

Index

- ABERS
 - approach 196
 - estimate for lower bound 200, 204, 206–7, 218
 - non-parametric estimator 74
- adding-up test
 - adaptation for 70–73
 - “adding-up condition”
 - applying only to goods obtained incrementally 60
 - consumer preferences not adhering to 67–8
 - definition 59
 - description 61–3
 - deviations from 68
 - findings 61, 78
 - implementation of 59
 - in previous studies 60
 - testing 60–61
- and adequate response to differences
 - in scope 59, 66, 78
- applied to restoration program for river system and lake 60–61, 69–75
- elicitation method 63, 67–8, 78
- explanation 61–3
- findings 61, 78
- income effects 64–5, 75–7
- incremental parts
 - for accelerated restoration 71
 - and cognitive burden 64
 - findings 61, 78
 - lack of studies on 59–60
 - meaning 59
 - in original study’s design 70
 - past studies review 66–8
 - use to test adding-up condition 60–61
- limitations of scope tests 58–9
- original study 68–70
- potential difficulties in implementing
 - cognitive burden 64
 - cost 66
 - income effects 64–5
 - provision mechanism 65
 - for reliability of CV 88–90
 - results 73–5
 - study discussion and conclusions 78
 - and truthfulness 60–61, 69, 78
- adequate
 - sensitivity to scope 129–37, 140
 - use of term 88, 140
- algae 60, 69, 100, 117, 257, 259
- alum 60, 69–70, 72, 74, 100, 117
- American Trader spill litigation 299
- anchoring
 - biases 178
 - cost 2, 5, 10, 84
 - effects 2, 5, 84, 114, 160, 163, 215, 277
 - as issue surrounding CV 30, 36
 - in red knot study 55–6
 - response distortions in 165
- behavior
 - choice 14, 176–9, 237–8
 - deterministic heuristic rule
 - predicting 239–40
 - ideal, for validity of WTP estimates 224–5
 - irrational 48
 - market 153–4, 156–7
 - protest 232
 - purchase 172, 277
 - randomizer 234
 - surveys of consumer, in court cases 299–300
 - use of conjoint methods for
 - predicting 162, 168–70, 173, 176
 - of utility maximizing 231, 255
 - behavioral anomalies 36, 112, 154
 - behavioral economics 155, 157, 159

- behavioral response
 - to high bids 17–18, 36
 - questions to explore 34–5
 - true 23
- behavioral theories 78, 154–5, 157, 159, 252
- belief in bid values 32–5
- bias ratio (BR) 271–4, 277–85
- bids
 - “composite good” approach
 - bid levels
 - cognition difficulties with part-whole relationships 214–15
 - comparison between composite good and V1 COS 207
 - non-monotonicity 200
 - propensity to shift votes 204–6
 - marine species preservation case 3
 - percentage of respondents voting for alum treatments 73–4
 - red knot studies
 - belief in bid values 32–5
 - bid amount
 - non-parametric estimates by 27, 32, 35
 - percentage of respondents who believed they would pay more or pay less than offered 34
 - percentage of yes responses at highest 19–21
 - percentage of yes responses by 27
 - yes response irrespective of 30
 - yes responses v. responses adjusted for “believed” 33
 - yes responses v. responses adjusted for certainty 31
 - bid design 22, 24–5
 - bid levels
 - highest 17–23, 25, 28–36
 - low-end 22–3, 30
 - share of “yes” votes 50, 52
 - bid range 18
 - non-monotonicity 26
 - truncated 17–18, 23, 25, 27–9, 36
 - willingness to pay estimates 28–30, 36
 - and yes-response function 26–7
 - single-focus approach bid levels 194–6
 - and WTP for meal vouchers 67–8
 - “bounded substitution” 84–5, 88–9, 131
 - brain activity 178–9
 - budget awareness
 - adoption in survey 192
 - in CVM studies 188
 - findings 219
 - three related enhancements 193
 - “wording additions” intended to enhance 216–19
 - budget constraint
 - affecting responses to valuation questions 189
 - findings 219
 - in single-focus valuation method 190
 - in WTP survey methods 189
 - California Environmental Improvement Program 193–4, 199–202, 205–8, 213, 215
 - California oil spill (COS) study *see* “composite good” approach
 - Carson, R.T. 17, 19, 58, 60–61, 69, 78, 85–8, 91–8, 100, 112–14, 117, 123, 132, 135, 140, 155, 159, 179, 192, 196, 209, 252–3, 255, 257, 271
 - CBC *see* choice-based conjoint (CBC)
 - census weights 54–5
 - certainty
 - adjustment 31–2
 - correction 138–40, 273–6, 279–81, 283–5
 - elimination of uncertainty 54–5
 - levels 30–31
 - questions 30–31
 - of response 255–6, 262, 266
 - weights 54–5
 - cervical screening study 3–4
 - “cheap talk”
 - in “composite good” approach 193, 215–16, 218–20
 - in hypothetical bias study 272, 274, 277, 279–81
 - in marine species preservation study 6, 228
 - in scope studies 137–8

- choice-based conjoint (CBC)
 - behavioral effects 154
 - comparison to CVM 154, 160
 - elicitations directly mimicking market choice tasks 158
 - example of typical menu 158
 - as leading SP method 153
 - lessons for 179–80
 - method and applicability 160–62
 - study design
 - data analysis 176–7
 - experimental design 166–8
 - failures 177–9
 - important issues 162–5
 - incentive alignment 170–71
 - making menus realistic 173–6
 - reconciliation and validation 171–3
 - sampling and recruitment 165–6
 - subject training 168–70
 - as variable in hypothetical bias study 278, 280–81, 283, 285
- choice experiment (CE)
 - choice
 - based on absolute costs 5, 11, 14
 - based on relative costs 5, 11, 14
 - behavior 14
 - corner 10–11
 - in higher cost scale 8–11, 14
 - in lower cost scale 8–11
 - pattern for do-something 2, 5, 8, 10
 - pattern for status quo 8, 10–11, 14
 - proportions 4–5
 - tasks, performing 2
 - choice questions
 - answering 6
 - sample 7, 229
 - components 1
 - definition 82
 - fat tails equivalent for 36
 - in hypothetical bias study 272, 278
 - implications for choice behavior 14
 - method 1–2
 - NOAA sponsored online study 202, 216
 - popular use of 1
 - in previous scope test studies 105–6
 - see also* choice-based conjoint (CBC); dichotomous choice surveys
- choke price 18, 28
- cognition difficulties
 - with part-whole relationships 214–16
 - sizeable proportion in responses 209–13
- cognitive burden 64, 258
- “composite good” approach
 - “cheap talk” 193, 215–16, 218–20
 - composite good version
 - priority allocations for components 201–4
 - standalone COS
 - reactions to scenario 204–5
 - values for program 205–6
 - valuing Version 2 199–200
 - context and rationale
 - foci 188–9
 - and single-focus approach 189–91
 - study design 192–4
 - not-for votes 196–7, 200, 206–8, 214, 218, 220
 - and single-focus approach 189–91, 199, 205, 208–9, 211, 213–15
 - single-good version
 - 1995 test-bed study
 - comparisons 196–8
 - similarities and differences 194–6
 - study findings
 - budget exercise and COS 213–14
 - cognition difficulties
 - with part-whole relationships 214–16
 - sizeable proportion in responses 209–13
 - lack of sensitivity to huge scope difference 206–8
 - plausible rationalization 219–21
 - within-questionnaire “wording additions” 216–19
 - single-good v. composite good WTP estimates 208–9
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) 293–4, 296, 299, 301–3, 305
- consequentiality 18, 23, 35–6, 189, 191, 219
- consumer choice behavior 14, 176–9, 237–8

- consumer utility theory 83–4, 140, 157, 177
- consumer well-being 154, 156, 160, 168, 177–8, 180
- contingent valuation (CV)
- concepts examined
 - difficulty answering questions *xiii–xv*
 - inadequate response to cost *x–xi*
 - inadequate response to number of payments *xii*
 - inadequate response to scope *xii–xiii, xvii*
 - legal issues *xvi*
 - restoration programs *xvi–xvii*
 - restricted samples *xv*
 - consequentiality as important issue in 35–6
 - definition 58
 - estimates of WTP for non-use environmental goods *see* scope tests
 - hypothetical bias presence in 29–30, 36
 - prominent concern about 58
 - reliability
 - adding-up test 88–90
 - examination of criteria 86–8
 - gradient 154, 179
 - as ignored issue 91
 - question of *x*, 58
 - recognizing unreliability *xvii*
 - survey problems 300
 - use of term *x*
 - use values 82–3
 - “warm glow” that can arise in 68
 - see also* “composite good” approach; referendum-style CV
- contingent valuation method (CVM)
- applicability 153
 - assumptions of 191
 - comparison to CBC 154, 160
 - in “composite good” approach 188–9
 - as controversial in economics community 160
 - criteria of reliability of 86–7
 - development of 159–60
 - hypothetical bias observed with 220
 - incentive compatibility as issue for 171
 - as leading SP method 153
 - legal obstacles
 - approaches to estimating non-use value for NRD 295
 - as highly disfavoured by NRD regulations 301–3
 - for non-use damages 292–3
 - as not relied on in non-NRD contexts 299–301
 - as not relied upon in NRD cases 296–9
 - trustees abandoning as matter of policy 305–6
 - trustees avoiding 303–5
 - as mimicking direct democracy by referendum 170
 - possible reasons for lack of development 154–5
 - and “protest no” votes 212
 - recreational use value of birdwatching 179–80
 - as sensitive to context and survey design considerations 199
 - tendency to pass scope tests 112–13, 128
 - typical referendum elicitation 159
 - valuation of lost use 162, 179
 - value of experience of SP methods 154
 - as widely used to value environmental goods and services 1
- COS (California oil spill) *see* “composite good” approach
- cost
- adding up v. scope test 66, 90
 - anchoring 2, 5, 10, 84
 - annual v. one-time payments *xii*, 43–56
 - application to endangered shorebird species *xi*, 17–36
 - in CBC studies 167, 177
 - in choice experiments 1–2
 - household 24–5, 30, 32, 212, 216–17
 - in logit model of yes/no vote 76–7
 - in SP valuation of environmental goods *x–xi*, 1–14

- cost-benefit trade offs *see* trade-offs
 cost prompts *see* bids
 cost scales
 effect of quadrupling costs on mean WTP estimates 8–11, 13–14, 108, 207
 effect on consumer goods 14
 effect on estimated WTPs 108–12
 effect on use and non-use amenities 5, 14
 effects on “T&E” species status 11, 14, 207
 estimation results for conditional logit model by 12
 in four survey versions 6, 8–11
 frequency of choosing improvement option by 9
 as having strong positive correlation with WTP 108
 impact on utility function 11, 14
 influence on WTP 2–5
 and scope effects 109–12
 status quo and corner choices by 10–11, 14
 summary of studies 4
 cumulative distribution function (CDF) 30
 CV *see* contingent valuation (CV)
 CVM *see* contingent valuation method (CVM)
- DDT and PCBs case 296–8, 305
 debriefing questions *see* follow-up questions
Deepwater Horizon oil spill xviii, 121, 303–5
 Desvousges, W., Mathews, K. and Train, K. (DMT) 17, 19, 22, 58, 69, 87, 90–92, 98–104, 112–13, 117, 126, 140
 dichotomous choice surveys 2, 21–3, 82, 124, 126, 137, 192, 218, 271
 disbelief of cost, elimination 54–5
 DMT *see* Desvousges, W., Mathews, K. and Train, K. (DMT)
- economic valuation approach 294–5
 emotional intensity scales 85
 endangered shorebird *see* red knot studies
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) 5–7, 13, 228–9
 environmental litigation *see* legal issues
Exxon Valdez oil spill 86, 305
- familiarity 162–3, 168–9, 279
 fat tails
 and consequentiality 35–6
 extent in response data 18
 in follow-up question responses 35
 as manifestation of hypothetical bias 29–30, 36
 as manifestation of yea-saying 30, 36
 for non-parametric estimators 17, 27
 for parametric estimators 17
 paths for future research 36
 phenomenon *xi*, 17
 sensitivity of WTP to response data with 23, 36
 truncating high-end bids in response to 36
- follow-up questions
 to assess validity of SP data
 earliest examples 253
 in fourth section of survey 258
 invalid responses 267
 lack of consistency in use of 253
 literature review 255–7
 method and results 259–66
 as used to identify problem responses 254
 in hypothetical bias study 276
 and identification of protestors 227, 232, 243
 as inducing “bargaining” mind-set 162
 in red knot study 34–6
 yea-saying as result of 124–5
- GfK Custom Research 25, 194
 Groves, T. 60–61, 69, 78, 171, 252
- Hanemann, W.M. 58, 65, 101, 112, 118, 123, 126, 133, 136, 162
 Hicksian welfare measures 252
 hypothetical bias
 adjusting for 30–32
 effect of “wording additions” 189
 fat tails as manifestation of 29–30, 36

- meta-analysis
 - current v. prior studies on 270
 - data
 - bias ratio 271–4
 - certainty correction 273–6
 - cheap talk 277
 - conjoint/choice experiment 278
 - familiar good 279
 - lab experiment 278
 - non-use 279
 - private good/public good 278–9
 - same respondents v. different respondents 277
 - student 278
 - regression analysis
 - base model 279–81
 - fixed effects regression 284–6
 - functional form 281–2
 - time trend 282–4
 - study conclusions 286
 - method of detecting 29
 - observed with CVM surveys 220
- Idaho v. Southern Refrigerated Transport Inc.* 298
 - “inadequate”, use of term 88
 - incentive alignment 170–71, 175–6, 179
 - incentive compatibility 163–4, 170–71
 - income effects 64–5, 75–7
- Kahneman, D. 44–5, 86–7, 92–4, 101–2, 119, 154, 157, 160, 178, 191
- Knetsch, J.L. 44–5, 86–7, 93, 102, 119, 191
- Knowledge Networks 6–7, 25–6, 194, 228–9, 299
- lab experiment variable 273–4, 278–85
- latent class models 226–7, 230–34
- legal issues
 - approaches to estimating non-use value for NRD
 - contingent valuation methods 295
 - restoration-based approach 294–5
 - contingent valuation methods
 - approach to estimating non-use value for NRD 295
 - as highly disfavoured by NRD regulations 301–3
 - for non-use damages 292–3
 - as not relied upon in non-NRD contexts 299–301
 - as not relied upon in NRD cases 296–9
 - trustees abandoning as matter of policy 305–6
 - trustees avoiding 303–5
- court cases
 - American Trader spill litigation 299
 - Idaho v. Southern Refrigerated Transport Inc.* 298
 - People v. Attransco, Inc.*, 299
 - Price v. Philip Morris, Inc.* 299–300
 - United States v. Montrose* 296–8
 - NRD regulatory framework and basis for non-use damages 293–4
- logit
 - model
 - binary 266
 - estimates for low-cost and high-cost data samples 11–13
 - mixed form
 - v. model with heuristics 235–7, 244–9
 - multinomial 176–7, 226
 - of trade-off respondents 238, 240–45
 - traditional 225–6, 231, 242–6, 248
 - of yes/no vote 76
 - parametric estimator 17
 - of random utility model 1–2
 - regression 264–6
 - Loureiro, M.L. 98, 105–9, 112
 - Louviere, J. 6, 157–8, 164, 172, 252–3, 257
 - mandatory payment
 - mechanism 191
 - survey mode 138
 - marginal utility
 - diminishing 60, 62, 83–5, 88–9, 112, 129–31
 - of income 231
 - levels for species improvement 231

- marine species preservation case
 - inferences from stated preference surveys 225–49
 - response to cost prompts *xi*, 5–14
- Mathews, K. *see* Desvousges, W., Mathews, K. and Train, K. (DMT)
- menus *see* choice-based conjoint (CBC)
- migratory bird studies *see* red knot studies
- minced pork study 3–4, 14
- Mitchell, R.C. 85–6, 94, 117, 155, 252
- natural resource damage (NRD)
 - ability of survey methods to measure non-use values in 292
 - approaches to estimating non-use value for
 - contingent valuation methods 295
 - restoration-based approach 294–5
 - assessment (NRDA) 253, 305
 - better approach for valuation of 306
 - contingent valuation methods as disfavoured by regulations of 301–3
 - court decisions associated with 296–9
 - Deepwater Horizon* oil spill *xvii*, 303–5
 - regulatory framework and basis for non-use damages 293–4
- “no purchase” option 163, 176
- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)
 - adding up test addressing concerns of 59, 63, 78
 - clarification of term “inadequate” 88
 - commissioning study of NRD 296
 - concern over scope 129, 140
 - conclusion on respondents’ WTP 114
 - and consequentiality 189
 - marine species survey
 - application of 225–7
 - data 5–11, 228–9, 243
 - mixed logit analysis of 248
 - model 230–34, 237
 - purpose of 58, 86
 - recommendation of referendum format question 195
 - recommendation of “Yes/No” follow-up questions 253
 - reliability of CV 86–8, 91, 140
 - scope studies 91
- non-parametric estimators
 - in red knot study
 - estimates by bid amount 27
 - adjusted for believed bid 35
 - adjusted for hypothetical bias 32
 - estimates of WTP 28–9
 - WTP and truncation of bids 23, 36
 - relation to fat tails 17
 - in river and lake quality study 73–5
- non-use amenities 3, 5, 14, 83, 107, 141
- see also* scope tests: and CV
 - estimates of WTP for non-use environmental goods
- non-use damages
 - in court case 298
 - NRD regulatory framework and basis for 293–4
 - role of trustees 302
 - survey valuation methods
 - legal obstacles to use 305
 - non-use by trustees 303–4
- non-use, in hypothetical bias study
 - considerations 270, 273, 275, 279–80
 - variable 279–81, 283–5
- non-use values
 - approaches to estimating for NRD
 - CV methods 82–3, 253, 292, 295, 302, 305
 - restoration-based approach 294–5, 303–4
 - as at bad end of reliability gradient 154
 - and brain activity 179–80
 - in California 192–3
 - compensation for 294
 - in court cases 296, 303–4
 - CV and CE as designed to infer WTP for 108
 - CVM eliciting from consumers 154–5
 - effects of training and context 170
 - greatest need for SP data in
 - application to environmental 180

- lack of data to support WTP estimates 252
- lack of success stories 180
- relation to market benchmarks 162
- SP discrete choice experiment for estimating 1
- SP methods applicable to 180
- NRD *see* natural resource damage (NRD)
- Oil Pollution Act (OPA) 192, 293–4, 296, 299, 301–4
- Ojea, E. 98, 105–9, 112
- one-time tax 24, 199, 216–17
- ordering problem *xiv*, 164
- parametric estimators 17, 22–3, 43–4, 46, 53, 55, 126–7
- payments, frequency of, inadequate response to
 - analysis 50–55
 - annual payments
 - comparison of split samples 52
 - implicit discount rates 44–9
 - lower-bound estimates 53
 - probit estimates 54
 - referendum question 50–51
 - relation to WTP 55–6
 - sensitivity results 55
 - share of “yes” vote by bid amount 52
 - in split-sample survey 43–4, 50
 - version B of survey instrument 50
 - literature review 44–9
- one-time payments
 - comparison of split samples 52
 - implicit discount rates 44–9
 - lower-bound estimates 53
 - probit estimates 54
 - referendum question 50–51
 - relation to WTP 55–6
 - sensitivity results 55
 - share of “yes” vote by bid amount 52
 - in split-sample survey 43–4, 50
 - version A of survey instrument 50
- purpose and method 43–4
- relation to WTP 55–6
- study conclusions 55–6
- survey 49–50
- People v. Attransco, Inc.*, 299
- power outages study 3–4
- present value willingness to pay (PV WTP)
 - analysis 50–55
 - conclusion 55
 - literature review 44–9
 - survey 49–50
- Price v. Philip Morris, Inc* 299–300
- private good/public good variable 273–4, 278–81, 283–5
- probit
 - estimates 54
 - model of yes/no vote 53
 - multivariate regressions 138–40
 - parametric estimator 17, 43
- protestors
 - common practice of excluding 7, 9, 124, 225, 240
 - definition 7, 9
 - and sensitivity of lower-bound mean WTP 211–12
 - in stated preference assessing validity study 253, 255–6, 260
 - in stated preference inferences study and estimated population share 239–40
 - model with three heuristics to identify 225
 - in sensitivity analysis 242–5
 - status quo only respondents 232
 - study conclusion on 249
 - use of latent class models to identify 227
- PV WTP *see* present value willingness to pay (PV WTP)
- Qualtrics sample 25–6
- random utility model (RUM) 1–2, 8
- rational choice model (RCM) 252
- red knot studies
 - fat tails and truncated bids
 - purpose and method 17–18
 - related literature 19–23
 - results
 - adjusting for hypothetical bias 30–32
 - belief in bid values 32–4
 - follow up questions 34–5

- willingness to pay estimates
 - 28–30
 - yes-response function 26–7
 - study discussion 35–6
 - survey 24–6
- response to frequency of payments
 - analysis 50–55
 - literature review 44–9
 - purpose and method 43–4
 - study conclusions 55–6
 - survey 49–50
- referendum-style CV
 - in hypothetical bias study 271
 - red knot studies 18–21, 24–5, 43, 50–51, 55–6
 - in river and lake quality study 69, 76
 - in single-focus and “composite good” approaches 190, 192–7, 199–206, 208, 210–13, 218, 220
 - in stated preference methods study 159–60, 163, 170–71
- responsible parties (RPs) 303–4
- restoration-based approach 294–5, 301–3, 305
- restoration programs
 - and contingent valuation *xvi–xvii*
 - oyster reef 44, 46
 - pros and cons of voting for 258
 - for river and lake 60–61, 69–75, 78
 - wetland 254–67
- revealed preference (RP) 82–3, 153–4, 156, 172, 178–9, 219
- river and lake quality study *see* adding-up test
- river health improvements study 3–5
- sample allocation 3
- scope effects 63, 84, 88, 91, 98, 108, 112–13, 123, 128
- scope elasticities 112, 129–37, 141
- scope insensitivity
 - categorical 84
 - demand for environmental amenity 83
 - evidence for 126
 - factors leading to 85–6
 - as often attributed to diminishing marginal utility and satiation 84–5
 - quantitative 84
- regressions examining factors
 - affecting 139–40
- rejection of hypothesis 91, 97
- “warm glow” as explanation for 86
- for wolves 83
- scope tests
 - and adding-up test study
 - adding-up test extending 62
 - cost 66
 - examining estimated WTP
 - increases 58–9, 63
 - issue of adequate response 59, 66, 78
 - non-negative scope effects 63
 - restoration program
 - discussion 78
 - results 73–4
 - of river and lake 69–70
 - and CV estimates of WTP for non-use environmental goods
 - diminishing marginal utility 83–5, 88–9, 112, 129–31
 - inconsistent statistical significance results 127–9
 - pass and fail results affected
 - by measurable survey characteristics 137–40
 - reliability of CVM 86–90
 - scope effects 84, 88, 91, 98, 108, 112–13, 123, 128
 - scope elasticities 112, 129–37, 141
 - scope insensitivity 83–6, 91, 97, 126, 139–40
 - scope literature
 - Carson’s review 91–7, 112–14
 - DMT’s review 91, 98–104
 - effect of cost scale on estimated WTPs 108–12
 - flaws in 107–8, 140–41
 - frequency of CV studies passing scope test 128–9
 - Ojea and Loureiro 98, 105–9
 - review of scope results reported in 113–24
 - scope sensitivity in 83, 87, 96–8, 107–8, 112, 123, 126
 - summary of state of 112–13
 - on use amenities 107

- scope sensitivity
 - demonstration of adequate
 - 129–37
 - in scope literature 83, 87, 96–8, 107–8, 112, 123, 126
- study conclusions 140–41
- use of external 84, 91–104, 112–15, 123–4, 129
- use values 82–3
- variations
 - in analytical models and statistical procedures 126–7
 - in data included in analysis 124–5
 - in survey design 125–6
- sensitivity analysis 209–13, 242–8
- single-focus approach 189–91, 199, 205, 208–9, 211, 213–15
- SP *see* stated preference (SP)
- stated preference (SP) evaluation of environmental goods
 - assessing validity of data using follow-up questions
 - consistency of questions 253
 - criteria for 252–3, 266–7
 - literature review 255–7
 - methods and results
 - cumulative assessment of validity of responses 261–4
 - descriptive statistics 260–61
 - regression analysis 264–6
 - three basic components 259–60
 - “problematic responses” 253–4
 - study design and data 257–9
 - study discussion and conclusions 266–7
 - survey subject 254
- inferences from surveys when costs and benefits are not compared
 - application of methodology to data 225
- estimation 235–8
- heuristic decision rules
 - attentive to environmental costs only 233–4
 - attentive to environmental improvements only 232–3
 - environmental improvements ignoring costs and benefits 234
 - randomizers ignoring costs and benefits 234
 - status quo only 232
- model
 - alternative to benefit-cost trade-offs 231–4
 - trade-off respondents 230–31
- related literature 226–7
- results
 - estimated population shares of choice rules 238–40
 - estimated WTP for species status improvement 240–42
 - sensitivity analysis 242–8
 - study conclusions 248–9
 - survey data 228–9
- WTP estimate
 - features determining 224
 - ideal behavior for validity 224–5
 - for species status improvement 240–42
- methods and applicability
 - choice-based conjoint study design 160–79
 - history of 155–61
 - importance of 153–4
 - lessons for 179–80
 - possible reasons for lack of development 154–5
- response to cost prompts
 - choice experiment method 1–2
 - cost scale studies 2–5
 - study conclusion 11–14
 - survey data 5–11
- status quo
 - in CBC studies 165, 177–8
 - in marine species preservation study 6–11, 14
 - in non-use amenities study 3–5
 - in stated preference inferences study 224, 227–8, 232, 235–40, 243–9
 - in stated preference validity study 258, 264, 266
- steelhead fish population damage case 298
- student variable 273–4, 278–81, 283–5
- subject training 168–70
- “subjective well-being” methods 160

- threatened and endangered (“T&E”) species
- marine
 - choice experiment
 - effects of cost scales on status
 - 11, 14, 207
 - NOAA survey data 5–11
 - study conclusions 11–14
 - stated preference survey
 - estimation 235–8
 - model 230–34
 - NOAA survey data 228–9
 - related literature 226–7
 - results 238–48
 - study conclusions 248–9
 - scope tests 105, 130
 - total value equivalency method (TVE)
 - 295, 302
 - trade-offs
 - in CBC studies 175, 178
 - criterion in assessment of SP 255
 - and familiarity 163
 - in red knot study 35–6
 - in stated preference inferences study
 - alternatives to benefit-cost trade-offs
 - attentive to environmental costs only 233–4
 - attentive to environmental improvements only 232–3
 - environmental improvements ignoring costs and benefits 234
 - randomizers ignoring costs and benefits 234
 - status quo only 232
 - estimation 235–8
 - need for heuristics 225
 - and respondent behavior 224–5
 - respondents 230–31
 - results 238–49
 - between status quo and do-something options 8–11, 14
- Train, K. *see* Desvousges, W., Mathews, K. and Train, K. (DMT)
- truncated bids
 - as common practice 18
 - effect on WTP 27–9
 - explanation 17
 - implications 25
 - intentional 23
 - as tempting response to fat tails 36
 - truthfulness 60–61, 69, 78, 161, 163–4, 169, 171, 176, 195
 - Turnbull, B.W. 17, 43, 50, 53, 109, 196, 219
 - United States v. Montrose* 296–8, 305
 - use amenities 3, 5, 14, 83, 107
 - use values
 - applications of SP methods to
 - environmental 179
 - and brain activity 179
 - CBC elicitations of 179–80
 - and contingent valuation 82–3
 - passive 1, 11, 86, 94, 121
 - from SP studies 154
 - utility function 1–2, 8, 11, 107, 155–6, 158, 233–4, 237
 - valuation of lost use 162, 179
 - “vignette analysis” 160
 - voluntary contributions 124, 191
 - voting question example 25, 51
 - “warm glow” concept 60, 68, 83–4, 86–7, 89–90, 115, 125, 131, 208, 216, 220
 - water quality studies
 - annual v. one-time payments 46–7
 - cost scale study 3–4
 - measuring yes-response rates 19–21, 23
 - scope tests
 - Carson 91–8
 - DMT 98–104
 - summary 117–24
 - use of debriefing questions 256
 - wetland restoration project study *see* stated preference (SP) assessing validity study
 - willingness to accept (WTA) 63, 67, 190
 - willingness to pay (WTP)
 - in adding-up test
 - addressing adequate response 59–60
 - description 62–3
 - findings 61, 78

- income effects 64–5, 75–7
- in original study 69
- in previous studies 59–60
- provision mechanism 65
- questionnaire versions 71
- relation to adding-up condition 59–60
- in restoration program 60–61, 69, 71, 74–5
- results 74–5
- review of past studies 66–8
 - and willingness to accept (WTA) discrepancy 63
- in CBC studies 165
- in “composite good” approach
 - in aggregate for large basket of alternative public goods 190
- effect if valuation question delayed 199
- effect of propensity to shift votes 204
- embodying budget constraint 189
- estimates
 - effect of “wording additions” 216–19
 - sensitivity to cognitive difficulties 209–13
 - single-focus v. composite good 208–9
- exploration of, using split-sample design 188
- impact of budget exercise 214
- lower-bound mean 196–7, 200, 203–4, 206–7, 210–11, 213, 218
- lowering of statistics 198
- respondents expressing value for first environmental good 215–16
- and scope failure 207
- similarities with average charitable donations 220
- v. single-focus survey 190–91
- statistics for long and short forms 198
- and consumer well-being 178–9, 180
- hurdles faced by CBC or CVM elicitation of 179
- in hypothetical bias study 271, 276–8
- marine species preservation case
 - impact of fourfold increase in costs 8–11, 13–14, 108, 207
 - influence of cost scales on 2–5, 14
- modeling consumer utility in “money metric” form 177
- for non-use amenities 3, 5, 14
- in red knot studies
 - adjusting for hypothetical bias 31–2
 - belief in bid values 34
 - effect of bid truncation on 27–8
 - estimates 18, 28–30
 - fat tails of yes-response function 24–5, 30
 - importance of maximum bid selection 28–9
 - lower-bound mean 27–9, 31–2, 35–6, 50–51, 53, 55
 - present value (PV WTP) 44–55
 - problem of negative estimates 17
 - related literature 22–3
 - sensitivity
 - to frequency of payments 43–4, 49, 55–6
 - of mean, to largest bid 36
 - results 55
 - size of mean bids 29
- scope tests
 - and CV estimates of WTP for non-use environmental goods 82–141
 - effect of cost scale on estimated WTPs 108–12
 - and increase in environmental benefits 58–9
 - and prominent concern of CV 58
- in stated preference inferences study estimates
 - features determining 224
 - fragility of 242–8
 - ideal behavior for validity 224–5
 - for maximization of utility 249
 - for species status improvement 240–42, 248
 - estimation 235–8
 - for landscape improvements 227
 - and trade-off respondents 231
 - for use amenities 3, 5, 14

- wine scent wheel 174
- “wording additions” 216–19
- yea-saying 30, 36, 253, 255–6
- yes-response function
 - adjusting for hypothetical bias 30–31
 - fat tails of 17–18, 34–5
 - many studies with truncated 18–21, 35
 - pinning down tails of 24–5, 35
 - results in red knot study 26–7
 - WTP captured in high-end tail of 36
- yes-response rates
 - bid design for 25
 - in binary choice models 23
 - expectations in valid surveys 30
 - at higher bid prices
 - effect of high 29
 - explanation for high 35
 - to highest bid in referendum-style CV studies 18–21
 - in non-parametric estimates by bid amount 27
 - to question about tax amount 33
 - relation to fat tails 17
 - share by bid amount 50, 52
 - in study of migratory birds 22
 - in WTP estimates 28

