AERE NEWSLETTER

Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (AERE) *Vol. 28, No. 1* *May 2008*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE PRESIDENT…

As always, the AERE President's letter serves to review some recent highlights of our association's recent activities and also to inform members about current endeavors and future plans for the organization.

January 2008 Board Meeting

At the annual AERE Board meeting, held on the Friday evening during the ASSA meeting in New Orleans, the Board welcomed its newly elected officers and Board members: President-Elect Kathleen Segerson (University of Connecticut) who will take over in January of 2009; Vice President Laura O. Taylor (North Carolina State University); and new members of the Board of Directors, Carolyn Fischer (Resources For the Future) and Richard G. Newell (Duke University). Sincere appreciation was expressed to Stephen Polasky (University of Minnesota) who ended a two-year term as Vice President and to the two outgoing Board members who served AERE for three years: Alan Krupnick (Resources for the Future) and Marca Weinberg (U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service). Since so much of AERE's work is accomplished by the generous support of volunteers, I can't thank them enough.

Reports were made at the Board meeting by Chuck Mason, managing editor of the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* (*JEEM*), Rob Stavins, managing editor of the *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* (*REEP*), and Martin Green of Oxford University Press, *REEP*'s publisher.

Ian Parry, who has unstintingly given his time to AERE as Treasurer for five years, gave a financial report and updated us on the improved health of the AERE budget. His careful watch over the numbers during our recent challenging times has been very much appreciated. Ian nominated Joseph E. Aldy, of Resources for the Future, to replace him as AERE Treasurer and the nomination was seconded and approved by the Board.

Dave Bauman of Executive Directors, Inc. (our new management firm based in Milwaukee, Wisconsin) also gave a report and answered questions about membership services.

Annual Membership Luncheon and Meeting

Once again, I was honored to preside over the annual AERE luncheon/awards/business meeting held at the Sheraton New Orleans Hotel. It's one of the most rewarding responsibilities for the AERE president since it is the annual opportunity to interact with so many of our members and to present our Association's awards and celebrate the contributions of some of the most outstanding researchers in our discipline.

At this year's Luncheon, Judd Hammack and Gardner Mallard Brown, Jr. received the **Publication of Enduring Quality Award** for their book, *Waterfowl and Wetlands: Toward Bioeconomic Analysis*, Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 1974. There is a complete write-up about this special book on page 9 of this newsletter. Although neither awardees was able to attend the meeting, we were able to include Gardner via speakerphone so participants could hear his remarks. Gardner was also inducted as one member of the 2007 class of AERE Fellows. He shared this honor with five other AERE members: Daniel W. Bromley, Charles W. (Chuck) Howe, Kenneth E. (Ted) McConnell, Kathleen Segerson, and David Zilberman. Congratulations to all. The official AERE Fellows Program is posted on the AERE Web and a list of past recipients can be found on page 10. (See page 6 for information about submitting nominations for an AERE Fellow Award, and note that the deadline is **June 1**, as always.)

Finally, Marilyn M. Voigt was honored this year with a (surprise) special award, a desk clock and pen along with a "memory booklet" to thank her for 20 years of dedicated service to AERE—first as Executive Secretary and now as Executive Director. The printed booklet was filled with messages from many past officers, board members and friends with whom she's worked over the years.

A Second Annual AERE Board Meeting

AERE's activities and management challenges have also become sufficiently demanding that I have instituted a mid-year Board of Directors meeting. This meeting will be conducted by teleconference in mid-June. We had considered holding it in conjunction with the AERE Workshop, but given the single-topic orientation of the Workshop, not all Board members will necessarily attend in each year. This year's meeting will take place on June 12th. The timing will give the Board its first opportunity to discuss nominations for this year's AERE Fellow Award--up to three may be selected. If you have issues concerning AERE that should be considered for the agenda of this Board meeting (or a future meeting), please be sure to suggest them to me or to Marilyn Voigt. We continue to look for ways to enhance the benefits of membership in AERE, subject to the constraints posed by our limited revenues.

Rethinking Membership Requirements

While *JEEM* is AERE's "official journal," *JEEM* is owned by Elsevier, not AERE. Our organization is invited to help with the selection of editors, but we receive no royalties from the publisher. AERE is currently exploring options with Elsevier concerning the fundamental changes that have occurred in journal access over the last several years. At present, a subscription to *JEEM* is required for all AERE members. We have asked Elsevier to consider allowing us to again separate AERE membership from *JEEM* subscriptions, as was possible in the past, because so many potential AERE members are affiliated with universities through which these researchers can access *JEEM* via their library's digital subscriptions. If we can reconfigure the structure of AERE membership and *JEEM* subscriptions without creating a pricing structure for *JEEM* that is too burdensome for nonacademic members of AERE, we may be able to make AERE membership more attractive to a wider variety of potential members.

More Opportunities to Present Research

In lieu of trying to launch an all-AERE annual conference, AERE will instead test the consequences of expanding its number of sponsored sessions at other ongoing meetings. This year, we have expanded our sessions at the American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA) meetings, experimentally, from six to nine. AERE's presence at the Southern Economic Association (SEA) meeting has also increased to twelve sessions this year, suggesting that research interest in environmental and natural resource economics may be on the rise. I have also confirmed plans with Michael Intriligator, the incoming President for the Western Economic Association International (WEAI), to introduce sponsored AERE sessions to the WEAI annual conference, beginning in 2009 in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. We hope for a strong turnout, so please plan to respond to the Call for Papers when it is issued, especially if you are a "western" environmental or natural resource economist who cannot always participate in AERE sessions at the ASSA meetings, the AAEA meetings, or the SEA meetings. We plan to model this meeting-within-a-meeting on the long-running SEA activities coordinated in recent years by John Whitehead. I will step up to coordinate the inaugural set of sessions. I'd love to see AERE develop a strong regional "core" of WEAI/AERE participants who are based in western states and provinces and whose research interests in some cases reflect regional policy priorities for the environment and natural resources.

Expanding the Audience for *REEP*

In January, I foraged around on the web in an effort to identify specific individuals and their email addresses among “environmental” reporters and columnists for major newspapers and news magazines. As the current AERE president, I made contact with a number of these individuals to inform them about the existence of *REEP* and its mission. Most seemed very interested. The contact information has been forwarded to Rob Stavins and Martin Green, to help them target press releases concerning upcoming features and symposia in *REEP*.

Modernizing AERE’s Web Resources

During the summer of 2008, I plan to initiate a process of modernizing AERE’s web presence. The format of AERE’s web pages has been static for many years now and it seems clear that there are innovations we may wish to introduce. Ramesh Sethuraman of Industrial Economics, Inc., generously serves as AERE’s volunteer webmaster, but it would be helpful to have multiple authorized contributors and to have web pages that allow edits to be made without much knowledge of HTML. Our vice-president, Laura Taylor, has made some helpful suggestions based on CEnREP’s overhaul of their web pages. Products such as Adobe’s Contribute software may prove to be suitable. I would welcome any advice or suggestions about competing software we might wish to consider.

AERE Membership Figures and Encouragement of Student Members

As of late May, AERE’s 2008 membership roll included 638 individual members, 83 student members, 27 University members and 4 Institutional members. I would like to encourage my colleagues to consider signing up more of their graduate students for student memberships in our association, and to encourage these students to submit their research to the selection committees for the appropriate AERE sessions at different meetings during the year. Regular AERE members, as more-experienced researchers, can enhance the quality of student presentations by carefully reviewing the scope and content and helping them rehearse their talks. Each thing you do to help your student produce a polished and professional presentation—one that is well-motivated, interesting and intelligible to a wide AERE audience—contributes to capacity-building in our field. We need to continue to fill the pipeline with talented young researchers who can hit the ground running when they complete graduate school. Environmental problems are not going to go away with neglect. Unfortunately, our field is a growth industry.

Environmental Economics and Wikipedia

A few months ago, I took note of the increasing number of student and nonstudent acquaintances who use Wikipedia as a "first resort" when they wish to learn something about an unfamiliar topic. For a long time, I was skeptical about this resource, but it seems to be gaining ground in terms of credibility, at least for "mature" pages. I searched for "environmental economics" and found an entry that represents a start on an overview of our field, headlined by a quote from the NBER Environmental Economics program, but it was only a sketchy and uneven description. In the interest of outreach to the wider world, AERE members should probably feel some obligation to contribute their knowledge of their own particular subject area to this resource, since it seems to be a public good of growing international importance. There is a bit of a learning curve with respect to creating content for Wikipedia, and there are numerous intrepid watchdog volunteers who screen new content very carefully. Once you get used to the very specific conventions for Wikipedia content (and after you've had your knuckles severely rapped a few times for violating these conventions) you'll get the hang of it.

I've tried to jump-start our presence in Wikipedia by creating an entry for AERE (which initially pointed to a defunct atomic energy research facility in the UK). I also made basic entries for a few of our discipline's main journals: *JEEM*, *REEP*, *Environmental and Resource Economics (ERE)*, *Land Economics*, and the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics (AJAE*). I included some data on growth in total citation counts over time and lists of highly cited articles to give people some idea of the topics we consider in our research. I added us to the list of Economics Journals and created a general headliner link to "Journals in Environmental Economics." I view these first entries as placeholders and hope that a variety of AERE members will pitch in to refine and enhance them.

Within a very short time after my initial contributions, I discovered that the European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (EAERE) had uploaded their own entry (more professionally rendered, I might add). A little spirited competition might be a great motivator in getting our discipline's messages out to the wider world in a completely accessible medium. I hope to see a lot more substantive Wikipedia content for “Environmental and Natural Resource Economics” by this time next year. Perhaps the creation or enhancement of such content would be a useful assignment for some of our senior graduate students. A need to articulate what you know, for a general audience, can be one of the best ways to cement your knowledge.

International Accessibility of Our Research

The AERE Board has been discussing whether the time is right to reinstate the presence of reports from “International Correspondents” in the AERE newsletter. In recent years, we seem to have focused relatively more on events and activities within the U.S. and, to a certain extent, Canada although this issue of the newsletter does include a number of announcements of events and programs in Europe and Africa. Vice-President Laura Taylor has volunteered to help assemble a pilot program for AERE International Correspondents, and this is an endeavor we hope to get off the ground during the coming summer. We would like to be sure that AERE members are aware of activities, issues, and research endeavors in the wider world. If you have thoughts or suggestions concerning how this initiative could be most effective, please share them with us.

North American and European AERE members should also keep in mind that there is a wide audience for all kinds of environmental economics ideas and research beyond just the well-trodden paths of the U.S., Canada, Western Europe and a handful of international centers. Based on a few conversations with other AERE members who had also been asked to review paper submissions for this year's EAERE conference, I was surprised by the fact that several authors who appeared to be doing their research in developing countries seem to be unaware of important research in environmental economics that has taken place over the last dozen years. We need to be more careful to publicize our research. Merely having your paper come out in one of our discipline's main journals does not guarantee world-wide access. As a for-profit publisher, for example, Elsevier does not permit past issues of *JEEM* to be available via JSTOR. Among the major environmental economics journals, it seems that only the nonprofit publishers of *Land Economics* and the *AJAE* include their older issues in JSTOR. Despite this, the extended JSTOR collections which include these two journals are not universally available, even with the relatively generous terms for JSTOR subscriptions offered to institutions in developing countries. For example, even my own campus, the University of Oregon, faces a tight enough budget constraint that it seems we cannot support access to the JSTOR collections which include *Land Economics* and the *AJAE*. For researchers at institutions which cannot afford digital or hardcopy versions of a broad range of journals, it may be very difficult to gain access to the ideas and insights produced by AERE members in some of their best research. While we must all be careful to honor copyright conditions, I encourage you to maintain the presence of your work, in some form, in open-access contexts on the web.

June 2008 AERE Workshop

Complete information about the AERE Workshop on “Health and the Environment” appears on page 13 along with the list of distinguished speakers and papers being presented. Every year, the AERE Workshop is a major logistical undertaking, so I want to thank this year’s Workshop Committee chair, Michael Greenstone, and his assistant, Deborah Jamiol, for all their hard work, along with the rest of the Workshop committee.

AERE at the AAEA

If you are attending the AAEA meetings in Orlando in July, please make plans to attend the AERE reception, scheduled for Sunday, July 27th from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Caribe Royale in Boca V. This year, I have asked Kathy Segerson, our President-Elect, to preside at the reception. To my disappointment, I will have to miss most of the event because as AERE President, I need to attend the Association Roundtable, a valuable meeting for information exchange among the leadership of the various specialized associations with connections to the AAEA. This year, the Roundtable overlaps with all but the last half hour of the AERE Reception—so I may enjoy only a brief opportunity to say hello to many of you who attend.

ASSA/AERE Joint Session, San Francisco, January 2009

Kathleen Segerson’s first substantive task has been to put together the Joint Session for the January 2009 ASSA meetings, since she will have taken over the position of AERE President as of January 1 of next year. Kathy has assembled a panel discussion on a great topic that should attract a lot of economists from outside of AERE to sit in on this, our key outreach event at the ASSA. The panel will address “Energy and the Environment: Policy Advice for the New Administration.” *JEEM* Editor Charles Mason will moderate, and the panelists will include Severin Borenstein (Berkeley), Jeffrey Frankel (Harvard), Catherine Kling (Iowa State), Richard Newell (Duke), John Reilly (MIT) and James Sweeney (Stanford).

World Congress Plans

I wish I could convey an announcement about the location of the upcoming 2010 World Congress of Environmental and Resource Economists, but Carlo

Carraro and the site selection committee, which includes Vic Adamowicz (AERE), Frank Convery (EAERE), Alan Krupnick (AERE) and Anastasios Xepapadeas (EAERE), are still waiting for additional information concerning two proposals before making their final decision. The information will be posted to AERE's web site as soon as the selection has been finalized.

Other Projects?

AERE's limited ordinary revenue streams mean that we must be judicious in our choice of projects on behalf of the organization. Many aspects of infrastructure development, as well as special projects, still rely heavily on the generous contributions of time and other resources from our dedicated base of volunteers. Have you perceived any ways in which AERE might better serve its membership, or become more attractive to a wider range of potential new members? Please share your ideas with me or with other members of the AERE Board, and/or Marilyn Voigt.

Meanwhile, I hope every AERE member has an opportunity to enjoy whatever change of pace the upcoming months may afford. Happy (northern hemisphere) summer!

Trudy Ann Cameron
Department of Economics, 435 PLC
1285 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
cameron@uoregon.edu
Telephone. 541-346-1242
Fax. 541-346-1243

In Memoriam

Alexander E. Farrell
(1962-2008)

Much admired friend and colleague.

Associate Professor in the Energy and Resources Group at the University of California, Berkeley, who was helping California chart a course to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

An engineer by training, Farrell's research focused on projects with practical and timely applications, including biofuels, hybrid electric vehicles, hydrogen-powered and transportation sustainability. He came to Berkeley in 2003 after teaching and doing research at Carnegie Mellon University. Since 2006, he had directed the campus's Transportation Sustainability Research Center.

The family requests that contributions in Farrell's memory be made to the:
Alex Farrell Memorial Scholarship Fund
Energy and Resources Group
310 Barrows Hall, #3050
Berkeley, CA 94720

Please make checks out to:
"Regents of the University of California"

Note: Please help AERE share memorial by conveying announcements to Co-Editor Marilyn Voigt at voigt@rff.org.

AERE Newsletter

Co-Editors
John Loomis
Colorado State University
Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics
jloomis@lamar.colostate.edu

Marilyn M. Voigt
AERE Executive Director
voigt@rff.org

Assistant Editor
Kathleen Meaney Stobie
kmstobie@att.net

Publisher
Association of Environmental and Resource Economists
1616 P Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036

AERE HOME PAGE
www.aere.org

Webmaster: **Ramesh Sethuraman**
Industrial Economics, Inc.

Please direct conference and meeting listings, links, personal Web pages, etc. to Ramesh at: **Webmaster@aere.org**

AERE NEWS

AERE AT THE AAEA

Registration and information about the joint annual meeting of the American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA) and the American Council on Consumer Interests (ACCI) in Orlando, Florida on July 27 - 29, 2008, is available on the AAEA home page at: www.aaea.org. **Monday, June 23, 2008**, is the deadline for early registration. See the AERE Sessions on page 15.

AERE members attending the meeting are cordially invited to a reception on Sunday, July 27th, from 5:30 - 7:30 p.m. at the Caribe Royale in Boca V.

AERE FELLOWS PROGRAM

In 2005, AERE instituted a new program to recognize outstanding contributions to the field by members of the association. Details are given below.

Criteria: Awardees will have demonstrated a significant contribution to the advancement of the profession of environmental and resource economics. A candidate must be living at the time of nomination and be a current member of the association or have been a member for at least ten years (not necessarily continuously).

Nomination Process: Any member of AERE can nominate a candidate for Fellow. A nomination packet should include a vita of the nominee, three letters of support, and a two-page nomination letter outlining what contributions the individual has made that warrant the award. In addition, members of the AERE Board of Directors can consider candidates that have not been otherwise nominated that they feel are especially worthy.

Selection Process: Nomination packages are to be submitted **by June 1, 2008,** to:

Trudy Ann Cameron
Department of Economics, 430 PLC
1285 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1285
cameron@uoregon.edu

The president will distribute copies to each of the Board members who will select newly appointed Fellows from the set of nominations. Nominations will not be carried over to future years. Announcements of the new Fellows will be made formally at the annual AERE luncheon; newly elected Fellows will be notified ahead of time to provide ample time for travel arrangements. In future years, a separate Fellows Committee may be impaneled to aid in the initial screening of candidates.

Maximum Number of Awards: Three for 2008.

AERE MEMBERSHIP STATUS IN 2008

Not sure if your dues have been paid and that your membership is current? Just check the AERE Home Page (http://www.aere.org) under "Membership" to see if your name appears. The list will be updated periodically. Since AERE membership runs on the calendar year...we are still accepting renewals and applications for this year—anyone joining now will receive the 2008 back issues of JEEM and REEP.

http://www.oxfordjournals.org/our_journals/reep/

AERE MEMBERSHIP OFFICE

Please direct any questions or requests regarding your membership, subscriptions to *JEEM* and *REEP*, workshop registrations, receipts, or related membership matters to:

AERE Membership Services
555 E Wells Street, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, WI 53202
info@aere.org
Telephone: 414-918-3186
Fax: 414-276-3349

Marilyn M. Voigt, AERE's Executive Director, can be reached at:

AERE
1616 P Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036-1400
voigt@rff.org
Telephone: 202-328-5125
Fax: 202-939-3460

PUBLICATION DISCOUNTS FOR AERE MEMBERS

All current AERE members are eligible to receive:

- A 25% discount on all books published by **Resources for the Future**—www.rff.org
- A special subscription rate of $54.00 to ***Resource and Energy Economics***--www.sciencedirect.com
- A 20% discount off a subscription to ***Environment and Development Economics—*** http://www.cambridge.org/uk/journals/ede/

INSTITUTIONAL AND UNIVERSITY MEMBERSHIP PROGRAM

The AERE Officers and Board of Directors invite research institutions, nonprofit organizations, government agencies, and corporations to become Institutional Members of AERE and colleges, universities, and university research centers to become University Members of AERE.

Intellectual entrepreneurship is a distinguishing characteristic of AERE. Equally important, AERE research activities also display a remarkable degree of involvement with other disciplines because the issues require it. But the dues of its individual members are not sufficient to support the growing needs of the organization. AERE needs the help of organizations involved in the same fields of interest to help with its programs and outreach to students and young professionals in both the U.S. and overseas. In addition, financial support will help with the increasing costs of managing membership services including the membership database, journal subscriptions, and workshop and annual meeting registrations among other association costs.

To become an **Institutional Member** of AERE, a contribution of $1,000 is required. With this contribution, institutions may:

- designate one staff member to receive a 2008 individual membership in AERE (which includes a print and electronic subscription to *JEEM*, an electronic subscription to *REEP*, the bi-annual *AERE Newsletter* and a reduced fee for submitting articles to *JEEM*);
- be entitled to a sponsorship listing on the AERE Web page (www.AERE.org), in the AERE Newsletter, and every issue of JEEM;
- receive one free advertisement this year on the AERE Web page and in the AERE Newsletter (a savings of $250);
- receive two nontransferable tickets for institution staff to the annual AERE luncheon and business meeting;
- receive one nontransferable registration for the annual AERE Workshop;
- receive recognition at the annual AERE luncheon and business meeting.

To become a **University Member** of AERE, a contribution of $350 is required. With this contribution, colleges and universities may:

- designate one faculty member to receive a 2008 individual membership in AERE (which includes a print and electronic subscription to *JEEM*, an electronic subscription to *REEP*, the bi-annual *AERE Newsletter*, and a reduced fee for submitting an article to JEEM);
- be entitled to a sponsorship listing on the AERE Web page (www.AERE.org) and in the *AERE Newsletter* and *JEEM*;
- receive one free advertisement this year on the AERE Web page and in the *AERE Newsletter* (a savings of $250).

Please see the list below of the organizations that have already joined this program. If you think your institution would be interested in supporting AERE through this program, please see the application form on the AERE Web Page.

2008 INSTITUTIONAL AND UNIVERSITY MEMBERS OF AERE

Institutional Members

Industrial Economics, Inc.

Resources For the Future

Stratus Consulting, Inc.

W.H. Desvousges & Associates, Inc.*

University Members

Appalachian State University
Department of Economics

Centre Interuniversitaire de Recherché en Économie Quantitative (CIREQ)
(of the Université de Montréal, McGill University and Concordia University)

Colorado State University
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

Duke University
Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences

Georgia State University
Department of Economics

The Harvard Environmental Economics Program

Iowa State University
Center for Agricultural and Rural Development
Department of Economics

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Department of Economics

North Carolina State University
Center for Environmental and Resource Economics Policy (CEnREP)

Texas A&M University
Department of Agricultural Economics

Tufts University (renewal pending)
Tufts Institute of the Environment

University of Alberta
Department of Rural Economy

University of California, Berkeley (pending)
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

University of California, Los Angeles
Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies

University of California, San Diego
Department of Economics

University of California, Santa Barbara
Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management

University of Central Florida
College of Business Administration

University of Connecticut
Department of Economics

University of Gothenburg*
Department of Economics

University of Guelph (renewal pending)
Department of Economics

University of Maryland, College Park
Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics

University of Michigan
School of Natural Resources and Environment

University of Michigan
Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Enterprise

University of Minnesota
Department of Applied Economics

University of Nevada, Reno*
Department of Resource Economics

University of Oregon
Department of Economics

University of Tennessee
Department of Economics

University of Washington
Department of Economics

University of Wyoming
Department of Economics and Finance

Virginia Tech
Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics

Yale University (pending)
School of Forestry and Environmental Studies

**** Denotes new member in 2008***

NOMINATIONS FOR AERE BOARD MEMBERS

This year, AERE members will vote for two new members of the Board of Directors who will serve for three years beginning in January 2009.

The nominations are being handled by a committee chaired by AERE Vice President Laura Taylor (North Carolina State University). The elections will occur in the Fall of 2008.

Nominations may also be made by the membership through petitions, each of which contains signatures of 5% of the association's members who are then in good standing. Such petitions should be sent to arrive at the AERE Secretary's address no later than August 1, 2008.

Dr. Ann Wolverton
National Center for Environmental Economics
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, MC 1809T
Washington, DC 20460
Wolverton.Ann@epamail.epa.gov

2007 AERE PUBLICATION OF ENDURING QUALITY AWARD

AERE's Publication of Enduring Quality Award for 2007 was awarded to Judd Hammack and Gardner Mallard Brown, Jr. for their book, *Waterfowl and Wetlands: Toward Bioeconomic Analysis*, Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 1974.

This book, which is only 95 pages long, is a paragon of applied renewable resource economics. It is one of the first publications to integrate economics and ecology. The book considers not only the population dynamics of waterfowl but the relationship between population and the environment—the amount of wetlands available for breeding, something we today call an "ecosystem service." The authors estimated nonmarket values, based on a mail survey questionnaire that asks hunters how much they would be willing to pay, and be willing to accept to give up their rights, to hunt waterfowl, and found that these values differed substantially. The book also offers an optimal control model in which the harvest and habitat are chosen jointly. The authors then combine these approaches to construct a cost-benefit analysis of wetland conservation, something which is finally in vogue today. The results show that more wetlands should be conserved, with the increase in habitat supporting a greater harvest. The sign of this estimate comes as no surprise: farmers are unable to appropriate the value of their conservation, and so conserve less land than is socially optimal. But the magnitudes of the calculations are eye catching. The book's analysis suggests that breeding habitat should increase from 50 to 500 percent. Estimates this large, derived from a study of this sophistication, cry out for a policy response, and it is pleasing to note that Hammack and Brown's estimates were later adopted by state and federal agencies for calculating the value of habitat purchases.[1] Their book and the approaches taken within it still serve as a model for how to do cost-benefit analysis—it is theoretically rigorous, empirically innovative, and sensibly and sensitively crafted.

Committee members:

Scott Barrett, Johns Hopkins University (Chair)
W. Douglass Shaw, Texas A&M University
Jason F. Shogren, University of Wyoming

[1] Richard T. Carson and W. Michael Hanemann (2005), "Contingent Valuation," in K.-G. Maler and J.R. Vincent (eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Economics, Volume 2, Valuing Environmental Changes*, Amsterdam: Elsevier North Holland, p. 831.

2008 AERE PUBLICATION OF ENDURING QUALITY AWARD

The AERE Board of Directors will present the annual award (to co-authors if appropriate) for a publication of enduring quality that appeared at least five years prior to the year of the award. The 2008 award will be announced at the annual AERE luncheon meeting in January 2009 in San Francisco, California. Nominated works are to be evaluated on their seminal nature and enduring value. Place and type of publication are unrestricted, but posthumous awards will not be given. Nominees may include individuals who are not members of AERE.

Evaluation of nominated works and final selection for the 2008 award will be undertaken by a committee chaired by Jason Shogren, University of Wyoming.

Nomination packages should consist of four copies each of a cover letter, a document supporting the nomination, and the publication itself. The supporting document (not to exceed three pages) should include quantitative as well as qualitative information (e.g., number of citations or copies printed). Nominations should be sent to arrive no later than **September 1, 2008.** This is an important award for AERE and for the recipients. Please give serious consideration to nominating a publication and to observing the submission requirements.

Professor Jason Shogren
University of Wyoming
Dept. of Econ & Finance 3985
1000 E University Avenue
Laramie, WY 82071
jramses@uwyo.edu

AERE FELLOWS

Instituted in 2005, the AERE Fellows Program recognizes outstanding contributions to the field by members of the association. The Awardees have demonstrated a significant contribution to the advancement of the profession of environmental and resource economics.

Inaugural AERE Fellows 2005:

Maureen L. Cropper
W. Michael Hanemann
Karl-Göran Mäler
Wallace E. Oates
V. Kerry Smith
Tom Tietenberg

AERE Fellows 2006:

Richard C. Bishop
Nancy E. Bockstael
Ronald G. Cummings
Anthony (Tony) C. Fisher
Geoffrey M. Heal
Clifford S. (Cliff) Russell

AERE Fellows 2007:

Daniel W. Bromley
Gardner M. Brown, Jr
Charles W. (Chuck) Howe
Kenneth E. (Ted) McConnell
Kathleen Segerson
David Zilberman

CALLS FOR PAPERS/CONTRIBUTIONS

AERE NEWSLETTER

The *AERE Newsletter* is soliciting essays about natural resource and environmental economics issues of general interest to the membership. These essays can be relatively short (6-10 double spaced pages) and address a topic that does not fit into the traditional journal outlet. There is currently no backlog, so your essay would likely be published in the following *AERE Newsletter*. Marilyn Voigt and I need your essay in February for the May issue and August for the November issue. If you wish to float an idea by me, feel free to contact me.

John Loomis
***AERE* Newsletter Co-Editor**
jloomis@lamar.colostate.edu
Telephone: 970-491-2485

JOURNAL OF NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY RESEARCH

The *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research (JNRPR)*, starting publication in January 2009 as a quarterly journal of original policy-oriented papers, is extending an invitation for original manuscripts for publication consideration. Frequency: 4 issues per year; Print ISSN: 1939-0459 Online ISSN: 1939-0467

Aims and Scope

The journal will address a broad range of natural resource fields including water, minerals, energy, fisheries, and forestry in a synthesizing fashion, rather than as stand-alone specialty areas. It will also publish papers on the natural resource implications of climate change, natural disasters, and biodiversity loss, among others. The papers, ideally, will be based on both conceptual and empirical studies and will be primarily policy-focused. Highly mathematical papers are discouraged. We invite papers from all relevant disciplines. Our goal is to foster productive dialog among the disparate sectors in the broad field of natural resources and among various social science perspectives leading to an improved understanding of institutional and economic dynamics and informed policymaking. Look for further announcements at:

www.informaworld.com/rjnr

For additional information, please contact:

Kristian Wilson, Taylor & Francis Group,
4 Park Square, Milton Park,
Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN, UK
Fax: +44 (0)20 701 76714
Email: kristian.wilson@tandf.co.uk

Submit all manuscripts electronically, if at all possible, to jonrpr@gmail.com. If electronic submission is not possible, please mail three hardcopies of your paper, with a disk in Microsoft Word in PC format to:

Professor Chennat Gopalakrishnan.
Editor, *JNRPR*
Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management
1910 East-West Road, Sherman Lab 118
University of Hawaii at Manoa
Honolulu, HI 96822-2279, USA
jonrpr@gmail.com

Submission Details

All papers published in the *Journal of Natural Resources Policy Research* will be subject to editorial screening and comprehensive peer review at the discretion of the Editor. We are looking for papers dealing with, but not limited to, the following topics:

1. Natural resource policy broadly defined – scope and dimensions
2. Holistic vs. sector-specific approach
3. Policy framework – components, sequencing, linkages, integration, robustness
4. Conceptual/theoretical paradigms – rationale and evolutionary perspectives
5. Country studies, case studies, case histories, survey papers
6. Natural resource policy modeling
7. Natural resource institutions – design and implementation
8. Natural resource policy crafting – ownership, allocation, planning, development, markets and pricing, conservation
9. Natural resources and political externalities; public choice and rent-seeking
10. Natural resource use and environmental quality
11. Public-private partnership issues
12. Natural resources and institutional entropy
13. Transboundary, transnational, and transgenic resources

14. Natural resource policy - efficiency, equity, and sustainability
15. Trigger issues - climate change, natural disasters, human disasters, deforestation, endangered species, invasive species, environmental pollution

Please prepare your papers in accordance with the journal guidelines and check the website for deadlines:
http://www.informaworld.com/rjnr

CONFERENCES, MEETINGS AND WORKSHOPS

2008 AERE WORKSHOP

Health and the Environment

Berkeley, California
June 21-23, 2008

The next AERE Workshop will be held on June 21-23, 2008 at the University of California, Berkeley, with convenient access to the Oakland and San Francisco airports. The theme of this year's AERE summer workshop is health and the environment. Workshop papers cover a wide range of topics, including the health impacts of climate change, clean water, indoor air pollution, diesel emissions and estimate of willingness-to-pay to avoid health damages due to environmental factors.

The Workshop will start with a reception on Saturday evening, June 21st from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Hotel Durant in Berkeley. The Workshop sessions will be held at the Faculty Club at the University of California-Berkeley on Sunday June 22nd, and will conclude at 3:00 p.m. on Monday afternoon, June 23rd. The standard registration fee is $200 ($150 for students), which includes copies of all Workshop papers, the reception on Saturday evening, continental breakfast and lunch on both Workshop days, and catered buffet dinner on Sunday evening, June 22nd, to be held in the beautiful lobby of the Hearst Mining Building on the UC-Berkeley campus. All locations are within easy walking distance, and a ten minute walk takes you to the BART train to San Francisco.

We are extremely grateful for the support provided by the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service.

The Hotel Durant

Special arrangements for workshop participants have been made with The Hotel Durant, 2600 Durant Ave, Berkeley, CA 94720. Call (510) 845-8981 or (800) 238-7268 for reservations—group name is **AERE Workshop** and the booking code is **FJ0000**. A block of rooms will be held **until 5:00 p.m. on May 21st** for Saturday, Sunday and Monday nights at a special rate of $133 for a single queen room or $163 for a room with two doubles. There are also a few rooms available at that rate for those arriving a day earlier or staying a day later. Call early, as space is limited—first-come first-served. Visit http://www.jdvhotels.com/hotels/durant/ for more information about the hotel.

The Claremont Resort and Spa

A very small number of rooms are being held at the Claremont Resort and Spa at a discount rate. The Claremont is located at 41 Tunnel Road, Berkeley, CA 94705. The rate is $225.46 and includes the $24.00 resort fee. Please contact Deborah Jamiol (dgarrity@mit.edu) if you wish to stay at the Claremont. The deadline for confirming reservations is May 21st. Their website is http://www.claremontresort.com/.

Registration and Questions

The registration form is posted on the AERE Web Page. Mail or fax it, with payment by check or credit card. Online registration is also available at: www.aere.org. Register early, because space is limited, and the registration fee goes up **after Wednesday, May 21st**. Registration forms should be sent to: AERE Office - AERE Workshop, 555 E Wells Street, Suite 1100, Milwaukee, WI 53202 or fax it to 414-276-3349.

2008 AERE Workshop Committee

Chair: Michael Greenstone, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
John Charbonneau, U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service
Norman Meade, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration
Marca Weinberg, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Ann Wolverton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
David Zilberman, University of California, Berkeley

AERE Workshop Program

Speakers:

Kenneth J. Arrow, Professor of Economics (Emeritus), Stanford University, and Nobel Laureate

Orley Ashenfelter, Joseph Douglas Green 1985 Professor of Economics, and Director, Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University

Maureen L. Cropper, Professor of Economics, University of Maryland, College Park

Authors/Titles of Papers:

Alberini, Anna (presenter), Erin Mastrangelo and Hugh Pitcher: "Climate Change and Human Health: Assessing the Effectiveness of Adaptation to Heat Waves"

Auffhammer Maximilian (presenter) and Ryan Kellogg: "Gasoline Content Regulation and Urban Air Quality"

Beatty, Timothy K. M. and **Jay P. Shimshack (presenter)**: "School Buses, Diesel Emissions, and Respiratory Health"

Brandt, Sylvia (presenter), W. Michael Hanemann, and Felipe Vasquez: "Valuing What Matters to the Household: Using Revealed Preference Data to Develop a Contingent Valuation Experiment"

Cameron, Trudy Ann, J. R. DeShazo, and **Erica H. Johnson (presenter)**: "Willingness to Pay for Health Risk Reductions: Differences by Type of Illness"

Davis, Lucas (presenter): "The Effect of Power Plants on Local Housing Markets"

Deschênes, Olivier (presenter) and Michael Greenstone: "Climate Change, Mortality and Adaptation: Evidence from Annual Fluctuations in Weather in the U.S."

Gamper-Rabindran, Shanti (presenter), Shakeeb Khan, and Christopher Timmins: "The Impact of Piped Water Provision on Infant Mortality in Brazil: A Quantile Panel Data Approach"

Mueller, Valerie (presenter), Alexander Pfaff, John Peabody, Yaping Liu, Travis Riddell, and Kirk R. Smith: "Evaluating the Health Impacts of Improved Cooking Stoves in China Using Propensity Score Matching"

Pattanayak, Subhrendu K. (presenter), Christine Poulos, Jui-Chen Yang, and Sumeet R. Patil: "How Valuable are Environmental Health Interventions? Evidence from a Quasiexperimental Evaluation of Community Water Projects"

Schnier, Kurt E. (presenter), William C. Horrace, and Ronald G. Felthoven "Occupational Risk and Fisheries Management: Studying Changes in the Deadliest Catch"

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION (AAEA)

and

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON CONSUMER INTERESTS (ACCI)

ANNUAL MEETING

July 27 – July 29, 2008
Orlando, Florida

AERE SESSIONS

Chairs, Presenters and Discussants indicated in bold.

New Fisheries Bioeconomics

Session chair: **James Wilen**
University of California, Davis

The canonical bioeconomic model of the fishery lumps together a myriad of bio-physical and economic processes into a single state equation. The traditional approach provides potent conceptual insights but has limited practical use in real-world fisheries management. This session presents generalizations to the canonical fishery model that are motivated by contemporary research in marine ecology and biological oceanography as well as an emerging emphasis on marine ecosystem-based management. To that end, the papers address spatial considerations, age structure in population dynamics, interactions of multiple species, and the effects of climate variability on fishery productivity.

1. **Olli Tahvonen** (Finnish Forest Research Institute). "Optimal Harvesting of Age Structured Fish Populations"
Discussant: **Wolfram Schlenker** (Columbia University)

2. **Joshua Abbott** (Arizona State University) and James Wilen (University of California, Davis) "Competition, Spatial Choice and The Commons: Do Fishermen Bother with Bycatch Avoidance?"
Discussant: **Daniel Kaffine** (Colorado School of Mines)

3. Christopher Costello (University of California, Santa Barbara) and **Daniel Kaffine** (Colorado School of Mines) "Can Spatial Property Rights Fix Fisheries?"
Discussant: **Olli Tahvonen** (Finnish Forest Research Institute)

4. Richard T. Carson (University of California, San Diego), Clive Granger (University of California, San Diego), Jeremy Jackson (University of California, San Diego), and **Wolfram Schlenker** (Columbia University) "Fisheries Management Under Cyclical Population Dynamics"
Discussant: **Joshua Abbott** (Arizona State University)

Renewable Energy: Intended and Unintended Consequences

Session chair: **Michael Caputo**
University of Central Florida

Concerns about climate change and energy security have sparked considerable interest in developing renewable energy sources. This session explores the economic and environmental consequences of policies that affect the renewable energy sector. The papers reveal that generating environmental benefits from renewable energy is not as simple as it may seem. The authors illustrate this point by incorporating price feedbacks into a traditional life cycle model, showing how conservation-driven limits to oil drilling impacts the market for biofuels, and measuring how growth in biofuels will affect regional water quality.

1. **Deepak Rajagopal** (University of California, Berkeley) and David Zilberman (University of California, Berkeley) "A New Micro-Economics Based Environmental Life Cycle Model"
Discussant: **Jinhua Zhao** (Iowa State University)

2. JunJie Wu (Oregon State University) and **Christian Langpap** (Oregon State University) "The Environmental Quality Effects of Increased Reliance on Bioenergy"
Discussant: **Sylvia Secchi** (Southern Illinois University)

3. **Jinhua Zhao** (Iowa State University) "Will Protecting ANWR Hurt the Growth of Biofuel and Solar Energies?"
Discussant: **Deepak Rajagopal** (University of California, Berkeley)

4. **Sylvia Secchi** (Southern Illinois University), **Lyubov Kurkalova** (North Carolina A&T State University, Catherine Kling (Iowa State University), Phillip Gassman (Iowa State University), and Jha Manoj (Iowa State University) "Rotation and Water Quality Effects of Harvesting Corn Stover"
Discussant: **Christian Langpap** (Oregon State University)

Land Use: Amenities and Disamenities

Session chair: **JunJie Wu**
Oregon State University

The economics of land use presents numerous conceptual and empirical challenges. This session brings together two conceptual and two empirical papers that explore important linkages between land use and amenity values. In conceptual studies, features of the landscape drive land use and landowner decisions, and these decisions in turn feed back on landscape features. The empirical papers use property value data to isolate the value of environmental attributes, including a meta-analysis of hedonic studies that value marginal changes and a sorting model that values non-marginal changes.

1. **Yong Chen** (Ohio State University), Ciriyam Jayaprakash (Ohio State University), and Elena G. Irwin (Ohio State University) "Ecological Feedbacks And Fast Slow Dynamics In A Model Of Amenity-Driven Regional Growth"
   Discussant: **Gwenlyn M. Busby** (Oregon State University)

2. **H. Allen Klaiber** (North Carolina State University) and Daniel J. Phaneuf (North Carolina State University) "Valuing Open Space in a Locational Equilibrium Model of the Twin Cities"
   Discussant: **John B. Braden** (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

3. **Gwenlyn M. Busby** (Oregon State University), Heidi J. Albers (Oregon State University), and Claire A. Montgomery (Oregon State University) "Public and private Fire Risk Management: Strategic Interaction and Spatial Interdependence"
   Discussant: **Yong Chen** (Ohio State University)

4. **John B. Braden** (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Xia Feng (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), Laura O. Taylor (North Carolina State University), and DooHwan Won (Korea Energy Economics Institute) "Noxious Sites And Property Values: A Meta Analysis"
   Discussant: **H. Allen Klaiber** (North Carolina State University)

Issues in Climate Policy

Session chair: **Wolfram Schlenker**
Columbia University

Optimal climate change policy requires understanding society's preferences and the characteristics of the policy environment. Two papers in this session explore the pure rate of time preference and the resulting implications for climate policy; one paper uses numerical methods to examine the implications of non-constant discounting while another considers issues associated with intergenerational equity and impatience. The two remaining papers examine alternative policy options for reducing carbon emissions, a revenue-neutral tax-subsidy policy, and a cap-and-trade policy in an alternating-current model of the power supply system.

1. **Daniel Shawhan** (Cornell University) and Ray Zimmerman (Cornell University) "A Regional Incentive-Based Carbon Dioxide Emission Regulation in the Power Sector: Impacts Predicted Using an Alternating-Current Model"
   Discussant: **Hui Su** (West Virginia University)

2. **Gregmar I. Galinato** (Washington State University), Jonathan K. Yoder (Washington State University), and Joel Michalski (Washington State University) "Revenue-Neutral Tax-Subsidy Policy For Carbon Emission Reduction"
   Discussant: **Larry Karp** (University of California, Berkeley)

3. **Hui Su** (West Virginia University), Haixiao Huang (West Virginia University), and Jerald J. Fletcher (West Virginia University) "Econometric Modeling of CO2 Emission Allowances under the European Union Emission Trading Scheme"
   Discussant: **Daniel Shawhan** (Cornell University)

4. Tomokii Fujii (Singapore Management University) and **Larry Karp** (University of California, Berkeley) "Numerical Analysis of Non-Constant Pure Rate of Time Preference: A Model of Climate Policy"
   Discussant: **Gregmar I. Galinato** (Washington State University)

Empirical Analyses of Environmental Health Risks

Session chair: **Trudy Ann Cameron**
University of Oregon

At least two dimensions of heterogeneity are potentially important in explaining variation in estimates of the willingness to pay for reduced mortality and morbidity risks: heterogeneity in terms of the attributes of individuals and heterogeneity in terms of the nature of the risk reductions. The session reports the results of stated and revealed preference analyses that examine these issues using data from developed and developing countries.

1. Carol R. Scotten (Knox College) and **Laura O. Taylor** (North Carolina State University) "Of Cab Drivers and Coal Miners: Accounting for Risk Heterogeneity in Value of Statistical Life Estimates"
Discussant: **Sonia N. Aziz** (Virginia Tech)

2. Trudy Ann Cameron (University of Oregon), J.R. deShazo (University of California, Los Angeles), and **Erica H. Johnson** (University of Oregon) "Willingness to Pay for Health Risk Reductions: Differences by Type of Illness"
Discussant: **Fei Yu,** (Mount Holyoke College)

3. **Sonia N. Aziz** (Virginia Tech) and Kevin J. Boyle (Virginia Tech) "Valuation of Avoiding Arsenic in Drinking Water in Rural Bangladesh: An Averting Behavior Analysis"
Discussant: **Erica H. Johnson** (University of Oregon)

4. **Fei Yu** (Mount Holyoke College) "Measuring Health Benefits From Interventions to Reduce Indoor Air Pollution in Rural China"
Discussant: **Laura O. Taylor** (North Carolina State University)

Conceptual Challenges in Nonmarket Valuation

Session chair: **Kevin J. Boyle**
Virginia Tech

The four papers in this session consider emerging methodological challenges in stated preference valuation studies. Three papers use data from field surveys to examine respondent choice difficulty, propose a method of estimating discount factors within a random utility model, and explore the empirical relevance of asymptotically bounded preferences for the willingness to pay-willingness to accept disparity. A final paper applies experimental methods to examine payment and provision uncertainty as potential explanations for hypothetical bias.

1. **Eric Duquette** (University of Oregon), Trudy Ann Cameron (University of Oregon), and J.R. deShazo (University of California, Los Angeles) "Subjective Choice Difficulty in Stated Preference Surveys"
Discussant: **Yohei Mitani** (University of Colorado, Boulder)

2. **Andrew Meyer** (University of Colorado, Boulder) "Estimating Discount Factors Within aRandom Utility Framework"
Discussant: **Sudip Chattopadhyay** (San Francisco State University)

3. **Yohei Mitani** (University of Colorado, Boulder) and Nicholas E. Flores (University of Colorado, Boulder) "A New Explanation for Hypothetical Bias: Subjective Beliefs of Hypothetical Aspects in Payment and Provision"
Discussant: **Eric Duquette** (University of Oregon)

4. **Sudip Chattopadhyay** (San Francisco State University) "Asymptotically Bounded Preference and the Difference Between Willingness to Pay and Willingness to Accept"
Discussant: **Andrew Meyer** (University of Colorado, Boulder)

Pollution and Firm Behavior

Session chair: **Madhu Khanna**
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

A broadening empirical literature examines the responses of firms faced with environmental regulation and the implications of firm responses for environmental quality. The three papers in this session explore these responses, focusing in particular on the impacts of mandatory and voluntary programs on firm emissions and location choices.

1. Mary F. Evans (University of Tennessee), **Lirong Liu** (University of Tennessee), and Sarah Stafford (College of William and Mary) "Causes and Consequences of Environmental Auditing: Evidence from Regulated Facilities in Michigan"
Discussant: **Donna Ramirez Harrington** (University of Vermont)

2. **Donna Ramirez Harrington** (University of Vermont), George Deltas (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), and Madhu Khanna (University of

Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) "Does Pollution Prevention Reduce Toxic Emissions? A Dynamic Panel Data Model"
Discussant: **Matthew Benton** (University of Colorado, Boulder)

3. **Matthew Benton** (University of Colorado, Boulder) "Environmental Regulation and Polluting Behavior of Firms: Identifying Spillover Effects"
Discussant: **Lirong Liu** (University of Tennessee)

The Economics of Conservation

Session chair: **Erin O. Sills**
North Carolina State University

The session investigates the challenges faced by developing countries in allocating resources between conservation and economic development. Two papers present conceptual models of optimal conservation, one jointly modeling small-scale farmer decision making and land use, another allowing for a feedback between land conversion decisions and conservation benefits. Two remaining papers explore the incentives associated with and the effects of programs designed to encourage reforestation.

1. Luke Jones (University of Tennessee) and **Jill Caviglia-Harris** (Salisbury University) "Rethinking The Cycle Of Abandonment: A Dynamic Model Of Frontier Expansion And Environmental Degradation"
Discussant: **Timo Goeschl** (University of Heidelberg)

2. **Shinsuke Uchida** (University of Maryland) and Gregmar I. Galinato (Washington State University) "Evaluating Temporary Certified Emission Reductions in Reforestation and Afforestation Programs"
Discussant: **Rohit Jindal** (Michigan State University)

3. Anke D. Leroux (La Trobe University), Vance Martin (University of Melbourne), and **Timo Goeschl** (University of Heidelberg) "Optimal Conservation, Extinction Debt, and the Augmented Quasi-Option Value"
Discussant: **Jill Caviglia-Harris** (Salisbury University)

4. **Rohit Jindal** (Michigan State University) "Exploring the Demand for Forestry in Lake Victoria Basin (Western Kenya): An Econometric Approach"
Discussant: **Shinsuke Uchida** (University of Maryland)

Incentives and Water Quality Protection

Session chair: **Marca Weinberg**
USDA, Economic Research Service

The session considers research and policy challenges associated with optimal water quality protection. One paper examines the value of water quality improvements in Canada and the United States. Two papers explore policy options for achieving improved water quality including best management practices for storm water management and a water quality trading program with nonpoint sources. A final paper investigates the impacts on water quality of changes in agriculture.

1. **Sergey Rabotyagov** (University of Washington), Philip W. Gassman (University of Washington), Manoj Jha (Iowa State University), and Todd Campbell (Iowa State University) "Energy Crops and Agricultural Conservation Practices: Implications for Optimal Water Quality Protection"
Discussant: **W. Bowman Cutter** (University of California, Riverside)

2. **Gaurav S. Ghosh** (The Pennsylvania State University) and James S. Shortle (The Pennsylvania State University) "Water Quality Trading Market Efficiency in a Stochastic Environment"
Discussant: **Paul J. Thomassin** (McGill University)

3. **W. Bowman Cutter** (University of California, Riverside), Kenneth A. Baerenklau (University of California, Riverside), Autumn DeWoody (University of California, Riverside), Ritu Sharma (University of California, Riverside), and Joong Gwang Lee (Tetra Tech) "Costs And Benefits Of Capturing Urban Runoff With Competitive Bidding For Decentralized Bmps"
Discussant: **Sergey Rabotyagov** (University of Washington)

4. **Paul J. Thomassin** (McGill University) and Robert J. Johnston (University of Connecticut) "Systematic Patterns in Willingness to Pay for Water Quality Improvements in the United States and Canada: A Meta Analysis"
Discussant: **Gaurav S. Ghosh** (The Pennsylvania State University)

ASSOCIATION FOR PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS AND MANAGEMENT (APPAM)

The Next Decade – What are the Big Policy Challenges?

November 6 – 8, 2008
Los Angeles, California

APPAM's Annual Fall Research Conference is a gathering of leaders within the policy analysis and management field. It has become the preeminent venue for the presentation and discussion of applied public policy and management research, attracting more than 1000 participants for over 150 sessions across three days of meetings each year. The Program Committee will organize an agenda that spans the interests and background of APPAM members across all issues areas and methodologies.

This year the conference will be held in Los Angeles and looks to capitalize on the momentum of recent conferences where APPAM has experienced a record number of attendees and participation on the 150+ sessions. Noteworthy highlights of the 2008 conference will include the David N. Kershaw Award and Prize Lecture, the Public Management Executive Roundtable, the concurrent plenaries, the Presidential Address, the Poster Session Luncheon, and the many special receptions.

APPAM especially is seeking increased conference participation from among policymakers at all levels of government and other practitioners who are directly involved in the areas of emphasis within the Fall Research Conference. APPAM is committed to including a diversity of perspectives on all sessions.

For all 2008 Fall Research Conference information including the schedule of events, registration, hotel reservations and travel planning, please go to: **http://www.appam.org**

10th ANNUAL BIOECON CONFERENCE (BIOdiversity and Economics for CONservation)

The Effectiveness and Efficiency of Biodiversity Conservation Instruments

September 28 – 30, 2008
Sidney Sussex College
Cambridge, UK

Hosted by CentER, Tilburg University and the Department of Land Economy, Cambridge University in association with the Dutch National Science Foundation's (NWO) project on Evolution and Behaviour, UK-DEFRA, and the Environment Agency for England and Wales

The Department of Land Economy, Cambridge University and CentER, in association with the NOW Evolution and Behavior, UK-DEFRA, the Environment Agency for England and Wales announce the Tenth International BIOECON conference on the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Biodiversity Conservation Instruments. The conference will be held at Sidney Sussex College Cambridge on September 28 – 30, 2008. The conference will be of interest to both researchers and policy makers interested in or working in the management and conservation of biodiversity.

The focus of the conference is on understanding what instruments are most effective and efficient in inducing biodiversity conservation. Instruments include auctions of biodiversity conservation contracts, payment-for-services contracts, taxes, tradable permits, voluntary mechanisms, and straightforward command and control. Optimal instrument choice crucially depends on the actual context in which landowners take their land use decisions. Four are of obvious relevance. First, biodiversity conservation programs are typically implemented in a context of asymmetric information—the landowner typically has better information about the species richness of her land, the costs she incurs when conserving, etc. Second, very often the extent to which a landowner is successful in increasing biodiversity conservation depends not only on her own actions and efforts, but also on those of landowners in her vicinity. Third, species richness and management practices co-evolve, species richness adjusting to the management practice implemented, which, in turn, affects biodiversity itself. Fourth, landowners are oftentimes willing to voluntarily incur costs in order to protect specific species (or more generally the species richness) on their lands. If landowners are indeed intrinsically motivated to provide at least some conservation services, do the various instruments and existing policies strengthen this motivation, or rather weaken it? Of course, other considerations may be important too, and the conference's theme is to assess the effectiveness and effectiveness of the various instruments in these contexts.

The conference will open with a reception at Sidney Sussex College Cambridge on the early evening of September 28. Conference sessions will commence in the morning of September 29 and conclude in the afternoon of September 30. Accommodation for all participants will be organized within Sidney Sussex College, with a conference banquet at the College Dining Hall on the evening of the 29th of September. Lunches and refreshments will also be provided.

Registrations for the conference are due by **June 30, 2008**. For further information on the conference, please go to www.bioecon.ucl.ac.uk

EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMISTS (EAERE)

16th Annual Conference

University of Gothenburg
Gothenburg, Sweden
June 25 – 28, 2008

The conference will be held at the School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg, situated right in the centre of Gothenburg. The city of Gothenburg is the second largest city in Sweden, still it is small and cozy. The centre is concentrated so most hotels will be close to the conference. The surrounding countryside is a midsummer night's dream—forests, lakes and a big archipelago with thousands of islands. In June the sun only dips into the sea for a few hours and it never gets dark, so it is a good idea to stay an extra day or two to explore.

For details, please go to http://www.eaere2008.org/

Please note there is also a ***Preconference** on Environment for Development*. For details, please go to http://www.eaere2008.org/?type=static&id=42&mo=136

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS (ISEE)

10th Biennial Conference

Applying Ecological Economics for Social and Environmental Sustainability

Nairobi, Kenya
August 7-11, 2008

The conference is being undertaken in conjunction with the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and the African Society for Ecological Economics (ASEE) at the United Nations conference facilities in Nairobi, Kenya. It will highlight the vision, methods and policy adjustments needed for ecological economics principles to be applied to the design and management of environmentally and socially sustainable development processes. The conference seeks to build capacity in this area in developing countries in the face of increasing global change and interdependence.

Conference Themes

I. ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS AND SERVICES

1.1- Equity and valuation issues in payment for ecosystem services
1.2- Biophysical dimensions (e.g., biodiversity, nitrogen cycle)
1.3- Qualitative dimensions of ecosystem services valuation
1.4- Bridging micro and macro perspectives
1.5- Markets for ecosystem services: theoretical and implementation dimensions

II. CLIMATE CHANGE

2.1- Climate mitigation strategies
2.2- Adaptation to climate change
2.3- Compensation for reduced deforestation

III. ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS FOR DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

3.1- Macroeconomic issues and the environment
3.2- Sustainable trade regimes
3.3- Ecological economics challenges and policies for Africa

IV. EVOLUTION, INNOVATION AND TRANSITIONS
4.1- Coevolution of production and consumption
4.2- Evolution, innovation and socio-ecological transitions
4.3- Industrial ecology, social ecology and environmental conflicts

V. ALTERNATIVE INSTITUTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES
5.1- Behavioral economics, policy and institutions
5.2- Building alternative socio-economic organizations
5.3- Environmental health, bioethics and innovation
5.4- Social metabolism and water: the water footprint and virtual water trade

VI. AGROECOLOGY, CONSERVATION AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
6.1- Management of coastal and marine environments
6.2- Restoration of natural capital
6.3- Sustainable agriculture, agroecology and biophysical indicators
6.4- Transboundary/Transfrontier conservation

VII. ANALYTICAL TOOLS AND DECISION PROCESSES
7.1- Analytical debates in ecological economics
7.2- Ecological footprint analysis
7.3- Macro sustainability assessment
7.4- Integrated modeling approaches
7.5- Multicriteria analysis
7.6- Participatory and deliberative processes

For further information, visit the Conference website – http://www.ecoeco.org/conference08/callforpapers.php or email secretariat@ecoeco.org.

3RD ATLANTIC WORKSHOP ON ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS

Climate Change Policies After 2012

A Toxa (Spain)
July 4-5, 2008

The Research Group in Economics, Business and the Environment (REBE) at the University of Vigo (Spain) announces the 3rd Atlantic Workshop on Energy and Environmental Economics. The workshop will be held on the island of A Toxa (near Vigo, in Galicia) on July 4 – 5, 2008, and will be appealing to researchers, policy makers and other agents interested in the economic aspects of climate change policies. This year the guiding research subject of the workshop is *Climate Change Policies after 2012*.

The workshop will include keynote lectures by Scott Barrett (Johns Hopkins), Carlo Carraro (Venice) and William Nordhaus (Yale), and invited papers by Joseph Aldy (RFF), Denny Ellerman (MIT), Michael Hanemann (Berkeley), Juan P. Montero (PUC Chile) and Santiago Rubio (Valencia).

Further information can be found at the workshop website: http://rede.uvigo.es/toxa

Organizers: Xavier Labandeira and José M. Martín-Moreno, Research Group in Economics, Business and the Environment (rede), and University of Vigo.

SOUTHERN ECONOMIC ASSOCIATION (SEA)

78th Annual Meeting
November 20 - 23, 2008
Grand Hyatt Hotel
Washington, D.C.

AERE Sessions

Organizers:
Sarah Stafford, College of William and Mary
John Whitehead, East Carolina University

Session 1: Land Use and Conservation

Session Chair: Jill Caviglia-Harris
Salisbury University

(1) *Deforestation, Development, and Transition Within an Amazonian Frontier Settlement: Methods for Maintaining Quality Panel Data* by Jill Caviglia-Harris (jlcaviglia-harris@salisbury.edu), Erin Sills (North Carolina State University-NCSU), Luke Jones (University of Tennessee), Dan Harris (Salisbury University), Shubhayu Saha (NCSU), Suzanne McArdle (East Carolina University), Marcos Pedlowski (Universidade Estadual do Norte Fluminense), and Dar Roberts (University of California, Santa Barbara).

Discussant: Clay Ogg
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

(2) Forests Versus Fuel by Clay Ogg (Ogg.Clay@epamail.epa.gov)

Discussant: Jill Caviglia-Harris

(3) *National Security Versus Environmental Stewardship: Optimum Design Of Conservation Reserves in and Around Military Installations* by Sahan Dissanayake (sdissan2@uiuc.edu), Hayri Önal, and James D. Westervelt (University of Illinois)

Discussant: Damian Adams, Oklahoma State University

(4) Managing Invasive Plants on Public Conservation Lands: Application of a Bio-economic Model by Damian C. Adams (damian.adams@okstate.edu), Donna J. Lee, and C.S. Kim, University of Oklahoma

Discussant: Paul Chambers
University of Central Missouri

Session 2: Agriculture and the Environment

Session Chair: John R. (Skip) Crooker
Central Missouri State University

(1) *Final Evaluation of Swedish Agricultural Support Programs (2000-2006) to Reduce Nutrient Losses* by Dennis Collentine (University of Gavle) (dce@hig.se)

Discussant: Edmund M. Tavernier, Rutgers University

(2) *A Two-Agent Dynamic Model with an Invasive Weed Diffusion Externality: An Application to Yellow Starthistle (Centaurea Solitialis) in New Mexico* by Kristine M. Grimsrud (Grimsrud@unm.edu), Janie M. Chermak, Jason Hansen, Jennifer A. Thacher, and Kate Krause (University of New Mexico).

Discussant: Dennis Collentine

(3) *Stated Preference Study of Water Use Decisions by Organic and Conventional Farmers in Georgia* by Joseph Price and Rebecca Moore (rmoore@warnell.uga.edu) (University of Georgia).

Discussant: Jennifer A. Thacher
University of New Mexico

(4) *Economic and Environmental Impacts of the Production and Transportation of Crop Residues as Bioenergy Feedstocks in North Carolina* by Mark Burkey (*North Carolina A&T State University*), Stephen Holland (sphollan@uncg.edu) and Lyubov Kurkalova (University of North Carolina – Greensboro)

Discussant: Rebecca Moore, University of Georgia

Session 3: Regulating Electric Utilities

Session Chair: Catherine Shelley Norman
The Johns Hopkins University

(1) *Rate of Return Regulation and Emission Permits Trading under Uncertainty* by Fan Zhang (The Pennsylvania State University*)* (fxz10@psu.edu)

Discussant: Elaine Frey, George Washington University

(2) *Technology Diffusion and Environmental Regulation: The Adoption of Natural Gas-Fired Combined Cycle Generating Units* by Elaine Frey (effrey@gwu.edu)

Discussant: Catherine Shelley Norman

(3) *Uncertainty, Regulatory Risk and Risk Management In Electricity Supply and Investment Choices* by Catherine Shelley Norman (csn4348@gmail.com) and Lin Fan

Discussant: Fan Zhang
The Pennsylvania State University

Session 4: Health and the Environment

Chair: Mary Evans
University of Tennessee

(1) *Measuring Health Benefits from Interventions to Reduce Indoor Air Pollution in Rural Households in China* by Fei Yu, *Mount Holyoke College* [feiyu@mtholyoke.edu]

Discussant: Jon Nelson
The Pennsylvania State University

(2) *Valuing Mortality Risk Reductions for Environmental Policy Using Stated Preference Studies* by Chris Dockins, Kelly Maguire (maguire.kelly@epa.gov) and Nathalie Simon (USEPA)

Discussant: Mary Evans

(3) *On the Income Elasticity of the VSL* by Mary F. Evans (mevans12@utk.edu) and V. Kerry Smith (Arizona State University)

Discussant: Kelly Maguire, USEPA

(4) *The Use (and Abuse) of Meta-Analysis in Environmental and Natural Resource Economics: An Assessment* by Jon Nelson (jpn@psu.edu) and Peter E. Kennedy (Simon Fraser University)

Discussant: Will Wheeler, USEPA

Session 5: Voluntary Environmental Activities

Session Chair: Sarah Stafford

(1) *Participation of Firms in Voluntary Environmental Protection Program: An Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility and Capital Market Performance* by Fei Yu (feiyu@mtholyoke.edu)

Discussant: Debra Israel, Indiana State University

(2) *Household Giving to Environmental Organizations: Evidence from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics* by Debra Israel (disrael@isugw.indstate.edu)

Discussant: Sarah Stafford

(3) *Causes and Consequences of Environmental Auditing: Evidence from Regulated Facilities in Michigan* by Mary Evans (University of Tennessee) Lirong Liu (University of Tennessee) and Sarah Stafford (slstaf@wm.edu)

Discussant: Fei Yu, Mount Holyoke College

(4) *Recovering Omitted Attributes with Pseudo-Bayesian Techniques: Non-observed Religiosity Characteristics and Public Good Contributions* by Paul E. Chambers (University of Central Missouri) (pchambers@ucmo.edu) and John (Skip) Crooker (Central Missouri State University)

Discussant: Chris Dumas
University of North Carolina, Wilmington

Session 6: Fisheries

Chair: John Whitehead
East Carolina University

(1) *License Buyback Auctions: An Experimental Analysis* by Matthew A. Freeman (University of Rhode Island) (mfreeman@mail.uri.edu) and Richard T. Woodward (Texas A&M University)

Discussant: Tae-goun Kim, Mississippi State University

(2) *Evaluating the Role of Variable and Model Selection in Propensity Score Based Weights: An Application to Recreation Site Choice Models* by Paul Hindsley (prh0902@ecu.edu) (East Carolina University)

Discussant: Matt Massey, USEPA

(3) *The Problem of Spatial Dependence in Fishing Site Choice Models* by Cameron Cameron Speir (cameron.speir@gmail.com) (University of Illinois)

Discussant: Matthew Freeman
University of Rhode Island

(4) *Inter-dependent Resource Economic Theory: Dynamical Bioeconomic Model of Marine Sand and Fisheries* by Tae-goun Kim (kim@agecon.msstate.edu) (Mississippi State University) and Thomas A. Grigalunas, James J. Opaluch (University of Rhode Island).

Discussant: Cameron Speir, University of Illinois

Session 7: Evaluating Environmental Impacts

Session Chair: Okmyung Bin
East Carolina University

(1) *Measuring the Impacts of Sea-Level Rise on Coastal Real Estate in North Carolina – A Hedonic Price Approach by* Okmyung Bin (bino@ecu.edu), Ben Poulter (Potsdam Institue for Climate Impact Research), Chris Dumas (University of North Carolina, Wilmington)
and John Whitehead (Appalachian State University)

Discussant: Scott Farrow
University of Maryland, Baltimore County

(2) *Adaptive Capacity and Welfare Loss in Drought-Prone Brazil by* Valerie Mueller (vam2105@columbia.edu) (Columbia University), Harounan Kazianga (The World Bank) and Alexander Pfaff, Kenneth Broad, and Renzo Taddei (Columbia University)

Discussant: Catherine Chambers
University of Central Missouri

(3) *Estimating the Effect of School Indoor Air Quality on Academic Outcomes* by Tess Stafford (tms546@eco.utexas.edu) (University of Texas)

Discussant: Valerie Mueller, Columbia University

(4) *Random Error and Simulation Models with an Unobserved Dependent Variable as Applied to the Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act* by Scott Farrow (Farrow@umbc.edu)

Discussant: Okmyung Bin

Session 8: Recreation and the Environment

Chair: George Parsons
University of Delaware

(1) *Estimating a Site Choice Recreation Demand Model Using Aggregate Data on Seasonal License Purchases* by Matt Massey (Massey.Matt@epamail.epa.gov), Steve Newbold, and Adam Daigneault (USEPA)

Discussant: Paul Hindsley, East Carolina University

(2) *Weak Complementarity and Willig Condition: An Empirical Examination* by Ju-Chin Huang (jchuang@cisunix.unh.edu) (University of New Hampshire), Daigee Shaw (Chung-Hua Institution for Economic Research) and Yu-Lan Chien (National Taipei University)

Discussant: George Parsons

(3) Air Quality and Forecasts: The Effects of Ozone Alerts on Driving and Outdoor Recreation Behavior in Atlanta by Douglas Noonan (Georgia Institute of Technology) (Douglas.Noonan@pubpolicy.gatech.edu)

Discussant: Ju-Chin Huang

(4) *Valuing Short Term Beach Closures on the Gulf Coast of Texas by* George Parsons (gparsons@udel.edu) and Stela Stefanova (University of Delaware)

Discussant: Douglas Noonan

Session 9: International Environmental Issues

Session Chair: Siwa Missangi
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

(1) On the Trade Liberalization in Environmental Goods and Services by Alain-Désiré Nimubona (University of Waterloo) (animubon@uwaterloo.ca)

Discussant: Siwa Msangi

(2) *The Dynamics of Learning and Environmental Externalities in Transboundary Pollution Problems* by Siwa Msangi (s.msangi@cgiar.org)

Discussant: Alain-Desire Nimubona

(3) *Why a Different Approach Is Required if Global Climate Change Is to Be Controlled Efficiently or Even at All* by Alan Carlin (USEPA) (Carlin.Alan@epamail.epa.gov)

Discussant: Patrick Karani
Development Bank of Southern Africa

(4) *Climate Change Mitigation Strategies: The Role of Development Finance Institutions* by Patrick Karani (PatrickK@dbsa.org)

Discussant: Alan Carlin

Session 10: Stated Preferences

Chair: Will Wheeler, USEPA

(1) *Exploring Respondent's Perception of Bid Design Precision in Nonmarket Valuation* by Chris Azevedo (cazevedo@ucmo.edu) (*Central Missouri State University)*, John Crooker (*Central Missouri State University) and* Brian Pattiz (The *Iowa State University)*

Discussant: Tim Haab, The Ohio State University

(2) *Estimating Willingness of Citizens to Pay for Recycling* by Glenn C. Blomquist, David Hardesty, Margaret Hughes, Brandon Koford (bckofo2@uky.edu), Fred Morgan, Kenneth Troske (University of Kentucky)

Discussant: Chris Azevedo
Central Missouri State University

(3) *Using Dynamic Models to Capture Sequence Effects in Multiple Responses Revealed and Stated Preference Surveys* by Bin Sun (The Ohio State University), Tim Haab (haab.1@cfaes.osu.edu) (The Ohio State University) and John Whitehead (Appalachian State University)

Discussant: John (Skip) Crooker Crooker
Central Missouri State University

(4) *The Decision to Manage Invasive Weeds: Which Factors Matter?* by Jennifer Thacher (jthacher@unm.edu), Kristine M. Grimsrud, Janie M. Chermak, Kate Krause (University of New Mexico)

Discussant: Brandon Koford, University of Kentucky

Session 11: Environmental Policy Design and Analysis

Session Chair: Christian A. Vossler
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

(1) *Nonpoint Water Pollution Regulation with Dynamic Taxes* by Christian A. Vossler* (cvossler@utk.edu), *Jordan F. Suter (Cornell University) and and Gregory L. Poe (Cornell University)*

Discussant: Dennis Collentine

(2) *Program Design for a Tradable Permit System for Nutrient Loads to the Baltic Sea* by Dennis Collentine (Dennis.Collentine@hig.se)

Discussant: Christian A. Vossler

(3) *How 'Smart' is the Split-Rate Property Tax? Evidence from Growth Patterns in Pennsylvania* by Spencer Banzhaf (hsbanzhaf@gsu.edu) and Nathan Lavery (Georgia State University)

Discussant: Charles Towe
University of Maryland, College Park

(4) *Testing the Effect of Neighboring Open Space on Development Using Propensity Score Matching* by Charles Towe (ctowe@arec.umd.edu or ctowe@ers.usda.gov) and Nancy Bockstael (University of Maryland, College Park)

Discussant: Spencer Banzhaf

Session 12: Environmental Management

Chair: Tim Haab

(1) *The Impact of Beach Nourishment on Beach Hotel Room Rentals* by Catherine M. Chambers (chambers@ucmo.edu) (University of Central Missouri) and Christopher F. Dumas (University of North Carolina, Wilmington)

Discussant: Edmund M. Tavernier

(2) *Flood Insurance Coverage in the Coastal Zone* by Craig E. Landry (landryc@ecu.edu) and Mohammad Jahan-Parvar (East Carolina University)

Discussant: Lynne Lewis
Bates College

(3) *Do Benefits Really Transfer? A Fish Tale across 3 Rivers* by Lynne Y. Lewis (llewis@bates.edu)

Discussant: Craig Landry
East Carolina University

(4) *Encouraging Wildlife Habitats: A New Jersey Case Study* by Edmund M. Tavernier (Rutgers University) (etavernier@AESOP.Rutgers.edu)

Discussant: John Whitehead

ESSAY

Summary of Workshop on Sample Representativeness and Government Approval of Stated Preference Surveys[1]

Alan Krupnick
Resources for the Future
Washington, D.C.

David A. Evans
National Center for Environmental Economics
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
Washington, D.C.

Introduction

Stated preference surveys are frequently used in regulatory contexts to inform policy. Conducting a high-quality stated preference survey presents a variety of methodological challenges, in particular, assuring representative responses. For example, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Panel on Contingent Valuation suggested that in-person surveys with a high response rate were needed to assure credibility of stated preference surveys. But these challenges are also not restricted to stated-preference surveys: many other government-sponsored surveys have experienced declining response rates in recent years, and researchers have devoted increasing attention to assessing the consequences for data quality. In response to these developments, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), which must approve most government sponsored surveys conducted for regulatory purposes, issued its *Guidelines and Standards for Statistical Surveys* (hereafter *Guidelines*) in September 2006. In January 2006, OMB released a companion to the *Guidelines*; *Guidance on Agency Survey and Statistical Information Collections* (hereafter *Guidance*)[2]

One of the key concerns expressed in the *Guidelines* is the potential effect of low response rates on non-response bias.[3] The *Guidelines* require federal agencies to conduct extensive non-response analyses when expected response rates are below 80 percent, which the OMB uses as an indicator of sample representativeness.[4] Experience has shown that, absent very high sampling budgets, most government-initiated stated preference surveys do not achieve response rates this high.

With the OMB *Guidance* as motivation, we convened a USEPA-sponsored workshop that was attended by over 30 experts in survey methods, statistics, and stated preference surveys to share their knowledge, insights, and experiences regarding how to achieve and test for sample representativeness in stated preference surveys. The participants also considered, when sampling budgets are limited, the desirability of increasing respondent representativeness relative to other objectives and qualities of a survey administration. We also asked authors of recently administered stated preference or similar surveys to complete a two-page template that elicited their study's results and, in particular, how they tested for and addressed any biases in the representativeness of their samples.

The discussion often focused on Internet-based surveys with samples drawn from a probability-based panel, like the one administered by the survey research firm Knowledge Networks. The use of panel-based Internet surveys has been growing in popularity as a method for

[1] The workshop described in this essay was funded in part by USEPA under Cooperative Agreement CR83299-01 with Resources for the Future. Although the information described herein was gathered in part through funding provided by USEPA, it does not necessarily reflect the views of the agency, and no official endorsement should be inferred. Evans was with Resources for the Future when the workshop was planned and conducted. Although he is now with the USEPA, the preceding disclaimer applies in that the views expressed in this essay are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the agency. The workshop participants have not endorsed, either explicitly or implicitly, this essay. We thank Alan Carlin, John Loomis, and Nathalie Simon for helpful comments.

[2] The *Guidelines* and the *Guidance* (also known as *Questions and Answers when Designing Surveys for Information Collections*), can be found at: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/inforeg/statpolicy.html#pr.

[3] There are relatively few nonresponse studies of stated-preference surveys in the literature. Those available include: Hudson, D., L.-H. Seah, D. Hite, T. Haab. 2004. "Telephone presurveys, self-selection, and non-response bias to mail and internet surveys in economic research." *Applied Economics Letters*. 11:237-240.; Whitehead, J.C., P.A. Groothuis, G.C. Blomquist., 1993. "Testing for non-response and sample selection bias in contingent valuation." *Economics Letters*. 41:215-220.

[4] By sample representativeness, we mean how well the survey respondents represent the population of interest (respondent representativeness), as opposed to how well those in the sampling frame represent the population of interest.

conducting stated-preference surveys.[5] This approach poses particular challenges for achieving high response rates because panel recruitment and participation occurs over multiple stages. Experiences with more traditional modes that can accommodate extensive information treatments, such as mail and in-person, were also discussed.

The balance of this essay describes the workshop proceedings and presentations as well as what we view are the take-home messages from the workshop. The slides and audio files from the presentations are provided on the workshop webpage:
http://www.rff.org/rff/Events/Sample-Representativeness.cfm. The webpage also provides a link to a detailed report of the workshop's proceedings, which includes an extended summary of each presentations and the discussion that followed as well as a compendium of the completed survey practitioner templates and a list of attendees.[6] We conclude the essay noting some developments since the workshop and our take on the differences in perspective between survey methodologists and stated-preference practitioners and between OMB and the agencies.

Workshop Proceedings

The first presentation was from Brian Harris-Kojetin of OMB's Statistical and Science Policy Office, who described OMB's responsibility in approving surveys and the development and main components of the *Guidelines* and *Guidance*.[7] Harris-Kojetin explained how the Paperwork Reduction Act provides the authority for and requires OMB's review of agency data collections, including focus groups and survey pretests. Data collections, which include surveys funded through contracts but not (usually) through grants, must have an OMB-approved information collection request (ICR).[8] The approval process includes reviews to assure sound statistical analyses are used. The purpose of the *Guidelines* and *Guidance* is to provide greater transparency about the OMB review process and to improve the quality of the data collected. The *Guidelines* are for a technical audience, while the *Guidance* is intended for a broad audience.

Harris-Kojetin focused on those standards that are particularly salient to response rates and nonresponse bias. OMB recognizes that response rates are merely an indicator of bias and are not a direct measure of nonresponse bias. Nonetheless, OMB believes that they can be used as a rough indicator of potential bias problems. Therefore, agencies need to report the expected response rate in the ICR. If the expected response rate is below 80 percent, an agency should plan to conduct a nonresponse bias analysis. Furthermore, the nonresponse bias analysis must look at bias in the substance of the information being collected. That said, Harris-Kojetin suggested that OMB has taken a more flexible approach to response rates by not requiring a minimum rate and by considering the purposes of the study when evaluating an ICR. He also highlighted how the guidance addresses multistage surveys and how this information relates to panels, noting in particular that the last-stage response rate is not the relevant one because it ignores the impaneling stages. An agency needs to report expected response rates at each stage, and attrition must be accounted for.

Members of the following panel, all representatives of federal agencies that conduct stated preference surveys, described their agencies' experiences in getting surveys approved by OMB, their reactions to the OMB guidance, and what they were looking to learn from the workshop. They welcomed the final *Guidelines* and *Guidance* for making the approval process less opaque, but all also expressed some frustration with the stringency of some of the guidelines as well as the ICR approval process and the delays it causes.

Two well-known survey methodologists, Robert Groves of the University of Michigan and Jon Krosnick of Stanford University, anchored the next session. Both summarized their ongoing research on the relationship between survey response rates and nonresponse bias, in general finding that increasing response rates did not necessarily improve or considerably change estimates of the statistic of interest. Both used novel research designs and different approaches for testing the relationship between bias and nonresponse rates. Groves showed that the level of nonresponse bias varied by questions within a particular survey, and that alone demographic variables are poor predictors of bias. He also presented research that systematically explored the effect of methods for increasing response rates on bias, such as signals of survey topic, sponsorship and incentives.

Krosnick used two well-known stated preference surveys in his analysis, showing that once 50 percent of the total responses were collected, mean and median

[5] USEPA. 2006. "Panel Discussion of the Use of the Internet in Valuation Surveys." Proceedings of *Morbidity and Mortality: How Do We Value the Risk of Illness and Death?* April 10-12, 2006. Washington, D.C. *http://yosemite.epa.gov/ee/epa/eermfile.nsf/vwAN/EE-0497-03.pdf/$File/EE-0497-03.pdf*

[6] The report may also be found here: *http://yosemite.epa.gov/EE/epa/eerm.nsf/vwRepNumLookup/EE-0512*

[7] The *Guidance* has a brief section on stated preference surveys, the only survey type with a dedicated section.

[8] Surveys conducted under grants may be subject to the PRA if there is significant involvement of federal employees in the preparation of the survey.

willingness-to-pay did not vary considerably with additional responses. He also presented research that showed that certain survey design elements that increase response rates in an empirical setting do not seem to do so once all design elements are accounted for.

Next came presentations by several stated preference survey practitioners. First, Kevin Boyle of Virginia Tech presented a meta-analysis of response rates to contingent valuation surveys conducted by mail, identifying those survey design elements with a significant affect on response rates. His work was motivated by the NOAA Panel's endorsement of an in-person mode of administration over mail. Unlike the few meta-analyses from the survey methodology literature, his analysis also captures the influence of design elements unique to stated preference surveys, such as resource type. Boyle and his colleagues find that response rates are strongly influenced by the investigator conducting the study.

We (Krupnick and Evans) then presented a summary of the stated preference survey templates. These surveys reflect the state of the art in stated preference survey methods. The practitioners reported using methods to increase response rates and to reduce and measure nonresponse bias that are both common (e.g., reminder letters, priority mailings) and novel (e.g., Viscusi et al.'s proposed use of a "distortion indicator" for adjusting for nonresponse bias). We also compiled and shared the research needs identified by the practitioners, which include analyses of effort and engagement by survey mode and behavioral explanations for survey response. This discussion was followed by a presentation by Joel Huber, at Duke University, where he evaluated the desirability of using panels for conducting stated-preference studies. Among the pros and cons of panels he offered, he also provocatively questioned whether a representative sample is actually desirable. He suggested that informed and compliant respondents, who might be thought to belong to standing panels, provide more reliable and relevant information for public policy than what may be gathered from random sampling of the general population.

In the research frontiers session, Trudy Ann Cameron of the University of Oregon summarized her work on strategies for finding and identifying covariates to correct for nonresponse bias due to observable and nonobservable differences between respondents and nonrespondents. One study she summarized evaluated the resulting sample representativeness from all of the stages of empanelment into the Knowledge Network's panel using selection correction models. Cameron showed that a variable may be correlated with participation at one stage, but then may not explain participation in a later stage or even have the opposite influence (i.e., its coefficient changes sign). Dan Hellerstein of the Economic Research Service presented a promising approach for correcting for nonresponse bias in conjoint surveys using a two-staged mixed-logit method (following the philosophy of the Heckman correction approach). Using simulated data, he showed that this approach could better estimate willingness to pay than naïve (i.e., uncorrected) approaches. Erika Edwards of Boston University presented the findings of a mixed-mode study of alcohol consumption behaviors using the Knowledge Networks panel. Edwards and her colleagues found that the responses from the panelists were not strongly conditional on whether they took the survey via the Internet or phone, and that the responses of the panelists mirrored the results of an in-person study conducted by the Census Bureau on behalf of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

The workshop closed with a panel consisting of an agency representative, a stated-preference practitioner, and a survey methodologist who reacted to the day's discussion. Brian Harris-Kojetin and Katherine Wallman, OMB's Chief Statistician, then responded to the comments of the panel and the audience.

Summary of Workshop

The workshop was characterized by frank discussions and enlightening presentations, with improved understanding by all sides of the issues involved. The important take-home messages are described below.

What are the problems?

The agencies and OMB see the problems differently. The agency representatives said their survey ICRs, particularly those that use standing panels, were taking too long to get through OMB review and that OMB had provided too little guidance on how to improve the studies or conduct the non-response bias analysis that they seek. Some attendees thought that a small OMB staff, a too-strict an interpretation of the Paperwork Reduction Act on OMB's behalf, and a lack of clear requirements (prior to the release of the *Guidelines*) are some of the causes of the delay in approving survey ICRs. Others focused on the implications of changes in methods of communication, behavior, and technological advances in survey methods that are not yet fully appreciated by both OMB and researchers. Examples include the decline in landline phone use and increased resistance to taking surveys. Both of these phenomena make it harder to achieve representativeness using traditional sampling methods. While changes in technology have made it easier to conduct surveys over the Internet, the body of knowledge on sampling issues has not yet caught up to these advancements. Even with more traditional sampling methods, there is a dearth of research on survey representativeness and response selection.

OMB, for its part, believes that there are problems with the representativeness of respondents to these surveys and that agencies are not paying enough attention to this issue. Furthermore, OMB suggests that part of the delay in approvals results from agencies not submitting their requests in a timely manner. OMB also believes that agencies could expedite the approval process by getting generic clearance for conducting focus groups. OMB also believes that the *Guidelines* and *Guidance* will provide greater certainty to the ICR approval process, while still being flexible to the circumstances of a particular survey. The survey methodologists welcomed the *Guidelines* and *Guidance*, feeling that, while there was room for improvement, overall they would improve survey practice, as well as highlight areas for further investigation.

However, many of the practitioners felt that the new *Guidelines* and *Guidance* are insufficiently flexible to survey circumstances, rely on insufficient evidence, and do not explicitly offer techniques that would demonstrate compliance with them. These feelings were based mostly on a perceived lack of acceptable techniques for evaluating and addressing sample representativeness, and the evidence on the relationship between representativeness and response rates. It was noted that as a consequence, surveys might not be performed, but agency decisions will be made with or without the information provided by them, with decisions being poorer as a result. In addition, for surveys that are performed, researchers may avoid OMB scrutiny by conducting fewer focus groups and pretests or making surveys shorter to raise response rates at the cost of increased measurement error. Similarly, researchers may overinvest in increasing respondent representativeness to the detriment of other components of the survey protocol.

Is the 80 percent threshold a standard or a guideline?

Before the workshop it was unclear to practitioners and agency representatives whether the OMB's 80 percent response rate threshold was a standard or a guideline. According to OMB, it is only a guideline meant to highlight their position that many of the surveys they review have not been designed with thoughtful consideration of response bias issues. Thus, surveys with response rates above this threshold are presumed to have low nonresponse bias, but OMB emphasized that even these surveys will still be scrutinized on other elements. While the OMB *Guidelines* and *Guidance* do not establish a minimally acceptable response rate, surveys below 80 percent have to make a showing that nonresponse bias is tolerably low. OMB was emphatic, however, that response rates for panel data must be calculated based on the panel recruitment stage, and not on the number of panelists asked to respond.

Is there any specific guidance on how to demonstrate in advance the attainment of an 80 percent response rate or how to measure nonresponse bias?

While there is some general guidance, it was agreed that there are no sampling protocols that OMB considers definitive for showing that an 80 percent response rate will be attained. The *Guidelines* and *Guidance* also provide little specific guidance as to what approaches for measuring nonresponse bias are acceptable to OMB for any particular survey. This is due in part to the lack of guidance from the survey methodology literature, which as Robert Groves pointed out, has long held an inferential paradigm that essentially ignores the consequences of nonresponse.

What is the appropriate amount of effort for testing and reducing nonresponse bias?

The consensus view was that researchers face tradeoffs in designing and implementing surveys, with minimizing response bias only one of the considerations. Others include components of the protocol such as sample size and respondent burden, although there was no agreement on the weights that should be given to these various factors. Stated-preference practitioners want relatively low weight to be attached to response rate per se because they do not believe that it is a sound indicator of sample representativeness. However, they appreciate that sample representativeness itself deserves close attention, and seek guidance on the appropriate methods to avoid and test for nonresponse bias.

What guidance does the literature offer on best practices to achieve and demonstrate sample representativeness?

We learned from Jon Krosnick and Robert Groves that this area of research is in its nascent stages and the guidance from the survey methodology field that is available often emphasizes the wrong thing (i.e., increasing survey response over sample representativeness). Furthermore, from the evidence available, the relationship between response rate and nonresponse bias or sample representativeness appears to be weak. They also indicated, as noted above, that there is little guidance as to what indicators could be used instead. What is clear is that efforts to increase response rates are wasted without considering directly their implications for nonresponse bias. OMB indicated that, although the *Guidelines* will not be updated frequently, the *Guidance* will be a living document reflecting, in part, the latest research results on the relationship between survey response and bias.

One particularly useful suggestion was to form a panel similar to the NOAA Panel to develop protocols for avoiding and testing for bias in stated preference surveys.

Is there anything special about survey panels?

Yes and no. There is almost no research by survey methodology experts on panel-specific issues related to nonresponse bias. However, as mentioned above, this is a problem common to all methods of survey sampling. The panel approach is different in that it is relatively new, at least with respect to computer-aided methods, and is growing in popularity. For example, marketers are increasingly moving to panel-based approaches. This alone suggests that their biases are low because mistakes made here can translate into lower profits. However, as Robert Groves reported, some marketers are becoming less comfortable with this method because survey results have shown to be unreliable, although there is an important distinction between probability- and nonprobability-based approaches to empanelling respondents. Stated-preference researchers generally find that panels developed from random-digit dialing techniques (e.g., Knowledge Networks' approach) generate low nonresponse bias on willingness to pay, despite low cumulative response rates.

What research needs exist?

The discussion at the workshop identified some promising paths for future research. In our view, the primary needs are for rigorous sample representativeness diagnostics, further study of the interaction between sampling methods and other survey design components (such as mode), and behavioral models of the panel selection/withdrawal process. Existing methods for identifying and correcting for nonresponse bias include the use of propensity scores and other selection-correction methods using a large number of demographic and behavioral variables. Participants also suggested that OMB should support the funding of primary cross-agency research on methods to avoid and test for nonresponse bias.

What can the agencies do to improve the survey review process?

Several intriguing ideas surfaced during the workshop. The most compelling was for the agencies to develop their own survey review procedures, which at the time of this workshop was only being done by the Federal Reserve Board. Subsequently, participants proposed that the agencies partner to develop a center for stated preference survey research that would serve all the partnering agencies' needs. In this case, OMB's reviews would focus on the cross-agency guidelines and less on any particular survey. A less dramatic option is for an agency to develop a protocol for internally reviewing surveys and overseeing the survey development stages. Rather than having to review ICRs for each focus group and pretest, with this approach, the OMB would only need to review the summary of these survey development stages as part of their review of the ICR for administration of the full survey.

Since the workshop was held, USEPA has adopted, at OMB's suggestion, an internal method of approving multiple focus groups for stated preference surveys.[9] (OMB has approved this process on an 18-month trial basis.) A standing committee of three USEPA economists (with one alternate) review the ICR, in part to ensure that the survey protocol receives an adequate level of peer review, and that the study is described in USEPA's publicly available science inventory data base. Once approved by the panel, the proposal is then sent to OMB for an expedited review (about 10 to 15 days). This process has already been used successfully to approve focus groups for one survey (on arsenic in drinking water).

What can OMB do to improve the survey review process?

Agency participants agreed that OMB could make the review process more transparent. This would include developing and distributing a list of surveys that have been approved (as well as rejected) along with the approach each took to address and measure nonresponse bias. It was also suggested that OMB should permit agencies to increase their budgets for funding survey development, encourage greater funding of surveys by Congress and of primary research on survey response, and exempt survey development stages from ICRs. One of the most dramatic options was for OMB to eliminate their review in favor of outside peer review.

Organizers' Perspectives/Observations

The workshop highlighted a tension between the survey methodologists, who believe that the new OMB *Guidelines* will bring focus to improving survey methods by encouraging new research (in part on sample representativeness), and the stated preference practitioners who are concerned that they will stifle the collection of much-needed information for benefit-cost analyses. We feel that both views have merit. That said, we also believe that the great should not be the enemy of the good. All sides–OMB, survey methodologists, practitioners, and the agencies–should work together to develop better protocols to improve regulatory outcomes but in the meantime OMB should allow surveys to go forward recognizing the limitations in the field and the expertise of the practitioners.

---

[9] See: USEPA, 2007. "Agency Information Collection Activities; Submission to OMB for Review and Approval; Comment Request; Focus Groups as Used by EPA for Economics Projects." *Federal Register*. 72(8):1511-2., and USEPA, 2007. *Focus Groups as Used by EPA for Economics Projects, EPA ICR No. 2205.01 Supporting Statement.*

Furthermore, one of the OMB's guidelines–that response rates to surveys should be increased by highlighting government sponsorship and the survey topic–must be viewed with caution. Stated preference surveys often *de-emphasize* the actual topic and sponsor of the survey so as not to select for those particularly interested in environmental quality (by, for example, couching the survey as one about budget priorities survey). This might have a depressing effect on response rates, but it provides comfort in the representativeness of the respondent sample and the responses to the preference-elicitation questions. Other guidelines may similarly be inappropriate for stated preference surveys. But, there is much for stated-preference practitioners to learn from the survey methodology literature, not the least of which are optimal methods for providing information on surveys, asking questions (i.e. cognition), and testing survey performance.

In a similar vein, the workshop added to the dialogue between OMB and the agencies regarding the survey approval process. OMB is understandably concerned about conducting quality surveys and has gone to great lengths to provide the agencies with understandable, yet flexible, guidance that overall appears likely to improve surveys and the approval process. Also, OMB has an invaluable cross-agency perspective and can facilitate the sharing of new findings and techniques among the agencies. However, OMB has based the *Guidelines* and *Guidance* on the qualities of highly funded and recurring surveys that solicit behavioral or descriptive data from respondent recall, and so they might not always be well-suited for nonrecurring surveys that have a high-information treatment and smaller budgets.[10] Furthermore, we question whether OMB is trying to use the Paperwork Reduction Act for more than it may have been intended. During his presentation, OMB's Brian Harris-Kojetin provided the analogy that, because OMB does not typically have continuing oversight of a collection once it is approved, reviewing a survey ICR is like conducting a peer review when one can only view the introduction and methods section. But if review of the methods section is all the Paperwork Reduction Act allows, then perhaps OMB should not be trying to use it to review the analysis, results, and conclusions (such as requiring certain reports from the survey administration). Furthermore, there are other venues and tools for reviewing the later sections of the study by OMB and others (peer-review, their use in regulatory impact analysis, Information Quality Act reviews, etc.).[11] The agencies and their charges have their own expertise, experiences, and incentives to perform sound analyses. Furthermore, the agencies presumably have the correct priorities when evaluating how all aspects of the survey protocol may influence the estimate of interest from the survey and therefore how best to allocate the survey budget.

The previous paragraph is not intended to let the agencies off the hook, however. Budgets for performing stated preference studies are inadequate given the importance of nonuse and other difficult to measure values in their regulatory activities. Budget priorities and resources dedicated to survey stated-preference design should account for the significant regulatory cost that nonuse values may justify, and that these costs might far exceed the changes in the allocation of government revenues associated with some highly funded government-sponsored surveys. Also, the agencies may arguably require additional edification in data collection and survey, including stated-preference survey, methods and expertise. Furthermore, the agencies should support primary research on the behavioral aspects of survey response and participate in the development of federal survey standards through organizations like the Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology with the implications for stated preference surveys in mind.

A well-deserved critique from one of the survey methodologists was that the topic of the workshop was really about unit nonresponse bias, which is only one of many design elements that affect sample representativeness. Issues of coverage, identifying the appropriate survey population, and identifying an appropriate sample frame, are perhaps equally important. This concern is particularly salient for economists concerned about ad hoc implicit definitions of the extent of the market in stated-preference studies. In fact, one finding almost universally held by the workshop attendees was that there was much more to consider when designing and evaluating a survey, and perhaps that response rates faced undue emphasis from OMB.

In closing, we extend our thanks to OMB, the agency representatives, presenters and other attendees for contributing to the workshop and participating in enlightening and productive discussions. We encourage you the reader to review the workshop report if you are interested in a more detailed description of what was covered in the presentations and the discussions that followed. As readers of this newsletter have further experiences with the agencies and OMB with stated preference surveys, we encourage them to contact us with their insights about whether the process has improved since the release of the *Guidelines* and *Guidance*.

[10] We base this observation on the research used to justify the *Guidance* and *Guidelines* (see the references therein) as well as the breath and depth of the *Guidelines* and the cost required to adhere to them.

[11] The Information Quality Act allows the public to challenge the data underlying government rulemaking analyses.

BULLETIN BOARD

CAMP RESOURCES XV

The 15th edition of Camp Resources will convene at the Hilton Riverside on Thursday and Friday, August 7 and 8, 2008, in Wilmington, North Carolina. Camp Resources is a workshop designed for graduate students and young professionals to present their research in a relaxed but serious environment. Papers are not expected, however, a clear, well-organized, 20-minute presentation describing a completed or emerging research project has been standard fare. For those interested in making presentations, please email a one-page abstract to Jack Crawley (jack_crawley@ncsu.edu) **by May 31, 2008**. Please email them in *.pdf or MS Word format. Be sure to put CAMP RESOURCES in the subject line. Selection and notification of those who will present at Camp Resources XV will be done by June 13, 2008.

Everyone who wants to come is of course welcome! Please email Jack Crawley for more information.

CA'FOSCARI UNIVERSITY OF VENICE PhD PROGRAM IN SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT OF CLIMATE CHANGE

PhD Programme in Science and Management of Climate Change

Università Ca'Foscari Venezia

In 2007, the Department of Economics and the Department of Environmental Sciences of the Ca' Foscari University of Venice, in collaboration with the Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change (CMCC) established a 3-year PhD Program in **Science and Management of Climate Change**. The PhD Program is aimed at providing the job market with experts with a broad, in-depth, scientific and socio-economic background, as well as with a sound and innovative research experience focusing on the dynamics of climate change and on the methodologies and techniques for their evaluation and management.

The PhD Program is organized in two Streams: - **Dynamic Climatology** at CMCC in Bologna and- **Climate Change Impact and Management** at the Department of Economics of the Ca' Foscari University in Venice.

For the year 2008 (24th cycle of Italian PhD Programs) the Euro-Mediterranean Centre for Climate Change offers three studentships, others may be provided by other institutions or research projects.

In order to apply, students are required to hold an Italian "laurea magistrale" or a university degreeequivalent of a MSc. Foreign applicants shall provide full documentation of their university studies, including course profiles. Knowledge of the English language is a necessary prerequisite, since all the courses will be given in English.

General information, the Call for Application and forms for the Ph.D. Program on Science and Management of Climate Change can be downloaded at http://www.venus.unive.it/phd-climate-change/en Applications close on May 23, 2008.

EUROPEAN JOB MARKET FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMISTS

Dear Colleagues,

The European Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (EAERE) announces the European Job Market for Environmental and Resource Economist, to be held within its 16th Annual Conference, from the June 25 – 28, 2008, in Gothenburg, Sweden. Institutions with open positions and candidates are invited to take part in this initiative. Detailed information is available at www.eaere.org/job.html.

We look forward to receiving your application and to meeting you in Gothenburg.

Thomas Sterner, EAERE President
16th Annual Conference Organizer

Santiago Rubio, EAERE Vice-President

Monica Eberle, EAERE Secretary General

RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE (RFF) WEEKLY POLICY COMMENTARY

www.rff.org/weeklycommentary

This website provides an easy way for students, policymakers, and academics to learn about economic and other aspects of environmental, energy, urban, and public health policies. Each week, an expert provides a short, nontechnical commentary on a timely policy issue.

Recent commentaries have discussed, for example, oil price shocks, the European Trading Scheme, trash policies, superbugs, permit auction design, London's congestion charge, clean technology innovation, the political economy of fishery regulation, the green building movement, fuel economy standards, the Dead Zone, air pollution damages, malaria, airport congestion, pesticide regulation, emissions taxes versus cap-and-trade, smoking cessation, housing policy in poor countries, voluntary environmental programs, food safety, and valuing mortality in poor countries.

Ian Parry	**Felicia Day**
Series Editor	**Managing Editor**
parry@rff.org	**day@rff.org**

RFF ANNOUNCES RECIPIENTS OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM AWARDS

Recipients of six academic fellowships and special internships have been named by Resources for the Future to conduct environmental and energy research during the coming academic year.

The awards provide stipends and program support for the recipients, who are selected through a competitive process. Each year, more than $120,000 is available for post-doctoral and other academic awards as well as graduate-level researchers, funded by special gifts to the RFF endowment.

"We are especially gratified by the exemplary accomplishments of this year's awardees," said Molly Macauley, senior fellow and director of academic programs. "Their interests will augment and expand many of the ongoing research activities already underway at RFF, and we look forward to the results of their work."

Winners for the 2008-09 academic year in each award program are:

Gilbert F. White Postdoctoral Fellowship

Dr. Wolfram Schlenker, an assistant professor in the Department of Economics and School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, and a faculty research fellow of the National Bureau of Economic Research, will join RFF during 2008-09 to pursue research on estimating the impact of global warming on American agriculture.

John V. Krutilla Research Award

C. Josh Donlan III, a Ph.D. graduate of Cornell University in ecology and evolutionary biology and a visiting fellow at Cornell University, will use his stipend to conduct research on biodiversity offsets as a tool for managing fisheries by-catch.

Walter O. Spofford Jr. Memorial Internship

Liguang Liu, a Ph.D. student in the School of Public Administration at Florida International University, will contribute to research on climate issues and China during his summer with RFF.

Joseph L. Fisher Doctoral Dissertation Fellowships

Hunt Allcott, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Public Policy, Harvard University, will complete his research on energy demand, including household electricity usage and the response of the American auto industry to changes in corporate average fuel economy standards.

Chad Lawley, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of Maryland, will complete his research on non-indigenous species and U.S. trade policy to examine the extent to which border inspections are determined by protectionist versus risk-reduction motivations.

Heather Sander, a Ph.D. student in the Department of Geography at the University of Minnesota, is completing her degree in conservation biology by using spatial modeling to examine the ecological and economic effects of changes in land use in the St. Paul, Minnesota, metropolitan area.

Resources for the Future, an independent and nonpartisan Washington, DC, think tank, seeks to improve environmental and natural resource policymaking worldwide through objective social science research of the highest caliber.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY OF FORESTRY
CANADA RESEARCH CHAIR – TIER 1
NATURAL RESOURCE/
ENVIRONMENTAL ECONOMICS

The Department of Forest Resources Management, Faculty of Forestry, invites applications from outstanding individuals for one full-time, tenured position at the Professor level. As a result of our current directions in undergraduate and graduate programs, and to build on areas of research strength, we are interested in high quality candidates with research expertise applied to Natural Resource/Environmental Economics topics.

The successful candidate will provide a focus for Natural Resource/Environmental Economics, integrating across UBC. The applicant must demonstrate a concern about sustainability through work in such fields as forest economics, natural resources economics, ecological economics, environmental economics, agricultural economics or other related fields. Strength in quantitative methods would be an advantage. It is expected that the appointee will have demonstrated leadership ability by having an established research program in a relevant field, teaching experience, an interest in policy issues and an aptitude to enter into public debate concerning economic issues relating to the management of natural resources.

This position is at the Full Professor level; however, outstanding candidates may be considered at the Associate Professor level. Outstanding research, graduate student supervision and teaching records are required for appointment at the CRC Tier I level. Applicants will hold an earned Ph.D. in economics or related field, and will have made significant contributions in major economic journals and public policy fora.

The Department of Forest Resources Management has strong teaching and research programs that embrace the full range of forest management. The Faculty of Forestry, within which the Department is situated, aims to be a leader in Canada, and offers undergraduate education in five programs in Forest Resources Management, Forest Sciences, Natural Resources Conservation, Wood Products Processing and Forest Operations. In addition, through joint appointments, the Department has strong, established, ties with Civil Engineering, Geography, Land and Food Systems and the social sciences.

The appointment will be effective July 1, 2009, but an alternative date may be arranged. Salary and rank will be commensurate with experience and qualifications. All University of BC positions are subject to final budgetary approval.

The closing date for applications is **September 15, 2008**. Interested candidates are asked to submit a curriculum vitae, names of four references, a statement of current and future research interests, a record of teaching effectiveness and three papers most significant and relevant to research interests to:

Heather Akai, Administrator
University of BC
Department of Forest Resources Management
2045, 2424 Main Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4
heather.akai@ubc.ca

UBC hires on the basis of merit and is committed to employment equity. We encourage all qualified persons to apply.

DIRECTOR
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
HAUB SCHOOL AND RUCKELSHAUS INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Helga Otto Haub School and William D. Ruckelshaus Institute of Environment and Natural Resources is a program that brings multiple academic disciplines and diverse stakeholders together to address complex issues related to the environment and natural resources (ENR) in the Rocky Mountain west. The University of Wyoming is seeking a leader to guide the School and Institute and build upon its reputation as a leading interdisciplinary center addressing critical ENR issues and offering innovative undergraduate and graduate education. For more information about the Haub School and Ruckelshaus Institute of Environment and Natural Resources, please visit http://www.uwyo.edu/enr.

The Director will report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. We seek an energetic leader with proven intellectual and administrative skills who will work with the faculty in contributing academic units and advance the stature of the Haub School and Ruckelshaus

Institute as one of the world's top institutions in ENR issues. The Director must represent the School and Institute effectively to the university administration, the Ruckelshaus Institute advisory board, external constituents concerned with ENR issues, state and national political leadership, and to the public.

Preferred qualifications include: 1) an earned doctorate, or a combination of education and experience appropriate for a tenurable appointment in any of ENR's cooperating disciplinary departments; 2) an internationally recognized record of teaching and research in environment and natural resources; 3) administrative experience that demonstrates vision, managerial ability, and communication skills; 4) the creative leadership needed to create synergy with other university programs and with outside interests; 5) sensitivity to the ENR issues confronting the Rocky Mountain West; and 6) a commitment to integrating academics, research excellence, effective outreach, and constructive collaborative engagement of multiple stakeholder interests.

Applications should include a letter describing the applicant's qualifications and experience related to the position. Applicants should also include a curriculum vitae. For finalists, the search committee will ask for the names and addresses of three references. Review of applications will begin in April 7, 2008, but applications will be accepted until the position is filled. The University of Wyoming is an equal opportunity - affirmative action employer with an institutional commitment to diversity. We encourage women and members of under-represented groups to apply. E-mail submissions are welcome and can be sent to wilmav@uwyo.edu.

Please send applications and nominations to:

Dr. Frank Galey, Chair, ENR Director Search
c/o Wilma Varga
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Wyoming
1000 E. University Ave. Dept. 3302
Laramie, WY 82071

LINK TO JOBS
http://www.aere.org/jobs/index.html

ASSOCIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND RESOURCE ECONOMISTS
2008 OFFICERS AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

President:

Dr. Trudy Ann Cameron
Department of Economics, 435 PLC
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 94720-3310
Telephone: 541-346-1242
Fax: 541-346-1243
E-mail: cameron@uoregon.edu

President-Elect:

Prof. Kathleen Segerson
Department of Economics
University of Connecticut
Box U-63
Storrs, CT 06269-1063
Phone: 860-486-4567
Fax: 860-486-4463
E-mail: kathleen.segerson@uconn.edu

Vice President:

Laura O. Taylor
North Carolina State University
Dept. of Agricultural and Resource Economics
Campus Box 8109
Raleigh, NC 27695-8109
Telephone: 919-513-3761
Fax: 919-515-1824
E-mail: lotaylor@ncsu.edu

Secretary:

Dr. Ann Wolverton
National Center for Environmental Economics
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, MC 1809T
Washington, DC 20460
Telephone: 202-566-2278
E-mail: Wolverton.Ann@epamail.epa.gov

Treasurer:

Dr. Joseph E. Aldy
Resources for the Future
1616 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: 202-328-5091
Fax: 202-939-3460
E-mail: aldy@rff.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS