

From: [Matthew A. Weber](#)
To: [CWC Water Storage Investment Program](#)
Cc: Stephen.Hatchett@CH2M.com
Subject: Updated reference information for the Technical Guidance Document
Date: Tuesday, December 06, 2016 9:35:08 AM

Dear Mr. Yun,

We have a minor comment relating to one of the references in the Technical Guidance Document. As noted in the list of modifications there were numerous updated references, and we submit the following suggested change, which we hope will make the reference more easily available to interested parties. The study is peer-reviewed and open-access.

Instead of:

Weber, M. 2015. Navigating benefit transfer for salmon improvements in the Western U.S. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Western Ecology Division, Corvallis OR.

We suggest:

Weber, M. 2015. Navigating benefit transfer for salmon improvements in the Western U.S. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 2: 74. Available at:
<http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmars.2015.00074/full>.

Furthermore, we would suggest slight rewording in how this reference is presented in the Technical Guidance Document, since the referenced study was meant to support benefit transfer of salmon values for numerous potential policy cases, and not just the Willamette River of Oregon, and is less definitive about the choice of meta-regression vs. structural benefit transfer. In addition, the Technical Guidance Document omitted the reference year for the dollar estimates.

Instead of:

Weber (2015) reviews the available information from contingent valuation studies to consider a potential benefits transfer to the Willamette River in Oregon. Results show the large potential variation in benefits per household (\$47 to \$4,370) when using a range of reasonable benefits transfer methods. The author recommends structural benefits transfer as opposed to meta-analysis, and provides a reference list.

We suggest:

Weber (2015) reviews studies providing WTP to preserve, increase, or avoid the loss of a given number of Western US salmon. Using an illustrative benefit transfer case study for the Willamette River in Oregon, a range of benefit transfer methods based on available data show large potential variation in benefits per household (\$47 to \$4,371 in 2015

dollars). Pros and cons of structural benefit transfer vs. meta-regression are reviewed, and a reference list is provided.

Thanks very much for your important work.

Matt Weber, Ph.D.
Senior Water Resources Economist

MONTGOMERY & ASSOCIATES

[We have a new website!](#)

www.elmontgomery.com

[\(503\) 347-1555](#) (mobile)

[\(520\) 881-4912](#) (office)

[\(520\) 881-1609](#) (fax)

This e-mail message and any attached electronic files are intended solely for the use of the addressee(s) named above, are confidential, and may be legally privileged. Unauthorized dissemination, distribution, or copying of this e-mail message or any part thereof is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify us by reply e-mail and/or by phone and delete all copies of this e-mail message including attachments from your computer system.