

ISSN 1444-7185

**TESTS OF BENEFIT TRANSFER ACROSS SITES
AND POPULATION IN THE FITZROY BASIN**

RESEARCH REPORT No. 4

John Rolfe, Adam Loch and Jeff Bennett

**VALUING FLOODPLAIN DEVELOPMENT IN
THE FITZROY BASIN RESEARCH REPORTS**

MARCH 2002

About the authors

John Rolfe is an Associate Professor within the Faculty of Business and Law at Central Queensland University.

Adam Loch is a Masters candidate within the Faculty of Business and Law at Central Queensland University.

Jeff Bennett is a Professor at the National Center for Development Studies at the Australian National University.

Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Reports are published by the Faculty of Business and Law, Central Queensland University, Emerald, 4720.

These reports represent the provisional findings of the research project ‘Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin’.

The project is being funded by the Australian Research Council and the Queensland Department of Natural Resources through the Strategic Partnerships with Industry – Research and Training Scheme. Additional support is being provided by the Centre for Land and Water Resource Management at the Central Queensland University.

The views and interpretations expressed in these reports are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the organisations associated with the project. Because these reports present the results of work in progress, they should not be reproduced in part or in whole without the written authorisation of the Project Leader, Dr John Rolfe.

Any comments will be gratefully received and should be directed to Dr John Rolfe, Faculty of Business and Law, P.O. Box 197, Emerald 4720.

Telephone (07) 4980 7081

Fax: (07) 4984 4053

Email: j.rolfe@cqu.edu.au

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
1. Introduction	1
2. Choice Modelling and Benefit Transfer Issues	2
2.1 Site Equivalence	4
2.2 Population Equivalence	5
3. The Case Study Areas	6
4. Design and Performance of the Experiments	7
4.1 Survey Statistics	9
5. Results and Analysis	10
5.1 Site Equivalence Results	11
5.2 Population Equivalence Results	16
6. Conclusions	19
References	20

Abstract

Policy makers are often interested in transferring benefit estimates made in one situation to related circumstances. This transfer of values may be inaccurate if significant differences exist between the sites in question, or if different population groups are involved. To identify where benefit transfer applications may be appropriate, the results of similar Choice Modelling experiments across different sites and population groups are reported. The experiments were centered on a major river catchment in Queensland, Australia, and indicate that some benefit transfers are possible.

1. Introduction

Within the framework of environmental valuation the need often arises to apply values estimated for an environmental good in one context to another similar context. This process is called benefit transfer (BT). Boyle and Bergstrom (1992:657) state that benefit transfer is 'the transfer of existing estimates of non-market values to a new study which is different from the study for which the values were originally estimated'. One of the major motives for partaking in a benefit transfer process is that value estimation exercises are often very expensive to perform. It can be potentially far cheaper to transfer values from previous studies or from other, similar sites than to repeat the estimation process each time a valuation is required. Interest by researchers and policy makers in the transfer of economic values for non-market resources has existed since the 1960's (Loomis 1992). The development of non-market valuation databases such as ENVALUE are facilitating interest in benefit transfer applications (Morrison 2001).

A number of techniques are available for estimating environmental values where the information is not directly available from market information. These include related market techniques, such as the travel cost and hedonic pricing methods, and stated preference techniques such as the contingent valuation method (CVM) and choice modelling (CM). Questions about benefit transfer relate particularly to the stated preference valuation techniques, where there are concerns that any inaccuracies or biases in the values may become exacerbated in the transfer process (Brookshire and Neil 1992).

For BT to be accurate, the two main requirements are that the values estimated in the first study are free of major biases, and that the benefit transfer process does not generate substantially more. Much of the development work for techniques such as the CVM has concentrated on the first issue. The difficulty for the CVM is that because of its 'single shot' nature, it is difficult to identify how well values can be transferred to other locations where the circumstances may be slightly different. This can be illustrated by looking more closely at what is involved in a benefit transfer exercise.

There are two particular ways in which BT may be undertaken. The first is where values for an environmental good are transferred from one site to another that has similar bio-physical characteristics. The assumption that is made in the process is that the population will value the second site in the same way that they have valued the first. In circumstances where the sites vary according to certain bio-physical characteristics, the values for the sites might be expected to differ in proportion to the difference in characteristics. For example, if the area of two remnant vegetation sites varies, then this would be expected to impact on values. The use of the CM technique has particular advantages here because it generates values according to underlying attributes. The results of the technique are thus particularly suitable to BT issues.

The second broad way in which BT might be undertaken is to infer that values held by a population for a particular issue might be transferred to a second population group. It may be possible that the values held by people are similar to the extent that the populations are similar. Capturing information about populations such as socioeconomic data, and relating that to the way that people make choices about environmental tradeoffs, may be an important way of allowing values to be transferred. Again, the CM technique has strengths in this area, as does the CVM.

These issues of benefit transfer are closely related to framing issues in valuation experiments. Framing effects occur when the respondent to a survey is sensitive to the context in which a particular tradeoff is offered, and are normal and commonplace in valuation experiments (Rolfe, Bennett and Louviere 2002). Framing problems occur when values are unduly sensitive or insensitive to the context in which they are offered. One focus of benefit transfer

exercises is to determine where framing differences occur between source and target sites, so that values might be adjusted for these variations. Another focus of benefit transfer exercises is to determine where framing problems occur, because these indicate where it may not be appropriate to perform the exercise.

In this report, the potential for benefit transfer is explored in relation to water resources and irrigation development issues. A series of CM experiments relating to potential further development of water resources in the Fitzroy Basin in Central Queensland have been performed. The experiments differ according to the case studies selected and the population groups that have been surveyed. This allows the analyst to test whether a single experiment could have been performed, and then the results extrapolated to account for site and population differences.

This report is structured as follows. In the following section, an overview of previous research relating to CM and benefit transfer is presented, together with discussion about the key issues to test. In section three, the case study is described with the key issues that frame the experiments of interest. In section four the experiments of interest are outlined, and the design and performance of the different CM surveys are described. Results and discussion are presented in section five, and conclusions drawn in section six.

2. Choice Modelling and Benefit Transfer Issues

CM is a stated preference technique that has been adapted from conjoint analysis roots to estimate both use and non-use values. There have been a number of applications to recreational, environmental and social issues in recent years (eg Adamowicz et al 1998, Blamey et al 2000, Rolfe, Bennett and Louviere 2000, Morrison and Bennett 2000, Bennett and Blamey 2001).

CM involves asking respondents to a survey to make a series of choices about alternatives for environmental management. Each choice set involves a number of profiles describing the alternatives on offer. One of the profiles describes a current or future status quo option, and remains constant between the choice sets. The other profiles vary, so that respondents are being asked to make a series of similar, but different choices. An example of a choice set is given in Figure 1.

The profiles are made up of a number of attributes that describe the environmental issue in question. For example, profiles about environmental issues in floodplain management might be described in terms of the health of the waterways, the amount of remnant vegetation in good condition on floodplains, and the proportion of stream flows that are reserved for environmental purposes. To generate differences between profiles, these attributes are allowed to vary across a number of different levels (eg 30%, 40% or 50% of healthy vegetation in floodplains). These profiles then represent different options for future development and protection of the issue in question.

The choice information is analysed using a logistic regression model. The probability that a respondent would choose a particular attribute can be related to the levels of each attribute making up the profile (and the alternative profiles on offer), the socio-economic characteristics of the respondent, and other factors. The latter might include the ways in which the choices are framed to respondents through background information and structure of the survey, and the way in which the surveys are collected (Bennett and Blamey 2001, Rolfe, Bennett and Louviere 2002).






The logistic regression function can be used to generate probabilities of choice, and estimates of compensating surplus between different choice profiles. Most interest usually lies in finding the difference in compensating surplus between the status quo option and specific policy relevant profiles. As well as these estimates of consumer surplus, the models can also be used to generate estimates of marginal value changes for each attribute. Known as part-worths, implicit prices, or attribute values, these provide an indication of the value to respondents of each one unit change in the provision of an attribute. Both the part worth and the compensating surplus estimates can be used for testing the equivalence of different models. They may also be used for benefit transfer purposes (Morrison and Bennett 2000, Rolfe, Bennett and Louviere 2000).

Figure 1. Example Choice Set used in the Survey

X

Question X: Options A, B and C.

Please choose the option you prefer most by ticking ONE box.

	Twenty-year effects					
					<div style="border: 1px solid blue; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">R</div> <div style="border: 1px solid blue; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">E</div> <div style="border: 1px solid blue; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">C</div>	
Option A	\$0	20%	1500	300	0%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Option B	\$20	30%	1800	325	5%	<input type="checkbox"/>
Option C	\$50	40%	2100	350	10%	<input type="checkbox"/>

Guidelines have been suggested for benefit transfer applications involving non-use values. Boyle & Bergstrom (1992) suggest 'idealistic' technical criteria such as:

- the non-market commodity valued at the study site must be identical to the non-market commodity to be valued at the policy site, (both in the characteristics of the good and the nature and extent of the change being valued),
- the populations affected by the non-market commodity at the study site and the policy site hold identical characteristics, and
- the assignment of property rights at both sites must lead to the same theoretically appropriate welfare measurement (e.g. willingness to pay versus willingness to accept).

Some development work has already occurred in relation to using CM for potential benefit transfer applications (Morrison, Bennett, Blamey and Louviere 1998, Rolfe and Bennett 2000, Van Bueren and Bennett 2000, Morrison and Bennett 2000. The richness of data from CM experiments allows analysts to test where differences might be between values for two sites when two separate valuation experiments have been performed. If the values for one experiment could be successfully used to replicate the second experiment and estimate values for the other site, then it appears that potential for benefit transfer exists.

Bennett and Blamey (2001) discuss this in more detail, identifying several justifications for the use of choice modelling as the basis for successful BT, which include:

- Whereas other techniques may produce estimates of demand for one or two potential goods, CM produces estimates that can be modelled for any scenario alternative that falls within the range of attributes and label space of the experiment. This provides obvious cost advantages, which is relevant to the normal justification for using BT.
- The decomposition of value into component parts (attributes) also assists in the process of BT. Often, BT is inhibited by differences between the original and transfer sites. Where sites share similar descriptive attributes, but the proposed changes differ, CM allows the flexibility for the transfer to proceed. In addition, such detailed descriptive (attribute) information assists researchers to identify where site and study similarities may exist or if attributes can be safely removed from the proposed BT study.
- CM also allows the inclusion of attributes to capture values for socioeconomic issues. Such socioeconomic attribute values (e.g. a concern for possible unemployment as a result of choices made), which may form part of respondent's value statements in other methodologies yet remain hidden in an amalgam of environmental and social contributions, can be drawn out in the CM experiment. This enables more confidence among policy makers as to the nature of the values held and offers further depth to BT site comparisons.
- The nature of CM, like other stated preference techniques, requires greater public participation than alternate valuation methodologies. This both engenders a perception of transparency amongst respondents and may lead them to think they are being included in the decision making process at an early stage.
- CM, through its rich data set, provides a suitable platform for structuring experiments for inclusion in research databases. These databases allow for the centralised collection of BT value estimation experiment objectives, site characteristics, the study methodology, data sets and results. In turn, this makes it much easier for researchers and policy makers to undertake the process of BT.

Previous research has raised a number of issues that are important to the application of CM in attempts at BT of environmental values. The process of BT can only ever be as methodologically sound as the estimation technique on which the previous study is based (Atkinson et al 1992, Smith 1992). Boyle & Bergstrom (1992), Desvouses et al (1992) and Garrod and Willis (1999) suggest a range of criteria for conducting successful BT. These focus on site and population equivalence as important prerequisites of benefit transfers.

2.1. Site Equivalence

As discussed above, for successful BT to take place there must be a high degree of similarity between the source and the target sites. Site equivalence focuses upon whether or not one population holds the same values for similar sites. With the CM technique, this can be tested by ascertaining if the values for particular components (attributes) are equivalent, and if similar conservation profiles have the same consumer surplus value.

Morrison, Bennett, Blamey and Louviere (1998) focussed upon estimating values held by the Sydney population for the Gwydir Wetlands (Site 1) and the Macquarie Marshes (Site 2) in New South Wales. The objective of the study was to examine the validity of BT using CM to transfer values between sites. The researchers tentatively concluded that although the derived value estimates from the populations were not equivalent across the two sites, there was some equivalence in the compensating surplus values for similar profile changes. The test results are thus inconclusive (Morrison and Bennett 2000).

Rolfe and Bennett (2000) explored how two different population groups (respondents from Queensland and the Northern Territory) valued the preservation of native vegetation in the Desert Uplands of Queensland (Site 1) and the Daly-Sturt region in the Northern Territory (Site 2). The key objective was to understand how factors such as state boundaries and geographic distance—defined in the study as parochial effects—impacted on value formulation and future BT processes. The researchers concluded that there was little significant difference between the part worth values for the two sites in question across the two population groups. The same conclusions were supported when compensating surplus values for protection scenarios were compared. These conclusions remain somewhat limited however, due to the number of insignificant attributes in the models that were generated.

2.2. Population Equivalence

Tests of population equivalence can also be carried out in CM studies by comparing values for component changes and scenario profiles. Morrison, Bennett, Blamey and Louviere (1998) also tested for equivalence in their study for values of the Gwydir Wetlands between populations in Sydney and Moree. The authors found that the results were significantly different with implicit price estimates and compensating surplus figures diverging substantially. Accordingly they stated that BT between rural and urban populations should be treated with caution.

On the other hand, Rolfe and Bennett (2000) included between population tests in their CM study across values for the Daly-Sturt region. While inconclusive owing to the limited number of significant attributes, the researchers reported little significant difference between the two respondent groups (populations from Queensland and the Northern Territory). There were however significant differences in value within a state population. Queenslanders from the south-east corner of the state (grouped as an ‘urban’ population), had significantly different values for vegetation preservation in the Desert Uplands to the ‘regional’ population in the rest of the state.

Testing the issue of population equivalence was also part of the work undertaken in the National Land and Water Audit project into the non-market costs of land and water degradation in Australia (Van Bueren and Bennett 2000). Two of the tests conducted in that study compared the values held by a regional population and a capital city population for land and water protection in a regional area. The regional areas of interest were the Fitzroy Basin in Central Queensland and the Great Southern Basin in Western Australia. The populations surveyed were Rockhampton and Brisbane for the Fitzroy, and Albany and Perth for the Great Southern Basin. In both cases, little difference in values could be ascertained between the capital city and the regional populations. The one exception was in the Fitzroy study where the Rockhampton population had a much higher part-worth value for one attribute (the viability of country communities) than did the Brisbane population.

Another test reported in Van Bueren and Bennett (2000) compared the values for land and water protection at the national level held by two regional populations (Albany and Rockhampton) as well as the national population. No difference existed between the values held by the Albany and Rockhampton populations, indicating that these two regional populations viewed the issues in a similar light. However, regional respondents have significantly higher values for landscape aesthetics and lower values for species protection when compared to the national sample. This suggests that urban/regional population differences do exist.

Bennett and Morrison (2001) analysed value differences for five rivers across NSW. They concluded that the environmental attribute of different rivers were valued differently both by

respondents resident in each river catchment and by people living outside the catchment. Specifically, non-use values for outside catchment residents were greater than for in-catchment residents. The opposite result was found for the user value attributes of rivers.

3. The Case Study Areas

The Fitzroy Basin, encompassing 142,000 km², is the second largest externally draining basin in Australia. Beef cattle, grain, irrigated crops and coal are key primary products in the region. The Fitzroy Basin has two major irrigation centres; the Emerald irrigation area located on the Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie river systems and the Dawson Valley irrigation area located along the Dawson river. These irrigation areas are approximately the same size and produce mostly cotton, peanuts, citrus and grains. The basin is described in more detail in Loch and Rolfe (2000).

These two sub-catchments are similar in resource and environmental conditions. About 50% of vegetation has been cleared from the floodplains in both areas, although there are much higher levels of clearing in some soil and vegetation types. Each of the sub-catchment's river systems comprise around 1000 kilometers of waterways and there is only a slight variance in river health between the two areas. The Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie has about 50% of its river systems in a healthy condition and the Dawson River has 40%. In addition, if the proposal to build a major storage dam along the Dawson River is approved, there will be little or no water left in reserve for future environment or development purposes in the two areas.

There are however, some important social differences. The Emerald irrigation area is advantaged by the Fairbairn Dam, providing a greater system yield to irrigation farmers and somewhat greater security of supply. In addition, the Emerald district is home to other major industries such as coal mining and horticulture (which employs many seasonal workers). As a direct result, the population in the Emerald irrigation area is larger and more stable than that of the Dawson irrigation area. The Dawson Valley is serviced by a number of smaller towns which appear more susceptible to population losses and/or economic stagnation.

When compared to the Fitzroy Basin, these sub-catchments appear to be good indicators of the larger picture. In terms of environmental conditions, around 50% of floodplain vegetation has been cleared from the Fitzroy River basin and it has about 60% of its 2800 kilometers of waterways rated in good health. While the population of the basin is quite stable, there is an underlying pattern of people shifting from rural areas and small townships into the larger centres. However, in contrast to the sub-catchments where approximately 50,000 megalitres remain in reserve, there is a greater amount of potential reserve water available in the lower Fitzroy area—some 300,000 megalitres—although this is largely situated along or around land unsuitable for major irrigated agriculture.

Demands for irrigation water are very high in the basin where land suitable for cotton and/or horticulture is available. When additional supplies from the raising of the Bedford weir were auctioned in 1997, medium security water averaged \$909/megalitre, and high security water averaged \$1600/megalitre. There is substantial interest in developing more irrigation in the Dawson and Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie sub-catchments, where there is land suitable for irrigation purposes.

Proposals for further development include a major storage on the Dawson (the Nathan Dam), smaller weirs or other instream diversions, and offstream storages. Offstream storages are typically built by irrigators on their own land, and used to capture overland flows and water harvested from rivers in floodtimes. One advantage of developing off-stream storages is that they are privately funded. In contrast, instream storages tend to be funded from the public

purse, although the costs can be recouped from subsequent sales of water to industry and agriculture.

The diversion of further water for irrigation purposes is likely to have some social and environmental consequences. Social consequences include increased regional spending and employment prospects that flow from increasing production, although the scale economies of most irrigation developments limit the job creation potential. Environmental consequences include biophysical effects of the interruption to natural flows in watercourses, the development of land for farming, and potential for runoff to impact on water quality in the system.

Concerns about the potential for overallocation of water resources and subsequent environmental impacts, together with the 1994 Council of Australian Governments Water Reform Agreement has prompted the Queensland Government to establish where the limits between development and protection should lie. The framework chosen for this is the Water Allocation and Management Plan (WAMP) developed for the Fitzroy catchment. This has effectively capped the level of potential extractions from the system at approximately 50% of median flow levels, together with rules for not harvesting the first spring floods.

Although the Fitzroy WAMP sets limits for water extraction in the basin, a number of questions remain about where balance between production and environmental protection should be struck. For economists, these include questions such as:

- whether the current WAMP limits reflect the weight of community values for production versus protection outcomes,
- whether some water should be retained in reserve to guard against unforeseen outcomes,
- should more development should be allowed in some catchments in return for increased protection in others, and
- how proposals for competing developments within a catchment with different environmental and social outcomes should be evaluated.

To be able to evaluate these issues in economic terms, it is important to be able to estimate values for both production and non-production outcomes. While the former (such as the value of additional cotton production) can be estimated from market data, the latter (such as community values for protecting vegetation in floodplains) are more difficult to estimate. CM can be employed to estimate these non-use values.

4. Design and Performance of the Experiments

A series of CM surveys was designed to estimate values for environmental and social tradeoffs associated with irrigation development in the Fitzroy basin. It was important that the valuation information could be applied in various formats, particularly at the sub-catchment or project level. For these reasons, the surveys were designed to test a number of hypotheses about benefit transfer issues. The first test was about whether different populations held the same values for environmental and social tradeoffs in the Fitzroy Basin. The second test was about whether the same population group held the equivalent values for similar sub-catchments within the Fitzroy Basin. The tests are outlined in more detail in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Tests to be performed

Test	Test to be Performed*	Description
A – population equivalence	FTZ Bne = FTZ Rok = FTZ Emd	Test whether values for the Fitzroy are equivalent across population groups
B – site equivalence	CNM Bne = DAW Bne	Test whether values for the two sub-catchments are equivalent across one population

*FTZ = Fitzroy, CNM = Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie, DAW = Dawson, Bne = Brisbane population, Rok = Rockhampton population and Emd = Emerald population.

The main case study focus was on the Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie and the Dawson rivers and the whole Fitzroy River basin. The populations of interest included Brisbane as a major capital city centre, Rockhampton as a regional centre and Emerald as a likely impacted local center. To capture the required data, three versions of the survey were devised (Loch, Rolfe and Windle 2001). The application of the three versions to the relevant population groups is depicted in Table 2.

Table 2. Experiment Plan for Survey Round

Version No.	Survey Version Description	Population to be Sampled		
		Brisbane	Rockhampton	Emerald
1	Floodplain development (Fitzroy)	√	√	√
2	Floodplain development (Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie)	√		
3	Floodplain development (Dawson)	√		

The objective of the CM experiment was to estimate respondent's preferences for tradeoffs between further floodplain development in the Fitzroy Basin and environmental and social tradeoffs. To present survey respondents with development and protection alternatives, the issues had to be described in several concise attributes. These were selected with the aid of scientific and policy experts in the basin, and the conduct of a series of focus groups in the towns to be surveyed (Loch, Rolfe and Windle 2001).

For consistency, the same attributes were used as the basis for the choice scenarios generated for the three case study areas. These attributes were:

- Payment levy (an annual levy collected through local government rates over 20 years)
- The amount of healthy vegetation left on floodplains
- The kilometers of waterways that remain in good health
- The number of people leaving rural or country areas every year, and
- The amount of water kept in reserve for future use.

The base was selected as the likely level in twenty years time for each attribute if current trends continued. The other levels for each attribute to be used in the alternative scenarios were set between the current level and the expected future level. This allowed for a variety of different outcomes if various protection measures were implemented. In the case of the reserve attribute, a negative level was used for both the Dawson and Comet-Nogoa-Mackenzie basins to indicate that water could potentially be allocated below the WAMP limits (the median flow level). The base and alternative levels for each version of the survey are set out in Table 3.

Table 3. WTP Base and Attribute Levels for the Case Study Areas

Attribute	Fitzroy Levels		CNM Levels		Dawson Levels	
	Base	Alternatives	Base	Alternatives	Base	Alternatives
Payment	0	20, 50, 100	0	10, 20, 50	0	10, 20, 50
Healthy vegetation in floodplains	20%	30%, 40%, 50%	25%	30%, 40%, 50%	10%	20%, 30%, 40%
Kilometers of healthy waterways	1500	1800, 2100, 2400	400	500, 650, 800	300	400, 550, 700
People leaving country areas	300	275, 325, 350	0	0, 25, 50	300	275, 325, 350
Amount of water in reserve	0%	5%, 10%, 15%	0%	-2%, 2%, 4%	0%	-5%, 5%, 10%

Each of the choice sets presented to respondents involved a status quo or base option (the expected position in twenty years time), together with two alternative scenarios that involved some annual payment for increased protection measures. The experimental design resulted in a series of 25 choice sets. These were blocked into five versions of the survey, so that five choice sets within a version were presented to respondents. An example of the choice sets presented to respondents is provided in Figure 1.

A drop-off and pick-up approach was used to collect the surveys. Respondents were sampled at random in Emerald, Rockhampton and Brisbane based on a cluster sampling technique. Each survey collector was provided with a set of instructions incorporating an outline of respondent selection in each node and how to verbally introduce the survey itself. Collectors made a minimum of two attempts to collect the survey. The surveys were collected at the three locations in November and December 2000.

In Brisbane, 340 completed surveys were collected for the three versions collected three. In Rockhampton, 122 surveys were completed, and there was 149 completed in Emerald. 50.5% of all people approached gave back a fully completed survey. 41.5% of all people approached declined to complete the survey, and 9% of people approached took a survey form and either did not return it to the collector or did not complete it fully.

4.1 Survey Statistics

The socio-demographics of the respondents who completed the surveys are summarised in Table 4 below.

It is interesting to note from these figures that the three populations felt that the state of the environment had generally declined, and ranked highly their concern for the environment, (in both cases higher than the state average). However, the numbers of respondents either donating or belonging to environmental organisations significantly declines the closer the population is to the specific tradeoffs involved between environmental concerns and further development. This is particularly noticeable in the Emerald population, where membership drops to less than 2%, as would be expected given the probable lack of representative organisations and a likely focus on employment and further development.

Table 4. Socio-Demographics of the Survey Respondents

Variable	Brisbane	Rockhampton	Emerald	State Average
Age (> 17 years)	43.00 yrs	43.82 yrs	39.43 yrs	42.2 yrs †
Gender (% Male)	43.65%	51.69%	44.51%	49.72%†
Education (%>year 12)	50.78%	58.96%	50.08%	45.62%†
Income (household)	\$43,125	\$37,57	\$41,399	\$27,500†#
Employed full or part time	60.14%	60.66%	65.73%	59.71%†
% that agree env. Declined	56.07%	57.24%	54.89%	41.7%*
% concern for env. Problems	19.94%	21.87%	20.55%	8.1%*
% donated to environment	51.16%	35.50%	30.05%	n/a^
% environmental group member	10.75%	9.84%	1.53%	n/a^

* - Figures for Qld. from March 1999 ABS Environmental Issues Paper 4602.0.


† - Figures obtained and estimated from 1996 Census data.

- Mean disposable income (i.e. after tax). Population figures quoted include tax component.

^ - Comparable state figures not available from Census or other data, however if they were available the actual numbers would be most probably overstated. This is likely the case with the population figures also.

5. Results and Analysis

The choice data from each version of the CM surveys were analysed and modelled using the LIMDEP program. The data can be analysed with simple multinomial logit (MNL) models. To minimise potential violations of the IIA/IID conditions, a two level (nested) choice model can also be estimated. In this case, respondents were assumed to firstly make a choice about whether they would support increased protection measures against continuation of the current trends. This choice was modelled against the socio-economic characteristics of respondents. In the second stage, respondents were assumed to choose between the alternatives presented according to the levels of each attribute. The nested choice model is depicted in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Nested choice structure

Generating nested models involved three different types of variables. The branch choice equation (explaining the support/don't support choice) involves attributes that represent the socio-demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. The utility functions that predict choices between different protection alternatives involve the choice set attributes. The third variable is an inclusive value parameter which specifies the link between the two levels of the model. Each of the variables used in the nested model is specified in Table 5.

Table 5. Variables used in the CM Application

<i>Attributes of branch choice equations</i>	<i>Indicates why people choose between the support/no support branches in the models</i>
Age	Age of respondent (in years)
Income	Income of household in dollar terms
Education	Education (ranges from 1=primary to 5=tertiary degree)
Occupation	Occupation (ranges from 1=employed to 5=othercategories)
ASC	Constant value – reflects the influence of all other factors on choice between support/no support branches of the model.
<i>Attributes in the utility functions</i>	<i>Indicates why people choose between the two alternatives</i>
Cost	Amount that households would pay in extra rates (or rent) each year to fund improvements
Vegetation	% of healthy vegetation remaining in floodplains
Waterways	Kilometers of waterways in catchment remaining in good health
People leaving	Number off people leaving country areas each year
Reserve	% of water resources in catchment not committed to the environment or allocated to industry/urban/irrigation uses
ASC_1	Alternate specific constant which reflects the influence of all other factors on choice between different choice profiles.
<i>IV Parameter</i>	<i>Provides statistical link between the two levels of the nested model</i>

The models that could be generated from these data were used to test the specific framing issues of interest relating to site and population factors. These issues are discussed in turn.

5.1 Site Equivalence Results

The site test was aimed at finding whether the values of two similar catchments (Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie and the Dawson) held by the same population (Brisbane) were identical. The hypothesis can be stated as follows:

Ho: $\beta \text{ CNM} = \beta \text{ DAW}$

H1: $\beta \text{ CNM} \neq \beta \text{ DAW}$

where $\beta \text{ CNM}$ and $\beta \text{ DAW}$ are the parameter vectors corresponding to the Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie and the Dawson data sets respectively.

Model results for the two data sets are shown in Table 6 below, calculated by both MNL and nested alternatives. The models appear robust, with most attributes significant and signed as expected¹.

There are several ways of testing the hypothesis that the models generated are equivalent. These include log-likelihood tests, comparison of part-worth values, and comparison of compensating surplus values. The performance of each test is described in turn.

¹ The exceptions in the nested models are that the income coefficient is negative in both models, and the education coefficient is negative in the CNM model.

Table 6a. Results of MNL Models for CNM and Dawson Sites

	Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie		Dawson	
	Coefficient	Standard Error	Coefficient	Standard Error
Cost	-0.023***	0.004	-0.029***	0.004
Vegetation	0.032***	0.010	0.037***	0.009
Waterways	0.002***	0.0006	0.002***	0.0005
People	-0.015***	0.004	-0.004*	0.002
Reserve	0.153***	0.032	0.074***	0.012
Alternate specific constant	-1.139	0.761	0.341	0.752
Age	0.007	0.009	-0.013	0.008
Occupation	-0.035	0.106	0.071	0.101
Education	0.286**	0.119	-0.343***	0.106
Income	1.42E-05**	5.83E-06	2.92E-05***	5.58E-06
Model Statistics				
No of Observations		435		605
Log-Likelihood		-377.02		-548.39
Chi-square (D. of Freedom = 15)		129.88		195.22
Adjusted Rho-square		.19724		.16547

*** - P<0.001

** - P<0.01

* - P<0.10

Table 6b. Results of Nested Logit Models for CNM and Dawson Sites

Variables	CNM Site		Dawson Site	
	Coeff.	St. Error	Coeff.	St. Error
Utility Variables				
ASC_1	.0585	.1192	-.3567***	.1283
Cost	-.0234***	.0046	-.0406***	.0058
Vegetation	.0333***	.0116	.0488***	.0105
Waterways	.0020***	.0007	.0036***	.0007
People	-.0156***	.0037	-.0057**	.0023
Reserve	.1544***	.0337	.1018***	.0152
Branch Choice Equations				
ASC	.9776	.9819	-1.6137**	.8210
Age	-.0069	.0080	.0128*	.0068
Education	-.2777***	.1051	.3481***	.0945
Income	-.0001***	.0001	-.0001***	.0001
Inclusive Value Parameters				
Pay	.8903***	.3196	.2425**	.1204
No Pay (Fixed Para.)	1		1	
Model Statistics				
N (Choice Sets)	435	(0 skip'd)	615	(10 skip'd)
Log L	-378.20		-538.29	
Adj. rho-square	.31182		.27164	
Chi-square (DoF = 12)	356.80		415.06	

*** - P<0.001

** - P<0.01

* - P<0.10

5.1.1. Site Significance Test

The first test for this site hypothesis is examine the significance of a location variable. Likelihood ratio tests can be used to identify whether significant differences exist between models with and without an additional variable (Whitten and Bennett 2000). The test statistic is $-2 \times (LL_1 - LL_2)$, where LL_1 is the log-likelihood of the first model, and LL_2 is the log-likelihood of a second model with additional parameters added. The test statistic is approximately chi-square distributed with the degrees of freedom equivalent to the number of parameters added. If the test statistic is larger than the appropriate chi-square statistic, the added parameters create a significantly different model (Louviere et al 2000).

The test is performed by combining data sets and estimating a model, but without specifying a location attribute. Then a model is calculated where a dummy variable is included for one of the locations. In the MNL models, the log-likelihood of the joint CNM/Dawson model is -905.8151 , while the log-likelihood of a model with a dummy variable for the Dawson sample added is -889.7891 . The test statistic is therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} &= -2 \times (-905.81 - -889.79) \\ &= 36.05 \end{aligned}$$

In the nested models, the log-likelihood of the joint CNM/Dawson model is -956.93 , while the log-likelihood of a model with a dummy variable for the Dawson sample added is -938.92 . The test statistic is therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} &= -2 \times (-956.93 - -938.92) \\ &= 36.02 \end{aligned}$$

The appropriate chi-square statistic with one degree of freedom is 3.84. Therefore it can be concluded that a significant difference does exist when the location is taken into account.

5.1.2. Part-Worth (Implicit Price) Site Test

The part-worth tests involve the comparison of confidence intervals for the part-worth values calculated from the models. The part-worths, also known as implicit prices, are the point estimates of the value of a unit of change in a non-monetary attribute. Because standard errors are not calculated in the nested multi-nomial models it is necessary to use the Krinsky and Robb (1986) procedure for this purpose. The simulation involves the random draw of a number of parameter vectors from a multivariate normal distribution with mean and variance equal to the β vector and a variance-covariance matrix from the estimated nested multinomial logit model (Morrison, Bennett, Blamey and Louviere 1998). Confidence intervals can be estimated from the upper and lower tails of the simulation exercise. The part-worths and the 95% confidence intervals for the two models are shown below in Table 7².

Table 7a. Part Worth & Confidence Interval Estimates for the CNM and Dawson sites using MNL models

Attribute	P Worth	Comet /Nogoa/Mackenzie		Dawson		
		Lower CI	Upper CI	P Worth	Lower CI	Upper CI
Veg	1.36	0.39	2.56	1.25	0.68	1.93
Water	0.08	0.03	0.15	0.08	0.05	0.13
People	-0.66	-1.10	-0.40	-0.13	-0.27	-0.01
Reserve	6.59	3.49	11.08	2.53	1.72	3.62

² The part-worth for the ASC 1 for the CNM model is not included because this parameter was not significant (see Table 6).

Table 7b. Part Worth & Confidence Interval Estimates for the CNM and Dawson sites using nested models

Attribute	Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie			Dawson		
	P Worth	Lower	Upper	P Worth	Lower	Upper
Vegetation	1.43	0.33	2.53	1.20	0.63	1.77
Water	0.09	0.02	0.18	0.09	0.05	0.13
People	-0.67	-1.22	-0.35	-0.14	-0.28	-0.05
Reserve	6.61	3.32	12.36	2.50	1.81	3.46
ASC 1	Not significant			-8.78	-13.81	-2.55

Comparison of the results shows that there is overlap of confidence intervals between three of the four part-worths for the two sites. There is no overlap for the *People leaving* attribute. This may be because the levels for *People leaving* were very different in the two sub-catchments (see Table 3), indicating that the part-worths are sensitive to the absolute values of the levels involved. The results indicate that the models are equivalent in the areas where the case studies were similar, but vary when the attributes have very different levels in the different case studies.

5.1.3. Compensating Surplus Site Test

The third test involves a comparison of compensating surplus values for the three populations. This involves estimation and comparison of compensating surplus for specific alternatives. Because a very large number of scenarios could be described from the attributes and levels used in the experiment, an experimental design process was used to select a representative sample of nine scenarios. The models reported in Table 6 were used to generate compensating surplus measures for each, and upper and lower confidence intervals were estimated utilising the Krinsky and Robb (1986) bootstrapping procedure. In the final formulae, the mean levels for the relevant socio-economic characteristics were used for estimation purposes.

The compensating surplus values provide an estimate of value for the scenario of interest relative to the base option used in the survey. However, the models have generated negative values for those base options, so that even though the different alternatives may be preferred over the base, the overall estimate of value remains negative. The negative values for the status quo options are likely to be because this was the future base depicted in twenty years time, reflecting large potential environmental losses from the current situation. Respondents may not have viewed this status quo base as a preferred choice, thus creating the negative values.

In the CNM basin, the value of the status quo option can be estimated at -\$80.70. Where the scenario values are higher than this level (see Table 8), it indicates the scenario is preferred to the base option. In cases where the scenario value is lower than this amount, it means that some negative attribute changes (eg more people leaving country areas) are outweighing any other positive attribute changes. It is a similar story in the Dawson catchment, where the value of the status quo option in twenty years time is -\$11.07. Scenarios that have higher values than this (see Table 8) are preferred to the base.

Table 8a. Compensating Surplus Estimates for CNM and Dawson sites using MNL models

Scenario	Attribute Changes from Base	Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie			Dawson		
		Expected value	Upper CI	Lower CI	Expected Value	Upper CI	Lower CI
1	Veg +5%, Water +100k 's, People 0 change, Reserve -2%	-4.69	-14.05	2.64	3.28	-0.06	7.51
2	Veg +5%, Water +250k 's, People +25, Reserve +4%	30.94	11.60	57.35	27.64	17.32	40.70
3	Veg +5%, Water +400k 's, People +50, Reserve +2%	13.89	-16.09	42.41	31.78	17.48	52.04
4	Veg +15%, Water +100k 's, People+25, Reserve +2%	5.29	-7.14	17.64	10.30	5.37	16.50
5	Veg +15%, Water +250k 's, People+50, Reserve -2%	-24.93	-51.79	-7.93	9.39	-1.04	21.91
6	Veg +15%, Water +400k 's, People 0 change, Reserve +4%	60.20	36.58	98.66	43.37	28.00	64.84
7	Veg +25%, Water +100k 's, People+50, Reserve +4%	2.10	-20.62	22.33	12.28	4.22	20.12
8	Veg +25%, Water +250k 's, People 0 change, Reserve +2%	34.54	20.97	56.40	26.04	16.54	38.97
9	Veg +25%, Water +400k 's, People+25, Reserve +2%	30.66	8.25	61.15	35.24	21.15	52.89

Table 8b. Compensating Surplus Estimates for CNM and Dawson sites using nested models

Scenario	Attribute Changes from Base	CNM	Dawson
1	Veg +5%, Water +100k 's, People 0 change, Reserve -2%	-81.30 (-142.55, -33.78)	-8.04 (-59.48, 50.92)
2	Veg +5%, Water +250k 's, People +25, Reserve +4%	-76.81 (-165.84, -35.86)	-6.39 (-55.98, 50.31)
3	Veg +5%, Water +400k 's, People +50, Reserve +2%	-80.37 (-166.47, -34.69)	-4.00 (-52.35, 51.60)
4	Veg +15%, Water +100k 's, People+25, Reserve +2%	-88.25 (-161.16, -47.28)	-9.65 (-59.88, 46.89)
5	Veg +15%, Water +250k 's, People+50, Reserve -2%	-91.93 (-168.97, -50.22)	-7.30 (-56.28, 48.13)
6	Veg +15%, Water +400k 's, People 0 change, Reserve +4%	-50.33 (-132.32, 6.72)	-1.39 (-51.53, 56.69)
7	Veg +25%, Water +100k 's, People+50, Reserve +4%	-102.90 (-188.27, -59.15)	-10.45 (-60.05, 44.85)
8	Veg +25%, Water +250k 's, People 0 change, Reserve +2%	-61.77 (-147.06, -11.76)	-4.66 (-55.42, 53.41)
9	Veg +25%, Water +400k 's, People+25, Reserve +2%	-65.45 (-158.72, -12.91)	-3.15 (-52.08, 53.65)

The comparisons of compensating surplus values between the different sites indicate that little difference exists between values for the Comet/Nogoa/Mackenzie and Dawson basins. This suggests that the null hypothesis should be accepted.

In conclusion, the log-likelihood test indicates that a significant difference does exist between the models generated for the CNM and Dawson catchments. The part-worth tests indicate that the difference is centered on the *People leaving* attribute, and care should be taken in any extrapolation of these values for benefit transfer purposes. The automatic transfer of point values is not appropriate in this case. The compensating surplus tests indicate that the model differences are not significant enough to cause significant differences in the value of a representative sample of alternative profiles. The conclusion to be drawn is that while model differences do exist, they do not invalidate the use of benefit transfer. However, benefit transfer is appropriate for a value function, but not for point estimates.

5.2. Population Equivalence Results

The population test was aimed at finding whether the values of the local population, the regional city (in the catchment) population and the capital city (out of the catchment) population were identical. The hypothesis can be stated as follows:

Ho: $\beta \text{ BNE} = \beta \text{ ROK} = \beta \text{ EMD}$

H1: $\beta \text{ BNE} \neq \beta \text{ ROK} \neq \beta \text{ EMD}$

where $\beta \text{ BNE}$, $\beta \text{ ROK}$ and $\beta \text{ EMD}$ are the parameter vectors corresponding to the Brisbane, Rockhampton and Emerald population data sets respectively.

Table 9. Results of the Multinomial Logit Models for Population

Variables	Emerald Population		Rocky Population		Brisbane Population	
	Coeff.	St. Error	Coeff.	St. Error	Coeff.	St. Error
Cost	-0.018***	0.002	-0.012***	0.002	-.0203***	.0021
Vegetation	0.031***	0.008	0.025***	0.008	.0354***	.0080
Waterways	0.001***	0.000	0.001***	0.000	.0005**	.0002
People	-0.005***	0.002	-0.003	0.002	-.0060***	.0019
Reserve	0.035**	0.017	0.035**	0.016	.0094	.0163
Alt. Specific Constant	0.944	0.659	0.910	0.690	-1.3674	.5969
Age	-0.027***	0.010	-0.028***	0.009	-.0053	.0112
Occupation	-0.023	0.075	-0.075	0.074	.1283	.0812
Education	-0.022	0.085	-0.175*	0.088	.3153***	.0884
Income	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001**	0.0001	.0001***	.0001
Model Statistics						
Number of Choice Sets		630		605		650
Log Likelihood		-579.29		-611.70		-601.27
Adjusted rho-square		.13911		.06813		.14818
Chi-square (D. of Freedom = 15)		144.09		102.26		193.68

*** - $P < 0.001$

** - $P < 0.01$

* - $P < 0.10$

The models generated from the three populations (Table 9) appear to be robust³. Most attributes are significant and signed as expected. The results indicate that the Rockhampton population did not consider *People leaving* to be significant, and the Brisbane population did

³ The use of nested models did not generate a significant IV parameter for the Rockhampton population. This was due to the smaller sample size collected for that city. To facilitate comparisons, simple multinomial logit (MNL) models have been calculated for each sample, and nested models are not reported.

not consider *Reserve* to be significant. In the socio-economic section there is far greater variance between the models, with none of the attributes appearing as significant across all three populations. *Occupation* seems unrelated to choice across each of the populations while *Age* appears to be significant only for the Emerald and Rockhampton respondents. *Education* and *Income* appear to be significant factors of support for the no-choice option in Rockhampton and Brisbane only.

As with the site hypothesis, there are three tests that can be applied to determine if the models for the two similar sites are equivalent. These are reported in turn.

5.2.1. Location Significance Test

The first test for this population hypothesis is that of location significance. The test is performed by combining data sets and estimating a model, but without specifying a location attribute. Then a model is calculated where a dummy variable is included for one of the locations. The log-likelihood values for each of the models are used to calculate the test statistic. The results of the test for the different possible combinations of the datasets are reported in Table 10.

The results indicate that while no significant difference exists between the Rockhampton and Brisbane, and Emerald and Brisbane populations, a significant difference does exist between the Emerald and Rockhampton population. When the data from the three data sets is combined, and one location at a time is tested (see Table 11), the addition of Rockhampton creates a significant difference while the addition of Emerald or Brisbane does not.

Table 10. Log-likelihood tests for location significance

Population	LL	-2*Difference	χ^2 statistic	Equiv.
ROK & EMD	-1178.65		(1) deg. freedom	
Add Emerald parameter	-1174.48	8.34	3.84	X
ROK & BNE	-1227.90		(1) deg. freedom	
Add Brisbane parameter	-1226.01	3.78	3.84	✓
EMD & BNE	-1189.93		(1) deg. freedom	
Add Brisbane parameter	-1189.22	1.42	3.84	✓
EMD, ROK & BNE	-1807.05		(2) deg. freedom	
Add Rockhampton variable	-1801.72	9.78	5.99	X
Add Emerald variable	-1804.16	5.78	5.99	✓
Add Brisbane variable	-1806.73	0.68	5.99	✓

5.2.2. Part-Worth (Implicit Price) Tests for Population differences

The part-worths, together with confidence intervals for the three sites of interest can assist in testing for equivalence. The part-worths and the 95% confidence intervals are shown below in Table 11. The part-worths for *People leaving* in the Rockhampton sample and *Reserve* in the Brisbane sample are omitted because these coefficients were not significant in the models (see Table 9).

The results indicate substantial overlap between the confidence intervals for each of the attributes. This result suggests that the null hypothesis should be accepted.

Table 11. Part Worth and Confidence Interval Estimates for EML, ROK and BNE

Attribute	Emerald			Rockhampton			Brisbane		
	P-worth	Lower	Upper	P-worth	Lower	Upper	P-worth	Lower	Upper
Vegetation	1.74	0.86	2.70	2.04	0.60	3.69	1.74	1.05	2.74
Water	0.07	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.00	0.05
People	-0.29	-0.54	-0.10		Not significant		-0.30	-0.49	-0.08
Reserve	1.97	-0.16	3.99	2.81	0.06	5.97	Not significant		

5.2.3. Compensating Surplus Population Test

The third test involves a comparison of compensating surplus values for the three populations across a representative sample of possible scenarios. The results for the compensating surplus population tests are detailed in Table 12 below. The compensating surplus values have been estimated without *Population leaving* changes for the Rockhampton model, and without *Reserve* changes for the Brisbane model.

The results indicate that values for the Emerald and Brisbane populations are similar with significant overlap in the lower and upper confidence intervals across the nine scenario alternatives. For the Rockhampton and Brisbane populations there is overlap between confidence intervals for four scenarios, and significant differences for the other five. These differences may be caused by the omission of an insignificant variable in both the Rockhampton and Brisbane models, which may tend to magnify value differences⁴. It is possible that models based on larger sample sizes may be more accurate, not have insignificant attributes, and have more similar compensating surplus values.

Table 12. Compensating Surplus Estimates for EML, ROK and BNE

Scenario.	Attribute Changes (from base)	Emerald	Rockhampton	Brisbane
1	Veg +10%, Water +300k 's, People -25, Reserve +5%	2.67 (-1.49, 7.36)	1.84 (-5.14, 7.35)	1.55 (-2.58, 5.12)
2	Veg +10%, Water +600k 's, People +25, Reserve +10%	17.09 (4.15, 29.96)	29.77 (14.30, 49.69)	-1.35 (-9.25, 7.09)
3	Veg +10%, Water +900k 's, People +50, Reserve +10%	15.74 (-1.25, 33.16)	35.19 (15.78, 57.16)	-5.17 (-19.91, 10.46)
4	Veg +20%, Water +300k 's, People +25, Reserve +10%	3.54 (-4.42, 10.30)	13.30 (6.15, 22.19)	-4.75 (-9.99, 1.55)
5	Veg +20%, Water +600k 's, People +50, Reserve +5%	-1.76 (-14.45, 11.51)	13.09 (-0.38, 22.84)	-8.57 (-20.02, 4.87)
6	Veg +20%, Water +900k 's, People -25, Reserve +15%	34.25 (19.12, 51.15)	41.02 (19.12, 67.52)	9.78 (0.53, 19.84)
7	Veg +30%, Water +300k 's, People +50, Reserve +15%	0.47 (-14.15, 13.13)	19.13 (7.31, 33.30)	-11.96 (-21.68, -0.19)
8	Veg +30%, Water +600k 's, People -25, Reserve +10%	20.69 (11.95, 31.00)	24.55 (11.79, 39.94)	6.39 (0.62, 12.75)
9	Veg +30%, Water +900k 's, People +25, Reserve +5%	23.28 (10.26, 38.78)	35.60 (16.20, 57.63)	2.56 (-8.66, 14.15)

Overall, the results of the population tests are mixed. It is clear that the different populations have very similar values for floodplain development in the Fitzroy. While most of the tests

⁴ This is because the omission of the *People leaving* attribute in the Rockhampton model would tend to increase compensating surplus values, while the omission of the *Reserve* attribute in the Brisbane model would tend to reduce compensating surplus values.

showed equivalence of values between the populations, some of them did not. It is unclear whether these differences were driven by significant differences in the populations or poorly specified models. There does not appear to be sufficient evidence to either accept or reject the null hypothesis on this evidence.

6. Conclusions.

In this report, two different tests are reported that are relevant to benefit transfer issues. The first test focused on whether the same population viewed tradeoffs for two similar issues in the same way. This was tested by comparing the values that respondents from Brisbane had for floodplain protection in the Dawson and Comet-Nogoa-Mackenzie (CNM) catchments in Central Queensland. While the models were not shown to be equivalent, the part-worth tests showed the differences appear to be linked to one attribute that was given very different levels in the experiment. Where the attributes for the levels were broadly similar, there was no significant difference in the models. Importantly for benefit transfer purposes, the compensating surplus estimates for similar scenarios were not significantly different.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from these site tests. First, the transfer of point estimates (part-worths) from one location to another is not recommended if there is a large difference in the characteristics of the site. Second, the transfer of value functions is recommended, even if there is some differences between the sites (i.e. in one of the attributes). Where there is broad similarity between sites, it appears appropriate to transfer benefits from one site to another.

The second test focused on whether different populations viewed the same tradeoff in similar ways. This was tested by comparing values held by Emerald, Rockhampton and Brisbane populations for floodplain protection in the Fitzroy Basin. Emerald is an irrigation town in the upper Fitzroy catchment, Rockhampton is a regional centre at the mouth of the catchment, and Brisbane is the state capital some 700 kilometers to the south.

The results of the population test are mixed. The location parameter significance tests indicates that there is some difference between the Emerald and Rockhampton populations, and the compensating surplus tests indicates that there is some difference between the Brisbane population relative to the other two, but not between Emerald and Rockhampton. The part-worth tests suggest that these differences are focused on one or two attributes.

The conclusions to be drawn are there appears to be strong support for benefit transfer processes to continue. It is not appropriate to transfer point values where there are large differences between the sites for that attribute. Care has to be taken in extrapolating results across populations. However, it does appear valid to transfer values between similar sites where there are not substantial bio-physical and policy differences, and that it may be possible to transfer values between different populations.

Acknowledgements.

The research reported in this report has been supported by the Australian Research Council and the Queensland Department of Natural Resources and Mines.

References

- Adamowicz, W., Boxall, P., Williams, M. and Louviere, J.J., 1998. Stated preference approaches for measuring passive use values: choice experiments and contingent valuation”, *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 80:64-75.
- Arrow K., Solow R., Portney P., Leamer E., Radner R. and Schuman H. 1993, *Report of the NOAA Panel on Contingent Valuation*, Report to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Federal Register, Vol. 58 (10).
- Atkinson, S. E. , Crocker, T. D. and Shogren, J. F. 1992, “Bayesian Exchangeability, Benefit Transfer and Research Efficiency”, *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 715-722.
- Bennett, J.W. and Blamey R.K. 2001, *The Choice Modelling Approach to Environmental Valuation*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd., Cheltenham, UK.
- Bennett, J.W. and Morrison, M.D. 2001 *Valuing the Environmental Attributes of NSW Rivers*, Report prepared for the NSW EPA, Environmental and Resource Economics, Gundaroo.
- Blamey, R., Rolfe, J., Bennett, J and Morrison, M. 2000, “Valuing remnant vegetation in central Queensland using choice modelling”, *The Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, Vol. 44 (3), pp. 439-456.
- Boyle, K. J. and Bergstrom, J. C. 1992, “Benefit Transfer Studies: Myths, Pragmatism and Idealism”, *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 657-663.
- Brookshire, D. S. and Neill, H. R. 1992, “Benefit Transfers: Conceptual and Empirical Issues”, *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 651-655.
- Brower, R. 2000, “Environmental Value Transfer: State of the art and future prospects” *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 32, pp. 137-152.
- Desvouses, W. H., Naughton, M. C. and Parsons, G. R. 1992, “Benefit Transfer: Conceptual Problems in Estimating Water Quality Benefits using Existing Studies”, *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 675-683.
- Garrod, G. and Willis, K.G. 1999, *Economic Valuation of the Environment: Methods and Case Studies*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK.
- Kahneman, D. and Knetsch, J. L. 1992, “Valuing Public Goods: The Purchase of Moral Satisfaction”, *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, Vol. 22, pp. 57-70.
- Krinsky, I. and Robb, A. 1986, “On Approximating the Statistical Properties of Elasticities”, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 68, pp. 715-719.
- Loch, A. J. and Rolfe, J. C. 2000, *Irrigation Development in the Fitzroy Basin: Production and Development Tradeoffs*, Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Report No. 2., Central Queensland University, Emerald.
- Loch, A., Rolfe, J. and Windle, J. 2001, *Using Focus Groups to Design Choice Modelling Valuation Frameworks for Floodplain Development*, Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Report No. 3., Central Queensland University, Emerald.
- Loomis, J. B. 1992, “The Evolution of a More Rigorous Approach to Benefit Transfer: Benefit Function Transfer”, *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 701-705.
- Louviere, J.J., Hensher, D.A. and Swait, J.D. 2000 *Stated Choice Methods: Analysis and Applications*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

- Morrison, M. 2001, "Non-Market Valuation Databases: How Useful are they?" *Economic Analysis & Policy*, Vol. 31 (1), pp. 33-56.
- Morrison, M.D. and Bennett, J.W. 2000, "Choice modelling, non-use values and benefit transfer", *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 30(1):13-32.
- Morrison, M. D., Bennett, J. W. and Blamey, R. K. and Louviere, J. J. 1998, *Choice Modelling and Tests of Benefit Transfer*, Choice Modelling Research Report No. 8, University of New South Wales, Canberra.
- Rolfe, J. C. and Bennett, J. W. 2000, *Testing for Framing Effects in Environmental Choice Modelling*, Choice Modelling Research Report No. 13, University of New South Wales, Canberra.
- Rolfe, J.C., Bennett, J. W. and Louviere, J. J 2000, "Choice Modelling and its Potential Application to Tropical Rainforest Preservation", *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 35, pp. 289-302.
- Rolfe, J.C., Bennett, J.W. and Louviere, J.J. 2002 "Stated values and reminders of substitute goods: testing for framing effects with choice modelling", *Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics*, forthcoming.
- Smith, V. K. 1992, "On Separating Defensible Benefit Transfers from 'Smoke and Mirrors'" *Water Resources Research*, Vol. 28 (3), pp. 685-694.
- Van Bueren, M. and Bennett, J. W. 2000, "Estimating Community Values for Land and Water Degradation Impacts", draft report prepared for the National Land & Water Resources Audit Project.
- Van Bueren, M. and Bennett, J. 2001 "Towards the Development of a Transferable Set of Value Estimates for Environmental Attributes", paper presented at the 45th Annual AARES Conference, Stamford Plaza, Adelaide, 22-25 January 2001.
- Whitten, S. M. and Bennett, J. W. 2000, "Non-Market Values of Wetlands: A Choice Modelling Study of Wetlands in the Upper South East of South Australia and the Murrumbidgee River Floodplain in New South Wales", Private and Social Value of Wetlands Research Report No. 8, University of New South Wales, Canberra.

Other Research Reports in this Series

Rolfe, J. 2000, “Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin – Project Overview”, *Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Reports*, No. 1., September 2000, CQU.

Loch, A. J. and Rolfe, J. C. 2000, “Irrigation Development in the Fitzroy Basin: Production and Development Tradeoffs”, *Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Reports*, No. 2., December 2000, CQU.

Loch, A., Rolfe, J. and Windle, J. 2001, “Using Focus Groups to Design Choice Modelling Valuation Frameworks for Floodplain Development”, *Valuing Floodplain Development in the Fitzroy Basin Research Reports*, No. 3., April 2001, CQU.