



Economic Valuation of Ecosystem Services

Randall A. Kramer

INTRODUCTION

When the well is dry, we know the worth of water.
(Benjamin Franklin, *Poor Richard's Almanac*,
1746).

On an ever more crowded planet, the challenges of maintaining healthy ecosystems seem ever more complex. More and more natural ecosystems have been dramatically altered by the activities of humans through their development, manufacturing, and consumption activities. While there is cause for concern about the declining health of ecosystems, there is also an emerging recognition that natural ecosystems make significant contributions to economic and human well-being (Heal, 2000). Or, in a term increasingly used by economists as well as environmental scientists, nature provides important "ecosystem services."

In *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*, Gretchen Daily (1997) defines ecosystem services as "the conditions and processes through which natural ecosystems, and the species that make them up, sustain and fulfill human life" (p. 3). For instance, wetlands and meandering streams act as a sort of filter, removing or neutralizing pollutants that might otherwise end up in oceans and lakes, affecting the seafood we eat and the water we drink. Protecting tropical forests can conserve unique biodiversity that may be the source of future pharmaceutical or agricultural products and can store carbon to offset increasing carbon emissions of our manufacturing and transportation activities. The importance of nature's services lends credence to the need to do a better job of managing the systems.

The United Nations' sponsored Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) recently reviewed the current status and trends of the world's ecosystems. It found that ecosystem services are under unprecedented threats from economic activities, and the loss of services derived from ecosystems constitutes a significant barrier to achieving the UN Millennium Development Goals to reduce disease, hunger, and poverty. The assessment concluded that "We must learn to recognize the true value of nature – both in an economic sense and in the richness it provides to our lives in ways much more difficult to put numbers on" (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, p. 5).

This chapter begins by describing the different components that make up the total value of ecosystems and examines the tools that economists use to estimate these values.¹ The chapter then focuses on presenting several case studies that show these tools in use. The case studies focus on valuation of water services, but the cases illustrate how economic valuation might apply to other ecosystem goods and services such as maintenance of biodiversity. Finally, a concluding section discusses implications of this literature for the improved management of ecosystems.

The world's human population depends on healthy ecosystems for a variety of important services. Our decisions to protect, restore, and manage ecosystems should be based in part on a better understanding of how humans benefit from ecosystems and how human behavior can be modified through regulation, economic incentives, and other policy initiatives. Those who advise policymakers on matters of ecosystem management can learn much from the field of environmental

economics on the valuation of ecosystem services. With a better understanding of the often neglected and undervalued ecological benefits of improved management of our natural resources, we will be able to design more effective resource management policies.

ECOSYSTEM VALUATION

Water has economic value in all its competing uses and should be recognized as an economic good (The Dublin Principles, 1992).²

Total economic value of ecosystems

Government agencies and environmental organizations increasingly recognize that it is useful to measure the benefits and costs of different policy actions that may improve, protect, or degrade our natural resources. Successful long-term economic development depends on wise use of natural resources, and on avoiding, as much as possible, the detrimental impacts of development activities. These impacts can be avoided with more careful planning and design of transportation, urban development, and other infrastructure projects, and by more careful attention to impacts during implementation of the projects (Dixon *et al.*, 1986). Failure to recognize fully the value of natural resources can lead to policies that discourage wise resource use. For example, deforestation may be accelerated and the opportunities for residual forests may be impaired if the environmental services provided by forests are not valued by governments because those services are not traded in the market place (Kramer *et al.*, 1992).

Economic analysis of the environmental impacts of projects and policies has its roots in a body of theory developed by the economists Arthur Pigou (1920) and John Hicks (1939). They held that policies and projects should be based on the resulting changes in social welfare, where social welfare is the sum of individual welfare. Individual welfare is measured by each person's willingness to pay (WTP) for the changes brought about by a policy or project. The intuition behind monetary measurement of project benefits is rather straightforward: people show their preferences for those things they desire by their willingness to spend money to purchase them. The challenge to those who wish to determine the economic benefits of ecosystem services is to develop measurements of the individual willingness to pay and then to aggregate that over the relevant population of beneficiaries.

The total economic value of an environmental resource can be calculated as a sum of four main components: use value, indirect use value, option

value, and nonuse value (Randall, 1991; Pagiola *et al.*, 2004):

- *Use value* refers to the benefit people receive from direct use of the environment: withdrawing water from a river for drinking or irrigation, collecting medicinal plants in a forest, for example. Use value can also include nonconsumptive uses like camping and hiking in a protected ecosystem area. Use value can be diminished by overharvesting, pollution, or certain types of development.
- *Indirect use value* arises from services that users get indirectly and often some distance away from where they originate. Examples include carbon storage and climate regulation provided by intact forests.
- *Option value* refers to users' WTP to preserve the *possibility* of using a resource in the future. An example is the value of protecting a reservoir from nearby development because it might be needed as a future source of drinking water for a municipality.
- *Nonuse value* reflects what people are willing to pay to protect resources they will never use. Some people may derive satisfaction from endangered species being protected out of a sense of environmental stewardship that is unrelated to direct or indirect use, current or in the future.

These various components of resource value constitute the total economic value:

$$\text{Total economic value} = \text{Use value} + \text{Indirect use value} + \text{Option value} + \text{Nonuse value}$$

For monetary valuation, some of these components are easier to measure than others (Pagiola *et al.*, 2004). Use values are generally the most straightforward to measure because there are observable quantities of products consumed as well as market prices that can be used to determine economic value. Recreational use can also be measured by observing the number of visits and the characteristics of visitors and sites. Indirect use values are more difficult to measure for two reasons. First, quantities are often a challenge to measure, for example, determining the flood control provided by a particular wetland. Second, the indirect uses are not usually traded in marketplaces and therefore have no associated prices. Hence, "shadow values" must be estimated in order to "price" the produced services. Option values and nonuse values are the most difficult to measure because these are not reflected in observable behavior. These values are estimated by using surveys that ask people a series of questions about their willingness to pay for ecosystem services they do not use.

For those environmental services provided by ecosystems that are not priced and traded in a

marketplace, environmental economists have developed a set of methods to estimate their economic value. Two major categories of methods are used: stated preference and revealed preference methods. Stated preference methods use surveys to elicit directly from individuals the economic value they assign to nonmarket ecosystem services. Revealed preference methods rely on observations of the choices that people make to infer values of resources they are using. No single method is appropriate for every valuation situation.

Despite a growing interest on the part of the academic, governmental, and nongovernmental sectors, environmental valuation remains controversial. Even those who accept the rationale for environmental valuation have ongoing debates about methodological issues, including choice of method, survey design, and selection of economic models (McMahon and Postle, 2000). The biggest controversy, however, arises from ethical concerns about placing monetary values on environmental services (Foster, 1997). Mark Sagoff (1988), an environmental philosopher, argues that people hold altruistic "citizen preferences" about environmental resources and hence cannot engage in meaningful monetary valuations of the resources. He maintains that using aggregated WTP estimates

in a benefit–cost analysis is an inappropriate way to inform environmental policymaking. Other critics argue that an emphasis on benefit–cost analysis may skew the political process by giving too much influence to the analysts or to the "questionable" information they provide (Shabman and Stephenson, 2000). David Pearce (1999) responds that using resources to pursue a social objective will always impose opportunity costs. So spending more to clean up mercury in the environment means less funding will be available to preserve critical habitat. Therefore, it is appropriate and useful for policymakers to be able to compare the monetary value of different policy options (McMahon and Postle, 2000).

Environmental valuation methods

Environmental economists have developed a number of valuation methods to value services provided by ecosystems. This section will briefly review five of the more widely used methods and provide examples in the context of services provided by freshwater ecosystems. Table 11.1 summarizes these five methods, showing which water-related services are appropriate for the method, and outlining data requirements and method limitations.

Table 11.1 Economic valuation methods for ecosystem services

<i>Method</i>	<i>Approach</i>	<i>Water service appropriate for method</i>	<i>Data needs</i>	<i>Limitations</i>
Contingent valuation method	Ask people directly their willingness to pay (WTP)	All use values and nonuse values (e.g. drinking water, fishing, protecting species)	Survey with scenario description and questions about WTP for specific services	Potential biases due to hypothetical nature of scenarios
Travel cost method	Estimate demand curve from data on travel expenditures and choices	Recreation: boating, fishing, swimming	Survey on expenditures of time and money to travel to specific sites	Only captures recreational benefits; difficult to apply for multiple destination trips
Hedonic property value method	Identify contribution of environmental quality to land values	Water quality, wetland services	Property values and characteristics including environmental quality	Requires extensive information about ecosystem services at hundreds of specific sites
Change in productivity method	Assess impact of change in water service on produced goods	Commercial fisheries, agricultural uses	Impact of change in water service on production; net value of produced goods	Information on biological impacts of changes in ecosystem services often unavailable
Benefit transfer method	Uses value estimates from past studies to approximate value at a new policy site	Any services valued at comparable sites in previous studies	Valuation estimates for same services at similar sites	Limited accuracy due to wide variety of factors that vary across sites

Adapted from Pagiola *et al.* (2004)

The most widely used approach to measuring the economic benefits of environmental conservation is the *contingent valuation method* (CVM). This is a "stated preference method" that allows a sample of people who benefit from a particular resource to tell researchers directly, through surveys, what they are willing to pay for some improvement in environmental quality. Demand for nonmarket goods such as a particular ecosystem service is established by first describing to individuals the characteristics of a simulated market and then asking what they would be willing to pay to ensure that the good is available. One of the strengths of this method is that it can capture both use value (e.g. drinking water use) and nonuse value (e.g. protection of threatened aquatic species) (Mitchell and Carson, 1993). Because of this versatility, it is the most widely used method, although it is controversial because, critics say, people are reporting *hypothetically* on their WTP rather than observed actually spending the money, possibly biasing the resulting valuation estimates (Hanemann, 1995). These concerns can be addressed with careful survey design and implementation (Carson *et al.*, 2001).

How ecosystem values changed a water policy debate in Southern California

One of the best examples of ecosystem values having an impact on public decision-making is the case of allowing tributary waters to flow into Mono Lake in California versus diverting the flows for municipal and industrial water users in Los Angeles. In 1983, the California Supreme Court ordered a reevaluation of Los Angeles' water rights and a balancing of public trust water uses. A contingent valuation study by John Loomis (1987) showed that people were willing to pay for the protection of birds and fish in Mono Lake and that these benefits far exceeded the replacement cost of water from other sources. As a result of this initial study, California's Water Resources Board required that the state's Environmental Impact Report include non-use ecosystem values in its analysis of water reallocation alternatives. In the analysis, non-use ecosystem values were compared dollar for dollar to the hydropower and water supply benefits. Eventually, the state required that tributary flows to Mono Lake be increased significantly, and Los Angeles' water rights were cut almost in half. Although the driving concerns were air and water quality, the economic analysis showing that the new allocation generated important nonuse economic benefits likely influenced this major policy shift (Loomis, 2000).

Another widely used approach to valuing water ecosystem services is the *travel cost method*, a

"revealed preference" approach that is based on how people make recreational choices (Smith and Desvousges, 1986). The underlying principle is that people spend time and money to travel to and use a site for recreation. By measuring the expenditure of time and money, we can determine what the recreational service is worth. There are two main versions of this method (Freeman, 1993). The first version estimates a statistical relationship between the number of visits at a site and the level of travel expenditures by visitors, and uses that relationship to estimate the total value of recreation services provided by the site to all users. The second version uses statistical analysis to examine how specific site characteristics influence decisions to recreate at different sites and then to infer the economic value of those characteristics. The travel cost method can be used to estimate the economic values associated with various types of protected ecosystems that afford recreational opportunities.

Although many environmental goods are not traded in markets, their presence may have an affect on property values. The *hedonic property value method* takes advantage of this connection (Smith, 1993; Taylor, 2003). Land prices are usually higher for land parcels close to lakes or estuaries because of the views and boating or fishing opportunities. By statistical analysis, the part of land values due to these environmental services can be separated out. The method controls for other variables influencing land prices so that any remaining price differential is a measure of the WTP for the unpriced environmental good. As an example, the hedonic method could be used to value the availability of better quality water. Suppose that by protecting a forest in its natural state rather than using it for timber production, downstream water quality is enhanced due to reduced land disturbance. If downstream farmers have higher incomes because of the better quality water, those farms should have higher property values. A hedonic study of farms in both high and low water quality areas could control for other differences between the farms and estimate the marginal contribution of water quality to land values.

The *change in productivity method* recognizes that when changes in environmental quality affect the production of marketed goods, these effects can be captured by observing what happens in a related market (Freeman, 1993). So if water pollution reduces fish catches or acid rain reduces timber harvest, we can value those productivity impacts based on the price of the resource, for example, fish or timber. The basic premise is that changes in ecosystem services can impact the quantity and quality of products being marketed. Once those biological impacts are identified,

the productivity impacts can be valued through standard economic analysis based on the prices of related goods that are sold in the marketplace (Kramer *et al.*, 1997). Consider the example of wetlands that provide breeding areas and increased food supply for various nearby fisheries. If these fisheries are commercially exploited, then the value of a wetland can be measured in part by the dollar value of the increase in fish catches resulting from the wetland. This method requires an interdisciplinary approach involving biologists and economists.

Finally, there are many policy situations where it is not feasible to conduct an original ecosystem valuation study, either because of time or resource constraints. In such situations, analysts may want to take advantage of previous valuation studies of the same ecosystem services evaluated at other sites (Desvousges *et al.*, 1992). *Benefit transfer* refers to taking existing knowledge and transferring it into a new context. Data are taken from one or more study sites and applied to a policy site where a decision is being made that would benefit from valuation information. How accurate are valuation estimates derived from other sites? Studies have shown that benefit transfer may have limited accuracy because of the large number of factors that can vary across sites, but when the study and policy sites are in the same geographic area, errors are reduced (Rosenberger and Loomis, 2003).

Examples of valuation studies

In this section, several examples are presented of environmental valuation methods applied to aquatic ecosystems. These studies illustrate a range of applications and provide some details on how the methods are applied. Readers interested in additional details should consult the original publications.

Travel cost example: How does atrazine affect water recreation?

Dietrich Earnhart and Val Smith (2003) examined the effects of the pesticide atrazine on water-based recreation at Lake Clinton, Kansas. Atrazine may enhance recreational enjoyment by inhibiting the growth of nuisance algae and thus encourage greater recreation; but the presence of atrazine in reservoirs may be detrimental to fish populations and hence, reduce recreational use. To quantify and compare these countervailing effects, the authors applied the travel cost method in combination with contingent behavior questions.

The authors conducted a survey of 245 residents of Lawrence, Kansas, about their recreational use of Lake Clinton, collecting data on visitation patterns and socioeconomic characteristics. They calculated respondents' travel costs to the lake as

the sum of transportation cost (at 31.5 cents per mile), their time costs (wage rate times the two-way driving time), and access fees. In addition, the researchers asked respondents how their chosen destinations would change with various changes in water quality. Some changes were described as a decrease in algae, some were described as a decrease in fish, and some were described as a combination of the two effects of atrazine.

They found that the average respondent had a \$22 trip cost to the lake and made about three trips in the previous year. An improvement in algae-related water quality would lead to an average increase of 2.7 visits, while a decline in fish-related quality would trigger an average decrease of 0.5 visits. The combination of quality changes would lead to an average decrease of 0.6 visits.

The authors then conducted an in-depth statistical analysis of likely travel behavioral responses to water quality change in the light of countervailing effects of atrazine on algae quality and fish quality. They examined the tradeoffs for recreators between these two quality dimensions and concluded that for each 1 per cent decline in fish-related quality, respondents required a 4.7 per cent increase in algal-related quality so as to maintain their same level of recreational enjoyment. While they did not monetize the overall impact of atrazine, they concluded that "knowing the effective rate of exchange between fish- and algae-related water quality in Clinton Reservoir will allow reservoir managers to estimate recreators' responses to future changes in the watershed" (p. 1089).

Hedonic property value example: effects of water quality on residential land prices

Compared to a large number of studies of air quality, the hedonic property value method has been used only a handful of times to value changes in water-related ecosystem services. An excellent example of the potential usefulness of this approach is illustrated by Christopher Leggett and Nancy Bockstael's investigation (2000) of whether water quality affects residential property values along the Chesapeake Bay. They were able to take advantage of a favorable geographic situation: "a highly irregular estuarine coastline that supports a lively market for waterfront homes and that exhibits considerable variation in water quality within a small area" (p. 122).

The authors used data from waterfront property sales from 1993 to 1997 in Anne Arundel County, Maryland. One of the most challenging aspects of using the hedonic method is measuring environmental quality for each property site. They used fecal coliform data from samples collected at 104 sites along the county's coastline and constructed a water quality measure based on the distance of each property from the nearest monitoring station.

Box 1 Summary of Water Quality Management Plan Presented to Catawba Basin Survey Respondents

This management plan addresses the main water-pollution problems in the basin: sediment and nutrients. It also continues to manage related problems such as pollution by toxic substances and bacteria and viruses. While this specific management plan has not been proposed by state governmental agencies, it is drawn from their best available information. This includes information on the condition of the basin and how to best manage the problems.

This potential management plan includes the following components:

- 1 Construction and use of best management practises (BMPs) within the basin. These include buffer strips and holding ponds for farms, construction sites, and residential areas.
- 2 Development of a basinwide land-use plan. This would encourage land uses in the basin that are consistent with the goals for water quality in the basin. Government agencies could use this land-use plan to make decisions that would affect water quality.
- 3 Improving and increasing the capacity of sewage treatment plants in cities within the basin.
- 4 Purchasing and setting aside of tracts of land that have been determined as critical to the protection of water quality.

The results showed that coliform levels had a significant and negative impact on property values. Once the researchers established this significant effect of water quality on property values, they demonstrated how their results could be used to value water quality improvements. They illustrated the usefulness of the hedonic model by focusing on a hypothetical localized improvement in water quality on waterfront property values along the Saltworks Creek Inlet northwest of Annapolis. They found that modest reductions in fecal coliform counts in the middle and upper reaches of the inlet increased property values by 2 per cent. While this may appear to be a small impact, the potential gains across all properties in the county could amount to more than \$12 million if water quality was improved by a similar amount elsewhere. The study makes a convincing case that waterfront owners exhibit a strong willingness to pay for reducing concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria.

Contingent valuation example: the economic value of water quality in the Catawba River basin

A Duke University study used the contingent valuation method to estimate the economic value of protecting water quality in the Catawba River basin at its current level (Eisen-Hecht and Kramer, 2002; Kramer and Eisen-Hecht, 2002). Telephone interviews were conducted with 1085 randomly selected households in 16 counties within the Catawba River basin in North and South Carolina. Before the interviews, the survey respondents were mailed a short information booklet that described a water quality management plan (summarized in Box 1). Respondents were then asked if they would support the management plan. The management plan was offered to respondents at one of eight different price levels, ranging

from \$5 to \$250 per year for five years (Box 2). The contingent valuation scenario was developed through reviews of other studies and refined during focus groups and pretests.

The survey results indicated that, besides showing a high level of concern about water quality, area residents placed a significant monetary value on protecting water quality in the Catawba basin. Two-thirds of the respondents expressed a WTP, through an increase in state income taxes, for the management plan described in the presurvey booklet. The willingness to pay expressed by respondents puts a dollar value on the well-being they receive from the protection of water quality in their region. This well-being translates into an annual economic benefit of \$139 per Catawba River basin taxpayer and more than \$75 million

Box 2 Contingent Valuation Question for Valuing Water Quality Management Plan

Now, assume a vote is being held today to approve or reject this management plan. Your payment for this plan would be collected through an increase in your usual state income taxes. All residents in counties within the Catawba River basin would make identical payments. This money would only be used for implementing this management plan for the Catawba River basin. If a majority of Catawba basin county residents vote in favor of this management plan, it will go into effect. Before you answer the following question, please consider your current income, as well as your expenses.

Suppose that this management plan would cost you \$—(5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 150, 200, 250) each year for the next five years in increased state income taxes. Would you vote in favor of the management plan?

Table 11.2 Willingness to pay to protect Catawba River water quality

<i>Respondent group</i>	<i>Mean willingness to pay (\$)</i>
Total sample	139
<i>Comparison across states</i>	
North Carolina residents	135
South Carolina residents	150
<i>Comparison across income levels</i>	
Household income \$30,000 and under	116
Household income between \$30,001 and \$75,000	157
Household income above \$75,000	180

for all taxpayers in Catawba basin counties. Table 11.2 shows a distribution of willingness to pay values. South Carolina residents, living near the more polluted downstream portion of the river, were willing to pay more than North Carolina residents were. For residents in both states, willingness to pay rose with household income.

After the contingent valuation question, the survey questionnaire contained various questions designed to elicit additional information from respondents regarding their votes on the management plan. One of these questions sought to uncover the most important reasons why respondents might value the management plan. The highest-rated reason was quality of area drinking water, followed by the knowledge that the waters in the basin were being protected, regardless of respondents' use of them. These results show that their willingness to pay was a function of both use and nonuse values.

The annual benefits from the CVM survey were used as part of a cost-benefit analysis of implementing the water management plan (Table 11.3). Detailed costs were estimated for each component of the management plan. The results showed a net present value of \$95 million that would result from implementing the plan, indicating that benefits far outweighed the costs.

IMPLICATIONS FOR IMPROVED ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT

It is increasingly recognized that the natural wealth embodied in the Earth's various ecosystems

Table 11.3 Benefit-cost analysis of implementing the Catawba basin management plan

Net present value of benefits over time	\$340 million
Net present value of costs over time	\$245 million
Benefits minus costs	\$95 million

provides critical support of human well-being and economic activity. The economic worth of these ecosystem services often goes unrecognized. Why should we worry about the economic valuation of these services? In part, because there will always be competing demands for the use of both natural resources and limited public financial resources. Benefit-cost analysis has proven to be a useful tool to guide public decision-making in the face of competing interests. Environmental organizations and other public interest groups may find it useful to turn to benefit-cost analysis, including the analysis of nonmarket values, to advocate for a complete accounting of the impacts of public policies. Those concerned about fiscal responsibility of public investments in natural resource related projects may find that the discipline provided by impartial weighing of benefits and costs can contribute to a wiser use of public funds. Because many of the services provided by ecosystems are outside the realm of market transactions, the value of these service flows is best evaluated with nonmarket methods developed by environmental economists. It is important for environmental professionals to be better informed about these methods, when they are called for, and their strengths and weaknesses (Braden 2000). Environmental valuation is a mature and rapidly growing field, with thousands of applications now complete, many of them applied to ecosystem services. Research in this field has documented a large willingness to pay for improvements in environmental quality and protection of ecosystem services.

The enterprise of producing valuation information and feeding it into the public policy process is unlikely to slow down in the future. As environmental economist Kerry Smith (1993) noted in his appraisal of nonmarket valuation methods, "Environmental resources are increasingly recognized as assets providing services that are no longer readily available. Indeed, demands to measure their values and incorporate them into our decisions is precisely what we would expect as their scarcity increases" (p. 1).

Our expanding knowledge about how to quantify ecosystem services provides opportunities for improved policy formulation regarding the management of those resources. Obviously, the valuation studies will not be the only factor when decisions are being made that will affect the management of ecosystems. But in cases where political decisions are relatively "close calls," estimates of nonmarket values as part of a benefit-cost analysis of policy alternatives may be influential and lead to improved policy formulation (Bennett, 2003).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This review was funded in part by a grant from a coalition of organizations including Environmental Defense, Southern Environmental Law Center, Sierra Club, the North Carolina Conservation Network, the Conservation Council of North Carolina, and the North Carolina Public Interest Research Group. The author appreciates advice and assistance provided by David McNaught, Lisa Dellwo, Rebecca Madsen, Joel Sholtes, Greg Harper, and Jon Eisen-Hecht. The opinions expressed are those of the author only.

NOTES

1 See Chapters 9 and 10 for an in-depth discussion of economic surplus measures and other valuation concepts encountered in estimating total economic value.

2 The 1992 International Conference on Water and Environment in Dublin, Ireland, developed a set of four principles to guide management of freshwater that became known as the Dublin Principles. The other three principles are: (1) fresh water is a finite and vulnerable resource, essential to sustain life, development, and the environment; (2) water development and management should be based on a participatory approach, involving users, planners, and policymakers at all levels; (3) women play a central part in the provision, management, and safeguarding of water (World Meteorological Organization).

REFERENCES

- Bennett, Jeff. (2003). "Environmental Values and Water Policy." *Australian Geographical Studies* 41(3): 237–250.
- Braden, John B. (2000). "Value of Valuation: Introduction." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 126: 336–338.
- Carson, Richard T., Nicholas E. Flores, and Norman F. Meade. (2001). "Contingent Valuation: Controversies and Evidence." *Environmental and Resource Economics* 19: 173–210.
- Daily, Gretchen (ed.) (1997). *Nature's Services: Societal Dependence on Natural Ecosystems*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Desvousges, W., M. Naughton, and G. Parsons. (1992). "Benefits Transfer: Conceptual Problems in Estimating Water Quality Benefits Using Existing Studies." *Water Resources Research* 28: 657–663.
- Dixon, John A., Louise F. Scura, Richard A. Carpenter, and Paul B. Sherman. (1986). *Economic Analysis of Environmental Impacts*. London: Earthscan.
- Earnhart, D. and V. Smith. (2003). "Countervailing Effects of Atrazine on Water Recreation: How do Recreators Evaluate Them?" *Water Resources Research* 39: WES 2.1.
- Eisen-Hecht, Jon I., and Randall A. Kramer. (2002). "A Cost–Benefit Analysis of Water Quality Protection in the Catawba Basin." *Journal of the Water Resources Association* 38: 453–465.
- Foster, John. (1997). *Valuing Nature? Economics, Ethics, and Environment*. London: Routledge.
- Freeman, A. Myrick, III. (1993). *The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values: Theory and Methods*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future.
- Hanemann, W.M. (1995). "Contingent Valuation and Economics." In K.G. Willis and J.T. Corkindale (eds) *Environmental Valuation: New Perspectives*. Cheltenham, UK: CAB International.
- Heal, G. (2000) *Nature and the Marketplace: Comparing the Value of Ecosystem Services*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Hicks, John R. (1939). *Value and Capital: An Inquiry into Some Fundamental Principles of Economic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kramer, Randall A., and Jon I. Eisen-Hecht. (2002). "Estimating the Economic Value of Water Quality in the Catawba River Basin." *Water Resources Research* 38: 1–10.
- Kramer, Randall, Robert Healy, and Robert Mendelsohn. (1992). "Forest Valuation." In Narendra Sharma (ed) *Managing the World's Forests*. Arlington, VA: Kendall Hunt.
- Kramer, Randall, Daniel Richter, Subhrendu Pattanayak, and Narendra Sharma. (1997). "Ecological and Economic Analysis of Watershed Protection in Eastern Madagascar." *Journal of Environmental Management* 49: 277–295.
- Leggett, C.G. and N.E. Bockstael. (2000). "Evidence of the Effects of Water Quality on Residential Land Prices." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 39: 121–144.
- Loomis, John B. (1987). "Balancing Public Trust Resources of Mono Lake and Los Angeles' Water Rights. An Economic Approach." *Water Resources Research* 23(8): 1449–1456.
- Loomis, John B. (2000). "Environmental Valuation Techniques in Water Resource Decision Making." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 126 (6): 339–344.
- McMahon, Paul, and Meg Postle. (2000). "Environmental Valuation and Water Resources Planning in England and Wales." *Water Policy* 2: 397–421.
- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. (2005). *Living Beyond Our Means: Natural Assets and Human Well-Being*. New York: United Nations Environmental Program.
- Mitchell, Robert C. and Richard T. Carson. (1993). "The Value of Clean Water: The Public's Willingness to Pay for Boatable, Fishable, and Swimmable Quality Water." *Water Resources Research* 29(7): 2445–2454.
- Pagiola, Stefano, Konrad von Ritter, and Joshua Bishop. (2004). *Assessing the Value of Ecosystem Conservation* (World Bank Environmental Department Paper, no. 101), The World Bank Environmental Department, in Collaboration with the Nature Conservancy and IUCN – The World Conservation Union.
- Pearce, David W. (1999). "Valuing the Environment." In David W. Pearce (ed) *Economics and the Environment: Essays in Ecological Economics and Development*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Pigou, Arthur C. (1920). *The Economics of Welfare* (1952, 4th edn). London: Macmillan.

- Randall, Alan. (1991). "Total and NonUse Values." In J.B. Braden and C.D. Koistad (eds) *Measuring the Demand for Environmental Quality*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Rosenberger, Randall S., and John B. Loomis, (2003). "Benefit Transfer." In P.A. Champ, K.J. Boyle and T.C. Brown (eds) *A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- Sagoff, Mark. (1988). *The Economy of the Earth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shabman, Leonard and Kurt Stephenson. (2000). "Environmental Valuation and Its Economic Critics." *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management* 126: 382-388.
- Smith, V. Kerry. (1993). "Nonmarket Valuation of Environmental Resources: An Interpretive Appraisal." *Land Economics* 69(1): 1-26.
- Smith, V. Kerry and William H. Desvousges. (1986). *Measuring Water Quality Benefits*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Taylor, Laura O. (2003). "The Hedonic Method." In P.A. Champ, K.J. Boyle and T.C. Brown (eds) *A Primer on Nonmarket Valuation*. Boston: Kluwer Academic.
- World Meteorological Organization. (1992). "The Dublin Statement on Water and Sustainable Development." Accessed June 2004 at <http://www.wmo.ch/web/homs/documents/english/icwedece.html>