and some solutions. *in* E. U. Weber, J. Baron, and G. Loomes, editors. *Conflict and Tradeoffs in Decision Making: Essays in Honor of Jane Beattie*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Borcherding, K., T. Eppel, and D. von Winterfeldt. 1991. Comparison of weighting judgments in multiattribute utility measurement. *Management Science* **37**:1603-1619.
- Clemen, R. T. 1996. *Making Hard Decisions: An Introduction to Decision Analysis*. PWS-Kent Publishing Co., Boston, MA.
- Failing, L., G. Horn, and P. Higgins. 2004. Using expert judgment and stakeholder values to evaluate adaptive management options. *Ecology and Society* **9**:13-32.

- Gregory, R., J. L. Arvai, and T. McDaniels. 2001. Value-focused thinking for environmental risk consultations. *Research in Social Problems and Public Policy* **9**:249-275.
- Gregory, R., L. Failing, and P. Higgins. 2006. Adaptive management and environmental decision making: A case study application to water use planning. *Ecological Economics* **58**:434-447.
- Hammond, J., R. L. Keeney, and H. Raiffa. 1999. *Smart Choices: A Practical Guide to Making Better Decisions*. Harvard Business School Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Hammond, J. S., R. L. Keeney, and H. Raiffa. 1998. Even swaps: A rational method for making trade-offs. *Harvard Business Review* **76**:137-138, 143-148, 150.
- Keeney, R. L. 1992. *Value-focused Thinking. A Path to Creative Decision Making*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Keeney, R. L., and H. Raiffa. 1993. *Decisions with multiple objectives: Preferences and value tradeoffs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Payne, J. W., J. R. Bettman, and E. J. Johnson. 1992. Behavioral decision research: A constructive processing perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology* **43**:87-132.
- Payne, J. W., J. R. Bettman, and D. A. Schkade. 1999. Measuring constructed preferences: Towards a building code. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* **19**:243-270.
- Slovic, P. 1995. The construction of preference. *American Psychologist* **50**:364-371.
- Trousdale, W., and R. Gregory. 2004. Property evaluation and biodiversity conservation: Decision support for making hard choices. *Ecological Economics* **48**:279-291.

**Attachment G: Committee Members' Comments for November C-VPES  
Teleconferences**

**Comments from Member of the SAB Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPES) for Teleconferences on November 19 and 20, 2007 – (Alphabetical Order)**

**Comments Included**

<b>Comments from Dr. Gregory Biddinger .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>Comments from Dr. Terry Daniel.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Comments from Dr. A. Myrick Freeman .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Comments from Dr. Louis Pitelka .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Comments from Dr. Paul Slovic .....</b>	<b>31</b>

---

**Comments from Dr. Gregory Biddinger**

(For section 6.2, language for describing the gap between traditional and the CVPES approaches.) Lets try the following sentences inserted on page 145 line 10 after the words " have been identified".

..... The process outlined in figure 8 and the text that follows, starts from a premise that at the onset we need to define what we want the site to be after remediation and redevelopment and need to identify what ecological services are to be preserved, restored or enhanced for use by the local community in that future use scenario. This differs from the more traditional practice which initially focuses on the type, degree and extent of chemical contamination in various media on the site and asks what human and ecological receptors are currently exposed and therefore at risk under current chemical conditions. In the more traditional approach, the data collection for the site characterization step captures the degree and pattern of chemical contamination in various media across the site but does not collect information about the ecological condition of the site nor the value of any services associated with the site in its current or proposed future conditions. Additionally, in the traditional approach the conceptual model that defines the exposure pathways to key receptors and therefore guides the design of the risk analysis is based on assumptions under current conditions rather than future conditions. This can lead to a risk assessment that selects receptors which are sensitive under current conditions but may not be sensitive nor important receptors under alternative future use scenarios. Additionally following this logic focuses the remedy evaluation and selection process step on controlling the risks under current use. In the end the traditional approach is assuming that risk reduction and management are the ultimate performance goals rather than optimized reuse value for the community. Such an approach may leave the community feeling the risk is gone but not clear on the value

gained by the clean-up. Integrating future use considerations and a focus on value generation will lead to better outcomes which will satisfy the public. To accomplish this metamorphosis of the tradition it is essential to find ways to introduce estimates of value and ecological service into management strategy and associated analytical processes.

(break paragraph here).

As is clearly shown, .....

### **Comments from Dr. Terry Daniel**

The writers are to be congratulated for achieving a general and eclectic description of criteria for evaluating the appropriateness of different methods for assessing the value of ecosystems and services. As is duly noted, specific criteria will depend upon the specific contexts, including the types of values that are at issue and the roles that these values are to play in decision making. There is a danger that the guidelines offered may be viewed as too general to be of much use in any particular application, but the recommendation that the Agency make the selection and evaluation of assessment methods an explicit component of any policy deliberation and decision making process seems to go about as far as is possible without specifying the particular context.

page 1, line 21-22

“... in the specific **valuation** context **at hand** of assessing the values of ecosystems and services, where no methods have yet been tested by extensive experience.”

page 2, line 4-6

“... whether **a** survey methods **in general** can appropriately ... specific survey was actually properly **and** executed so as to estimate or elicit the **particular** intended values.

page 2, line 31

“... value where possible, **based on OMB’s current interpretation of the type of values that were intended by Executive Order 12866 and 13422.**

page 3, line 18

“... value, such as **only biodiversity or human health or individual willingness-to-pay.**

page 3, line 19-24

[What is meant by “estimate or elicit values **directly**”? Does this assume (contrary to substantial research literature) that people can be expected to know what they value and can express this value (these values) accurately when asked directly to do so? Does this section imply that “revealed preferences” (an indirect reflection of values) should be assumed to be less valid than “expressed preferences” (a direct statement of values)?]

page 4, line 13

“... changes being valued, as well as the implications of those changes for themselves and for others.”

page 4, line 23

“... similar value estimates? For methods that claim to achieve an absolute measure of value, replication requires a “match” in indices, while for methods that claim only a relative measure of value replication can be demonstrated by a correlation between indices.

[This may be too fine a point for this context (and too poorly made by the sentence offered), but some of the methods we recommend do make stronger claims than others on the extent to which measures of value are intended to be absolute and transsituational. For example it would not generally be considered a successful replication if w-t-p (in dollars) measures differed substantially in absolute magnitude, even if the measures showed a high positive correlation across some common set of policy alternatives. On the other hand, measures based on rating scales are not generally required to show an absolute match, and a high correlation across the relevant range of policy alternatives is accepted as an indication of successful replication.]

page 4, line 24

“... should be stable (i.e., reliable) in the sense...”

page 4, line 28 to page 5, line 2

[This point potentially conflicts with the point made above (page 4, line 6-8) regarding the goal of determining “well-informed” values. If, as we have often assumed/declared, the general public is often not well-informed about many of the ecosystems/services values that EPA seeks to assess, then the values expressed by a well-informed individual cannot be “representative” of public values. The earlier section made clear that the C-VPESS believes that EPA policy should be based on assessments of values that the public “would hold if it were well informed,” i.e., the target of assessments should be the values of a hypothetical well-informed public, not the actual (ill-informed) public. This section does not clearly maintain that distinction.

While on this point (again), there might be contexts in which the EPA would want to assess the actual values of the public as they exist—whether well- or ill-informed. In addition, it is not always easy to determine who is “well-informed” and who is not, as there can be legitimate disagreements among very highly trained scientists/experts (which expert opinion should set the standard for a well-informed public?) and it is quite common for people who are equally well informed (and substantively in agreement on the facts) to disagree vehemently on the “values.” C-VPESS has debated this issue in a number of forms and a number of ways, and we are not likely to resolve it in this final document. Perhaps we could acknowledge the distinction and admit that the values of well-informed publics may be more relevant in some contexts and the values of ill- or variously-informed publics may be more appropriate in other contexts.]

page 5, line 9-11

[The point of this paragraph is important, but it could be misinterpreted (or misused) to encourage further reliance on ill-fitting benefits transfers and other handy-but-inadequate and inappropriate data about ecosystems/services values, and discourage investment in the development and trial of a wider menu of methods as we have recommended. Because assessments of the value of ecosystems/services is still relatively new, the Agency, and their funders and regulators, must expect to spend a bit more time and money developing, testing and applying new methods to get new value-relevant data.]

### **Comments from Dr. A. Myrick Freeman**

Here are my comments on the Decision Science Write up. I am assuming that it is the same as what was sent out in October. I haven't had time to read this version to confirm that.

1. This is a clear statement;
2. it looks as if it is supposed to go in Chapter 4. But if so, it is too long. So perhaps it should replace the material now in Appendix B..
3. In any case:
  - it does not include a critical assessment of strengths and limitations;
  - it does not mention the potential influence that the choice of a facilitator can have on the results;
  - it doesn't explicitly link the method to the valuation task, that is, to measuring the contribution to human well-being;
  - its focus is on the single decision maker; but the valuation task as we see it is likely to involve a group of diverse stakeholders who might not always reach a consensus. This problem should be discussed. See the paper by David Schkade, Cass Sunstein, and Reid Hastie, Chicago Law and Economics Working Paper 06-19 that I circulated many months ago. This paper should be cited.

### **Comments from Dr. Louis Pitelka**

I read the new sections but do not have any comments.

### **Comments from Dr. Paul Slovic**

1)p3,line5.I strongly object to the term "true value".Better to say that validity refers to the degree to which a method measures what it is supposed to measure.Perhaps "underlying construct" was what was intended here. The underlying construct of "value" is not directly observable but can be estimated through the use of appropriate,ie valid, methods.

2)p3,lines19-24.I object to the idea that methods that elicit values directly can be expected to have greater validity than those that measure something correlated with

value (such correlation is the essence of construct validity) or that use a constructed scale. Every method entails the construction of value in some way! What is needed is a method that constructs value in a logical, defensible way. That is what multiattribute methods aim to do.

3)p4, lines 21-26. Yes, replicability and stability are important. A related but equally important criterion is "procedure invariance". Logically equivalent methods of measuring value should lead to equivalent results. Willingness to pay methods, for example, sometimes fail this criterion. People have been found to be willing to pay more for state A than state B, but to claim that B is more valuable to them.



Attachment H: **UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**  
**WASHINGTON D.C. 20460**

**OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR  
SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD**

October 12, 2007

Note to Members of the SAC Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services

From: Angela Nugent, Designated Federal Officer

Please find attached three sets of “informal review comments” requested by the SAB Staff Office, in consultation with the C-VPESSE Chair and Vice-Chair, to aid the committee in determining revisions to be made to the September 18, 2007 C-VPESSE report. I requested review comments from three experts who either have served or are currently serving with SAB committees or panels: Dr. Roger Kasperson (Clark University), Dr. Duncan Patten (Montana State University), and Dr. James Opaluch (University of Rhode Island).

The SAB Staff Office requested that they focus their comments on: 1) the reasonableness of the advice and general approach recommended in the report; 2) whether descriptions of valuation methods and their applications contain any technical errors; and 3) whether descriptions of ecological science and its use in valuation contain any technical errors.

There will be a more formal technical review when the chartered SAB conducts a Quality Review of the C-VPESSE draft, but I hope these comments will provide the committee now with fresh perspectives and insights on the current draft. I am grateful to the reviewers for their willingness to review the draft within the tight time constraints necessitated by the upcoming teleconference and I hope their comments will be useful to you.

Attachments (3)

"Roger Kasperson" <rkasperson@clarku.edu>  
10/10/2007 02:03 PM To  
Angela Nugent/DC/USEPA/US@EPA  
cc

bcc

Subject  
C=VRESS Report

Angela, I have done a fast review of this very substantial report which merits a closer review than I have been able to do in the limited time. But here are some big picture comments to begin.

Some Major Positives.

1. Overall. This is a very high quality study which should be very valuable to the Agency. In particular, I appreciate very much

a. the broad scope of treatment. The narrow scope given in the past to the very range of issues has been perhaps the major deficiency

b. the call for a well-developed conceptual model to ground the Agency's work. It is hard for me to see significant high-quality work on the valuation issues without such a conceptual model. That said, it would be helpful if the Committee could provide more guidance on how such a model could be designed.

c. the discussion of uncertainty is very important and thoughtful. But is also seems somewhat buried in this report. Should it be a separate chapter, or, shortof that, given more visibility? You cannot find it in the Table of Contents, for example.

d. the discussion of methods, supported by the lengthy Appendix, is probably the best treatment currently available anywhere.

e. I also appreciate the Committee's structuring around 3 major domains of EPA work.

2. It may seem strange coming from me, an academic, but I worry a bit about the abstract nature of the report. Despite the Committee's good intentions, I do think the report comes across as quite abstract, and not as pragmatic or applied as it might be. So I wonder how much it will be used. More examples throughout would be helpful and in particular one well worked-out example of a case with the implementation steps recommended on page 39 would be very helpful. A model case showing how the Committee's recommended procedure could be done in one separate chapter would be invaluable. This should include a conceptual model.

3. The big problem in the report, in my view, is Chapter 7, Recommendations and Conclusions. It does not do justice to a fine report. I see it as currently a mish-mash of findings, conclusions, observations, and recommendations. I count 24 bolded items in this chapter and I have no idea whether they are findings, conclusions, or recommendations, or Committee

perceptions. Suggest a substantial rewrite and tightening of this chapter, with clear linkages between any conclusions or recommendations and where the supporting evidence can be found in the preceding chapters. I like a format sometimes used in NAS reports where a numbered conclusion is set forth, a paragraph of justification follows, and then a numbered, related recommendation is stated. Ideally, the numbers of such principal conclusions and recommendations should be perhaps 8-10, not 24. Statements that the Committee "believes" this or that are ambiguous. This chapter needs a major reworking so that it is worthy of a very good report.

Roger



society (e.g., changes in catch and perhaps lifestyle), where the values are defined as in Appendix A of the report.

It might then be useful to use this in organizing and clarifying the potential contribution of various methods discussed in the report. For example, pure bio-physical methods might quantify ecosystem effects and the resultant changes in ecosystem functions, but are unlikely to quantify fully the losses in services to society, and almost certainly are not capable of providing comprehensive measures of losses in social values. Thus, bio-physical methods are essential contributors to analyses of changes in ecosystem values that are the subject of EPA analyses, but are not themselves valuation methods. Thus, bio-physical methods focus on stages (2), (3), and possibly part of stage (4) of the problem as laid out above.

Conversely, social valuation methods are unlikely to be able to resolve complex ecosystem effects, or the resultant changes in biological functions. Rather, these methods focus on stages (4) and (5). Thus, valuation studies clearly require supporting analyses from natural scientists. As is pointed out in the report, the general public often has a poor understanding of the natural systems, and their judgment of the functioning of these systems should not serve as the basis for EPA decisions. I liken this to air travel. I would never fly on a plane that is designed according to a survey of the general public. Rather, I hold greater trust in the expertise of trained engineers.

As an aside, I applaud the statement to that effect on page 19, line 22. It is very important for the Agency to keep mind that, while natural scientists have much to contribute to helping us understand the functioning of ecological systems, the preferences of natural scientists should not dictate social values.

Within this framework, I would argue that public opinions and attitudes elicited from approaches like focus groups are most useful in scoping studies that might identify service flows that are socially important, but are probably less useful quantifying values. For example, Table 7 on page 230 shows a series of questions and importance ratings. While this provides some generic information on public issues of concern, it is unclear how this information could be used to support a specific decision. Should total expenditure of the US Forest Service budget be proportional to these importance ratings? Should the importance rating be used to determine whether or not to develop a particular road? If so, this means that no new roads would be developed in forest and grasslands, since it only has an importance rating of 2.62, while conserving forests and grasslands have an importance rating of 4.73. Thus, while this kind of attitude survey might provide some useful information about general public concerns, the results are not specific enough to answer particular policy questions. So I would argue that the approach might help identify important service flows, but not for quantifying values in a manner appropriate to answer particular policy questions.

I would argue that “values” cannot be expressed on biophysical units, rather ecosystem functions or perhaps service flows might be expressed in bio-physical units (e.g., Page 20, line 8 and lines 11-12). This means that the “valuation” and the ecology must be carried out separately, and both are needed to value ecosystem changes.

A framework of this sort might also allow the committee to place a strengthen the foundation for their recommendation that multiple techniques are complementary, not only because some techniques are more useful than others in identifying particular values, but also because multiple techniques are required to fully quantify many of the individual values.

## (2) Explicit Recognition of Decisions Faced by EPA

I think the report might also have benefited by a more explicit recognition that ecosystem valuation analyses are targeted to answer specific questions faced by EPA. This implies that, at least in some cases, analyses don't necessarily have to be complete to provide the information needed to answer a particular question. To continue the example of Table 7 in the Report, if a policy question is faced on whether to allow logging, and one could show that the lost recreational values alone exceed the net value of logging, one could conclude that logging is not justified without determining all the remaining ecosystem effects. It is important to note, of course, that the converse is not true. But at least in some cases, incomplete information is sufficient to resolve a policy question faced by EPA. It would be inappropriate to expend a large effort to analyze the full suite of values, when the correct decision becomes clear with only a subset of values.

## (3) Report Does Not Give Balanced Criticisms of Methods

The committee has, in some places, taken a very narrow view of the contributions of economics to valuation, and indeed in some cases the report reads like some panel members have a chip on their shoulder regarding economic methods. I believe that the report could be more balanced in its discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of different methods. The report discusses at some length, and in many different places, the perceived shortcomings of economic methods, while by-and-large providing a much less critical eye towards other methods that are presented. For example, throughout the report, it indicates that economic analysis assumes perfect rationality (P16 L27), well-formed preferences (P17 L1), is based solely on anthropocentric values (P79 L13), ignores civic values (P16 L2), reflect only self-interest (P16, L25), values are expressed in monetary terms (P15 L33), require individuals to express values in monetary terms that might be considered offensive (P22 L16), are restricted to monetary values to individuals in their roles as consumers (P194, L21), etc.

Yet, other methods are presented almost uncritically, or at least any criticisms are much more muted and far more difficult to find. This makes the report appear unbalanced—aside from the fact that I don't agree with some of these points (I include more discussion on this later). Although the report mentions some shortcomings of these approaches, it does so in far less obvious and critical terms than it does economic methods. For example, the report discusses methods like citizen juries. Citizen juries have the advantage that participants spend a considerable amount of time studying an issue, thereby potentially educating participants regarding some of the complexities being faced. However, juries have the well-known limitation of being subject to manipulation by eloquent and skillful participants. We are all aware of horror stories of outlandish jury awards. I don't mean to imply that the citizen jury approach should be rejected. Simply that the report does not have a balanced discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach.

Another example is the energy-based methods of valuation, which are presented far more uncritically. The report could have observed that energy analysis is based on the assumption that all forms of (excess) energy are equally valued, independent of their form. So, for example, per unit values of energy used to support microbes or the smallpox virus are same as per unit value of energy that supports humans, blue whales and tigers. Emergy analysis would imply, for example, that there is great value to be obtained by dumping untreated sewage into Lake Tahoe, thereby greatly increase emergy content of that highly oligatrophic lake. Yet, the town of South Lake Tahoe was required by EPA to install very expensive secondary and tertiary treatment methods specifically to avoid increasing biological productivity of Lake Tahoe. Emergy analysis would seem to imply that rapid global warming is of great benefit to the earth, since it will increase the energy content of the global system from which organisms can draw. Thus, global warming could potentially greatly increase emergy content of the global system. Yet, even if this were true, one would not argue EPA policy should encourage increased emissions of greenhouse gases in order to increase global emergy. It would be a great error for EPA policy to be based on emergy analysis. Indeed, emergy analysis would seem to violate everyone one of the Report's key recommendations for valuation, as expressed on pages 57-58. Nevertheless, there have been advocates for emergy analysis within EPA.

Yet criticism of Emergy analysis is difficult to find within the report, and rather muted (albeit fairly damning). Indeed, to the contrary, the report states on Page 18, line 20 that valuation based on energy flows are based indirectly on public preferences. I don't understand the reasoning behind this claim, unless the committee sees energy flows as contributing one part of the problem, such as stage (2) in the framework above.

Although I believe that the analysis of flows of energy and materials through a system can provide useful information, these approaches cannot be viewed as measuring values, as values are defined by the report in Appendix A. A framework such as that discussed in my item (1) above would provide a basis for inclusion of these types of values. Although an accounting of energy and materials flows through ecosystems might provide some useful information about ecosystem functioning, it does not provide a measure of values.

Judgment and attitude based methods are similarly based on assumptions of perfect knowledge, otherwise judgment and attitudes could be equally misleading as economic methods. Although social deliberative process are the basis of democratic society, they are subject to manipulation by a vocal and highly motivated minority, who seek their own personal benefit.

All methods have shortcomings, but the discussion in the first Chapter only points out shortcomings of economic techniques, and not other methods. This does not indicate a balanced review of valuation methods. Citizen-juries have potential, but judgments of juries have well known problems.

#### (4) The Report Adopts a Very Narrow View of Economic Methods

Throughout the report, a very narrow view of economic methods is adopted, assuming economic approaches only use monetary valuation methods. In fact, the foundation of economic approaches to valuation is *preference oriented*, not money, and there is a considerable and rapidly growing body of economic studies that focus on non-monetary means of valuation.

Admittedly, EPA may not have widely adopted the techniques to date, but the report criticizes not EPA's choice of methods (often driven by regulations), but economic methods.

For example, conjoint analysis and other choice-based approaches have been employed by economists for over two decades, and is a rapidly growing area of research. Indeed, choice-based approaches to economic valuation has arguably been the most heavily researched area of economic valuation over the past decade. Choice-based methods are based on the same concept of relative preference over alternative commodities described for attitude and judgment based approaches indicated on Page 17 Line 26. But choice-based economic methods are also consistent with, but do not require, valuation in monetary terms. Similarly, habitat equivalency analysis can also be formulated in a manner that is entirely consistent with economic theory, and use of HEA methods was first suggested by economists, and have been embodied into regulations under the service-to-service equivalency. See, for example, Mazzotta, Opaluch, and Grigalunas, 1993; 1994, Unsworth and Bishop 1994; Matthews et al, 1995.

#### (5) Benefit Transfer

The committee correctly places great attention to benefit transfer methods, given that most valuation analyses carried out by EPA are not based on new primary studies. Given its importance, should the report place greater emphasis on the need for EPA to improve benefit transfer methods. Given that most valuation studies are based on benefit transfer due to limitations in time and cost, how can EPA employ the far more extensive method suggested by the panel? Either we need to think about how non-economic methods can be transferred, or the panel should say strongly that more resources should be allocated to valuation, or most likely, both.

Given its practical importance, I would amply the recommendation that EPA should support research to improve benefit transfer. Should EPA be advised to fund a research program to test transferability of values (economic or otherwise), to design values estimates that are specifically designed to be more reliably transferred, and to estimate values systematically to cover the range of services that EPA must regularly value. This would provide a "catalog" of values that could be transferred. It is also important that these values be regularly updated to stay current and to insure that studies are based on state-of-the-art methods.

Page 91, line 6. I'm not sure I would agree that little attention had been paid to the challenges and limitations of benefits transfer prior to 2000. For example, in 1992 there were three key events focused on benefits transfer. First, NOAA hosted a workshop directed towards developing databases to support benefits transfer, and EPA compiled a bibliography of the NOAA environmental benefits studies. Water Resources Research published a special section that was dedicated to papers addressing key issues related to benefits transfer, and AERE held a workshop entitled "Benefits Transfer: Procedures Problems and Research Needs" funded by US EPA, NOAA and USDA.

#### (6) Defining Non-Anthropocentric Values

I fear it is misguided to base the definition of anthropocentric values on whether something effects human well-being, if "well-being" is broadly defined to include such thing as economic

nonuse values (Page 13, Line 1-2). I fear that this definition makes the distinction between anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric values purely semantic. For example, suppose I hold value for endangered species, and I believe that they should be protected for their own sake. Is my psychic “well-being” affected if a new law is passed which strengthens protection provided to endangered species? According to the report, this is an anthropocentric value if it based on the economic concept of nonuse values since it affects my well-being, but is otherwise nonanthropocentric. In economic theory, if I think something is important, and I am willing to sacrifice for it, then it is modeled as affecting my well-being (utility). It is not possible to determine whether something effects “well-being”, unless well being is defined narrowly to include only direct effects, such as recreation or health effects. If I voluntarily give money to the poor or if I vote for a provision to increase my taxes to support the homeless, am I making myself “worse off”, or am I doing it to improve my psychic well-being because I care about the poor and homeless? I would argue the distinction is purely semantic.

I believe that one could equally well define these actions as increasing one’s own well-being, simply by saying that my well-being includes concern for others. In this case, the distinction between whether or not a voluntary action increases one’s own well being is purely semantic. So the concept of nonuse value could equally well be defined as “anthropocentric” or “non-anthropocentric” depending on whether one accounts for an individual’s concern for other species.

An alternative way of thinking about anthropocentric values is to distinguish between “weakly” non-anthropocentric and “strongly” non-anthropocentric. A weakly non-anthropocentric value is a value that is ascribed to an entity by humans, but that does not relate directly to human use of a natural entity. For example, many people feel strongly that conservation of blue whales, endangered species, unique natural features (e.g., Grand Canyon), free flowing rivers, healthy ecosystems and pristine wilderness, above and beyond any present or future use by the individual or by people in general. This value is non-anthropocentric, in that it does not depend upon the effect of the resource on people, but is weakly non-anthropocentric since the value is ascribed by humans. Thus, the value exists because and only because it is held by people.

A strongly non-anthropocentric value is a value that exists as a Universal Truth, and is beyond determination by people, but rather is imposed on people by some greater Truth. This is underlies the notion of true “intrinsic” values, which are values that an entity holds irrespective of how it related to others, or what is believed by others.

People cannot gain insights into strongly non-anthropocentric values except by seeing “into the mind of the Creator”. This is a form of religion. Of course, it is always possible that individuals believe that non-human species have value endowed by a Creator, which serves as their basis for ascribing value. But the value lies in the beliefs by the members of society, and is not imposed on a society that does not share that belief. Many animal rights extremists would conform to this latter view, that the intrinsic value of all species is a right that should be imposed on society irrespective of the beliefs of the members of society. I would argue that “strongly” non-anthropocentric values are based on religious faith, and should not guide EPA policy.

I think this distinction is important, because I believe that many with a biocentric viewpoint hold to the strong non-anthropocentric value that is a form of religion. Furthermore, this distinction helps to separate out “values” that are based on expert judgment (including preferences of

scientists), rather than social values. Furthermore, with this distinction, nonuse values as defined by economists are weakly non-anthropocentric, and specifically not anthropocentric. I firmly believe that the notion of whether nonuse values contribute to human well-being is not a meaningful one.

Many of the approaches described are just as “anthropocentric” as are economic methods, but this is only pointed out when discussing economic methods. For example, Section 4.1.3 describes “Methods of Attitudes Preferences and Intentions” which are anthropocentric.

I think the term “intrinsic values” is misplaced. An intrinsic value is a value of something in and of itself, without consideration of how others are affected. Humans can hold values for existence of something, but this is not “intrinsic”, but rather the value ascribed to an held by another. In my view, insights into intrinsic values are either purely speculative or obtained by seeing into the mind of a Supreme Being, which is a religious value. EPA should not be driven by religious values. (Top of page 13). (Bottom of page 13). (Bottom of page 14).

## **Review of Draft SAB C-VPES Report “Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services” Provided by Duncan Patten, Montana State University**

General Comments: This is a comprehensive report that obviously has been written by a team. This results in some wordy sections but perhaps wordiness is appropriate for a difficult topic. The approach taken by the committee seems appropriate, that is, an overview, a general approach with a more specific expansion of steps, overview of existing methods, addressing uncertainties, case studies, and general recommendations. This reviewer could not find what one might consider any fatal flaws in the report, although there are many smaller issues that might be addressed in revision.

The more specific review comments below expand on many marginal notes made during reading of the report. Some of the review comments may seem repetitive but if so, then concern for that particular issue may be greater than others. The comments are based on Chapters and Sections of the Report.

### Chapter 1. Introduction.

Brief and to the point and leads the reader into the body of the report.

### Chapter 2. Conceptual Framework.

A good but somewhat tedious background to ecosystem services and valuation with some good examples and suggestions as to application to EPA.

Some text has suggestions as to valuation of “benefits” but not much mention of costs (e.g., page 7, lines 15-22).

Recognition of boarder aspects of ecosystem services is good as many people only think of direct benefits to humans, not indirect benefits such as ecosystem processes that may result in human benefits. It is also good to bring into the valuation picture intrinsic values versus instrumental values. It is also important to recognize that different individuals and disciplines think of the concept of value differently. Throughout the text, this idea is developed but perhaps might be more emphasized earlier in the text.

Constraints on EPA are recognized (page 25, lines 16-26) but how important are these to overall valuation guidelines if EPA constraints change?

In the Integrated and Expanded Approach, the report focused on EPA where there is an environmental protection decision to be made. Like many other places in this report where decisions are addressed, the process often emphasizes protection but this implies the system is “not broken”. Many other comments on using valuation in the text talk about ecosystem “change”. The committee needs to address the use of the word “change” because in many places (to be pointed out later), what is really being addressed is ecosystem “response” to some action. The response may be “no change”.

Figure 1 (page 32) shows a model that directly ties values to decision making and problem formulation. There should be an additional circle in the model between “values” and “decision making” which would be “analysis of values”. This then leads to final decision making or side tracks to more “problem formulation”.

The “Approach” presented in pages 32-33 does not obviously fit with the conceptual model in Figure 1. The committee should consider another more detailed diagram that depicts the steps used in the “approach”. These are not obvious in Model Figure 1 unless they somehow are combined in “problem formulation”.... This needs to be made clear.

Page 35 the report mentions that ecological models have been developed for purposes other than EPA policy and regulation, usually research. It would be useful here to mention the need to adapt these models or create appropriate models. This is mentioned and recommended later in the chapter.

Page 37 line 10 is a good example of the use of value of “ecological change”. If one uses EISs as examples, there is a “no action” component. This might create no change, or the action itself might create no change, thus using the concept of “ecological response” or “ecosystem response” might be more accurate. In some places the use of “change” is appropriate but the use of this term must be used cautiously.

Figure 2, page 40 shows just one feedback to problem formulation. The committee should consider other feedback loops such as from (4) Projection of Changes in Ecosystem Services to (1) Problem formulation or at any step that might generate new information or concepts. The feedback from (5) Measurement of changes to Problem Formulation is appropriate.

In summary, the approach is designed for integration but the models and discussion appears more linear than it might be.

### Chapter 3: Building a Foundation for Ecological Valuation

This chapter discusses use of conceptual models, operationalizing the models and development of ecological production functions, this latter considered the “best” approach to valuation of ecosystem services. One note prior to reading this was that the reviewer was to look for addressing actions that had positive, negative and no-changes. This was to address the reviewers concern that all EPA action leads to “change” which is not necessarily true.

Page 47, line 28. The point made here for “iteration and possible model changes and refinement over time” is major and needs to be reemphasized whenever appropriate.

The discussion of model development and selection is well done but more examples might help the user of this report. Many people have no idea what really constitutes a “conceptual model” whether it is a diagram, complex set of interactive thoughts, etc.

Page 53, line 16. What does “that model will need to be parameterized for the specific valuation context of interest” mean? Perhaps for the non-bureaucrat a definition of “parameterization” needs to be given with examples.

Two important recommendations are hidden in the text. Page 53, line 31 use of models, and Page 54, line 13, selection of model criteria. These are repeated in summary but it seems they need to be highlighted in the text as they are important.

This chapter uses change over and over. The implication to the reader is that valuation requires some change, that one can only put values on things or processes that change. Is this true???? This is implied in lines 9-16 page 55 in the discussion of identifying relevant outputs.

Page 56, line 4. Who or what are stakeholders? They may be public, decision makers, land owners, etc. For the good of this report, they “players” might be better defined.

Page 58-59. A good discussion of possible differences between indicators, endpoints and ecosystem services. Might this be more emphasized?

Page 60, line 20. 3.3.3. The reviewer suggests a change in heading based on concern for use of “change”.... Mapping Changes in Ecological Inputs to Sustainability of Ecological Services..... this recognizes the concept of ecological integrity.

Page 61, line 22. This definition of indicator is a very limited definition. It could also be “a state that tells something about a process” and there are more definitions of indicators. This should be recognized here.

Page 62, line 17. An indicator is not a metric. A metric is what is measured to quantify an indicator.

Page 64, line 16. The report needs to recognize the potential subjectivity of “report cards”.

Page 65, line 19. Meta-analysis discussion implies index or indices (e.g., IBI...Karr is referenced). Should this be recognized?

Page 67. The reviewer seriously questions the applicability of NEON to EPA valuation procedures for ecosystem services. Does the committee really believe this?

Chapter conclusions and recommendations are good, but here again, the committee should consider not using “change” as the only outcome of some action.

## Chapter 4. Methods for Assessing Value

The reviewer is not familiar with all the methods presented and discussed and assumes several committee members are well versed in these methods thus the reviewer will make few comments here.

One is that the discussion of “benefits transfer” is well done and addresses many concerns about the method. The committee in its recommendations also appropriately cautions EPA in the use of this method.

## Chapter 5. Cross-Cutting Issues

This chapter addresses “uncertainty” and “communication”. These two points are probably two of the most important components of this report.

The discussion of uncertainties in ecological valuation is probably so important that this concept should be addressed at several earlier steps in this report. Even development of conceptual models in Chapter 2 is laced with uncertainties and steps in the integrated approach also.

Many points made in discussing uncertainties at times need to be emphasized. One that comes to mind is one dealing with use of experts and that they all might agree but all be wrong. This is important because use of “expert opinion” is such a useful tool when other quantitative data are not readily available.

Section 5.2.3 seems repetitive but perhaps that is useful as a way of emphasizing both communication and uncertainty.

The recommendations at the end of this chapter should have some statements about “uncertainties” not just “communicating ecological valuation information”.

## Chapter 6. Applying the Approach in Three EPA Decision Contexts.

This chapter elaborates on three key features of the approach applied to three different “cases”. The features are (1) early identification of impacts important to people, (2) predicting ecological change (should this be “ecological response”?), and (3) use of multiple methods. The three cases are national, local and regional.

One general issue with the recommendations is that only for the regional approach does the committee recommend in detail what EPA needs to do about staffing, etc. On a national basis shouldn't there also be some expansion of an office that would be able to follow through on the approach to valuation, while on the local level, EPA needs to better be able to aid the community or local constituents which means having some kind of

SWAT team available for such actions. If these are addressed in the text, it is not obvious.

National Valuation...The CAFO case. The reviewer found himself constantly circling the word “change” in this section where “response” or “output”, or “consequences” might be better words.

Page 120, lines 11 and 12. How is use of experts and the public different from “mediated modeling”?

Page 121, line 25. Good point about links between stressors and ecosystem services not being fully understood.

Page 124, lines 4-9. How does EPA select a model that applies nationally and yet has sufficient detail to help the process? It can be done but might be explained. As pointed out in line 26, the site specific nature of many ecological impacts makes a national assessment difficult.

Page 125, line 8. Is the conceptual model of a system as Figure 6 useful or is the problem too general for a national model?

This case study of CAFO discusses water quality but should also address air quality and perhaps quality of localities near cattle feed lots. This is brought into the conceptual model discussion on page 133, lines 6-11 but should be mentioned earlier such as at page 129, line 9.

Site-Specific Valuation (Superfund sites, Mines, etc.)

This section presents a model of approach but does not mention or present a model of the system (or typical system). Both models are necessary for adequate understanding. Another place a model would be useful is to “align risk endpoints with ecosystem services” (page 147 line 21.)

Finally in section 6.2.3.3 there is a recommendation to construct models. The points made here need to be made in steps 6.2.1 and Figure 7.

The use of the bulleted list of recommendations on page 166 is a good list and this approach might be used throughout and perhaps in an Executive Summary, remembering that there is a discussion of recommendations at the end of the report.

Valuation in Regional Partnerships

There may be a need to have a better distinction between local or site specific examples that might have broader impacts, for example on water quality, and regional examples

such as a watershed which also relates to water. Can this be explained at the beginning of this section or beginning of chapter?

How representative is the Chicago Wilderness study of regional problems throughout the country or was it one that EPA worked with? Explain.

How representative is the SE Ecological Framework Project if it does not attempt to combine economic and ecologic analyses (page 186, line 6)? This project has a deep scientific foundation in conservation but did not do valuation. One is not certain of its applicability here unless this is better explained.

The primary recommendations for the regional case studies is for more staffing and funds for EPA regions. Is this appropriate guidance as to how EPS should organize itself? This seems out of balance for recommendations offered in the national and site specific studies.

Chapter 7. Summary of Major Recommendations and Conclusions.

This is well done.

One more time I need to point out the use of “changes”... page 191, line 6 for example. There are not always changes but there are always “ecological process responses”.

Most of the recommendations stand by themselves but some may be more important than others (one person’s perspective). One such recommendation (page 196, line 15) points out issues in transferability of ecological information. This is a critical recommendation as it is simple to transfer information in making conceptual models or identifying ecosystem components for valuation.

**Comments on Draft Report from the SAB Committee on Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services (C-VPESS) "Valuing the Protection of Ecological Systems and Services" (Draft Report 09/24/07) – Comments from Committee Members (Alphabetical Order)**

**Comments Included**

<b>Comments from Dr. Ann Bostrom</b> .....	1
<b>Comments from Dr. Terry Daniel</b> .....	2
<b>Comments from Dr. A. Myrick Freeman</b> .....	6
<b>Comments from Dr. Dennis Grossman</b> .....	11
<b>Comments from Dr. Harold Mooney</b> .....	12
<b>Comments from Dr. Louis Pitelka</b> .....	14
<b>Comments from Dr. Mark Sagoff</b> .....	17
<b>Comments from Dr. Paul Slovic</b> .....	18
Comments from Dr. Kerry Smith.....	23

**Comments from Dr. Ann Bostrom**

Dear Angela,

Here are just a few written comments, as I am running up against the deadline for submitting these to you. In general, my reaction is that the report does an admirable job of synthesizing and presenting the committee's thoughts (thanks especially to you, Kathy and Buzz).

There are various small typos that came to my attention - will send notes on some of those separately. There are also several places where there are missing references and one place at least where there is missing text, as you are undoubtedly aware (decision analysis).

Best,  
Ann

Page 16 line 37 - change "researchers have argued" to "researchers have demonstrated"

Page 22 - lines 5-6 and later in the paragraph - this suggests that those with experience are not subject to manipulation or bias, which I am not sure there is evidence to support in the strong form presented here. Is there? Might add references to support this if so.

Page 23 and elsewhere - need some sensitivity still to becoming captive to the idea that scientists just need to educate the public. Maybe switch the order of involvement an public education on line 4. On page 44, line 8 - edit "educating the public" to read "increasing and augmenting public discourse about"

Page 55 line 3-4 and elsewhere (e.g., page 190 lines 23-26) there is a little lack of clarity regarding EPA providing value information versus eliciting values. Need to be careful

with this wording to clarify this.

Page 78 line 4 and the rest of this paragraph - preferences for ecological states and changes, not just changes?

Page 79 line 5 delete "specially selected" (nothing about the methods requires or presupposes this - mental models studies have been carried out with random samples as well as convenience samples)

Page 191 line 6 - add to this sentence (...of the ecological changes)"from the policy in question."

### **Comments from Dr. Terry Daniel**

I ran across a number of small typos etc in my reading, but I will pass these along later. Also, I saw things in my own writing here and there that either were poorly crafted in the first place, or lost their intended meaning when lifted and dropped into their current locations in the text. I hope there will be an opportunity to "tune-up" this text before it goes much further. As requested, the following is limited to more "substantive" issues or to places where the intended meaning of a text seems to be unclear.

P 45

23 These include challenges associated with  
24 understanding and modeling the relevant ecology, clearly identifying the relevant  
ecosystem  
25 services, and mapping ecological changes into changes in the ecosystem services ~~of~~  
~~interest~~ likely to be affected by targeted stressors and Agency actions.  
[Just trying to take advantage of an opportunity to get the "stressor" idea in, and to  
further define "of interest."]

50-1 Figure 4

[We should add "aesthetics" or "sense of place" to the examples in this figure of services  
to better represent the range of "cultural services."]

P 64

16 EPA actions. The report card approach is a possible method for characterizing  
contributions  
17 to human well-being for the purposes of Circular A-4 when economic benefits ~~of~~ of  
ecological  
18 services cannot be readily adequately monetized.  
[A fine point, perhaps, but such values are almost never "readily" available.]

P 71

25 information. The intent is not to provide an exhaustive treatise on any given method,  
nor are these descriptions intended to be a cook-book for applying the methods.

P 80

5 economic benefits. This is viewed by many as a drawback of this approach to defining value in the context of determining public policies.

P 86, Table 3, Conservation Value Method, row 1 column 3

• Use as a means of quantifying biophysical impacts when they cannot be quantified monetized (as required by the OMB Circular A-4)

P 118 figure 6

[I do not recall this model being presented in the CAFO documents that we reviewed and critiqued. My understanding was that a “conceptual model” at this level of detail was not developed until after the CAFO benefits assessment was essentially concluded. My concern is that if this figure is taken by the reader to be from the CAFO analysis (especially if it was developed and used early in the process), it may call into question some of the criticisms and recommendations that we present earlier in our report.]

P 143 -144

[The NEBA process introduction and text box would be better moved to P 160, line 23, or to p 163, line 21. As currently placed, it interrupts the presentation and “flow” of the site-specific case examples. And, it fits better later, where it is called upon more specifically.]

P 148 line 24

[The text boxes for the individual site-specific cases work better when each is presented nearer their introduction into the discussion (exact locations suggested below).]

P 150 text box

21 the environment. The cleanup and restoration plan called for most remaining wastes  
22 to be consolidated on site and secured with a protective material where needed, and  
covered by a

23 thick cap of soil and vegetation known-as-a-cap.

24

25 Front Royal is located in close proximity to the Appalachian Trail, the Shenandoah  
26 National Park and George Washington National Forest, as well as a number of  
significant Civil War sites, making it a major tourist

27 center for the Blue Ridge Mountains.

[This first item is just picky texting, but the second change is needed to make sense of a later reference to the possible role of “historians” as part of the interdisciplinary team working on the site assessment.]

P 152, line 33

The Charles George Landfill text box would go well about here.

P 152

37 community, the health and safety concerns were addressed. Although the Record of  
38 Decision was published over 20 years ago, the site is still a fenced off no-man’s land  
and the potential for ecosystem services remains

39 untapped.

P 153

1 By contrast, the remediation and redevelopment of the DuPage County landfill site,  
2 ~~now known as the Blackwell Forest Preserve~~ [text moved below] appears to have been  
motivated largely by the  
3 need to address existence values (e.g., the presence of hawks and other rare birds) and  
4 recreational values (e.g., hiking, bird watching, boating, camping, picnicking,  
sledding). The  
5 remediation effort succeeded, ~~and the site is now known as the Blackwell Forest  
Preserve~~. Listed as a Superfund site in 1990, “a once dangerous area is  
6 now a community treasure, where visitors picnic, hike, camp, and take boat rides on the  
7 lake.”

[The DuPage Count Landfill text box would fit well about here.]

P 153, line 28

[The Avtex Fibers text box fits well about here.]

P 154

~~3 Defining the ecosystem services that matter to people requires a carefully constructed  
4 and systematically implemented program that integrates the use of multiple methods to  
fairly  
5 and faithfully reflect the perspectives of multiple stakeholders. There is no simple  
recipe for  
6 accomplishing this task and no simple algorithm for calculating values and summing  
them up  
7 to make a decision.~~

[In the current context, this text/platitude (which is close to something I wrote for another  
time and place) adds little to the discussion.]

P 154, line 15

[The Leviathan Mine text box fits nicely here.]

P 156

10 chosen by the committee. Both the DuPage County Landfill and the Aztex Fibers  
cases appear to have at least qualitatively considered ecosystem services, with  
commendable results. These examples ~~did, however, provide~~ illustrate how more formal  
11 assessments using ecological models and production functions could influence site-  
specific remediation and redevelopment efforts  
12 ~~results~~ in a positive manner.

p 191

18 **parameterized to the ecosystems. Second, EPA must identify the ecosystem  
services  
19 that are of public importance, while still being watchful for services that the  
public should appreciate but may not be aware of.**

[This may not be the best way—but we need to remind the Agency somewhere in here of the other important edge of the public value sword.]

P 194

24 the role of citizen rather than the role of consumer. Various deliberative and assisted  
25 methods assume that many **people do not have well formed values (monetary or  
otherwise)** for ecosystem  
26 services and that accurate valuation requires experts to actively assist people in  
constructing  
27 and determining **their values**.

P 223, Column 2, row 1

Quantitative indices of attitudes ,  
preference rankings, or  
behavioral intentions toward  
~~depicted~~ **represented** environments or  
conditions

Column 3, row 2

Public concerns, attitudes, values,  
beliefs, and behavioral intentions  
related to specific trade-offs among  
attributes **of policy options**

p 283

2 found either way, it seems reasonable to assume that ~~individual narrative interviews~~  
**focus groups** have not been important components of EPA decision  
3 making processes. Certainly the qualitative nature of the information provided by **both**  
focus groups ~~and individual interviews~~, and the

P 317

11 These differences necessitate the need for trade-offs—the **third step** in a valuation by  
decision-aiding process—across the attributes to  
[This section starts off by referring to a two-step process. Does the writer mean  
something like “what might be construed as a third step” (in a 2-step process)?]

-----

In several places in the report we refer to “qualitative assessments” and then  
illustrate/define that with something like “high, medium, and low” classifications. It is  
perhaps a fine point (and perhaps not even considered in “hard sciences”), but such  
classifications would probably be termed “ordinal scale measures” (even if rather  
imprecise) or as “lexicographic” scales (where “measures” are more roughly ordered and  
are presented only with words, and not with numbers). This is not worth wholesale  
editing, but perhaps a short footnote early on could acknowledge the particular variation  
of the term used in this report.

Also, in several places in the report we use the term “psycho-social” and in other places  
we use “socio-psychological” to mean the same thing. Either will work fine, but we  
probably should be consistent.

## **Comments from Dr. A. Myrick Freeman**

### C-VPESS Report - Comments by Freeman

#### Chapter 3

By and large, this is a good chapter. My only comment is that I think that a little more should be said about how ecosystem dynamics and non-linearity can make prediction of changes in ecosystem services very difficult. There is only one sentence about this now (p. 53, lines 4-5) I suggest a paragraph that describes the problem in a little more detail, provides some examples, and cites Partha Dasgupta and Karl-Goran Maler, eds., The Economics of Non-Convex Ecosystems, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004.

Kathy has a query on p. 65 that I can shed a little light on. The passage at the top of the page (lines 1-4) is clearly based on Barbier (2001). So the cite should be changed from Hoagland and Jin to Barbier. See the last paragraph of his paper. The one change should be in line 3, “non-monetary” rather than “non-market.” I have only looked at the abstract of H&J. It might be relevant somewhere. It is about the need for good ecological AND economic modeling in the valuation of the green crab invasion. Perhaps whoever wrote this section can suggest what to say about this paper (if anything) and where it should go (if anywhere).

### C-VPESS Report - Comments by Freeman - SECOND INSTALLMENT

#### Overall Comments:

1. There are two things that struck me while reading this draft of the Report after being “away” from the project for several months:

- We devote a lot of space to the more general topic of how to structure and carry out policy evaluations rather than sticking to the narrower question of how to go about valuing ecosystems and services. This is especially the case in Section 2.2.3 on the CAFO case.

- There is a lot of repetition of points, especially about the need for an “integrated and expanded framework,” etc. This is true within Section 6.1 as well as between Section 6.1 and the Conceptual Framework and between Section 6.1 and the discussion of the CAFO analysis.

All of this makes the Report longer than it needs to be. And I am afraid that it will blunt the impact of the Report and obscure the valuable things that it has to say about ecosystem valuation. It is no doubt too late to do anything about this now. But we should anticipate some criticism of the Report on these grounds when it goes to the Charter Board and the wider public.

2. If the Agency accepts our recommendations, especially regarding the “integrated and expanded framework” and greater public involvement, it will need a lot of resources. I think that we need to acknowledge this. If additional resources are not forthcoming, do we believe that the Agency should divert existing resources from other activities? If so, which ones? If not, can we indicate what initial steps might be undertaken within available resource constraints? There is some discussion of this issue on p. 197, lines 5-11. But do we have more to say on this?

Comments on Recommendations/Conclusions:

1. I think that one of our major conclusions should be something like this: Many Agency actions affect not only ecosystems and ecological services but also other things that matter to people (affect human well-being), for example human health, and on the cost side, incomes and the prices of goods and services. In these cases, valuation methods that focus solely on ecological effects will necessarily provide an incomplete picture of the consequences of the action. The Agency should strive to use valuation methods that capture information on the widest possible range of effects of the Agency’s actions.

2. p. 192, lines 17-30: We say that one of the critical gaps regarding the third step (how ecosystem services are affected) is difficulty in prediction. But this is also true of the first step- predicting changes in basic ecosystem characteristics.

3. P. 193, lines 9-10: This speaks of “assessing the value of changes ...[emphasis added]” But there are multiple concepts of value. Change this to something like “assessing the various forms of value of changes ...” See also p. 193, line 25. Change this to “values.”

4. P. 193, lines 19-21: We speak of “those methods that have already been validated by substantial research ...” But there is very little discussion of the validity of the methods described in Appendix B. The one example is the discussion of validity of stated preference methods on p. 271. So what advice can we give the Agency about which methods have been validated.? By validity, I mean “.... the degree to which [a method] measures the theoretical construct under investigation (Mitchell and Carson, 1989).”

I think that there are two things that need to be done one this. The first is to add discussions of validity tests for each of the major methods discussed in Appendix B with summaries of the results of any such efforts. The second is to recast this recommendation in light of whatever comes out of the discussions of validity in Appendix B.

This same point applies to a statement on p. 36, lines 15-16: “ ... only those methods that meet accepted scientific standards of precision and reliability ...” I assume that reliability and validity are refer to essentially the same idea. What are the “accepted scientific standards”? What do we know about which methods meet these standards? Can we agree on the validity of stated preference methods? What about the validity of citizen juries? We know that Constructed Preference Methods and Decision-Science methods can be influenced by the facilitator; so what does that say about the validity of

measures developed using these measures? And so on.

See also the entry for Individual Narratives in Table 3 on p. 87 (“can provide reliable and valid quantitative assessments ...”)

5. P. 193, line 30 +: This is a separate idea. This should be the start of a new paragraph.

6. On p. 26, lines 8-16, we speak of the problem that the Information Collection Request poses for getting new value information. I think that this should also be brought up in the Recommendations/Conclusions section.

#### Comments on Appendix A - Special Terms:

The definition of “benefits” has been removed. I think that it should be put back, especially in light of the discussion on pp. 14-15 and the fact that the term is not always used consistently in the Report (for example, p. 33, line 21). \

#### Specific Comments - Section by Section:

##### Section 1:

p. 9, line 7: we say, “The Committee will offer advice on several approaches to characterizing ... values ...” I am hard pressed to say what that advice is, other than be open to a variety of different methods. Can we summarize this advice in the Recommendations/Conclusions section?

##### Section 2:

1. p. 36, lines 24-26: we say “... the use of multiple methods to characterize the same underlying value can ...” This is technically correct. But the opportunities for doing this are quite limited, for example as between revealed preference and stated preference economic methods, but not as between economic methods and surveys of attitudes, etc.

2. p. 42, lines 6-22: I think that this paragraph oversells deliberative processes. In any case, it is out of place in a section on “Implementation.” So cut it.

##### Section 4:

1. Table 2, p. 74 : Entry for Referenda, Column on “Who Expresses Value? Should be “People who vote on the issue.”

2. P. 77, line 26: It says “ ... econometric benefit transfer analysis, which is a monetary weighting technique.” I am not sure what this is supposed to mean. Couldn’t we just say “ ... economic valuation methods.”?

3. Section 4.1.6: When will we see this material?

4. Table 3, p. 88: I still don't think that Focus Groups is a valuation method. It is a useful tool. And this is how it is described on p. 81. The same comment applies to pp. 281-283.

5. P. 91, line 13: Regarding benefits transfer, I think that "uniformly negative" is too strong. Another reference would be:

"Testing a meta-analysis model for benefit transfer in international outdoor recreation,"

Ram K. Shrestha and John B. Loomis, Ecological Economics, 39(1): 67-83.

#### Abstract

The economic values of outdoor recreation are estimated using a benefit transfer approach in which one applies existing consumer surplus measures to value the resources at a new site. In this article, a benefit transfer study was conducted based on meta-analysis of existing research in outdoor recreation use values of the United States from 1967 to 1998. The meta-analysis method was used to estimate a meta-regression model, resulting in a benefit transfer function that could be applied to estimate a wide range of recreation activity values in other countries. The estimated meta-model was tested using original out-of-sample studies from countries around the world for international benefit transfer purposes. The tests reveal that there is mixed evidence in using meta-analysis of existing studies in outdoor recreation in the United States to value the recreational resources in other countries that are used by tourists. In the best case, 18 correlation coefficients between meta-predicted and out-of-sample values were positive and significant at the 5% level or greater, but nine of the 18 t-tests indicated a significant difference between the two sets of values at the 10% level. However, the absolute average percentage error of the meta-predictions was 28%, which may be acceptable for many benefit transfer applications.

6. Section 4.2: Somewhere here (perhaps p. 98?), we should mention the Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory (EVRI), a searchable data base of environmental valuation studies. EPA has supported the creation of this data base.

#### Section 5:

1. P. 109, lines 9-23: This paragraph is out of place. It is more about how to communicate information to respondents in a survey to elicit values.

2. Section 5.2.3: This section should be integrated into section 5.1 on uncertainty.

#### Section 6:

1. P. 126, lines 20-22: “Few studies provide national level value estimates ...” Is this accurate? Other than the CAFO recreation values based on Mitchell and Carson, none come to mind. So, “few” might be an overstatement.

2. P. 128-129, Re: Kathy’s Queries: I think that most of this material came from Kerry Smith. So the questions should be directed to him.

#### Appendix B - The Conservation Value Method:

1. In the first paragraph (p. 200), there is reference to “environmental, social, and economic values,” followed by the statement: “The Conservation Value Method (CVM) is a scientific process to map these values across the landscape ...” By my understanding of the CVM, it is limited to mapping those things that are related to the goal of biodiversity conservation and does not include social and economic values.

2. P. 202, lines 14-15: Regarding the sentence about integrating conservation values with socio-economic and other data: Is this a part of the CVM? Or does it represent a potential extension of framework developed by the CVM to make use of additional data? the outputs

3. P. 203, line 9-10: How could the CVM be used to predict ecological impacts?

4. P. 205, the 3<sup>rd</sup> item in the list of “The Method’s Strengths”: It can’t be a single benefits number as we have defined benefits. What is the single number that is arrived at by aggregation? And is this done commonly? How about some examples.

5. P. 205: What is a surrogate dataset”?

#### Appendix B - Energy and Materials Flows:

p. 212, lines 9-11: The blue crab spawning sanctuary does not seem to me to be an example of the ecological footprint of the blue crab population, especially given the much wider distribution of the blue crab population throughout the Bay during the summer. .

#### Appendix B - Surveys:

pp. 235-238: Why is Text Box 13 in this section rather than in the economic methods section?

#### Appendix B - Group Processes:

p. 279, for Referenda, “Issues involved in Implementation”: I don’t understand this entry.

#### Appendix B - Deliberative Processes:

1. pp. 305-310: I still don't think that mediated modeling is a valuation method. Mediated modeling is a process for reaching consensus on a wide variety of analytical issues. To the extent that it is used to deal with valuation issues, how does it differ from deliberative processes more generally? In the South African fynbos example (pp. 306-307), where did the values listed in Table 1 of Higgins, et al., (1997) come from? Was there a deliberative process? Was this a form of benefits transfer? The unit value of wildlife harvest might have been simply a market price.
2. P. 309: Please explain the "atelier approach" and "open space techniques."
3. P. 319, under "Strengths and Limitations": Isn't one limitation the fact that the resulting value is or at least can be influenced by the facilitator?

### **Comments from Dr. Dennis Grossman**

Dennis Grossman  
10/11/2007

VPSS Draft Report

Overview Comments:

Chapter 2.

[Page 10] There is a very quick jump from the discussion of ecosystems to that of ecosystem services and then values. I suggest that the **An Overview of Key Concepts** (2.1) section would make more sense if the first sub-section were The Concept of Ecosystems: Their Processes and Functions. Everything that follows is predicated upon this hierarchy of concepts, so we should lay out the information here to provide a strong foundation.

[Page 13, lines 20-23] I would not use the example using the tradeoff between a species and money. It is a volatile subject and could take people away from the point that you are trying to make.

[Page 18, line 31] the use of the term "actually generated" refers to a subset of the values. For example, the ecological systems did not 'actually generate' biodiversity values.

[Page 19, Lines 12-26] I find this paragraph confusing. Valuation is not seeking to measure the value of an impact, nor is valuation providing a comparison of predicted outcomes. These are 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> order analyses following our ability to value components of the ecosystems and their services. We are too far ahead of our story here, and it will probably confuse other readers.

## Chapter 3.

I would suggest that we review the utility and transferability of the ‘economic production function’ concept for use in ‘ecological production functions’. Economic production functions represent human decisions to provide input in different quantities that result in a desired function or service. Ecosystem services are based on ‘outputs’ from complex ecosystem components and interactions over which humans have a variable ability to control. I know that it resonates with some as it provides a nice parallel structure to economics, but it has never made complete sense to me.

[Page 48, Lines 15, 17; Page 49, Line 8] The word ‘stressor’ pops up here with no context and setting forth a narrower vision than warranted. Like ‘impact’, ‘stressor’ is only looking at one side of the change spectrum, so we should use a broader term that encompasses both positive and negative changes to a system.

[Page 49, Lines 18-24] This part does not work. It may be helpful to first introduce ecological endpoints, which is a difficult concept unto itself and specifically related to EPA practice. Asking the reader to relate ecological endpoints to ecological production functions without definition and context is expecting too much. All of these concepts must be simply explained before asking the reader to understand their application and interrelationships in the context of VPES.

## Chapter 4.

[Page 76, Line 22] The Biophysical Ranking methods are not “based on GIS technology”, that clause needs to be deleted. These methods can benefit by the use of GIS, but the methods are independent of the technology and we do not want to confuse or misdirect the reader.

### **Comments from Dr. Harold Mooney**

#### Chapter 2

Pg 6, line 18 Streams “inhabit” is probably not proper usage

Pg 7, line 18. Is it good form to use a foundational quote and then calling attention to an error (sic)

Pg 11, Lines 14-23. This could be simplified greatly by saying that Boyd and Banzhaf do not include supporting services (indirect) in their definition of ecosystem services but only include direct services, i.e, provisioning, regulation and cultural.

Pg 13. Line 23. This is probably not the best example since the ESA considers the economic value of species loss as infinite (you can’t mitigate against or substitute for the loss)

Pg 15. Line 9. Biophysics is normally utilized as a single word, at least in the any university catalog and scientific journals.

Pg 16 as one example, and in general for this introductory chapter. I think this chapter is of course very important but it makes very heavy reading as an introductory chapter particularly since it is so filled with material showing the contradictory, diverse and even contentious nature of the valuation field. I would imagine a practitioner concluding that if the experts don't agree on how to go about this challenge (see pg 20, lines 21-22) there is not much reason for my reading further in the document. It might be hard to get agreement on this from the committee but another way would be to just lead with how the committee has utilized these concepts, or the ones they think are most valuable for EPA's work, and leaving the bulk of the nature of the field and all of the different views to another appendix. It would certainly make for easier reading.

Pg 30. Second paragraph. It might be good to give a little clarity here. We talk elsewhere about the first step is to develop a conceptual model of all of the interactions in order to make sure all of the impacts are included in the analysis, then the second step is to utilize whatever quantitative models are available as discussed in this paragraph.

Chapter 3.

Pg 46. Line 15. This is taken from rather than adapted from unless a graphics person is going to change this.

Pg 50. Line 8, 9, 13. "Kremen" not Kremens

Pg 54, line 8, insert comma after "among"

Pg 57, line 19. After "once" insert "in a particular analysis"

Pg 62. Line 17-18. Redo first two sentences to read, "Figure 5 illustrates metrics that can be utilized at different levels of ecological organization that indicate intermediate contributions to ecological services. One of the ecosystem organization levels contributing to ecosystem services is functional groupings." (It is crucial that the proper figure (which is forever being lost) be used here which shows the arrows going upward from biodiversity to services.). (If the group wants to delete this figure and this concept no problem. It adds a valuable (in my opinion) but not essential point given the earlier text.

Pg. 64. Lines 7-9 show that many indicators of ecosystem services are somewhat qualitative, eg. "quality" "integrity is why I have added Fig 5 which gives a different type of indicators that can be measured objectively, eg. Ecosystem service inputs at different levels.

Pg. 65. Lines 4-6. I don't know this particular study and do not have it available.

Pg 67. Line 6-9. It is a shame that the committee didn't discuss further the suggestion by the OMB staff person of pushing for a Bureau of Ecological Data comparable to the Bureau of Standards. It is frustrating to see the wealth of data available from FAOstat and the Division of Agricultural Statistics where it is so easy to see trends and to realize that nothing comparable is available for economists-ecologists from which to work.

### **Comments from Dr. Louis Pitelka**

Overall the report is well written and accurately reflects my understanding of the information and advice the committee wants to provide to EPA. However, I did find a number of instances where the text was confusing or seemed inconsistent with statements made elsewhere in the report:

Page 13-18. I found this discussion of values difficult to follow and sometimes confusing and wonder how useful the section will be to EPA.

Page 30, lines 3-16. It is not clear here whether the discussion pertains to the conceptual model that was developed to describe the system or the mathematical/computer models that were used to estimate quantitatively the ecological effects of the rule. For instance, on lines 6-7, the sentence is addressing the conceptual model (mentioned in the prior sentence), but later in the paragraph reference is made to "opportunities to quantify effects precisely", which is not what a conceptual model is for. The last sentence of the paragraph starts with "Developing integrated models of relevant ecosystems..." and it is not clear whether this refers to the conceptual or the quantitative models.

Pg. 100, line 2-5. This is potentially confusing because I presume the "three analytic steps" mentioned here are the same as the 3 steps discussed in Chapter 3. However, the second one here, "predicting behavioral reactions to these outcomes" sounds very different from "predicting the effects of these outcomes on ecosystem services valued by people" (my wording).

Pg. 104, line 12. I wondered about this statement because a few years ago I worked with Granger Morgan on an expert elicitation in which we developed subjective probability distributions for all the questions that experts answered. While Granger was responsible for that part, it did not seem "difficult" to me. I am no expert on expert elicitations but wonder why "translation into probabilities is difficult"? I suggest adding to the sentence "but can be done." If a reference is needed one option is the paper from the project I worked on with Granger:

Morgan, J.G., L.F. Pitelka, and E. Shevliakova. 2001. Elicitation of expert judgments of climate change impacts on forest ecosystems. *Climatic Change*, 49:279-307.

Pages 116-135. These pages of section 6.1 ostensibly are about national rule making, but the text actually is a general discussion of the committee's advice for all three contexts of EPA decision-making. CAFO and national rule making are mentioned very little in these

pages, and in most cases, where they are mentioned, you could replace them by referring to “all EPA decision-making”. Thus, there are 19 pages of text with little analysis or advice specific to the national rule making context. Thus, the entire section, while clear and well-written, seems redundant with earlier sections of the report. In contrast, the two major sections that follow (6.2 and 6.3) on site-specific and regional decision making are quite focused on unique aspects of those two decision-making contexts. It seems odd that pages 28-31 of the report and Text Boxes 2 and 3 represent the actual analysis of the CAFO process (more along the lines of what is done in 6.2 and 6.3) but are either elsewhere in the report or relegated to text boxes. Section 6.1.3 Conclusions (pages 132 to 135) summarizes the prior 16 pages and yet takes three pages to do so. Thus, the summary is redundant with the prior 16 pages, which are redundant with other parts of the report.

Page 117, line 9 – page 120, line 32. This discussion seems to be ambivalent about the active involvement of the public or publics in the development of the conceptual model. For instance, on page 117, lines 9-10 and page 118, lines 18-20, the text seems to state that the conceptual model should be developed by the experts without direct public involvement. This is in contrast to what we say in other places in the report where we strongly recommend direct public involvement. On page 118 the text acknowledges that it is important to consider what ecosystem features are valued by the public but says that “This can be gleaned from a variety of research approaches” rather than stating that the public, or relevant publics, should be involved in the process. On page 119, lines 8-20 the potential involvement of the public is included in two of the three bullets, but even here there is a sense that the experts need to find out what the public cares about but not necessarily involve them in the process of developing the conceptual model. On page 120, lines 11-20 there is finally mention of “a more participatory process”, but it is presented as an option, rather than being the clear recommendation of our committee. Is the national rule-making process different enough to make public involvement less critical or more difficult? If so, perhaps that should be stated more clearly so that the approach discussed here does not seem inconsistent with what we say elsewhere.

Page 121, lines 4-5 and 12-13. This discussion of ecological production functions does not reflect the definition that was settled upon in recent discussions and so should be made consistent. The ecological production function is the translation of changes in ecosystem properties and processes into effects on services that people care about, and does not cover all of what is mentioned in these two sentences.

Page 124, lines 11-13. I am not sure what this means. This makes it sound as though there is a methods manual for applying the concept of functional groups. It really is not that straightforward. For one thing, how species are divided into functional groups depends on what criteria are used and so is arbitrary. Plant species A and B could both have wind-dispersed seeds and be grouped in the same functional group with regard to seed dispersal. But A might be a nitrogen-fixing herb and B a conifer tree. They would be in different functional groups with regard to growth form or their roles in nitrogen cycling.

Page 191, lines 16-17. This seems to be putting the cart before the horse. This is calling for the application of ecological models before the conceptual model is developed. For instance, the term “predict” sounds too quantitative. I think the concept here is that the experts should identify and describe in qualitative terms how the EPA action could affect the ecosystem. This can be done without “using ecological models that are scaled and parameterized to the ecosystems.” We are simply advocating a box and arrow conceptual model. The application of appropriately scaled and parameterized models would happen later when the time comes to quantify the effect on ecosystems, determine how that affects ecosystem services that matter to people, and value those changes.

Page 191, lines 26-33. The term “biophysical” is used fairly commonly in the report, but this paragraph now makes we wonder if there are different concepts of what it means. How are biophysical properties different from ecological properties? In this paragraph, what is the difference between “experts in both relevant biophysical aspects of the modeling” and “ecologists, who know what biophysical changes can be measured”? This seems to be calling for the involvement of ecologists twice but under different names. Maybe a little rewording would solve this.

### **Minor Comments, Word Changes, and Typos**

Page 22, lines 7-8. Is something missing here? It appears to be an incomplete sentence and an incomplete parenthetical remark – there is no closing parenthesis.

Page 24, line 12. Change “impact” to “benefits”, and change “from” to “after” so that it reads: “...could be enhanced by ecological valuation that could demonstrate the potential benefits of ecological services after site redevelopment.”

Page 24, line 14. Change to “other governmental and non-governmental organizations where...”

Page 70, lines 19-22. Linked to what?

Page 80, line 8. Insert “and” after “...revealed preference methods)”

Page 80, line 9. Delete “In contrast,”.

Pg. 112, line 17. Is “animation” different from “visualization” and “interactivity” discussed a couple of pages earlier? If not, to avoid confusion I would use “visualization”.

Page 175, lines 30-32. This does not make sense as stated. In particular, location would be important for any of these recreational activities. I think something like the following might be what is meant: “Ecological models would be necessary to calculate effects of

preserving open space on some recreational activities (e.g., fishing, hiking or bird watching), while others (e.g., walking in the park) could be estimated more simply.”

Page 181, line 9. Delete “s” at end of “Applications” and change “are” to “is”.

Page 183, line 7. Change “find” to “identify”

Page 183, line 8. Add “practices” after “management”, i.e., “more effective watershed management practices”.

Page 183, lines 25-29. Need to use semicolons and commas, or parentheses, to distinguish the items in the list of monetized benefits from explanatory phrases about specific benefits.

Page 185, lines 28-29. This statement is unclear. It sounds as though the framework is saying that 43% of the land area of the 8 states should be protected, but that would seem to be a very unrealistic and thus not very useful recommendation. Or does it mean that 43% of some sub-category of land should be “protected and managed for specific contributions to human well-being.”?

Page 187, lines 15-27. Use of identical bullet symbols for two different levels of bulleted items is confusing here. The three items in lines 18-27 are “sub-bullets” to the first bulleted item. Use a different symbol here. Normally, MS Word does that automatically, so I don’t know how this happened.

### **Comments from Dr. Mark Sagoff**

Dear Angela:

Thank you for sending the materials for the teleconferences October 15 and 16.

Anyone who reads the current draft report must be impressed with the effort that went into it. I am grateful to you, Buzz Thompson, Kathy Segerson, and everyone who has contributed to such a carefully conceived and thoroughly thought-through document.

If I were to hazard a comment other than to express appreciation, it would be this. The Report deals with two quite different ways that ecosystems services may be threatened or diminished. The CAFO example well illustrates the first -- pollution. When manure and other pollutants run off feedlot operations and percolate through the groundwater and into streams, these effluents of course cause damage. The Report ably discusses examples of this kind of economic harm.

The Report also deals ably with a second way ecosystems services may be lost, that is, through development. The standard example, mentioned on page 83, observes that an undeveloped ecosystem may perform filtration services that a developed one may not. Similarly, when wetlands are dredged or filled for farming, their ability to absorb water

during flooding may be lost. The Chicago Wilderness example illustrates the advantages of forgoing development to protect ecosystem or natural values.

I would like to point to what I think is a conceptual and normative distinction that the report draws implicitly -- one that could be made a little more explicit -- between 1) pollution and 2) development as causes of the loss of ecosystem services. The polluter causes damage beyond the limits of his property -- and thus occasions a moral and to an extent legal concern about invasion or trespass -- that is, incursion on the property of others. Development in principle, in contrast, may not spill over beyond its own property lines -- the problem is that the land no longer may provide downstream services it once supplied. So the normative or ethical or legal question is not so clear-cut as in the case of pollution, that is, where there is a clear trespass of property rights. Instead one must ask whether the landowner is required (without compensation) to supply the ecological good in question to his or her neighbors.

In a Coasian economic analysis, of course, none of this matters -- property rights may affect the direction that compensation is paid but not the economic values to be measured or the efficient outcome to which those values would lead. Yet from a legal perspective, one conditioned by common law traditions and practices, the distinction between polluting someone else's land and developing one's own land (even if as a result it ceases to provide certain services to others) is a distinction with a difference. It is worth making explicit, I believe, especially since it runs implicitly through the document.

Congratulations on such an impressive project.

Best wishes,

Mark

### **Comments from Dr. Paul Slovic**

To: C-VPESS Committee

From: Paul Slovic

RE: Comments on Draft Report 9/24/07

Date: October 8, 2007

I am very appreciative of the hard work that underlies this draft and the clear intent to do justice to the vast amount of information that needed to be presented and integrated. I also appreciate and respect the sincere attempt to document and consider the many diverse points of view put forth by the committee members. Thanks to all who did this heavy lifting.

However, despite the many good features of this report, I am not comfortable with it. The introduction and conceptual framework include many statements that I do agree with, regarding the complexity of the valuation task, the need for early involvement of the public, the need to consider and use multiple methods, good discussions of the

weaknesses of certain methods, the need for a fully informed public if public input is used, a strong critique of the CAFO report, and so on. What bothers me is that these important recommendations and qualifications are not consistently applied in the report. The report has an optimistic tone that implies that, despite certain limitations, we do have acceptable methods for valuation that can be taken off the shelf and used, perhaps supported a bit by other less-tested but promising methods.

I am much more pessimistic. This pessimism stems from my many years of studying judgment, preferences, and decision making. Despite lip service to the need for an informed public, and occasional mention of constructed preferences, the report clearly buys into the assumption that the public engaged by EPA will be informed about the complexities of ecosystem functioning, that they will have the well-formed and stable preferences and values required by economic methods, that the methods will be able to reliably uncover these stable values and, finally, that the values that people are discovered to hold are values that *should*, normatively, guide the policies of a regulatory agency.

Pros and cons of various methods are presented but, in my view, the cons are underweighted. Forty years of research on constructed preferences indicates that preferences for complex, unfamiliar outcomes are not well-formed but are often constructed on the spot in the context of elicitation. I am not talking about general values (e.g., biodiversity is important) but rather about the quantitative tradeoffs essential to valuation (see, e.g., p. 79, lines 22 and 23 on substitutability and tradeoffs underlying economic-valuation methods).

The report urges the use of multiple methods in order to allow diverse (valid) components of value to emerge, to round out the picture for decision makers. But the literature on preference construction informs us that the inconsistencies or conflicts that often are revealed when multiple methods are used are not merely due to the methods uncovering different components of value. Rather, these inconsistencies may be due to the fact that the values (tradeoffs) are not strongly held and are *shaped* in different directions by the methods themselves, echoing the Heisenberg uncertainty principle from physics.

Preference construction poses many serious challenges to the methods and conclusions of this report. But there is a bright side. The decision-aiding methods described briefly in the appendix (pp. 314-322) are designed to guide experts and laypersons to an informed, rational, transparent *construction* process, resulting in a defensible expression of value. Because the process is transparent, critics can debate and modify the structure. These constructions can be put before decision makers in the stages where integration, deliberation, and negotiation is addressed in more or less formal interactions with stakeholders and publics (see pg. 227, lines 18-19).

The report incorrectly states that such decision aiding produces multiple dimensions of value that cannot be synthesized into a single quantitative measure (p. 315, lines 1-5). This is incorrect. The correct view, that a single value could be constructed using multi-attribute utility theory, is presented on p. 318, lines 9-15.

#### **A few comments linked to the text**

p. 10. Here and throughout the report, ecosystem services are given far more attention than ecosystems. Perhaps the word “ecosystems” should be deleted from the title of the report.

p. 19 lines 10-11. The fact that the public may sometimes appreciate higher-level endpoints or services such as clean water does not mean they have well-formed tradeoffs among these services.

p. 19 lines 28-29. Indicates some methods are well-developed (and ready to use). I think the cupboard is quite empty when it comes to adequate methods for many forms of ecosystem valuation.

p. 20. I believe multiple methods should be required so that inconsistencies, indicative of preference construction, can be identified and dealt with. The report assumes that useful information about value is contained in inconsistent measures. Maybe not.

p. 23 lines 1-5. Urges public education. Will public agencies likely be willing and able to do this?

p. 26 lines 5-16. Given the obstacles to analysis posed by OMB, perhaps proper valuation cannot be done in some circumstances. The formal reliance on benefits transfers is appropriately criticized later in the report.

p. 36. Section 2.3.3. Sets forth criteria for using multiple values, when expanded methods meet accepted scientific standards of precision and reliability, and so on. These criteria should apply to *all* measures used. As noted above, I think few would meet these standards.

p. 55. Notes the need for finding out what is important to people, once they have been informed. Our report should make clear, early on, that every reference to public input assumes an *informed* public.

p. 68. Section 3.5. Very important observation about EPA’s limited and shrinking resources for ecological research. This may seriously constrain efforts to do valuation properly.

Question: How do we recognize valuations that are so uncertain or flawed that they should not be used?

p. 80 line 5. Yes, income effects may be a drawback to economic methods, but issues raised by preference construction are even more serious.

p. 85 line 6. This is one of the few mentions of the cost of using a state-of-the-art valuation method. Cost is an important issue. If resources are limited, will less than state-of-the-art methods be used? Is this acceptable? Might it actually degrade decision making?

p. 90. This long and detailed critique of value transfer is excellent. Should other criticisms of economic-benefit methods be given equivalent coverage?

p. 99 Section 5.1. Most of these uncertainties pertain to statistical issues. These are perhaps less important than the uncertainties coming from the assumptions underlying the methods, which may not be met.

p. 105 Section 5.2. This section makes numerous good points about communication but it seems miscast. Dialogue with the public is not merely to educate them about the valuation analysis but to involve them integrally in the entire assessment process. That was the real message of the 1996 NAS report, *Understanding Risk*.

p. 109 lines 21-23. Says numbers will be dominated by qualitative and visual stimuli. Yes, except when these numbers are dollar values. Dollars carry special meaning that other numbers may not have. Dollars will likely dominate non-monetized dimensions of value.

p. 112 Section 5.2.4. First bullet. Iterative approach needed for elicitation of values, not just for communication.

General comment: Perhaps keep the part of Section 5 dealing with statistical uncertainties. The communication part is really more about interacting with the public in value elicitation. This fits better with the discussion of Robin Gregory's work in the decision-aiding section.

p. 191 lines 1-3. EPA should conduct (not start) any valuation by deciding what it should value . . .

p. 191 lines 18-20. What if experts disagree with the public's priorities for services?

p. 192. Certainly the public input should be respected, but what if the informed public does not wish to place much/any value on systems and services that experts believe important? This wording seems slanted too much in favor of the public's views.

p. 193. See my early criticisms regarding validity of methods and use of multiple methods of value that may disagree.

p. 194 line 6. Decision-aiding methods should be cited here.

p. 194 line 27. Concepts of non-value (or construction) may also be exposed by multiple methods.

196. line 3. Yes, communications about benefits are important but communication issues are secondary to major problems of value elicitation.

197 line 6. What if resources are lacking?

245 line 8. I disagree that the largest barriers to use of survey methods are institutional. I believe they are conceptual (lack of validity).

318. Valuation by Decision Aiding. The name for this method is misleading. The method applies multi-attribute modeling to construct values, in keeping with preference construction. Yes, it aids decisions, but that is the aim of all other methods as well. Perhaps call it Value Construction Methods.

315 line 1. No. The method can provide a specific estimate, as correctly noted on p. 318 lines 9-14.

320 line 5. All methods in this report aim to provide decision support through valuation. Yes, it may not be liked by OMB. This may reflect a deficiency in OMB's guidelines. Yes, the facilitator may influence the results. Nuances of the other methods also may influence their results. That's what preference construction implies.

**Final comment:** As I have noted before, it is far easier to criticize a report than to draft it. I thank all those who created this clearly written and comprehensive report on this complex topic of valuation. If my criticisms are harsh, it is because I believe the report to be very important.

Paul

To: ANGELA NOGEM

From Reverly Smith

COMMENTS on C-V PRESS DRAFT

25 pages including

cover sheet

To: Buzz Thompson And Katy Seerson  
And Angela Nugent

From: Keeley Smith

Subject: Comments re C-V PRESS Draft

First of all - let me thank you

for all your hard work for the Committee  
to get this presented and circulating

for a handwritten set of comments. I

simply cannot type fast enough to  
get this to you and don't have access  
to help. So the choice for me was

nothing or handwritten comments.

I choose the latter. I have  
a large number of comments - some

General and some specifics.

Rick mentioned to me questions you asked Kelly in the text and

I will try to address them.

I have an own writing screen

that may demonstrate all the rest. If

we cannot address it directly in

the report and you need comments

on the substance of the report

from the committee I feel it is

best if I withdraw from the

committee. I cannot begin on to

some of the conclusions and

recommendations. Some of this I mentioned

to Kelly covering the case of  
the term "benefits" and the report  
attempts but does not fully address  
this issue. There are some and  
characterization of economic methods.  
So if there can't be addressed  
you can simply ignore what you  
said of the other comments and  
I will resign. I don't have time  
to prepare a minority opinion.

### Send an Impact Statement / Comments

(1) For the most part the report  
seems to describe economic values  
and their distributions where  
values are expressed in monetary

seems. I don't agree that this is essential.

Someone wishes because somebody people make to obtain a change is something or to avoid experiencing a change is that being.

I have referred to the thing as an object of choice following the language that Kegan uses in his graduate thesis - text

What is essential is the troubled giving up an amount of one thing in order to obtain an amount of another thing or that a person is able to accept to experience as specified change is something else.

This is the essence of what Mary Bohlert and a group of us explored in the paper &

## circulated years ago in Environments Science and Technology.

Then appears to be an overall theme -  
if it is monetary it is economics.  
So if you don't like money  
or you think people don't have  
dollar value nothing account  
in their heads -- you should  
form other methods of  
coming up with values and  
perhaps other aspects of value.

People believe all concepts of value.  
Philosophy, ecologists, psychologists  
are people. The concepts they  
believe do not trump  
economic concepts of value.

Strongly believe they are  
not defined in monetary terms.  
They are also not independent  
of people -- because it is not  
the recognition of something great  
because it is an ecologist or  
a innovation biologist accounting  
a reason why changes in an

exception or exception arises  
 are important and these  
 factors underlying this  
 judgment would not be reflected  
 in an economic measure of  
 value.

The fact remains it is a person  
opportunity that value.

Similarly when a person  
 receives reasons a person's  
 perspective why a change is  
 more or less important and  
 abstracts from his or her  
 "personal feelings" about the  
 change -- it remains that  
 person arguing ~~for~~ a concept  
 of value.

We all know this - but it is  
 lost in the report.

All values come from people -  
 experts argue for different  
 aspects of value for different fields

These agents are not recognized  
spokes persons for their corporations.

Examples of where this has an  
effect:

- (1) Page 14 lines 13-14, lines 27-30 -  
give impression a person has not  
articulated their views; ordinarily  
page 15 lines 8-24 are  
essentially comparing in this  
course, page 18 lines 3-27

- (2) Characteristics of economic values -  
Page 16 lines 24-27 - economic  
values do not represent  
people are self-interested!  
They assume people know  
what is best for themselves.  
They can gain entrance  
well-being by giving to  
others. This is not  
"self interested".  
Economic values are  
inferred from action or  
stated choices by people.

(3) of don't agree with  
~~obtained~~ both of page 18  
lines 30-31 and saying to page 19  
about what the committee  
believes.

(4) however page 19 lines 12-26  
contract obtained beyond and after  
e.g.  
although retention should be ignored  
by best available source, IIT  
retention, needs to repeat the  
values that would be held  
by a fully ignored general  
partner not merely the  
personal values or preferences  
of this paragraph

Compare this to:

Recommendation page 38 lines 12-25

Recommendation page 19 lines 15-23

4  
Experts characterize the value of  
change in computer systems

and services to the extent possible

It is not experts' values!

Experts are trying to measure  
people's values

P 193 - June 23-27

When someone

~~writes~~ methods cannot

provide accurate assessments

of someone's value.

Or a partner's changes

in ecological systems can

provide

Other methods may provide

Who judges accurate - why

are other methods recommended

to be more accurate?

(5) The tabular summary of

methods is misleading; in

~~fact~~ terms of summary of

the systematic and goals

Table - pages 72-75 -

Impact of non-conscious -

expresses values -  
but goal is people's  
values;

Bottom line - (1) Reports need to be  
economic values or concepts of  
value are narrow, inaccurate.  
(Because they are narrow or  
because people cannot make  
their choice) whereas other  
methods have experts express  
who can come from express  
more accurate values for  
the people than the people  
could.

How do they accomplish this?  
There is the observational  
that it is more accurate  
characteristics of people's  
non-ambiguous values,  
I'm not sure what this  
would be given the  
representative  
system to

(2) Reports suggest that  
everybody agrees and that

valuations are more important  
 than other things EPA  
 takes account of. This is  
 misleading for several  
 reasons.

(A) pages 190 lines 8-10 -  
 most experts found a  
 common level benefits -  
 over it not part of  
 the exception - consequently  
 won't a change in character of  
 human species actually  
 an exception benefit?

(B) We don't know whether  
 not automatically convertible  
 value of actions (line 8) This  
 argues

(C) To the extent  
 intrinsic valuations arise  
 for benefit - cost markets -  
 the policy is already  
 defined by some other  
 process that is specified  
 by the statute.

Antitrust Exemption valuation only has an effect if net benefits of a regulatory action are negative without them.

Certainly if it is a close call then one might argue counterfactuals might lead either way.

All of this raises the point that their benefit-cost is not the settlement basis of any decision.

(3) The report reads as if we don't understand the distinction between a regulatory agency and an autonomous entity. EPA must report to the states beginning how it should behave. So acknowledging the agency to have decisions on exemptions is foolish if the legislative mandate sets other objectives.

(4) The report comments that  
is almost always

- Economic value can only be argued for changes in something; it appears to accept the cost-benefit logic for making complete arguments - The change is all or nothing - what is forked; in other places it is more clear on recognizing relative changes

- I lost in the specific comments a large number of views will withstand of this sort. No doubt it reflects many values contrasting.

Specific Comments

(1) Page 7 - lines 5-8 - too sweeping;  
conclusion Anthropogenik interpreted conductive  
of ecosystems for some services  
of ecosystems. The title has been  
concluded a great deal. There is  
not comprehensive or interpreted

(2) Page 9 - lines 3-5 ; Other studies  
have concluded man - economic  
methods; EIA reversed then and  
reported the man - economic as  
improbable. This conclusion is  
overstated.

(3) Page 12 line 9-10 many sources of water  
(leave out "types") that may be  
relevant when evaluating  
NOT Volung.

(4) Page 13 - not numerical values is  
line 14 ability to make  
tradeoffs.

Page 13 line 24-28 - distinction between

a lower bound on value and  
value needs to be made

(5) Page 14 lines 9-12

Repeat current text

People are smart than ( ) is one approach  
for evaluating the importance of  
ecosystems and therefore assess one  
added consideration.

(6) Page 14 lines 13-20 - I don't agree

Page 14 lines 23-26 - knowers is  
different groups value concepts -  
not necessarily relevant to  
everyone; strong misunderstanding

lines 27-31 misunderstanding  
need to be re-worked

P15 lines 9-10 Nature Next on  
human presence. Can be  
either anthropocentric or  
non-anthropocentric; this  
is introduced elsewhere in  
Report, does not fit  
nature before it.

page 16 - 2 commentaries on capturing  
in lines 24-36

page 18 line 22-27 - Recognizing  
Report suggests a nature  
seems to imply great  
striving for EPA mandate -  
this is not true.

page 18 line 28 - page 19 1-12 -  
good impression -  
can extract 10% extract  
will not be relevant  
change; contradictory  
elsewhere in report  
see line 18-19

when meaning value of a  
ecosystem study (rather than a  
change in title) <sup>the</sup> <sup>Apple</sup> <sup>sense</sup>  
SENTENCES MAKES THE APPLE SENSE

Page 20 - lines 7-17 -

employees all measures have spent validity and studying this is not true

line 28 - estimates of

value pay a key role in

Policy decisions → NOT TRUE

Most EPA Policy does

not allow consideration of

Values; based on science

criteria

Page 21 - lines 2-5 - wrong

lines 18-21 wrong

Page 22 line 18-21 wrong states

preference - about

choices; don't force

regulators to constrain

preferences

22 line 25-27 - support to

limit relevance of

transmission methods; this

is not correct.

Page 25 - Essence of objectives of  
 CAFE rule lines 6-11 are  
 wrong; contain  
 lending errors - benefits  
debatable rationale is wrong

Page 30 - representation and  
 lines 23-30 on - representation case  
 studies never define  
 what representation is  
 and makes little sense

Page 31 - Executive order does  
 lines 26-30 not preclude EPA from  
 doing other analysis; but  
 must do benefit cost and  
other does not substitute  
 and rules are required  
 by legislation - as  
 this is both main and  
 current as as description  
 of what EPA can do

Page 33 - lines 18-23 seems to imply other rates as the included in the benefits - wrong if this means as it implies adding in - economic benefits to economic benefits;

this is one place where going to committee to discuss benefits for economic was not upheld.

Page 38 - strongly object to lines 17-25 -

Page 41 lines 7-11 - seems to contain / response further not but to remain

Page 72-75 - Note notes speaks w/ people

Characteristics of Hillborn group & getting below morning

Page 79 line 13 - economic  
 values don't require  
adjustments; revised preferences  
 and choice just you are  
 out we.

Page 80 line 2 - 6 WTA  
not constrained by income  
 correct

5 - 10 - WTA is  
 measured not between  
 ways; as this is  
 correct

Page 83. HEA is not a  
 economic method; because  
 lines 7 - 17 is not  
 correct

Page 84 lines 15-17

Strongly disagree I cannot agree to this

Table 3 - page 87 Appendix and

Intention - sample size  
spreads economic values  
to monetary - don't agree

Page 88 - Hedonic measures

MARGINAL willingness to pay

Page 89 Regressions cost

less cost changes to total with great care; should not be used!

Page 97 - concept of differences including effects constant and linear to OLS but values

Page 100 - left out some

shortly start outcome of Policy

Page 101

Write costs reduces transparency;  
don't agree with  
characteristics of method!

Page 120 why are authors

line 29-31 comments limited to  
ethical values

lines 23-26 don't agree with

Recommendation:

Page 126 topic of benefit  
analysis implies requirements  
for national benefits  
understanding  
KS question

Page 128

Robert Tompkins' work in  
water resources research

Stem Boyle work for EBA  
IEC report

Bryhoy - James Journal of  
Applied Geomorphology  
(in press)

RTI Cayo analysis 807  
Smithfield experiment

Richard Coors' Elgar books  
with bibliography

Page 129 - see Kinner books

Chapter 7 - I disagree  
by Anthony

**REPORT-WIDE ISSUES FOR INITIAL DISCUSSION AT SEPTEMBER 15, 2007  
TELECONFERENCE**

1. Optimistic tone of report related to possible use of methods for valuation
2. Need for more context to explain the history of EPA's use of economic valuation and project scope to explore the appropriate role of other types of methods to characterize different types of values associated with ecological protection
3. Should there be a more rigorous rubric for assessing methods (e.g., based on precision, validity, reliability or other criteria)?
4. What are the bottom-line conclusions related to use of different methods now? Related to how EPA can do better valuations now?
5. Is there a lack of balance in evaluating economic methods vs. other kinds of valuation methods?
6. Define economic methods in terms of analysis of trade-offs, not in terms of monetization
7. Question of combining numbers derived through multiple metrics
8. Confirm report's message that all values are defined by people
9. Whose values are valued? Role of experts vs. lay publics.
10. Report message is that there are many types of values and different methods can be appropriate for characterizing different types of value
11. Does valuation only involve valuing the change in an ecosystem or ecosystem properties? Or can it involve valuing the state of an ecosystem?
12. Refer to "ecosystem response" rather than "ecosystem change" (a response could be "no-change")
13. Introduce a clear statement of steps involved in a structural framework for valuation

**SELECTED MAJOR ISSUES RAISED BY C-VPESS MEMBERS AND EXTERNAL REVIEWERS' COMMENTS FOR TELECONFERENCES – OCTOBER 15 AND 16, 2007**

<b>Chapter/section (new report outline)</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>No.</b>
1 Introduction	Freeman – issue passim with message about multiple methods p. 9, line 7: we say, “The Committee will offer advice on several approaches to characterizing ... values ...” I am hard pressed to say what that advice is, other than be open to a variety of different methods. Can we summarize this advice in the Recommendations/Conclusions section?	1.
	Slovic: “ The report has an optimistic tone that implies that, despite certain limitations, we do have acceptable methods for valuation that can be taken off the shelf and used, perhaps supported a bit by other less-tested but promising methods.” Preferences are volatile	2.
	Slovic: “p. 10. Here and throughout the report, ecosystem services are given far more attention than ecosystems. Perhaps the word “ecosystems” should be deleted from the title of the report.”	3.
2 Conceptual framework 2.1. An overview of key concepts 2.2. Some caveats regarding valuation 2.3. Ecological valuation at EPA 2.4. An integrated and expanded approach to ecosystem valuation: key features 2.5. Implementing the integrated and expanded approach 2.6. Conclusions and	Opaluch proposal for different structural framework “a set of stages in quantification of ecosystem values” – and relate concept of value and role of methods to it	4.
	Costanza : should economic methods be more than WTP, and whether we should be able to aggregate across methods.	5.
	Opaluch and Smith: call for economic methods to be described as more than monetary methods, essence involves trade-offs	6.
	Mooney – simplify definition discussions in chapter by moving much of text to an appendix	7.
	Pitelka: Page 13-18. I found this discussion of values difficult to follow and sometimes confusing and wonder how useful the section will be to EPA.	8.
	Opaluch – simplify values discussion by distinguishing between	9.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.	
recommendations	strongly non-anthropocentric views and weakly non-anthropocentric views		
	Opaluch – address issue of when analyses may be sufficient to answer EPA’s question, even if they are incomplete	10.	
	Smith – use of the term benefits not consistent throughout the report	11.	
	Freeman – section 2.2.3 goes beyond valuation to policy valuation (no recommendation)	12.	
	Freeman – redundancies between Chapters 2 and 6 and within chapter 6 – report too long. Pitelka – same issue (with a twist – see 6.1 comment)	13.	
	Smith: report doesn’t communicate clearly that all values come from people	14.	
	Smith: role of the expert vs. role of the public in defining values not clear (see examples given, p. 7-8 of his comments)	15.	
	Pitelka- CAFO discussion Page 30, lines 3-16. It is not clear here whether the discussion pertains to the conceptual model that was developed to describe the system or the mathematical/computer models that were used to estimate quantitatively the ecological effects of the rule. For instance, on lines 6-7, the sentence is addressing the conceptual model (mentioned in the prior sentence), but later in the paragraph reference is made to “opportunities to quantify effects precisely”, which is not what a conceptual model is for. The last sentence of the paragraph starts with “Developing integrated models of relevant ecosystems...” and it is not clear whether this refers to the conceptual or the quantitative models.	16.	
	Smith – p. 29 text describing CAFO rule and conclusion is wrong		
	Smith – p. 30 – need to define what a representative case study is		
Smith – p. 33 – concern lines 18-23 about how concept of benefit is used and implication that non-economic benefits can be included in			

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	a benefit-cost analysis. related concern p. 38, lines 17-25	
	Freeman, Slovic – address the issue of resources needed more directly.	17.
	Slovic: p. 55. Notes the need for finding out what is important to people, once they have been informed. Our report should make clear, early on, that every reference to public input assumes an informed public.	18.
	Slovic: p. 20. I believe multiple methods should be required so that inconsistencies, indicative of preference construction, can be identified and dealt with. The report assumes that useful information about value is contained in inconsistent measures. Maybe not.”	19.
	Freeman – p. 35, lines 15-16 refers to “accepted scientific standards of precision and reliability” – questions what are accepted scientific standards – questions language	20.
	Slovic: p. 36. Section 2.3.3. Sets forth criteria for using multiple values, when expanded methods meet accepted scientific standards of precision and reliability, and so on. These criteria should apply to all measures used. As noted above, I think few would meet these standards.	21.
	Freeman. p. 42, lines 6-22: I think that this paragraph oversells deliberative processes. In any case, it is out of place in a section on “Implementation.” So cut it.	22.
	Slovic– Emphasize deliberative processes: Preference construction poses many serious challenges to the methods and conclusions of this report. But there is a bright side. The decision-aiding methods described briefly in the appendix (pp. 314-322) are designed to guide experts and laypersons to an informed, rational, transparent construction process, resulting in a defensible expression of value. Because the process is transparent, critics can debate and modify	23.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	the structure. These constructions can be put before decision makers in the stages where integration, deliberation, and negotiation is addressed in more or less formal interactions with stakeholders and publics (see pg. 227, lines 18-19).	
	Slovic: The report incorrectly states that such decision aiding produces multiple dimensions of value that cannot be synthesized into a single quantitative measure (p. 315, lines 1-5). This is incorrect. The correct view, that a single value could be constructed using multi-attribute utility theory, is presented on p. 318, lines 9-15.	24.
	Patton – comments to sharpen language (i.e., distinguish between “ecosystem change” and ecosystem “response” to an action which may be “no change”); link C-VPASS approach to Figure 2; more feedback loops in Figure 2 to show process is iterative, not linear	25.
	Bostrom: change language so it doesn’t give impression that experts are without bias	26.
	Bostrom: change language Page 55 line 3-4 and elsewhere (e.g., page 190 lines 23-26) there is a little lack of clarity regarding EPA providing value information versus eliciting values	27.
3 Building a foundation for ecological valuation: predicting effects on ecological systems and services	Kasperson’s call for more guidance on how a conceptual model should be designed. Duncan Patton made the same point. Pitelka called for consistency on how conceptual modeling is used	28.
	Patton suggested clarification of terms: “parameterization of models” and stakeholders	29.
3.1. The concept of linkages between stressors, ecological effects, and ecosystem services	Patton questions use of term “change” as the only outcome of some action. Suggests instead “Predicting ecological Response”.	30.
3.2. Challenges in implementing conceptual models and ecological production functions	Grossman questions recommendations relating to ecological production: “I would suggest that we review the utility and transferability of the ‘economic production function’ concept for	31.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
3.3. Strategies to provide the ecological science to support valuation 3.4. Identifying relevant ecosystem services 3.5. Conclusions/recommendations	use in ‘ecological production functions’. Economic production functions represent human decisions to provide input in different quantities that result in a desired function or service. Ecosystem services are based on ‘outputs’ from complex ecosystem components and interactions over which humans have a variable ability to control. I know that it resonates with some as it provides a nice parallel structure to economics, but it has never made complete sense to me.”	
	Grossman calls for more of an introduction to concept of endpoints before discussion of ecol production functions	32.
	Patton: page 61, line 22 calls for acknowledgement of broader definitions of indicators, including “a state that tells something about a process”; p.64 acknowledge report cards are subjective	33.
	Patton-page 65 line 19 discuss indices (e.g., IBI) in discussion of meta-analysis	34.
	Patton questions applicability of NEON to EPA valuation procedures	35.
	Risser suggests text delete, or at least shorten, the discussion of the criteria for identifying ecosystem services	36.
	Freeman comment about inserting more discussion of ecosystem dynamics and non-linearity	37.
	Pitelka question about functional groups – should text remain as is? Mooney comment on same issue	38.
	Mooney – replace figure 5 with veersion with arrows	39.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	Freeman Section 3.4.1 – responds to Kathy Segerson’s question about Barbier Reference, Hoagland and Jin.	40.
	Mooney: pg 67. Line 6-9. It is a shame that the committee didn’t discuss further the suggestion by the OMB staff person of pushing for a Bureau of Ecological Dta comparable to the bureau of standards. It is frustrating to see the wealth of data available from faostat and the Division of Agricultural Statistics where it is so easy to see trends and to realize that nothing comparable is available for economists-ecologists from which to work	41.
4 Methods for assessing value 4.1. An expanded set of methods 4.2. Value transfer	Freeman, Bostrom: What will be new section on decision science ?	42.
	Freeman – Table 3, p. 87 – questions comment on Individual Narratives – “can provide reliable and valid quantitative assessments	43.
	Opaluch and Smith– report does not give balanced treatment of methods (e.g., citizen juries, emergy, energy, socio-psychological).	44.
	Smith: Table 2 misleading in terms of summary of information and goals	45.
	Opaluch: Enlarge discussion of conjoint analyses to broaden discussion of economic methods, include HEA	46.
	Smith – HEA is not an economic concept. p. 83	
	Smith – replacement costs should not be used Slovic: Pros and cons of various methods are presented but, in my view, the cons are underweighted. Forty years of research on constructed preferences indicates that preferences for complex, unfamiliar outcomes are not well-formed but are often constructed on the spot in the context of elicitation. I am not talking about general values (e.g., biodiversity is important) but rather about the	47.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	quantitative tradeoffs essential to valuation (see, e.g., p. 79, lines 22 and 23 on substitutability and tradeoffs underlying economic-valuation methods).	
	Freeman:- Table 3, p. 88: “I still don’t think that Focus Groups is a valuation method. It is a useful tool. And this is how it is described on p. 81. The same comment applies to pp. 281-283.”	48.
	Smith issue: p. 84, lines 14-17 – with text that “no single method, metric or index of value can be used to fully reflect important ecological effects and human concerns for decision-making because value is such a complex concept”	
	Freeman – benefit transfer: P. 91, line 13: Regarding benefits transfer, I think that “uniformly negative” is too strong (gives citation for acceptable transfers)	49.
	Freeman- 6. Section 4.2: Somewhere here (perhaps p. 98?), we should mention the Environmental Valuation Reference Inventory (EVRI), a searchable data base of environmental valuation studies. EPA has supported the creation of this data base.	50.
	Opaluch –acknowledge recent work assessing benefit transfers research	51.
	Segerson: EPA use of benefit transfer in research on Mid-Atlantic region – issue of appropriate criteria for benefit transfer and reference to this example	52.
5 Cross-cutting issues	Kasperson’s suggestion to find structural way to give uncertainty section more visibility	53.
5.1. Analysis and representation of uncertainties in ecological valuation	Patton notes that uncertainty also relates to conceptual models – discussion of uncertainty might come earlier in report	54.
5.2. Communication of ecological valuation information	Smith: 101- Monte Carlo reduces transparency Patton looking for section summarizing recommendations from uncertainty section, suggests this could be merged with recommendations from communications section	55.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	Pitelka: Pg. 100, line 2-5. This is potentially confusing because I presume the “three analytic steps” mentioned here are the same as the 3 steps discussed in Chapter 3. However, the second one here, “predicting behavioral reactions to these outcomes” sounds very different from “predicting the effects of these outcomes on ecosystem services valued by people” (my wording).	56.
	<p>Pitelka Pg. 104, line 12. I wondered about this statement because a few years ago I worked with Granger Morgan on an expert elicitation in which we developed subjective probability distributions for all the questions that experts answered. While Granger was responsible for that part, it did not seem “difficult” to me. I am no expert on expert elicitations but wonder why “translation into probabilities is difficult”? I suggest adding to the sentence “but can be done.” If a reference is needed one option is the paper from the project I worked on with Granger:</p> <p>Morgan, J.G., L.F. Pitelka, and E. Shevliakova. 2001. Elicitation of expert judgments of climate change impacts on forest ecosystems. <i>Climatic Change</i>, 49:279-307.</p>	57.
	Patton: Section 5.2.3 has a lot of redundancy. Rick: Move to uncertainty section	58.
	Freeman: P. 109, lines 9-23: This paragraph is out of place. It is more about how to communicate information to respondents in a survey to elicit values.	59.
	Slovic: p. 105 Section 5.2. This section makes numerous good points about communication but it seems miscast. Dialogue with the public is not merely to educate them about the valuation analysis but to involve them integrally in the entire assessment process. That was the real message of the 1996 NAS report,	60.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	Understanding Risk.	
	Slovic: p. 109 lines 21-23. Says numbers will be dominated by qualitative and visual stimuli. Yes, except when these numbers are dollar values. Dollars carry special meaning that other numbers may not have. Dollars will likely dominate non-monetized dimensions of value.	61.
	Slovic p. 112 Section 5.2.4. First bullet. Iterative approach needed for elicitation of values, not just for communication. General comment: Perhaps keep the part of Section 5 dealing with statistical uncertainties. The communication part is really more about interacting with the public in value elicitation. This fits better with the discussion of Robin Gregory’s work in the decision-aiding section.	62.
6 Applying the approach in three EPA decision contexts	Patton: change terminology from “predicting ecological change” to “predicting ecological response”	63.
	Patton: discuss staffing issues more broadly than just in the regional context	64.
	Patton: make format for recommendations more consistent; likes bullet approach	65.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	<p>6.1 Valuation for National Rulemaking</p> <p>Freeman re: Kathy’s question: re “Few studies provide national level value estimates for a range of services that could be readily used in a national level benefit assessment.” Rick: 1. P. 126, lines 20-22: “Few studies provide national level value estimates ...” Is this accurate? Other than the CAFO recreation values based on Mitchell and Carson, none come to mind. So, “few” might be an overstatement.</p>	66.
	<p>Pitelka: Pages 116-135. These pages of section 6.1 ostensibly are about national rule making, but the text actually is a general discussion of the committee’s advice for all three contexts of EPA decision-making. CAFO and national rule making are mentioned very little in these pages, and in most cases, where they are mentioned, you could replace them by referring to “all EPA decision-making”. Thus, there are 19 pages of text with little analysis or advice specific to the national rule making context. Thus, the entire section, while clear and well-written, seems redundant with earlier sections of the report. In contrast, the two major sections that follow (6.2 and 6.3) on site-specific and regional decision making are quite focused on unique aspects of those two decision-making contexts. It seems odd that pages 28-31 of the report and Text Boxes 2 and 3 represent the actual analysis of the CAFO process (more along the lines of what is done in 6.2 and 6.3) but are either elsewhere in the report or relegated to text boxes. Section 6.1.3 Conclusions (pages 132 to 135) summarizes the prior 16 pages and yet takes three pages to do so. Thus, the summary is redundant with the prior 16 pages, which are redundant with other parts of the report.</p>	67.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	<p>Daniel: P 118 figure 6                      [I do not recall this model being presented in the CAFO documents that we reviewed and critiqued. My understanding was that a “conceptual model” at this level of detail was not developed until after the CAFO benefits assessment was essentially concluded. My concern is that if this figure is taken by the reader to be from the CAFO analysis (especially if it was developed and used early in the process), it may call into question some of the criticisms and recommendations that we present earlier in our report.]</p>	<p>68. 69.</p>
	<p>Pitelka: Page 117, line 9 – page 120, line 32. This discussion seems to be ambivalent about the active involvement of the public or publics in the development of the conceptual model. For instance, on page 117, lines 9-10 and page 118, lines 18-20, the text seems to state that the conceptual model should be developed by the experts without direct public involvement. This is in contrast to what we say in other places in the report where we strongly recommend direct public involvement. On page 118 the text acknowledges that it is important to consider what ecosystem features are valued by the public but says that “This can be gleaned from a variety of research approaches” rather than stating that the public, or relevant publics, should be involved in the process. On page 119, lines 8-20 the potential involvement of the public is included in two of the three bullets, but even here there is a sense that the experts need to find out what the public cares about but not necessarily involve them in the process of developing the conceptual model. On page 120, lines 11-20 there is finally mention of “a more participatory process”, but it is presented as an option, rather than being the clear recommendation of our committee. Is the national rule-making process different enough to make public involvement less critical or more difficult? If so,</p>	<p>70.</p>

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	perhaps that should be stated more clearly so that the approach discussed here does not seem inconsistent with what we say elsewhere.	
	Smith: p.120, lines 23-26 disagrees with recommendation that “in order to increase transparency the Agency should document in its economic benefit assessments and RIAs how the decisions underlying the conceptual model were made. It should clearly identify the criteria for including effects within the core analysis and how these criteria were applied to those analytical choices.”	
	Segerson- “There is precedent in the literature on economic benefits transfer for these types of analyses (see Rosenberger and Loomis 2003 and Navrud (in press), for examples of how this logic might be used in benefits transfer). [I don’t understand the idea behind this second approach from the description here. What is the key distinction? I think it would be helpful to have some clarification, but I can’t revise this to be clearer without more info. KS] “	71.
	Patton: edit text to see where “response” “output” or consequences” might better substitute for change.	72.
	Pitelka: Page 124, lines 11-13. I am not sure what this (“fully tested techniques are available for evaluating different functional groups”) means. This makes it sound as though there is a methods manual for applying the concept of functional groups. It really is not that straightforward. For one thing, how species are divided into functional groups depends on what criteria are used and so is arbitrary. Plant species A and B could both have wind-dispersed seeds and be grouped in the same functional group with regard to seed dispersal. But A might be a nitrogen-fixing herb and B a conifer tree. They would be in different functional groups with	73.

Chapter/section (new report outline)		Issue	No.
		regard to growth form or their roles in nitrogen cycling.	
		Patton: p.124 calls for more discussion of how to select a model “that applies nationally and yet has sufficient detail to help the process”	74.
		Patton – discuss air quality and CAFOs earlier, e.g., p. 129, 1.9	75.
	6.2 Valuation for Site- Specific Decisions	Patton: discuss modeling the ecosystem earlier in section	76.
		Daniel: can the story-line in this section be made clearer?	77.
	6.3 Valuation for Regional Partnerships	Patton: explain distinction between local or site specific examples with broader impacts and regional examples	78.
		Patton: discuss how representative Chicago Wilderness is	79.
		Patton: explain relationship of SE Framework to valuation	80.
7	conclusions and recommendations	Kasperson’s suggestion to reduce the number of recommendations, structure it along model of conclusion/justification/related recommendation	81.
		Freeman added recommendation: strive to use valuation methods that capture information on the widest range of effects of Agency actions	82.
		Freeman comment about p. 193, l. 19-21 “methods that have been validated by substantial research” – calls for adding discussions of validity tests for Appendix B methods and revising recommendations	83.
		Freeman – include discussion of information collection requests and burden on valuation	84.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	<p>Slovic issues: p. 191 lines 18-20. What if experts disagree with the public’s priorities for services?</p> <p>p. 192. Certainly the public input should be respected, but what if the informed public does not wish to place much/any value on systems and services that experts believe important? This wording seems slanted too much in favor of the public’s views.</p> <p>p. 193. See my early criticisms regarding validity of methods and use of multiple methods of value that may disagree.</p> <p>p. 194 line 6. Decision-aiding methods should be cited here.</p> <p>p. 194 line 27. Concepts of non-value (or construction) may also be exposed by multiple methods.</p> <p>196. line 3. Yes, communications about benefits are important but communication issues are secondary to major problems of value elicitation.</p> <p>197 line 6. What if resources are lacking?</p>	85.
	<p>Daniel: Page 191, line 19 add language to sentence that ends <b>that are of public importance;</b> <b>while still being watchful for services that the public should appreciate but may not be aware of.”</b>                      [This may not be the best way—but we need to remind the Agency somewhere in here of the other important edge of the public value sword.]</p>	86.
	<p>Pitelka comments:                      Page 191, lines 16-17. This seems to be putting the cart before the horse. This is calling for the application of ecological models before the conceptual model is developed. For instance, the term “predict” sounds too quantitative. I think the concept here is that the experts should identify and describe in qualitative terms how the EPA action could affect the ecosystem. This can be done without “using ecological models that are scaled and parameterized</p>	87.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	<p>to the ecosystems.” We are simply advocating a box and arrow conceptual model. The application of appropriately scaled and parameterized models would happen later when the time comes to quantify the effect on ecosystems, determine how that affects ecosystem services that matter to people, and value those changes.</p> <p>Pitelka Page 191, lines 26-33. The term “biophysical” is used fairly commonly in the report, but this paragraph now makes we wonder if there are different concepts of what it means. How are biophysical properties different from ecological properties? In this paragraph, what is the difference between “experts in both relevant biophysical aspects of the modeling” and “ecologists, who know what biophysical changes can be measured”? This seems to be calling for the involvement of ecologists twice but under different names. Maybe a little rewording would solve this.</p>	
Appendix A: special terms and their use in this report	Freeman - Include definition of benefits	88.
Appendix B: discussion of methods	Is treatment of decision science approaches appropriate here? (waiting to see Joe’s text)	89.
Bio-physical ranking methods	Freeman questions about Conservation Value Method	90.
Ecosystem benefit indicators		
Measures of attitudes, preferences, and intentions		
Economic methods		
Group expression of values and	Freeman question about Energy and Material flows: p. 212, lines 9-11: The blue crab spawning sanctuary does not seem to me to be an example of the ecological footprint of the blue crab population, especially given the much wider distribution of the blue crab population throughout the Bay during the summer.	91.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
social/civic valuation Deliberative processes	Slovic: 245 line 8. I disagree that the largest barriers to use of survey methods are institutional. I believe they are conceptual (lack of validity).	92.
Methods using cost as a proxy for value	Freeman question about conjoint survey Text box 13: pp. 235-238: Why is Text Box 13 in this section rather than in the economic methods section?	93.
	Freeman questions re Mediated Modeling: 1. pp. 305-310: I still don't think that mediated modeling is a valuation method. Mediated modeling is a process for reaching consensus on a wide variety of analytical issues. To the extent that it is used to deal with valuation issues, how does it differ from deliberative processes more generally? In the South African fynbos example (pp. 306-307), where did the values listed in Table 1 of Higgins, et al., (1997) come from? Was there a deliberative process? Was this a form of benefits transfer? The unit value of wildlife harvest might have been simply a market price. Also question of how facilitator influences outcomes	94.
	Slovic: 318. Valuation by Decision Aiding. The name for this method is misleading. The method applies multi-attribute modeling to construct values, in keeping with preference construction. Yes, it aids decisions, but that is the aim of all other methods as well. Perhaps call it Value Construction Methods. 315 line 1. No. The method can provide a specific estimate, as correctly noted on p. 318 lines 9-14. 320 line 5. All methods in this report aim to provide decision support through valuation. Yes, it may not be liked by OMB. This may reflect a deficiency in OMB's guidelines. Yes, the facilitator may influence the results. Nuances of the other methods also may influence their results. That's what preference construction implies.	95.
	Smith: report appears to suggest that ecosystem services and their	96.

Chapter/section (new report outline)	Issue	No.
	valuation are more important than other things EPA takes account of; this is misleading	
	Smith: report over-emphasizes ecosystem protection and doesn't put it in context of EPA's overall mission; legislative mandates may not require EPA to base decisions on ecosystems	97.
<p><b>APPENDIX C: SURVEY ISSUES FOR ECOLOGICAL VALUATION: CURRENT BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH</b></p>		98.