Economic Values of Freshwater in the United States

Kenneth D. Frederick
Tim VandenBerg
Jean Hanson

Discussion Paper 97-03

October 1996

Resources for the Future
1616 P Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone 202-328-5000
Fax 202-939-3460

ECONOMIC VALUES OF FRESHWATER IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Kenneth D. Frederick

Tim VandenBerg

Jean Hanson

Abstract

This report presents nearly 500 water value estimates for four withdrawal uses (domestic, irrigation, industrial processing, and thermoelectric power generation) and four instream uses (hydropower, recreation/fish & wildlife habitat, navigation, and waste disposal). The first section discusses important caveats for interpreting the data and the relevance of water values for achieving efficient use of the resource. The second section discusses the presentation of the data. Tables and graphs are used to summarize and help interpret the water value data that have been converted to constant 1994 dollars. Section 3 presents the data by geographic region to illustrate how the values within a region vary among uses. Section 4 presents the data for individual water uses to illustrate how the values for specific uses vary within each of the 18 water resources regions that comprise the conterminous United States. Information such as the location, year, and methodology used to derive each of the values are presented in the appendices along with each of the water value estimates. The data are organized by water resources region in Appendix B and by type of use in Appendix C.

This report was prepared for the Electric Power Research Institute, Charles McGowin, Project Manager. It is available as EPRI report WO3713-02, October 1995.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

ECONOMIC VALUES OF FRESHWATER IN THE UNITED STATES

1. INTRODUCTION

Water is essential for all life; consequently, its total value is infinite. But for purposes of allocating scarce resources efficiently among competing uses, marginal water values (that is, the additional value contributed by the last unit of water to a particular use) are of particular interest. An economically efficient allocation requires that the marginal value of water is equal in all uses.

In addition to being critical for the health of both humans and ecological systems, water is an important element in many of our recreational and economic activities. It is used in virtually everything we make and do. Water is the most widely used resource by industry; it is used both directly and indirectly to produce energy; it provides the basis for much of our outdoor recreation; it is an important part of our transportation network; it serves as a vehicle for disposing of wastes; and it provides important cultural and amenity values. Irrigation water can increase crop yields and expand the area where crops can be grown commercially. Economic and recreational opportunities and the overall quality of life depend in part on how water is allocated among these competing uses.

Freshwater is becoming increasingly scarce as the growth of demand, driven largely by population and economic growth, exceeds that of supply, which is constrained by limited opportunities and sharply rising costs for developing additional sources of freshwater. As supply and demand conditions change, the efficient allocation of the resource changes. The absence of market institutions to reallocate supplies in response to changing conditions and the importance of goods and services provided by water resources that are not traded and priced in markets are sources of potential discrepancies in the marginal values of water in alternative uses.

Objective and scope

This report describes and presents estimated values for four water withdrawal uses (domestic, irrigation, industrial processing, and thermoelectric power generation) and four instream uses (hydropower, recreation/fish & wildlife habitat, navigation, and waste disposal). Irrigation estimates are further divided into 22 crops or crop types and the recreation/fish & wildlife habitat estimates are broken down by fishing, wildlife refuges, fishing and whitewater, whitewater, and shoreline recreation. The nature of each of these water uses is described briefly in the following section.

Water use definitions

- Domestic use includes water used for household purposes such as drinking, bathing, washing clothes and dishes, toilets, food preparation, and outdoor uses such as watering lawns and washing cars. Outdoor uses are likely to be the lower value domestic uses.

- Irrigation use includes water artificially applied to agricultural crops.

- Industrial processing includes water used in the processing of chemicals, paper, minerals, cotton, vegetables, and meat.

- Thermoelectric power includes water used in the generation of electric power with fossil fuel, nuclear, and geothermal energy. Steam power plants require a method of cooling to condense the steam after it is used to drive the turbines. Water value estimates are available only for fossil fuel power plants.

- Hydroelectric power generation uses water to generate electricity at plants where the turbines are driven by falling water. Hydropower is classified as an instream use in this report although it sometimes involves diverting water from a stream channel. The value per acre-foot depends on the head of the flow at the dam or the cumulative head if the water would pass through multiple dams, the production factor of the turbine, and the unit value of the electricity produced.

- Recreation benefits provided by the nation's streams and reservoirs include activities such as fishing, boating, rafting, and swimming that make direct use of the water as well as activities such as picnicking and hiking that are enhanced by their proximity to water resources. Of the five categories of recreational activities for which there are water value estimates, three -- fishing, wildlife refuges, and fishing and whitewater -- might be viewed as proxies that capture part of the value of water for fish & wildlife habitat. The first two of these activities account for about 96 percent of all the recreation value estimates. About three-fourths of the 211 recreation estimates (see

Table 4.2) are for fishing, and nearly all of these values are from a single national study by Hansen and Hallam (1990). Another 44 of the estimates are for waterfowl hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing at wildlife refuges. The combined category of fishing and whitewater has 3 estimates and the remaining 6 recreation observations are for activities involving whitewater and shoreline recreation.

- Navigation on inland waterways is an important part of the transportation system in some areas of the country. The size of the cargo that can be transported at any given time and therefore the value of the transportation services provided depends on the depth of navigable rivers and lakes, which in turn varies with the quantities of water.

- Waste disposal is an important use of the nation's surface waters. The ability of a stream to assimilate wastes without exceeding water-quality standards depends on the quantity of flow, the nature of the waste, and the ambient meteorological conditions. Thus, releasing water from storage during critical periods can help maintain water quality. The value of water released for these purposes is calculated as either the downstream damages avoided or the waste-treatment costs foregone.

Interpreting the data

This report presents nearly 500 estimates, from 41 different studies, of the economic value of water in the above mentioned uses. The estimates come from both published and unpublished sources based on studies performed under a wide range of supply and demand conditions over the last several decades. For comparability, all estimates have been converted to 1994 dollars per acre-foot. However, a number of important caveats should be borne in mind in interpreting these numbers and applying them to current or future conditions.

- Water has a number of dimensions -- quantity, quality, timing, and location -- that influence its value in a particular use. Quantity is the dimension considered in the value estimates. Since water uses are subject to diminishing marginal utility, the larger the quantity available at any given time, the lower the marginal value.

- Water quality is important for most water uses. High quality water is critical for most domestic and industrial uses and some recreational activities, and the value of water for irrigation depends in part on the salinity level. Water quality considerations, however, are not directly captured in the estimated water values.

- Timing can have an important influence on a water value. Water is more valuable in the production of hydroelectricity when it is used for peaking power. Irrigation water is more valuable when it is applied during periods of critical plant growth and when crops are water-stressed. And instream flows for anadromous fish are especially important during the migration season of the smolts.

- Water values may vary widely among locations. Relative to its value in most uses, water is expensive to transport out of natural or existing channels. Even within the same basin, allowance should be made for the costs of transporting water from the stream to the site of use when comparing offstream and instream water values.

- A variety of methods have been employed to estimate the water values presented in the following tables, and these methods do not necessarily provide readily comparable estimates. Both average and marginal water values are included in this report although marginal values are the relevant measure for assessing the efficiency with which water is allocated among alternative uses. But estimates of marginal water values are not available for many water uses. For instance, some of the water value estimates for irrigation and recreation that are included in this report are average rather than marginal values. And in some cases it is not clear if the estimates are for marginal or average values. Irrigation water values are estimated from both crop-water production functions and farm crop budget studies that use linear programming analysis. The production function method can provide estimates of marginal values while the farm crop budget studies provide estimates of either the average value of water or the price of water at which it become profitable to irrigate a particular crop. In spite of the significant differences in the methodologies used, the primary factors underlying the wide variations in the estimated irrigation water values are the crop grown, the location, and the year of the estimate rather than the methodology employed. The water value estimates of nonmarketed water services such as fishing and rafting that are based on contingent valuation techniques are even more controversial and should be interpreted as only rough indicators of average water values.

- The data in this report confirm the expectation that domestic use is one of the more valuable applications of water. Nevertheless, the value of domestic relative to other uses may be understated by the data presented because, with negatively sloping demand functions, marginal values (which are estimated for domestic uses) are less than average values (which are estimated for some of the other water uses). Estimation of the domestic values start with derivation of a household demand curve for water. The area under the demand curve for the marginal unit of water represents the consumers' willingness to pay for a unit of pretreated, pressurized water delivered to the home. Subtracting the costs of treating and delivering the water to the home from the willingness to pay provides an estimate of the marginal value of water in municipal use that can be compared to the value of water in instream uses.

- Supply and demand conditions change over time. Large seasonal and annual variations in supplies can result in droughts or floods. In the absence of flow regulation and storage, the ratio of maximum to minimum streamflow within a year may exceed 500 to 1. Water demands for irrigation and domestic uses also vary seasonally. Natural climate variability results in interannual fluctuations; annual flows may vary by a factor of 3 or more, especially in arid areas. The marginal value of water for a particular use is likely to be higher during a period of drought than during a period of average or above average precipitation. And since demands are growing faster than supplies, marginal water values tend to rise over time.

- Water uses are rarely fully consumptive. Consequently, using water for one purpose does not necessarily preclude others from using the same water. However, allocating water for one use often, but not necessarily, adversely affects the quantity, quality, timing, and location of supplies for other uses. Ideally, water would be managed and allocated on a basin-wide level to maximize the total public benefits.

- Water provides both final goods and services that are used directly by consumers (e.g., domestic and recreational water uses) and inputs that are used in the production of other goods and services (e.g., crops and power). The value of water used as an input is derived from the value of the final goods and services. Thus, the values of water for irrigation and hydropower depend strongly on the prices of the crops and power produced.

- Conversion of the values to 1994 prices was accomplished using the price deflator (presented in appendix A) for gross domestic product from the 1995 Economic Report of the President. Changes in the prices of the various goods (such as crops and power) that influence the value of water in particular uses may differ considerably from those of the price deflator. And the values that society places on goods and services such as recreation and fish and wildlife habitat that are not priced in markets may change over time. The original values and the years in which the estimates were made are reported in the appendices to enable the user to make adjustments for variations in the price changes of specific goods.

- Technology can alter both the demand and supply of water and therefore its relative value over time. For example, technological developments early in this century led to the development and widespread use of hydroelectric power, thereby increasing the demand for water. In the 1930s improved pumps reduced the costs and, therefore, increased the economic supply of groundwater. More recently development of more efficient irrigation technologies that increased the returns to water in agriculture have had somewhat offsetting impacts on the demand for irrigation water; improved efficiency reduces the water applied per acre while lower water costs encourages the irrigation of additional land.

In spite of the many caveats that accompany the data, the systematic presentation of estimates of the economic value of water in alternative uses and locations provides important information for understanding the role of water in the economy and the potential benefits of institutions that facilitate the allocation of supplies to higher value uses as supply and demand conditions change over time.

2. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The individual water value estimates in this study are generally based on conditions relevant to specific locations, times, and water supply situations. Consequently, information such as the location, year, and methodology used to derive each of these values are presented in the appendices along with each of the individual water value estimates. For more complete information about a particular estimate and its applicability to other conditions, the user should refer to the original source. References for each estimate are provided in appendices B and C, and the list of references provides the necessary bibliographic information.

The appendices use a spread sheet format in which the information for each value estimate is presented in a single row. Many studies contain multiple water value estimates. Consequently, an estimate is uniquely identified by the combination of the study number and the number of the estimate within the study. When studies reported high, average, and low estimates for a single water use, all three values are included in the tables; the notes in column 'J' of appendices B and C describe each estimate.

To assist users in locating information for a particular region or use, the water value estimates are organized by water resources region in appendix B and then by type of use in appendix C. The United States is divided into the 21 water resources regions depicted in Figure 2.1. These regions are hydrologic areas that comprise either the drainage area of a major river such as the Missouri or the combined drainage of a series of rivers such as the South Atlantic Gulf Region. Water values for the various withdrawal and instream uses are presented for the 18 water resources regions within the conterminous 48 states.

The range of the estimated values for a particular use and region can be large because of the factors described in the introduction that affect both the actual and estimated values and because, when available, both high and low estimated values are included in the tables and figures. The small number of observations available for some of

Figure 2.1


Water Resources Regions
NEW ENGLAND (01)
MID-ATLANTIC (02)
SOUTH ATLANTIC-GULF (03)
GREAT LAKES (04)
OHIO (05)
TENNESSEE (06)
UPPER MISSISSIPPI (07)
LOWER MISSISSIPPI (08)
SOURIS-RED-RAINY (09)
MISSOURI (10)
ARKANSAS WHITE RED (11)
TEXAS-GULF (12)
RIO GRANDE (13)
UPPER COLORADO (14)
LOWER COLORADO (15)
GREAT BASIN (16)
PACIFIC NORTHWEST (17)
CALIFORNIA (18)
ALASKA (19)
HAWAII (20)
CARIBBEAN (21)
Puerto Rico
Kauai
Oahu
Molokai
Maui
Hawaii
0 400 MILES
0 80 MILES
0 150 MILES
0 400 MILES

the categories suggests that a single outlying value can have a large impact on the average of the estimated values for a particular use and region. Indeed, water value estimates are not available for all uses in all regions. As might be expected, there are many more estimates of water values for the more arid regions of the country where water conflicts are more common and long-standing and where marginal values are likely to be higher. The absence of water value estimates does not indicate that the marginal value of water in those uses and regions is zero. In some cases, however, the values may not have been sufficiently high to attract the interest of investigators.

The following two sections use tables and graphs to summarize and help interpret the nearly 500 values presented in the appendices. Section 3 presents the data for various geographic regions -- the conterminous 48 states, the humid East (water resources regions 1 to 9) compared to the more arid West (regions 10 to 18), and for each of the 18 water resources regions -- to illustrate how estimated water values within these geographic areas vary among uses. Section 4 presents the data for individual water uses to illustrate how the economic values of water in specific uses vary within each of the 18 water resources regions. The 18 estimates that are not identified with a specific region are included in the national estimates and in section 4.

3. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL WATER VALUES

Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1 present the national averages and medians of the water values for four instream uses (waste disposal, recreation/fish & wildlife habitat, hydropower, and navigation) and four withdrawal uses (irrigation, industrial processing, thermoelectric power, and domestic).[1] Industrial processing and domestic uses are the highest value uses based on both the average and median figures. Recreation/fish & wildlife habitat and irrigation, however, which together account for nearly 80 percent of all the estimates, have the highest individual estimated water values. The overall averages for each water use, which are considerably higher than the respective medians, are strongly influenced in some cases by a few unusually high outlier estimates. Unusually high

[1] Each estimate is given equal weight in calculating the averages.

Table 3.1 National Water Values by Use, ($/Acre-foot)

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream						
	Waste Disposal	3	1	0	12	23
	Recreation/F&W habitat	48	5	0	2,642	211
	Navigation	146	10	0	483	7
	Hydropower	25	21	1	113	57
Withdrawal						
	Irrigation	75	40	0	1,228	177
	Industrial Processing	282	132	28	802	7
	Thermoelectric Power	34	29	9	63	6
	Domestic	194	97	37	573	6
			Total Number of Values			494

Table 3.2 Water Values in the East vs the West, ($/Acre-foot)

Water Use	Average	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
East					
Instream	16	4	483	0	89
Withdrawal	29	19	198	0	17
West					
Instream	56	8	2,642	0	203
Withdrawal	80	42	1,228	0	167
		Total Number of Values			476

Figure 3.1 National Water Values by Use, ($/Acre-foot)



estimates might reflect the methodology employed (particularly when contingent valuation techniques are employed to estimate nonmarketed goods) or the specific circumstances of the study. The marginal value of water for a particular use in a specific location can vary widely over time depending on changes in the availability of supply and the number and needs of users. The medians, on the other hand, may be strongly influenced by a single study with multiple estimates of the value of water in a particular use. Although there are shortcomings of both summary measures, at the national level the medians may provide a better indication of the relative values of water in various uses under relatively normal hydrologic conditions. The median values of the withdrawal uses are all higher than those of the instream uses.

Table 3.2 and Figure 3.2 compare instream and withdrawal water values for the East (water resources regions 1 to 9) and the more arid West (regions 10 to 18). As would be expected, water values are considerably higher in the drier, more water-scarce areas of the country. Within both regions, the values are higher for withdrawal than for instream uses. Moreover, the median value of water withdrawals in the East exceeds the median value of instream uses in the West.

Table 3.3 and Figure 3.3 show the averages and medians of the values of all water uses combined for the 18 water resources regions. The averages are (with the exception of region 9 for which there are only two estimates) much higher than the medians. As noted above, this result reflects the large influence on the averages of a few very high estimates. For instance, the maximum values exceed $1,200 an acre-foot in three regions and $400 per acre-foot in another four regions. In general, these data reinforce the message that water values are higher in the West. The minimum estimated water values of $1 per acre-foot (af) or less in all 18 regions may be the result of treating water as essentially a free resource for some uses. A resource that is provided free to the user will be used until either its marginal value is zero or the supply is exhausted.

Caution should be used in making comparisons as to the relative water values in the various water resources regions based on the averages and medians; these values depend in large part on the relative number of estimates that are available for high and low value water uses in a specific region. Table 3.4 indicates the number of estimated values

Figure 3.2 Water Values in the East vs the West, ($/Acre-foot)



Table 3.3 Water Values by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resources Region Values	Average	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Number of
New England	4	2	12	0	7
Mid-Atlantic	25	5	198	1	10
S. Atlantic-Gulf	12	3	57	0	17
Great Lakes	7	4	42	1	10
Ohio	31	2	483	0	17
Tennessee	14	7	91	0	16
Upper MI	30	4	420	0	17
Lower MI	8	1	50	0	10
Souris-Red-Rainy	1	1	3	0	2
Missouri	13	4	95	0	49
AK-White-Red	31	3	187	0	24
Texas-Gulf	64	52	199	0	26
Rio Grande	191	36	1,615	0	21
Upper CO	32	27	70	0	29
Lower CO	122	49	2,642	0	70
Great Basin	38	4	461	0	14
Pacific NW	53	16	1,228	0	66
California	51	8	756	0	71
Total Number of Values					474

Table 3.3 Water Values by Region, ($/Acre-foot)



Table 3.4 Water Values by Region and Use, ($/Acre-foot)

Region 1: New England

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	2	2	2	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	4	0	12	6

Region 2: Mid-Atlantic

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	3	1	4	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	6	3	9	7
Withdrawal	Irrigation	198	198	198	1

Region 3: South Atlantic-Gulf

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	1	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	3	1	7	9
Withdrawal	Domestic	37	37	37	2
Withdrawal	Irrigation	20	0	57	5

Region 4: Great Lakes

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	2	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	9	1	42	8

Region 5: Ohio

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	4	2	6	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	3	0	8	14
Instream	Navigation	483	483	483	1

Region 6: Tennessee

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	0	0	0	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	2	1	4	4
Instream	Navigation	91	91	91	1
Instream	Hydropower	7	1	13	9
Withdrawal	Irrigation	19	19	19	1

Table 3.4 Water Values by Region and Use (Continued)

Region 7: Upper Mississippi

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	8	8	8	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	4	0	12	10
Instream	Navigation	215	10	420	2
Withdrawal	Irrigation	10	0	41	4

Region 8: Lower Mississippi

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	5	5	5	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	0	0	0	5
Instream	Navigation	10	10	10	1
Withdrawal	Irrigation	21	0	50	3

Region 9: Souris-Red-Rainy

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	3	3	3	1
Withdrawal	Irrigation	0	0	0	1

Region 10: Missouri

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	7	2	12	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	14	0	95	29
Instream	Navigation	0	0	0	1
Withdrawal	Irrigation	18	0	77	17

Region 11: Arkansas-White-Red

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	3	3	4	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	21	0	187	12
Withdrawal	Irrigation	49	0	113	10

Table 3.4 Water Values by Region and Use (Continued)

Region 12: Texas-Gulf

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	1	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	8	3	15	5
Withdrawal	Irrigation	81	0	199	20

Region 13: Rio Grande

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	1	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	313	6	1615	12
Withdrawal	Irrigation	33	0	107	8

Region 14: Upper Colorado

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	0	0	0	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	51	5	70	8
Instream	Hydropower	21	4	40	13
Withdrawal	Irrigation	5	0	18	4
Withdrawal	Thermoelectric Power	55	40	63	3

Region 15: Lower Colorado

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	0	0	0	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	597	62	2,642	5
Instream	Hydropower	35	26	46	2
Withdrawal	Domestic	97	49	144	2
Withdrawal	Irrigation	88	0	1,071	60

Region 16: Great Basin

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	1	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	60	0	461	9
Withdrawal	Irrigation	0	0	0	4

Table 3.4 Water Values by Region and Use (Continued)

Region 17: Pacific Northwest

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	0	0	0	1
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	1	0	3	13
Instream	Navigation	5	5	5	1
Instream	Hydropower	31	2	113	33
Withdrawal	Irrigation	143	0	1,228	18

Region 18: California

Water Use Classification Major	Minor	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Instream	Waste Disposal	1	1	1	2
Instream	Recreation/F&W habitat	27	0	404	48
Withdrawal	Irrigation	111	0	756	21

by type of water use for the 18 water resources regions. There are relatively few estimates available for some regions, especially in the eastern United States, and no region has estimates for more than five of the eight water-use categories listed in Table 3.1. The unusually high averages for the Rio Grande (region 13) and the Lower Colorado (region 15) that are illustrated in Figure 3.3 are attributable to some very high estimated recreation values and the dominance of recreation in the number of water-value estimates.

4. WATER VALUES BY CATEGORY OF USE

Waste disposal

Waste disposal is a relatively low-value water use in the 17 regions for which estimates are available. The values average less than $1/af in six regions and less than $3/af in another six regions (see Table 4.1 and Figure 4.1). Even the highest single estimated value for waste disposal ($12/af in the Missouri Region) and the highest average value ($8/af in the Upper Mississippi Region) are low relative to the estimated values of water for most other uses.

Recreation/fish & wildlife habitat

Recreation, which includes fishing, wildlife refuges, fishing and whitewater, whitewater, and shoreline recreation, is the only water use category with estimates for all 18 water resources regions. The range of the estimated recreation values is very wide, both within and among regions. The highest individual water value estimates are for recreational activities – $2,642 for fishing in the Lower Colorado Basin and $1,615 for fishing and whitewater boating (rafting and kayaking) in the Rio Grande Basin (see Tables 4.2 and 4.3 and Figures 4.2 and 4.3). These high values reflect the increasing demands for water-based recreation as well as the scarcity of high-quality streams for recreational activities in these basins. The scarcity of water-based recreational sites is attributable to both the natural aridity of those basins and the extensive development of their water resources for withdrawal and hydropower uses. At the other extreme, nine regions had estimated recreation values of zero and all five estimates of the marginal value of water for

Table 4.1 Water Values for Waste Disposal by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
New England	2.2	2	2	1
Mid-Atlantic	2.7	4	1	2
S. Atlanta-Gulf	0.7	1	1	1
Great Lakes	1.2	2	1	2
Ohio	3.9	6	2	2
Tennessee	0.3	0	0	1
Upper MI	8.0	8	8	1
Lower MI	5.2	5	5	1
Missouri	7.0	12	2	2
AK-White-Red	3.0	4	3	2
Texas Gulf	1.2	1	1	1
Rio Grande	1.4	1	1	1
Upper CO	0.3	0	0	1
Lower CO	0.3	0	0	1
Great Basin	0.7	1	1	1
Pacific NW	0.4	0	0	1
California	1.1	1	1	2

Figure 4.1 Water Values for Waste Disposal by Region
($/Acre-foot)



Table 4.2 Water Values for Recreation/Fish & Wildlife Habitat by Region, ($/Acrefoot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
New England	4	12	0	6
Mid-Atlantic	6	9	3	7
S. Atlantic-Gulf	3	7	1	9
Great Lakes	9	42	1	8
Ohio	3	8	0	14
Tennessee	2	4	1	4
Upper MI	4	12	0	10
Lower MI	0	0	0	5
Souris-Red-Rainy	3	3	3	1
Missouri	14	95	0	29
AK-White-Red	21	187	0	12
Texas-Gulf	8	15	3	5
Rio Grande	313	1,615	6	12
Upper CO	51	70	5	8
Lower CO	597	2,642	62	5
Great Basin	60	461	0	9
Pacific NW	1	3	0	13
California	27	404	0	48
unspecified	19	32	12	6

Table 4.3 Water Values for Recreation/Fish and Wildlife Habitat, ($/Acre-foot)

Recreation Activity	Average	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Values
Fishing	34	5	0	2,642	158
Wildlife Refuges	24	6	1	404	44
Fishing & Whitewater	1,042	1,505	6	1,615	3
Whitewater	9	9	5	12	4
Shoreline Recreation	19	19	17	21	2

Figure 4.2 Water Values for Recreation/Fish &Wildlife Habitat by Region, ($/Acre-foot)



Figure 4.3 Water Values for Recreation/Fish & Wildlife Habitat ($/Acre-foot)



recreation in the water-rich Lower Mississippi Region were zero. The recreation values tend to be considerably higher in the western states. For example, the averages of the recreation water values range from zero to $9/af in the nine eastern regions. In the West, the range is from $1/af in the relatively water-rich Pacific Northwest to $597/af in the Lower Colorado Basin.

There is a strong complementarity between the conditions that provide good fish and wildlife habitat and those that provide for good fishing, waterfowl hunting, and wildlife viewing at refuges. Consequently, the values for fishing, wildlife refuges, and fishing and whitewater, which make up about 97 percent of all recreation water value estimates, provide proxies for important components of the value of water for fish and wildlife habitat.

Hydroelectric power

Hydroelectric power values are available for only four water resources regions, the Tennessee, Upper Colorado, Lower Colorado, and Pacific Northwest (see Table 4.4 and Figure 4.4). These regions are highly developed for hydropower with multiple dams and generating plants in place along their major rivers. The potential value of water for hydropower within a basin varies widely with the location of the water on the river because the power produced by an acre-foot of water is determined by the developed head (the height of a retained body of water) above the generating turbines. For instance, an acre-foot of water at the headwaters of the Snake River in the Pacific Northwest could pass through 16 dams before joining up with the Columbia River and then through another 4 dams before reaching the Pacific Ocean. The cumulative developed head of these dams is 2,159 feet. In contrast, the developed head of Bonneville Dam, the last dam along the Columbia River, is 59 feet. Consequently, the value for hydropower of an acre-foot of water at the headwaters of the Snake is more than 36 times the value just above Bonneville Dam. The averages of the marginal hydropower values listed in Table 4.4 are the averages of the cumulative upstream generating capability at each dam along the respective rivers. Hydropower is an important, although not the highest value, water user in these four water resources regions (see Table 3.4).

Table 4.4 Water Values for Hydropower by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
Tennessee	7	13	1	9
Upper CO	21	40	4	13
Lower CO	35	46	25	2
Pacific NW	31	113	2	33

Table 4.5 Water Values for Navigation by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
Ohio	483	483	483	1
Tennessee	91	91	91	1
Upper MI	215	420	10	2
Lower MI	10	10	10	1
Missouri	0	0	0	1
Pacific NW	5	5	5	1

Figure 4.4 Water Values for Hydropower by Region, ($/Acre-foot)



Navigation

Navigation is an important part of the nation's commercial transportation system. When ports are accessible and time is not a critical factor, barge transportation is generally the least expensive form of shipping large loads. Navigation is sensitive to the level and flow of water. Minimum water levels are required for navigation on free-flowing rivers while too much flow can create problems for loading and unloading barges. Water levels on the Great Lakes and other reservoirs affect the size of the load that can be transported on a barge and thus the profitability of navigation. Water is also used when ships pass through locks although the quantities are small in comparison to the quantities of water used to support navigation on a free-flowing stream. Government subsidies for navigation add to the problems of estimating navigation water values. Accordingly, the water values for navigation presented in Table 4.5 and Figure 4.5 should be viewed with caution. The averages of the estimated values for navigation water in the Ohio ($483/af), Tennessee ($91/af), and Upper Mississippi ($215) are by far the highest estimated values for water in these regions (see Table 3.4). In contrast, the estimated values for navigation in the Lower Mississippi, Missouri, and Pacific Northwest regions are $10/af or less.

Irrigation

Irrigation is the largest withdrawal user of water in the United States, accounting for 40 percent of all withdrawals and 77 percent of withdrawals in the 17 western states (Solley, Pierce, and Perlman, 1993). The range of water value estimates is wide (Table 4.6). On the low end, the minimum value is zero for 13 of the 15 regions for which there are estimates; the two regions with non-zero minimums have only one observation. On the high end, two regions -- the Lower Colorado and the Pacific Northwest -- have maximum irrigation values in excess of $1,000/af. The estimates suggest that water can have considerable value in irrigation in both humid and arid regions although the values are generally higher in the West (Tables 3.4 and 4.6 and Figure 4.6).

Irrigation water values tend to be higher for the higher value crops such as vegetables and fruits and lower for the grains and hay (see Tables 4.7 and 4.8 and Figures 4.7 and 4.8). For specific crops, the average values per acre-foot are $784 for potatoes,

Figure 4.5 Water Values for Navigation by Region, ($/Acre-foot)



Table 4.6 Water Values for Irrigation by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
Mid-Atlantic	198	198	198	1
S. Atlantic-Gulf	20	57	0	5
Tennessee	19	19	19	1
Upper MI	10	41	0	4
Lower MI	21	50	0	3
Souris-Red-Rainy	0	0	0	1
Missouri	18	77	0	17
AK-White-Red	49	113	0	10
Texas-Gulf	81	199	0	20
Rio Grande	33	107	0	8
Upper CO	5	18	0	4
Lower CO	88	1,071	0	60
Great Basin	0	0	0	4
Pacific NW	143	1,228	0	18
California	111	756	0	21

Figure 4.6 Water Values for Irrigation by Region, ($/Acre-foot)



Table 4.7 Water Values by Crop, ($/Acre-foot)

Crop	Average	Median	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
Alfalfa	51	44	173	18	13
Apples	151	151	151	151	1
Barley	33	39	62	9	7
Beans	58	58	72	44	2
Carrots	550	550	550	550	1
Corn	91	98	134	44	7
Cotton	114	103	292	28	18
Grain Sorgham	57	44	199	5	11
Hay	36	36	49	23	2
Hops	18	18	18	18	1
Lettuce	208	208	208	208	1
Melons	54	54	70	37	2
Onions	40	40	40	40	1
Pears	137	137	137	137	1
Potatoes	710	784	1,228	46	4
Rice	86	86	86	86	1
Safflower	53	58	69	26	4
Soybeans	121	127	178	60	3
Sugar Beets	121	119	253	39	8
Tomatos	686	686	686	686	1
Vegetables	206	206	206	206	1
Wheat	51	47	104	14	13

Figure 4.7 Water Values by Crop, ($/Acre-foot)



Table 4.8 Water Values for Categories of Crops, ($/Acre-foot)

Crop Category	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Count
Cotton	114	292	28	18
Grain	57	199	5	40
Hay	49	173	18	15
Oil Seeds	82	178	26	7
Vegetable and Orchard	261	1,228	37	23

Table 4.9 Water Values for Domestic Use by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
S. Atlantic-Gulf	37	37	37	2
Lower CO	97	144	49	2
unspecified	448	573	324	2

Table 4.10
Water Values for Thermoelectric Power by Region, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
Upper CO	55	63	40	3
unspecified	12	18	9	3

Table 4.11
Water Values for Industrial Processing, ($/Acre-foot)

Resource Region	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Number of Values
unspecified	282	802	28	7

Figure 4.8 Water Values for Categories of Crops, ($/Acre-foot)



$686 for tomatos, and $550 for carrots compared to $18 for hops, $33 for barley, and $36 for hay. For crop groups, the average value for vegetable and orchard crops is $261/af, more than five times the $49/af average for hay crops.

Domestic

Water for domestic purposes is one of the higher value uses. However, observations are available for only two regions and each of these regions has only two observations (Table 4.9). At $37/af domestic is the highest value use in the South Atlantic-Gulf region. In the Lower Colorado region, the average domestic value $97/af ranks second behind the recreation/fish & wildlife values.

Thermoelectric power

The value of water for thermoelectric power averages $55/af in the Upper Colorado region, the only region for which such estimates are available, and $12/af for three estimates with no identifiable location (Table 4.10).

Industrial processing

Industrial processing with an average estimated water value of $282/af has the highest estimated value of any of the water uses (Tables 3.4 and 4.11). The seven observations for industrial processing are not identified with a specific water resources region.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Economic and recreational opportunities and the overall quality of life depend in part on how increasingly scarce water supplies are allocated among competing uses. An economically efficient allocation requires that the marginal value of water is equal in all uses. But the absence of market institutions to reallocate supplies in response to changing conditions and the importance of goods and services provided by water that are not traded and priced in markets are sources of potential discrepancies in the marginal values of water in alternative uses.

This report presents nearly 500 water value estimates for four water withdrawal uses (domestic, irrigation, industrial processing, and thermoelectric power generation) and four instream uses (hydropower, recreation/fish & wildlife habitat, navigation, and waste disposal). Geographically, the data are organized into the 18 water resources regions that comprise the conterminous 48 states. Although a number of important caveats should be borne in mind in interpreting and applying the water value numbers, the systematic presentation of estimates of the economic value of water in alternative uses and locations provides important information for understanding the role of water in the economy and the potential benefits of institutions that would facilitate the allocation of supplies to higher value uses as supply and demand conditions change over time.

Tables and graphs are used to summarize and help interpret the nearly 500 water values presented in the appendices. There are wide variations in the estimated values of water for particular uses and locations. This variability reflects both differences in the estimating methodologies employed and variations in marginal water values over time resulting from changes in the availability of supplies and in the number and demands of users.

Nationally, withdrawal water uses, especially industrial processing and domestic, tend to have higher estimated values than instream uses. (See Figure 3.1). However, recreation/fish & wildlife habitat, and irrigation which together account for nearly 80 percent of all the estimates, have the highest individual estimated water values. Water values tend to be higher in the drier, more water-scarce areas of the country. (See Figure 3.3).

Appendix A

Gross Domestic Product Price Deflators

Year	Implicit Price Deflator
1970	27.9
1971	29.4
1972	30.8
1973	32.8
1974	35.6
1975	39.0
1976	41.5
1977	44.3
1978	47.8
1979	51.9
1980	56.9
1981	62.6
1982	66.5
1983	69.2
1984	72.2
1985	74.9
1986	76.8
1987	79.3
1988	82.4
1989	86.0
1990	89.8
1991	93.3
1992	95.9
1993	97.9
1994	100.0

Source: Economic Report of the President, February 1995 , base year adjusted to 1994.

Appendix B

Details of Water Values, Organized by Region

Appendix B provides detailed information regarding the individual water value estimates. The information in this appendix is organized by water resources region. Columns in the appendices contain the following information:

Column A	Water use type
Column B	Value of one acre-foot of water in 1994 dollars
Column C	Nominal value of one acre-foot of water as reported in the original study
Column D	Year of the nominal value reported in column C (This may differ from publication date)
Column E	Author and year of the study
Column F	Number identifying the study among the forty one studies cited
Column G	Number identifying an individual value within a study
Column H	Water resources region for which the reported value was estimated
Column I	Methodology for estimating the water value
Column J	Additional notes regarding the water value
Column K	Name of the irrigated crop or the hydroelectric power site associated with a value
Column L	Feet of head at the hydroelectric power site
Column M	Cumulative feet of head at the hydroelectric power site and downstream hydroelectric power sites
Column N	Cumulative kilowatt hours of power generated at the hydroelectric power site and downstream hydroelectric power sites

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 1													
Recreation													
Recreation	1	0.29	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	1	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.69	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	2	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.67	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	3	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.73	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	4	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	5	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.25	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	6	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	2	1.25	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	1	1	Regional values for BOD dilution	New England				
Region 2													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	198	112.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	100	2	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Recreation	8	4.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	7	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	8	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.02	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	9	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.65	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	10	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.91	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	11	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.98	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	12	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	167	2	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	4	2.41	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	2	2	Regional values for BOD dilution	Deleware and Hudson				
Waste Disposal	1	0.68	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	3	2	Regional values for BOD dilution	Chesapeake				
Region 3													
Domestic													
Domestic	37	21	1980	Danielson, 1977	28	1	3	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Summer value				
Domestic	37	21	1980	Danielson, 1977	28	2	3	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Winter value				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 3 Continued													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	57	32.27	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	101	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	102	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Multiple			
Irrigation	19	10.84	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	103	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	104	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	25	13.95	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	105	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Hay			
Recreation													
Recreation	3	1.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	13	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.05	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	14	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.43	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	15	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.16	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	16	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	4.1	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	17	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	18	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.59	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	19	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	20	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	21	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	1	0.37	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	13	3	Regional values for BOD dilution	Southeast				
Region 4													
Recreation													
Recreation	1	0.76	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	22	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.84	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	23	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	42	23.65	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	24	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.76	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	25	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	26	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.79	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	27	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	4.23	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	28	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.01	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	29	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 4 Continued													
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	2	0.94	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	5	4	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Lakes East				
Waste Disposal	1	0.37	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	6	4	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Lakes West				
Region 5													
Navigation													
Navigation	483	274.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	43	5	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Ohio River				
Recreation													
Recreation	5	2.69	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	30	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	31	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.54	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	32	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	33	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	34	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.99	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	35	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	36	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	168	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	169	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	170	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	171	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	172	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	173	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	174	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	6	3.41	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	4	5	Regional values for BOD dillution	Ohio				
Waste Disposal	2	1.05	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	14	5	Regional values for BOD dillution	Cumberland				
Region 6													
Hydropower													
Hydropower	1	0.78	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	28	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Kentucky	50	50	43.5
Hydropower	3	1.49	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	29	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Pickwick Landing	46	96	83.52
Hydropower	5	2.94	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	30	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Wilson	93	189	164.43

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 6 Continued													
Hydropower Continued													
Hydropower	6	3.68	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	31	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Wheeler	48	237	206.19
Hydropower	8	4.29	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	32	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Gunterville	39	276	240.12
Hydropower	9	4.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	33	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Nickajack	39	315	274.05
Hydropower	10	5.59	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	34	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Chicka-munga	45	360	313.2
Hydropower	11	6.43	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	35	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Watts Bar	54	414	360.18
Hydropower	13	7.52	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	36	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Fort Loudon	70	484	421.08
Irrigation													
Irrigation	19	10.82	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	106	6	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Hay			
Navigation													
Navigation	91	51.86	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	45	6	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Tennessee River				
Recreation													
Recreation	4	2.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	37	6	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	0.96	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	38	6	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	0.96	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	175	6	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	176	6	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	15	6	Regional values for BOD dilution	Tennessee				
Region 7													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	41	23.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	107	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	108	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	109	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	110	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Navigation													
Navigation	420	238.7	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	44	7	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Illinois waterway				
Navigation	10	5.79	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	46	7	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Mississippi River				
Recreation													
Recreation	12	7.09	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	39	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.24	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	40	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.4	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	41	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.06	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	42	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 7 Continued													
Recreation Continued													
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	43	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.24	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	177	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	4	2.4	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	178	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.06	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	179	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	180	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	181	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	8	4.57	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	7	7	Regional values for BOD dilution	Upper Mississippi				
Region 8													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	50	28.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	111	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	112	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	12	7.01	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	113	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Navigation													
Navigation	10	5.79	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	47	8	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Mississippi River				
Recreation													
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	44	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	45	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	46	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	182	8	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	183	8	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	5	2.98	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	8	8	Regional values for BOD dilution	Lower Mississippi				
Region 9													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	114	9	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Recreation													
Recreation	3	1.44	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	47	9	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 10													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	49	40	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	7	10	Difference between irrigated/nonirrigated returns	Bitterroot River, MT				
Irrigation	23	19	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	8	10	Difference between irrigated/nonirigated returns	Big Hole River, MT				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	115	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	116	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	117	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	118	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	119	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	120	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	4	2.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	121	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	42	24.15	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	122	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	123	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	15	8.63	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	124	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	125	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	8	4.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	126	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	77	32	1976	Kaleta, 1976	34	1	10	Marginal value of irrigation water in nongroundwater areas	Eastern Colorado	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Young, 1984	25	1	10	Indeterminate	Colorado, Platte Basin	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Young, 1984	25	2	10	Indeterminate	Colorado, Platte Basin	Sugar beets			
Navigation													
Navigation	0	0.13	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	49	10	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Missouri River				
Recreation													
Recreation	95	78	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	1	10	Dichotomous Choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at low flow				
Recreation	84	69	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	2	10	Dichotomous Choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at low flow				
Recreation	0	0	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	3	10	Dichotomous Choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at high flow				
Recreation	10	8	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	5	10	Dichotomous Choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at high flow				
Recreation	6	3.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	48	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.29	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	49	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.73	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	50	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	10	5.62	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	51	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	52	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 10 Continued													
Recreation Continued													
Recreation	4	2.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	53	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	84	47.88	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	54	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	11	6.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	55	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	56	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	16	8.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	57	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	58	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	59	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	184	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	7	3.72	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	185	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	6	3.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	186	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	187	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	4	2.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	188	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	189	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	11	6.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	190	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	191	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	192	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	193	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	194	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	195	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	2	1987	Brown, 1989	40	2	10	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 10,000 Ac/Ft by Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife and Parks to aid fish survival on the Bitterroot River				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	2	1.16	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	9	10	Regional values for BOD dilution	Lower Missouri				
Waste Disposal	12	6.81	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	10	10	Regional values for BOD dilution	Upper Missouri				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 11													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	127	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	48	27.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	128	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	110	62.27	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	129	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	130	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	131	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	132	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	113	64	1980	Shulstad, R.N., et al	21	1	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	86	49	1980	Shulstad, et al.,1982	21	2	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	60	34	1980	Shulstad, et al.,1982	21	3	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Lettuce			
Irrigation	76	32	1976	Kaleta, 1976	34	2	11	marginal value of irrigation water in nongroundwater areas	Eastern Colorado	Wheat			
Recreation													
Recreation	187	106.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	60	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.03	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	61	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	62	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.72	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	63	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	27	15.34	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	64	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	65	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.03	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	196	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	197	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	198	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	199	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	200	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	201	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	3	1.47	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	11	11	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper Arkansas-White-Red				
Waste Disposal	3	1.99	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	12	11	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper-Arkansas-White-Red				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 12													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	21	12.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	133	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	134	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	30	17.3	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	135	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	136	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	137	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	98	56	1980	Condra, 1975	14	1	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Cotton			
Irrigation	121	69	1980	Condra, 1975	14	2	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	69	39	1980	Condra, 1975	14	3	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Wheat			
Irrigation	127	72	1980	Condra, 1975	14	4	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	14	8	1980	Condra, 1975	14	5	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Wheat			
Irrigation	100	57	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	1	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Potatoes			
Irrigation	199	113	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	2	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Potatoes			
Irrigation	62	35	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	3	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Corn			
Irrigation	118	67	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	1	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Grain sorg-hum(early)			
Irrigation	134	76	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	2	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Grain sorg-hum(early)			
Irrigation	167	95	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	3	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	56	32	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	4	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	5	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Vegetables			
Irrigation	178	101	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	6	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Wheat			
Irrigation	47	27	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	7	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Wheat			
Recreation													
Recreation	3	1.59	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	66	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.75	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	67	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	68	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	15	8.64	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	69	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.14	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	70	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 12 Continued													
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	1	0.68	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	16	12	Regional values for BOD dilution	Western Gulf				
Region 13													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	138	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	139	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	140	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	24	13.57	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	141	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	142	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	1	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Cotton			
Irrigation	91	52	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	2	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	107	61	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	3	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Soybeans			
Recreation													
Recreation	1615	1073	1982	Ward, 1987	6	1	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at low flow				
Recreation	6	4	1982	Ward, 1987	6	2	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at high flow				
Recreation	1505	1000	1982	Ward, 1987	6	3	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at normal flow				
Recreation	142	80.85	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	71	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	96	54.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	72	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	73	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	170	96.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	74	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	75	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	96	54.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	202	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	203	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	8	4.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	204	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	205	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	1	0.79	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	17	13	Regional values for BOD dilution	Rio Grandes				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 14													
Hydropower													
Hydropower	4	2.51	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	37	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Shoshone	170	170	147.9
Hydropower	7	3.7	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	38	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Palisades	80	250	217.5
Hydropower	21	12.07	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	39	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Glen Canyon	566	816	709.92
Hydropower	23	13.22	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	40	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Parker	78	894	777.78
Hydropower	27	15.16	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	41	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Davis	131	1025	891.75
Hydropower	40	23	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	42	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Hoover	530	1555	1352.85
Hydropower	28	28	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	3	14	Optimization model	Colorado River, Upper Basin				
Hydropower	4	2.51	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	1	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		170	170	147.9
Hydropower	7	3.7	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	2	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		80	250	217.5
Hydropower	21	12.07	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	3	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		566	816	709.92
Hydropower	23	13.22	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	4	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		78	894	777.78
Hydropower	27	15.16	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	5	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		131	1025	891.75
Hydropower	40	23	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	6	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		530	1555	1352.85
Irrigation													
Irrigation	18	18	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	1	14	Optimization model	Colorado River, Upper Basin				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	143	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	144	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	145	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 14 Continued													
Recreation													
Recreation	70	39.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	76	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	67	38.36	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	77	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	78	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	206	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	207	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	208	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	7	4	1980	Walsh, 1980	26	1	14	Survey	Colorado reservoir releases, kayaking				
Recreation	5	3	1980	Walsh, 1980	26	2	14	Survey	Colorado reservoir releases, rafting				
Thermoelectric Power													
Thermo-electric Power	63	32.59	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	1	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model	Water availability for Navajo Indian Irrigation Project				
Thermo-electric Power	63	32.59	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	2	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model, and 30% water reduction	Water availability for Navajo Indian Irrigation Project				
Thermo-electric Power	40	20.97	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	3	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model, and 30% water reduction	Water availability for Navajo Indian Irrigation Project				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	18	14	Regional values for BOD dilution	Colorado				
Region 15													
Domestic													
Domestic	144	82	1980	Young, 1973	27	1	15	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Summer value				
Domestic	49	28	1980	Young, 1973	27	2	15	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Winter value				
Hydropower													
Hydropower	25	22.05	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	2	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO River basin				
Hydropower	46	41.09	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	4	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO River basin, based on Yr. 2000 projections				
Irrigation													
Irrigation	19	19	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	2	15	Optimization model	Colorado River, Lower Basin				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	146	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	147	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	148	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	1	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	98	56	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	2	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	3	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Continued													
Irrigation Continued													
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	4	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	1	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Wheat			
Irrigation	72	41	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	2	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	47	27	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	2	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Corn			
Irrigation	62	35	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	3	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	157	89	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	4	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	292	166	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	5	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	5	3	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	6	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Tomatoes			
Irrigation	33	19	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	7	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	5	3	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	8	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	49	28	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	9	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Barley			
Irrigation	120	68	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	10	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, low estimate	Barley			
Irrigation	153	87	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	11	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Conservation District and Salt River Project, high estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	206	117	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	12	15	Farm crop budget	AZ, Roos. Water Cons. District and Salt River Project	Cotton			
Irrigation	53	30	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	13	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Cons. District and Salt River Project, low Est.	Grain sorghum (late)			
Irrigation	56	32	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	14	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water Cons. District and Salt River Project, High Est.	Grain sorghum (late)			
Irrigation	42	24	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	1	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Corn			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	2	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Corn			
Irrigation	550	313	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	3	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Cotton			
Irrigation	90	51	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	4	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	114	65	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	5	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	6	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Soybeans			
Irrigation	208	118	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	7	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Wheat			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	8	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Alfalfa			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Continued													
Irrigation Continued													
Irrigation	1071	609	1980	Martin & Snyder, 1979	20	9	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Barley			
Irrigation	123	70	1980	Martin & Snyder, 1979	20	10	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Carrotts			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Martin & Snyder, 1979	20	11	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	1	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	2	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	3	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Apples			
Irrigation	21	12	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	4	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs	Arizona, Pinal County	Corn			
Irrigation	9	5	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	5	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Hops			
Irrigation	14	8	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	6	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Pears			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	7	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Wheat			
Irrigation	58	33	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	8	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	67	38	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	9	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	97	55	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	10	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	88	50	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	11	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Barley			
Irrigation	28	16	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	12	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Barley			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	13	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Barley			
Irrigation	67	38	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	14	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	69	39	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	15	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	86	49	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	16	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	77	44	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	17	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	118	67	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	18	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	19	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	20	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	21	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Safflower			
Irrigation	42	24	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	22	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Safflower			
Irrigation	49	38	1986	Bush and Martin, 1986	37	1	15	Short run marginal value product	Value for 3 central AZ counties for alfalfa	Wheat			
Irrigation	173	133	1986	Bush and Martin, 1986	37	2	15	Short run marginal value product	Value for 3 central AZ counties for cotton	Wheat			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Continued													
Irrigation Continued													
Irrigation	8	6.96	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	1	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO River basin	Wheat			
Irrigation	18	15.86	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	3	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO River basin, based on Yr. 2000 projections	Alfalfa			
Recreation													
Recreation	154	87.7	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	79	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	80	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2642	1502	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	81	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	209	15	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	210	15	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	19	15	Regional values for BOD dilution	Colorado				
Region 16													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	149	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	150	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	151	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	152	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Recreation													
Recreation	1	0.856	1982	Rangesan, 1986	5	1	16	Travel-Cost/Simulation	Blacksmith Folk River Northern UT, value at 50% flows				
Recreation	0	0.13	1982	Rangesan, 1986	5	2	16	Travel-Cost/Simulation	Blacksmith Folk River Northern UT, value at actual 1982 flow				
Recreation	13	7.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	82	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	83	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	461	261.9	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	84	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	17	9.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	85	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	11	9	1987	Brown, 1989	40	1	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchased Right to 3000 Ac/ft. Maintain Lake level for fishing and boating, Lander Co. NV				
Recreation	13	11	1989	Brown, 1989	40	5	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchase of rights by the Nevada Waterfowl Assoc for 32 Ac/Ft for the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge				
Recreation	16	14	1989	Brown, 1989	40	6	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchase of rights by the Nevada Waterfowl Assoc for 400 Ac/Ft for the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 16 Continued													
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	1	0.42	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	20	16	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Basin				
Region 17													
Hydropower													
Hydropower	39	32	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	4	17	Estimate based on Gibbons[1986]	Bitter Root River, MT				
Hydropower	32	26	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	6	17	Estimate based on Gibbons[1986]	Big Hole River, MT				
Hydropower	2	0.87	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	1	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Bonneville	59	59	51.33
Hydropower	4	2.1	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	2	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	The Dalles	83	142	123.54
Hydropower	6	3.65	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	3	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	John Day	105	247	214.89
Hydropower	8	4.75	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	4	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	McNary	74	321	279.27
Hydropower	10	5.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	5	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Priest Rapids	77	398	346.26
Hydropower	12	7.04	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	6	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Wanpum	78	476	414.12
Hydropower	13	7.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	7	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Rock Island	38	514	447.18
Hydropower	16	8.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	8	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Rocky Reach	87	601	522.87
Hydropower	17	9.88	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	9	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Wells	67	668	581.16
Hydropower	22	12.35	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	10	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Chief Joseph	167	835	726.45
Hydropower	31	17.42	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	11	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Grand Coulee	343	1178	1024.86
Hydropower	11	6.2	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	12	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Ice Harbor	98	419	364.53
Hydropower	14	7.68	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	13	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Lower Monu-mental	100	519	451.53
Hydropower	16	9.13	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	14	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Little Goose	98	617	536.79
Hydropower	19	10.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	15	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Lower Granite	100	717	623.79
Hydropower	24	13.71	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	16	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Hells Canyon	210	927	806.49
Hydropower	27	15.49	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	17	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Oxbow	120	1047	910.89
Hydropower	34	19.58	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	18	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Brownlee	277	1324	1151.88
Hydropower	35	19.94	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	19	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Swan Falls	24	1348	1172.76
Hydropower	37	21.24	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	20	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	C.J. Strike	88	1436	1249.32
Hydropower	39	22.27	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	21	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Bliss	70	1506	1310.22

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 17 Continued													
Hydropower Continued													
Hydropower	41	23.15	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	22	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	L. Slamon Falls	59	1565	1361.55
Hydropower	43	24.33	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	23	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	U. Salmon Falls	80	1645	1431.15
Hydropower	48	27.47	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	24	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Shoshone	212	1857	1615.59
Hydropower	52	29.64	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	25	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Twin Falls	147	2004	1743.48
Hydropower	53	30.35	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	26	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Minidoka	48	2052	1785.24
Hydropower	56	31.93	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	27	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	American Falls	107	2159	1878.33
Hydropower	113	64	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	1	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	SE Idaho			2094	1822
Hydropower	72	41	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	2	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	SW Idaho			1336	1162
Hydropower	12	7	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	3	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	Lower Columbia			242	211
Hydropower	63	36	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	4	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	Columbia Basin			1167	1015
Irrigation													
Irrigation	31	31.06	1994	Aillery, 1994	1	1	17	Unstated	Loss in agricultural output, high estimate				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	153	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	154	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	155	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	156	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	157	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	158	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	159	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	253	144	1980	Ayer, 1983	12	1	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Washington				
Irrigation	104	59	1980	Ayer, 1983	12	2	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Washington				
Irrigation	1228	698	1980	Ayer, et al., 1983	13	1	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Idaho				
Irrigation	496	282	1980	Ayer, et al., 1983	13	2	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Idaho	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	18	10	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	1	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Cotton			
Irrigation	151	86	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	2	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Melons			
Irrigation	55	31	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	3	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Melons			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 17 Continued													
Irrigation Continued													
Irrigation	18	10	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	4	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Potatoes			
Irrigation	137	78	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	5	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Safflower			
Irrigation	91	52	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	6	17	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate prices ranges in which crops become competitive.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Safflower			
Navigation													
Navigation	5	2.65	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	48	17	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Columbia /Snake Rivers				
Recreation													
Recreation	3	2.36	1988	Johnson and Adams, 1988	7	1	17	Contingent-Valuation	John Day River, OR. Values for steelhead fishing only, value during summer				
Recreation	0	0.18	1988	Johnson and Adams, 1988	7	2	17	Contingent-Valuation	John Day River, OR. Values for steelhead fishing only, value during winter				
Recreation	1	0.56	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	86	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	87	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.57	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	88	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.35	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	89	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	90	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.16	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	91	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.36	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	92	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	211	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	212	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.35	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	213	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	214	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	0	0.2	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	23	17	Regional values for BOD dillution	Pacific Northwest				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 18													
Irrigation													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	160	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	756	429.9	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	161	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	162	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	163	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	164	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	165	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	166	18	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin					
Irrigation	125	71	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	1	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California, low estimate	Wheat			
Irrigation	227	129	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	2	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California, high estimate	Corn			
Irrigation	686	390	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	3	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	46	26	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	1	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Onions (dry)			
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	2	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Potatoes			
Irrigation	72	41	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	3	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	4	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Wheat			
Irrigation	65	37	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	5	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Cotton			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	6	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Rice			
Irrigation	37	21	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	7	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Soybeans			
Irrigation	46	26	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	8	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Alfalfa hay			
Irrigation	49	28	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	9	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Barley			
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	10	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Beans (dry)			
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	11	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Beans (dry)			
Recreation													
Recreation	3	3.34	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	1	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, average				
Recreation	9	8.62	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	2	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, average				
Recreation	21	20.4	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	3	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, average				
Recreation	7	6.43	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	4	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, average				
Recreation	8	7.7	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	5	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, average				
Recreation	1	0.93	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	6	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, average				
Recreation	4	3.71	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	7	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	10	9.57	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	8	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	23	22.66	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	9	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	7	7.15	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	10	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	9	8.55	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	11	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	1	1.03	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	12	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	3	2.99	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	13	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	8	7.7	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	14	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	19	18.24	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	15	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, lower value				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 18 Continued													
Waste Disposal													
Waste Disposal	1	0.74	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	21	18	Regional values for BOD dilution	Southern Pacific				
Waste Disposal	1	0.48	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	22	18	Regional values for BOD dilution	Central Pacific				
Region ?													
Domestic													
Domestic	324	184	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	6	?	Indeterminant	Value for domestic lawn watering				
Domestic	573	326	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	7	?	Indeterminant	Value for indoor domestic use				
Industrial processing													
Industrial processing	90	51	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	3	?	Indeterminent	Chemicals Industry				
Industrial processing	113	64	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	4	?	Indeterminent	Paper manufacturing				
Industrial processing	28	16	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	5	?	Indeterminent	Minerals industry				
Industrial processing	132	75	1980	Russell, 1970	30	2	?	Marginal recycling cost	Beet sugar processing				
Industrial processing	234	133	1980	Kollar, 1976	31	1	?	Cost to induce dye absorbtion treatment	Cotton textile finishing				
Industrial processing	575	327	1980	Kane and Ostantowski, 1981	32	1	?	marginal costs of waste water recycling	Low estimate, Meat packing industry				
Industrial processing	802	456	1980	Kane and Ostantowski, 1981	32	2	?	marginal costs of waste water recycling	High estimate, Meat packing industry				
Recreation													
Recreation	32	16.8	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	1	?	Indeterminant	Value for fishing, low flow				
Recreation	21	11.13	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	2	?	Indeterminant	Shoreline recreation, low flow				
Recreation	12	6.08	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	3	?	Indeterminant	Whitewater recreation, low flow				
Recreation	21	10.79	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	4	?	Indeterminant	Value for fishing, normal August flow				
Recreation	17	8.6	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	5	?	Indeterminant	Shoreline recreation, normal August flow				
Recreation	12	6.08	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	6	?	Indeterminant	Whitewater recreation, normal August flow				
Thermo-electric Power													
Thermo-electric Power	11	6	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	1	?	Cost of moving from once through to evaporative cooling systems	Low estimate, electricity sector				
Thermo-electric Power	18	10	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	2	?	Cost of moving from once through to evaporative cooling systems	High estimate, electricity sector				
Thermo-electric Power	9	5	1980	Russell, 1970	30	1	?	Indeterminent	Electricity sector				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 18 Continued													
Recreation Continued													
Recreation	6	5.75	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	16	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	7	6.88	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	17	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	1	0.83	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	18	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.3	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	19	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	6	5.94	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	20	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	14	14.05	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	21	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	5	4.43	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	22	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	5	5.3	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	23	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	1	0.64	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	24	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	4	3.84	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	25	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	10	9.92	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	26	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	24	23.48	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	27	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	8	7.4	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	28	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	9	8.86	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	29	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	1	1.07	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	30	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	1	0.91	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	31	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.35	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	32	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	6	5.55	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	33	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	1.75	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	34	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.1	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	35	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	0	0.25	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	36	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	352	303	1989	Creel and Loomis, 1992	8	1	18	Travel-Cost, linked site selection & frequency models	Five NWRs and three State WMAs in the San Jaoquin Valley				
Recreation	404	348	1989	Creel and Loomis, 1992	8	2	18	Travel-Cost, linked site selection & frequency models	Kern and Pixley refuges in the San Jaoquin Valley, which have undependable water supplies.				
Recreation	2	1.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	93	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.63	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	94	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	40	22.67	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	95	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	17	9.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	96	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.55	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	97	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	184	104.6	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	98	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	31	17.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	99	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	5	1989	Brown, 1989	40	3	18	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 30,000 Ac/Ft by California Dept. of Fish and Game (DF&G) for Waterfowl and Fish on San Joaquin River				
Recreation	12	10	1989	Brown, 1989	40	4	18	Price paid for water purchase	25 year purchase of 1500 Ac/Ft byCalifornia DF&G for ponds and riparian vegetation				
Recreation	8	7	1990	Brown, 1989	40	7	18	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 67,442 Ac/Ft by the US Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife refuge and duck ponds				

Appendix C

Details of Water Values, Organized by Type of Use

Appendix C provides detailed information regarding the individual water value estimates. The information in this appendix is organized by water use type. Columns in the appendices contain the following information:

Column A	Water use type
Column B	Value of one acre-foot of water in 1994 dollars
Column C	Nominal value of one acre-foot of water as reported in the original study
Column D	Year of the nominal value reported in column C (This may differ from publication date)
Column E	Author and year of the study
Column F	Number identifying the study among the forty one studies cited
Column G	Number identifying an individual value within a study
Column H	Water resources region for which the reported value was estimated
Column I	Methodology for estimating the water value
Column J	Additional notes regarding the water value
Column K	Name of the irrigated crop or the hydroelectric power site associated with a value
Column L	Feet of head at the hydroelectric power site
Column M	Cumulative feet of head at the hydroelectric power site and downstream hydroelectric power sites
Column N	Cumulative kilowatt hours of power generated at the hydroelectric power site and downstream hydroelectric power sites

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Hydropower													
Region 6 Hydropower Values													
Hydropower	1	0.78	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	28	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Kentucky	50	50	43.5
Hydropower	3	1.49	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	29	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Pickwick Landing	46	96	83.52
Hydropower	5	2.94	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	30	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Wilson	93	189	164.43
Hydropower	6	3.68	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	31	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Wheeler	48	237	206.19
Hydropower	8	4.29	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	32	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Gunterville	39	276	240.12
Hydropower	9	4.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	33	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Nickajack	39	315	274.05
Hydropower	10	5.59	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	34	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Chicka-munga	45	360	313.2
Hydropower	11	6.43	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	35	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Watts Bar	54	414	360.18
Hydropower	13	7.52	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	36	6	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Tennessee River	Fort Loudon	70	484	421.08
Region 14 Hydropower Values													
Hydropower	4	2.51	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	37	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Shoshone	170	170	147.9
Hydropower	7	3.7	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	38	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Palisades	80	250	217.5
Hydropower	21	12.07	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	39	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Glen Canyon	566	816	709.92
Hydropower	23	13.22	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	40	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Parker	78	894	777.78
Hydropower	27	15.16	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	41	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Davis	131	1025	891.75
Hydropower	40	23	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	42	14	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Colorado River	Hoover	530	1555	1352.85
Hydropower	28	28	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	3	14	Optimization model	Colorado River, Upper Basin				
Hydropower	4	2.51	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	1	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		170	170	147.9
Hydropower	7	3.7	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	2	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		80	250	217.5
Hydropower	21	12.07	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	3	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		566	816	709.92
Hydropower	23	13.22	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	4	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		78	894	777.78
Hydropower	27	15.16	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	5	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		131	1025	891.75
Hydropower	40	23	1980	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980	39	6	14	Foregone electricity	Colorado River		530	1555	1352.85

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Hydropower Values													
Hydropower	25	22.05	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	2	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO river basin				
Hydropower	46	41.09	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	4	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO river basin, based on Yr. 2000 projections				
Region 17 Hydropower Values													
Hydropower	39	32	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	4	17	Estimate based on Gibbons[1986]	Bitter Root River, MT				
Hydropower	32	26	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	6	17	Estimate based on Gibbons[1986]	Big Hole River, MT				
Hydropower	2	0.87	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	1	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Bonneville	59	59	51.33
Hydropower	4	2.1	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	2	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	The Dalles	83	142	123.54
Hydropower	6	3.65	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	3	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	John Day	105	247	214.89
Hydropower	8	4.75	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	4	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	McNary	74	321	279.27
Hydropower	10	5.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	5	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Priest Rapids	77	398	346.26
Hydropower	12	7.04	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	6	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Wanpum	78	476	414.12
Hydropower	13	7.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	7	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Rock Island	38	514	447.18
Hydropower	16	8.89	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	8	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Rocky Reach	87	601	522.87
Hydropower	17	9.88	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	9	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Wells	67	668	581.16
Hydropower	22	12.35	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	10	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Chief Joseph	167	835	726.45
Hydropower	31	17.42	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	11	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Columbia River	Grande Coulee	343	1178	1024.86
Hydropower	11	6.2	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	12	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Ice Harbor	98	419	364.53
Hydropower	14	7.68	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	13	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Lower Monu-mental	100	519	451.53
Hydropower	16	9.13	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	14	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Little Goose	98	617	536.79
Hydropower	19	10.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	15	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Lower Granite	100	717	623.79
Hydropower	24	13.71	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	16	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Hells Canyon	210	927	806.49
Hydropower	27	15.49	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	17	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Oxbow	120	1047	910.89
Hydropower	34	19.58	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	18	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Brownlee	277	1324	1151.88
Hydropower	35	19.94	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	19	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Swan Falls	24	1348	1172.76
Hydropower	37	21.24	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	20	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	C.J. Strike	88	1436	1249.32
Hydropower	39	22.27	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	21	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Bliss	70	1506	1310.22

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Stu-dy #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 17 Hydropower Values Continued													
Hydropower	41	23.15	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	22	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	L. Slamon Falls	59	1565	1361.55
Hydropower	43	24.33	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	23	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	U. Salmon Falls	80	1645	1431.15
Hydropower	48	27.47	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	24	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Shoshone	212	1857	1615.59
Hydropower	52	29.64	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	25	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Twin Falls	147	2004	1743.48
Hydropower	53	30.35	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	26	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	Minidoka	48	2052	1785.24
Hydropower	56	31.93	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	27	17	Cost difference between coal and hydro x Cum. kWh/AF	Snake River	American Falls	107	2159	1878.33
Hydropower	113	64	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	1	17	Opportunity cost of power forgone for power generation	SE Idaho			2094	1822
Hydropower	72	41	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	2	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	SW Idaho			1336	1162
Hydropower	12	7	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	3	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	Lower Columbia			242	211
Hydropower	63	36	1980	Whittlesey, 1981	35	4	17	Opportunity cost of forgone power generation	Columbia Basin			1167	1015
Navigation													
Region 5 Navigation Values													
Navigation	483	274.6	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	43	5	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Ohio River				
Region 6 Navigation Values													
Navigation	91	51.86	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	45	6	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Tennessee River				
Region 7 Navigation Values													
Navigation	420	238.7	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	44	7	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Illinois Waterway				
Navigation	10	5.79	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	46	7	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Mississippi River				
Region 8 Navigation Values													
Navigation	10	5.79	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	47	8	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Mississippi River				
Region 10 Navigation Values													
Navigation	0	0.13	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	49	10	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Missouri River				
Region 17 Navigation Values													
Navigation	5	2.65	1980	Gibbons, 1980	10	48	17	Explained in Gibbons(1986) Table 6-1	Columbia /Snake Rivers				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Recreation													
Region 1 Recreation Values													
Recreation	1	0.29	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	1	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.69	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	2	1		Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.67	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	3	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.73	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	4	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	5	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.25	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	6	1	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Region 2 Recreation Values													
Recreation	8	4.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	7	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	8	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.02	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	9	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.65	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	10	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.91	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	11	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.98	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	12	2	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	167	2	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 3 Recreation Values													
Recreation	3	1.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	13	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.05	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	14	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.43	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	15	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.16	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	16	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	4.1	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	17	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	18	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.59	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	19	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	20	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.52	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	21	3	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 4 Recreation Values													
Recreation	1	0.76	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	22	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.84	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	23	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	42	23.65	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	24	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.76	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	25	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	26	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.79	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	27	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	4.23	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	28	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.01	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	29	4	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Region 5 Recreation Values													
Recreation	5	2.69	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	30	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	31	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.54	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	32	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	33	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	34	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.99	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	35	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	36	5	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	168	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	169	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	170	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.19	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	171	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	172	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	173	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	174	5	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 6 Recreation Values													
Recreation	4	2.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	37	6	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	0.96	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	38	6	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	0.96	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	175	6	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	176	6	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 7 Recreation Values													
Recreation	12	7.09	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	39	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.24	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	40	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.4	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	41	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.06	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	42	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	43	7	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.24	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	177	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	4	2.4	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	178	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.06	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	179	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	180	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	181	7	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 8 Recreation Values													
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	44	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	45	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	46	8	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	182	8	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	183	8	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 9 Recreation Values													
Recreation	3	1.44	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	47	9	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 10 Recreation Values													
Recreation	95	78	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	1	10	Dichotomous choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at low flow				
Recreation	84	69	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	2	10	Dichotomous choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at low flow				
Recreation	0	0	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	3	10	Dichotomous choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at high flow				
Recreation	10	8	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	5	10	Dichotomous choice CV/Simulation	Bitterroot River, MT, value at high flow				
Recreation	6	3.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	48	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.29	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	49	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.73	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	50	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	10	5.62	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	51	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	52	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	4	2.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	53	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	84	47.88	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	54	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	11	6.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	55	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	56	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	16	8.89	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	57	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	58	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	59	10	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	184	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	7	3.72	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	185	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	6	3.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	186	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	6	3.41	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	187	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	4	2.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	188	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	189	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	11	6.32	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	190	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	191	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	192	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	193	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.42	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	194	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	195	10	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 10 Recreation Values Continued													
Recreation	3	2	1987	Brown, 1990	40	2	10	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 10,000 Ac/Ft by Montana Dept. Fish, Wildlife and Parks to aid fish survival on the Bitterroot river				
Region 11 Recreation Values													
Recreation	187	106.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	60	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.03	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	61	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	62	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.72	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	63	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	27	15.34	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	64	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2	1.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	65	11	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	9	5.03	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	196	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	197	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.26	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	198	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	3	1.61	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	199	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	2	1.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	200	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.18	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	201	11	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 12 Recreation Values													
Recreation	3	1.59	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	66	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	7	3.75	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	67	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	68	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	15	8.64	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	69	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.14	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	70	12	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Region 13 Recreation Values													
Recreation	1615	1073	1982	Ward, 1987	6	1	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at low flow				
Recreation	6	4	1982	Ward, 1987	6	2	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at high flow				
Recreation	1505	1000	1982	Ward, 1987	6	3	13	Travel-Cost/Optimal Control Model	Rio Chama River, NM. Values for angling and whitewater, shadow value at normal flow				
Recreation	142	80.85	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	71	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	96	54.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	72	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Stu-dy #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 13 Recreation Values Continued													
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	73	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	170	96.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	74	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	8	4.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	75	13	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	96	54.66	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	202	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	203	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	8	4.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	204	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	36	20.49	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	205	13	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 14 Recreation Values													
Recreation	70	39.94	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	76	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	67	38.36	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	77	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	78	14	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	206	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	65	36.83	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	207	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	208	14	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	7	4	1980	Walsh, 1980	26	1	14	Survey	Colorado reservoir releases, kayaking				
Recreation	5	3	1980	Walsh, 1980	26	2	14	Survey	Colorado reservoir releases, rafting				
Region 15 Recreation Values													
Recreation	154	87.7	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	79	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	80	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	2642	1502	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	81	15	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	209	15	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	62	35.39	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	210	15	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 16 Recreation Values													
Recreation	1	0.856	1982	Rangesan, 1986	5	1	16	Travel-Cost/Simulation	Blacksmith Folk River Northern UT, value at 50% flows				
Recreation	0	0.13	1982	Rangesan, 1986	5	2	16	Travel-Cost/Simulation	Blacksmith Folk River Northern UT, value at actual 1982 flow				
Recreation	13	7.12	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	82	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	3.38	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	83	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 16 Recreation Values Continued													
Recreation	461	261.9	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	84	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	17	9.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	85	16	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	11	9	1987	Brown, 1990	40	1	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchased right to 3000 Ac/ft. Maintain lake level for fishing and boating, Lander Co. NV				
Recreation	13	11	1989	Brown, 1990	40	5	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchase of rights by the Nevada Waterfowl Assoc for 32 Ac/Ft for the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge				
Recreation	16	14	1989	Brown, 1990	40	6	16	Price paid for water purchase	Purchase of rights by the Nevada Waterfowl Assoc for 400 Ac/Ft for the Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge				
Region 17 Recreation Values													
Recreation	3	2.36	1988	Johnson and Adams, 1988	7	1	17	Contingent-Valuation	John Day River, OR. Values for steelhead fishing only, value during summer				
Recreation	0	0.18	1988	Johnson and Adams, 1988	7	2	17	Contingent-Valuation	John Day River, OR. Values for steelhead fishing only, value during winter				
Recreation	1	0.56	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	86	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	87	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	3	1.57	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	88	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.35	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	89	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	90	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.16	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	91	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	1	0.36	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	92	17	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	211	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	212	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	1	0.35	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	213	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Recreation	0	0.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	214	17	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin	Downstream fishing benefits out of area				
Region 18 Recreation Values													
Recreation	3	3.34	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	1	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, average				
Recreation	9	8.62	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	2	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, average				
Recreation	21	20.4	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	3	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, average				
Recreation	7	6.43	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	4	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, average				
Recreation	8	7.7	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	5	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, average				
Recreation	1	0.93	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	6	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, average				
Recreation	4	3.71	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	7	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	10	9.57	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	8	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	23	22.66	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	9	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	7	7.15	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	10	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	9	8.55	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	11	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, upper value				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Stu-dy #	(G) Est. #	(H) Reg ion	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 18 Recreation Values Continued													
Recreation	1	1.03	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	12	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	3	2.99	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	13	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	8	7.7	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	14	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	19	18.24	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	15	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Mendota NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	6	5.75	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	16	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	San Luis NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	7	6.88	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	17	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Volta NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	1	0.83	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	18	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation Poisson Regression	Merced NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.3	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	19	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	6	5.94	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	20	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	14	14.05	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	21	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	5	4.43	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	22	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	5	5.3	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	23	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	1	0.64	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	24	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, average value				
Recreation	4	3.84	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	25	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	10	9.92	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	26	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	24	23.48	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	27	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	8	7.4	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	28	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	9	8.86	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	29	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	1	1.07	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	30	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, upper value				
Recreation	1	0.91	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	31	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Kesterson NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.35	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	32	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Los Banos NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	6	5.55	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	33	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Mendota NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	1.75	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	34	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	San Luis NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	2	2.1	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	35	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Volta NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	0	0.25	1993	Cooper, 1993	3	36	18	Travel-Cost/Simulation OLS Regression	Merced NWR CA, lower value				
Recreation	352	303	1989	Creel and Loomis, 1992	8	1	18	Travel-Cost, linked site selection & frequency models	Five NWRs and three State WMAs in the San Jaoquin Valley				
Recreation	404	348	1989	Creel and Loomis, 1992	8	2	18	Travel-Cost, linked site selection & frequency models	Kern and Pixley refuges in the San Jaoquin Valley, which have undependable water supplies.				
Recreation	2	1.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	93	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	5	2.63	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	94	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	40	22.67	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	95	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	17	9.81	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	96	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	12	6.55	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	97	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	184	104.6	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	98	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	31	17.47	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	99	18	Decrease in fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, intrabasin	Fishing benefits within area				
Recreation	6	5	1989	Brown, 1990	40	3	18	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 30,000 Ac/Ft by California Dept. of Fish and Game (DF&G) for waterfowl and fish on San Joaquin River				
Recreation	12	10	1989	Brown, 1990	40	4	18	Price paid for water purchase	25 year purchase of 1500 Ac/Ft byCA DF&G for ponds and riparian vegetation				
Recreation	8	7	1990	Brown, 1990	40	7	18	Price paid for water purchase	One-time purchase of 67,442 Ac/Ft by the US Fish and Wildlife Service for wildlife refuge and duck ponds				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region ? Recreation Values													
Recreation	32	16.8	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	1	?	Indeterminant	Value for fishing, low flow				
Recreation	21	11.13	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	2	?	Indeterminant	Shoreline recreation, low flow				
Recreation	12	6.08	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	3	?	Indeterminant	Whitewater recreation, low flow				
Recreation	21	10.79	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	4	?	Indeterminant	Value for fishing, normal August flow				
Recreation	17	8.6	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	5	?	Indeterminant	Shoreline recreation, normal August flow				
Recreation	12	6.08	1979	Duabert and Young, 1979	36	6	?	Indeterminant	Whitewater recreation, normal August flow				
Waste Disposal													
Region 1 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	2	1.25	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	1	1	Regional values for BOD dillution	New England				
Region 2 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	4	2.41	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	2	2	Regional values for BOD dillution	Deleware and Hudson				
Waste Disposal	1	0.68	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	3	2	Regional values for BOD dillution	Chesapeake				
Region 3 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	1	0.37	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	13	3	Regional values for BOD dillution	Southeast				
Region 4 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	2	0.94	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	5	4	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Lakes East				
Waste Disposal	1	0.37	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	6	4	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Lakes West				
Region 5 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	6	3.41	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	4	5	Regional values for BOD dillution	Ohio				
Waste Disposal	2	1.05	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	14	5	Regional values for BOD dillution	Cumberland				
Region 6 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	15	6	Regional values for BOD dillution	Tennessee				
Region 7 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	8	4.57	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	7	7	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper Mississippi				
Region 8 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	5	2.98	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	8	8	Regional values for BOD dillution	Lower Mississippi				
Region 10 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	2	1.16	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	9	10	Regional values for BOD dillution	Lower Missouri				
Waste Disposal	12	6.81	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	10	10	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper Missouri				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 11 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	3	1.47	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	11	11	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper Arkansas-White-Red				
Waste Disposal	3	1.99	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	12	11	Regional values for BOD dillution	Upper-Arkansas-White-Red				
Region 12 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	1	0.68	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	16	12	Regional values for BOD dillution	Western Gulf				
Region 13 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	1	0.79	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	17	13	Regional values for BOD dillution	Rio Grandes				
Region 14 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	18	14	Regional values for BOD dillution	Colorado				
Region 15 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	0	0.15	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	19	15	Regional values for BOD dillution	Colorado				
Region 16 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	1	0.42	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	20	16	Regional values for BOD dillution	Great Basin				
Region 17 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	0	0.2	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	23	17	Regional values for BOD dillution	Pacific Northwest				
Region 18 Waste Disposal Values													
Waste Disposal	1	0.74	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	21	18	Regional values for BOD dillution	Southern Pacific				
Waste Disposal	1	0.48	1980	Gray and Young, 1974	33	22	18	Regional values for BOD dillution	Central Pacific				
Domestic													
Region 3 Domestic Values													
Domestic	37	21	1980	Danielson, 1977	28	1	3	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Summer Value				
Domestic	37	21	1980	Danielson, 1977	28	2	3	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Winter Value				
Region 15 Domestic Values													
Domestic	144	82	1980	Young, 1973	27	1	15	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Summer value				
Domestic	49	28	1980	Young, 1973	27	2	15	Value for a 10% quantity reduction	Winter value				
Region ? Domestic Values													
Domestic	324	184	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	6	?	Indeterminant	Value for domestic lawn watering				
Domestic	573	326	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	7	?	Indeterminant	Value for indoor domestic use				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Industrial Processing													
Region ? Industrial Processing Values													
Industrial processing	90	51	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	3	?	Indeterminent	Chemicals Industry				
Industrial processing	113	64	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	4	?	Indeterminent	Paper manufacturing				
Industrial processing	28	16	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	5	?	Indeterminent	Minerals industry				
Industrial processing	132	75	1980	Russell, 1970	30	2	?	Marginal recycling cost	Beet sugar processing				
Industrial processing	234	133	1980	Kollar, 1976	31	1	?	Cost to induce dye absorbtion treatment	Cotton textile finishing				
Industrial processing	575	327	1980	Kane and Ostantowski, 1981	32	1	?	marginal costs of waste water recycling	Low Est. Meat packing industry				
Industrial processing	802	456	1980	Kane and Ostantowski, 1981	32	2	?	marginal costs of waste water recycling	High Est. Meat packing industry				
Irrigation													
Region 2 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	198	112.5	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	100	2	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Region 3 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	57	32.27	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	101	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	102	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Multiple			
Irrigation	19	10.84	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	103	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	104	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	25	13.95	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	105	3	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Hay			
Region 6 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	19	10.82	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	106	6	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model		Hay			
Region 7 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	41	23.17	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	107	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	108	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	109	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	110	7	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Stu-dy #	(G) Est. #	(H) Reg ion	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 8 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	50	28.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	111	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	112	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	12	7.01	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	113	8	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Region 9 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	114	9	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Region 10 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	49	40	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	7	10	Difference between irrigated/nonirrigated returns	Bitterroot River, MT				
Irrigation	23	19	1988	Duffield, 1992	4	8	10	Difference between irrigated/nonirigated returns	Big Hole River, MT				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	115	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	116	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	117	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	118	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	119	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	120	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	4	2.21	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	121	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	42	24.15	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	122	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	123	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	15	8.63	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	124	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	125	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	8	4.58	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	126	10	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	77	32	1976	Kaleta, 1976	34	1	10	marginal value of irrigation water in nongroundwater areas	Eastern Colorado	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Young, 1984	25	1	10	Indeterminate	Colorado, Platte Basin	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Young, 1984	25	2	10	Indeterminate	Colorado, Platte Basin	Sugar beets			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 11 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	127	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	48	27.11	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	128	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	110	62.27	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	129	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	130	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	131	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	132	11	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	113	64	1980	Shulstad, R.N., et al	21	1	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	86	49	1980	Shulstad, et al.,1982	21	2	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	60	34	1980	Shulstad, et al.,1982	21	3	11	Farm crop budget analysis (compared dryland to irrigated cultivation)	Arkansas	Lettuce			
Irrigation	76	32	1976	Kaleta, 1976	34	2	11	marginal value of irrigation water in nongroundwater areas	Eastern Colorado	Wheat			
Region 12 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	21	12.08	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	133	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	134	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	30	17.3	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	135	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	136	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	137	12	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	98	56	1980	Condra, 1975	14	1	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Cotton			
Irrigation	121	69	1980	Condra, 1975	14	2	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	69	39	1980	Condra, 1975	14	3	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Wheat			
Irrigation	127	72	1980	Condra, 1975	14	4	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Sugar beets			
Irrigation	14	8	1980	Condra, 1975	14	5	12	Farm crop budget, values net of groundwater pumping costs (1st unit)	Texas high plains	Wheat			
Irrigation	100	57	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	1	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Potatoes			
Irrigation	199	113	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	2	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Potatoes			
Irrigation	62	35	1980	Hoyt, 1982	15	3	12	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Texas	Corn			
Irrigation	118	67	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	1	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Grain sorghum (early)			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 12 Irrigation Values Continued													
Irrigation	134	76	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	2	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Grain sorghum (early)			
Irrigation	167	95	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	3	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	56	32	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	4	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	5	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Vegetables			
Irrigation	178	101	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	6	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion II	Wheat			
Irrigation	47	27	1980	Lacewell, 1974	19	7	12	Farm crop budget analysis (revenue less non-water input costs).	Texas, subregion I	Wheat			
Region 13 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	138	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	139	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	140	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	24	13.57	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	141	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	142	13	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	1	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Cotton			
Irrigation	91	52	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	2	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	107	61	1980	Hoyt, 1982	16	3	13	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	New Mexico	Soybeans			
Region 14 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	18	18	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	1	14	Optimization Model	Colorado River, Upper Basin				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	143	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	144	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	145	14	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Region 15 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	19	19	1994	Booker and Young, 1994	2	2	15	Optimization Model	Colorado River, Lower Basin				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	146	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	147	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	148	15	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	1	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	98	56	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	2	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Irrigation Values Continued													
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	3	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Ayer and Hoyt, 1981	11	4	15	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Arizona				
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	1	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Wheat			
Irrigation	72	41	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	2	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	47	27	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	2	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Corn			
Irrigation	62	35	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	3	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	157	89	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	4	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	292	166	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	5	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	5	3	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	6	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Tomatoes			
Irrigation	33	19	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	7	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	5	3	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	8	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	49	28	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	9	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Barley			
Irrigation	120	68	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	10	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Barley			
Irrigation	153	87	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	11	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	206	117	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	12	15	Farm crop budget	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Cotton			
Irrigation	53	30	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	13	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Grain sorghum (late)			
Irrigation	56	32	1980	Kelso, 1973	18	14	15	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	AZ, Roos. Water conservation district and Salt River project, low estimate	Grain sorghum (late)			
Irrigation	42	24	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	1	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Corn			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	2	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Corn			
Irrigation	550	313	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	3	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Cotton			
Irrigation	90	51	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	4	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	114	65	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	5	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	6	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Soybeans			
Irrigation	208	118	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	7	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Wheat			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	8	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	1071	609	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	9	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Barley			
Irrigation	123	70	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	10	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Carrotts			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Martin and Snyder, 1979	20	11	15	Farm crop budget, short-run.	Arizona, Salt River Project	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	1	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Sugar Beets			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 15 Irrigation Values Continued													
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	2	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	3	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Apples			
Irrigation	21	12	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	4	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Corn			
Irrigation	9	5	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	5	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Hops			
Irrigation	14	8	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	6	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Pears			
Irrigation	40	23	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	7	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Wheat			
Irrigation	58	33	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	8	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	67	38	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	9	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	97	55	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	10	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	88	50	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	11	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Barley			
Irrigation	28	16	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	12	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Barley			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	13	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Barley			
Irrigation	67	38	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	14	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	69	39	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	15	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Cotton (pima)			
Irrigation	86	49	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	16	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	77	44	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	17	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	118	67	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	18	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	19	11	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	19	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Maricopa County	Cotton (upland)			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	20	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pinal County	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	21	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Pima County	Safflower			
Irrigation	42	24	1980	Willitt, 1975	24	22	15	Farm crop budget analysis including fixed costs.	Arizona, Cochise County	Safflower			
Irrigation	49	38	1986	Bush and Martin, 1986	37	1	15	Short run marginal value product	Value for 3 central AZ counties	Wheat			
Irrigation	173	133	1986	Bush and Martin, 1986	37	2	15	Short run marginal value product	Value for 3 central AZ counties	Wheat			
Irrigation	8	6.96	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	1	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO river basin	Wheat			
Irrigation	18	15.86	1990	Brown, et al., 1990	41	3	15	Network flow model	Flow change from the Arapaho Natl. Forest are valued, for the entire CO river basin, based on Yr. 2000 projections	Alfalfa			

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 16 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	149	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	150	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	151	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	152	16	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Region 17 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	31	31.06	1994	Aillery, 1994	1	1	17	Unstated	Loss in agricultural output, high estimate				
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	153	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	154	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	155	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	156	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	157	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	158	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	159	17	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	253	144	1980	Ayer, 1983	12	1	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Washington				
Irrigation	104	59	1980	Ayer, 1983	12	2	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Washington				
Irrigation	1228	698	1980	Ayer, et al., 1983	13	1	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Idaho				
Irrigation	496	282	1980	Ayer, et al., 1983	13	2	17	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	Idaho	Alfalfa			
Irrigation	18	10	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	1	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Cotton			
Irrigation	151	86	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	2	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Melons			
Irrigation	55	31	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	3	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Melons			
Irrigation	18	10	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	4	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Potatoes			
Irrigation	137	78	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	5	17	Farm crop budget.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Safflower			
Irrigation	91	52	1980	Washington State U., 1972	23	6	17	Farm crop budget; numbers indicate price ranges in which crops become competitive.	Washington, Yakima River Basin	Safflower			
Region 18 Irrigation Values													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	160	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	756	429.9	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	161	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	162	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	163	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	164	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					

(A) Water Use Type	(B) 1994 Value	(C) Orig. Undef Value	(D) Orig. Val. Year	(E) Study Author	(F) Study #	(G) Est. #	(H) Region	(I) Valuation Method	(J) Notes	(K) Crop / Power Plant	(L) Ft. of Head	(M) Cum. Ft. Head	(N) Cum. kWh
Region 18 Irrigation Values Continued													
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	165	18	Shadow prices from Natl. Agricultural Resources interregional LP model					
Irrigation	0	0	1980	Hansen and Hallam, 1990	9	166	18	Decreased fishing days, (valued @$10/day) due to flow changes, extrabasin					
Irrigation	125	71	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	1	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California, low Est.	Wheat			
Irrigation	227	129	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	2	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California, high Est.	Corn			
Irrigation	686	390	1980	Kelley and Ayer, 1982	17	3	18	Values calculated at 10% reductions from yield maximizing level.	California	Grain sorghum			
Irrigation	46	26	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	1	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Onions (dry)			
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	2	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Potatoes			
Irrigation	72	41	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	3	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Sugar Beets			
Irrigation	44	25	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	4	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Wheat			
Irrigation	65	37	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	5	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley	Cotton			
Irrigation	70	40	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	6	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Rice			
Irrigation	37	21	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	7	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Soybeans			
Irrigation	46	26	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	8	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Alfalfa hay			
Irrigation	49	28	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	9	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 1	Barley			
Irrigation	26	15	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	10	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Beans (dry)			
Irrigation	39	22	1980	Shumway, 1973	22	11	18	Farm crop budget, long-run.	California, W. San Joaquin Valley, region 2	Beans (dry)			
Thermoelectric Power													
Region 14 Thermoelectric Values													
Thermo-electric Power	63	32.59	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	1	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model	Water availability for Navajo indian irrigation project				
Thermo-electric Power	63	32.59	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	2	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model, and 30% water reduction	Water availability for Navajo indian irrigation project				
Thermo-electric Power	40	20.97	1979	Gisser, 1979	38	3	14	Payment by utility to compensate farm welfare loss based on LP model, and 30% water reduction	Water availability for Navajo indian irrigation project				
Region ? Thermoelectric Values													
Thermo-electric Power	11	6	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	1	?	Cost of moving from once through to evaporative cooling systems	Low estimate, electricity sector				
Thermo-electric Power	18	10	1980	Young, et al., 1972	29	2	?	Cost of moving from once through to evaporative cooling systems	High estimate, electricity sector				
Thermo-electric Power	9	5	1980	Russell, 1970	30	1	?	Indeterminent	Electricity sector				

References

A study number is included for the references used in appendices B and C. The study number following each reference corresponds to the number in column F in the appendices.

Aillery, Marcel P., Paul Bertels, Joseph C. Cooper, Micheal R. Moore, Stephen J. Vogel, and Marca Weinberg, 1994 "Salmon Recovery in the Pacific Northwest: Summary of Agricultural and Other Economic Effects." *USDA ERS Agricultural Information Bulletin No. 699* (Study Number 1)

Ayer, Harry W., 1983a "Crop Water Production Functions: Economic Implications for Washington." *USDA ERS Report No. AGES-830314*, Washington, D.C. (Study Number 12)

Ayer Harry. W., 1983b "Crop-Water Production Functions for Potatoes and Dry Beans in Idaho." *USDA ERS Report No. AGES - 830302,* Washington, D.C. (Study Number 13)

Ayer, Harry W. and Paul G. Hoyt, 1981 "Crop Water Production Functions: Economic Implications for Arizona". *Technical Bulletin No. 242,* University of Arizona Agricultural Experiment Station (Study Number 11)

Booker, J.F. and Robert A. Young, 1994 "Modeling Interstate and Intrastate Markets For Colorado River Water Resources." *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 26(1):66-87 (Study Number 2)

Brown, Thomas C., Benjamin L. Harding and Elizabeth A. Payton, 1990 "Marginal Economic Value of Streamflow: A Case Study for the Colorado River Basin." *Water Resources Research* 26(12):2845-2859 (Study Number 41)

Brown, Thomas C., 1989 "Water for Wilderness Areas: Instream Flow Needs, Protection, and Economic Value." *Rivers* 2(4) (Study Number 40)

Bush, David B. and William E. Martin, 1986 "Potential Costs and Benefits to Arizona Agriculture of the Central Arizona Project." *University of Arizona College of Agriculture Technical Bulletin No. 254* (Study Number 37)

Condra, Gary. D. and Ronald D. Lacewell, 1975 "Effects of Alternative Product and Input Prices on Demand for Irrigation Water:Texas High Plains." *Dept. Agricultural Economics Information Report No. 75-1.* Texas A & M University (Study Number 14)

Cooper, Joseph C. and John Loomis 1993 "Testing Whether Waterfowl Hunting Benefits Increase with Greater Water Deliveries to Wetlands Environmental and Resource Economics." Environmental & Resource Economics 3(6): 545-561. (Study Number 3)

Creel, Michael and John Loomis, 1992 "Recreation Value to Wetlands in the San Joaquin Valley: Linked Multinomial Logit and Count Data Trip Frequency Models." *Water Resources Research* 28(10):2597-2606. (Study Number 8)

References continued

Danielson, Leon E., 1977 "Estimation of Residential Water Demand." *Economic Research Report No. 39* North Carolina State University at Raleigh (Study Number 28)

Duabert, John T. and Robert A.Young, 1979 "Economic Benefits From Instream Flow in a Colorado Mountain Stream", *Colorado Water Resources Research Institute, Completion Report No. 91* (Study Number 36)

Duffield, John W., C.J. Neher and ThomasC. Brown, 1992 "Recreation Benefits of Instream Flow: Application to Montana's Big Hole and Bitterroot Rivers." *Water Resources Research* 28(9): 2169-2181. (Study Number 4)

Economic Report of the President: Transmitted to Congress February 1995 United States Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (Study Number 42)

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 1980 "Hydroelectric Power Resources of the U.S., Developed & Undeveloped." Washington, D.C. United States Printing Office (Study Number 39)

Gibbons, Diana C., 1980 The Economic Value of Water A Study From Resources For The Future, John Hopkins University Press (Study Number 10)

Gisser, Micha, Robert R. Lansford, William D. Gorman, Bobby J. Creel and Mark Evans, 1979 "Water Trade-Off Between Electric Energy and Agriculture in the Four Corners." *Water Resources Reseach* 15(3):529-538 (Study Number 38)

Gray, S. Lee and Robert A. Young, 1974 "The Economic Value of Water for Waste Dilution." *Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation* 46(7) (Study Number 33)

Hansen, LeRoy T.and Arne Hallam, 1990 "National Estimates of the Recreational Value of Streamflow, Water Allocation Tradeoffs: Irrigation and Recreation." *USDA ERS No.634* (Study Number 9)

Hoyt, Paul G., 1982a "A Model for Estimating Demand for Irrigation Water on the Texas High Plains." *Texas Water Resources Institute Technical Report No. 68* Texas A & M University (Study Number 15)

Hoyt, Paul G., 1982b "Crop Water Production Functions: Economic implications for New Mexico" *USDA ERS Report No. AGES - 821201* Washington DC (Study Number 16)

Johnson, Neal S., and Richard M. Adams, 1988 "Benefits of Increased Streamflow: The Case of John Day River Steelhead Fishery." *Water Resources Research* 24(11):1839-1846 (Study Number 7)

References continued

Kaleta, Ghebreyohannes, 1976 "Economics of Cost-Sharing Arrangements for Public Irrigation Projects." M.S.Thesis. Dept. Economics Colorado State University at Fort Collins (Study Number 34)

Kane, James and Ostantowski Richard, 1981 "An Evaluation of Water Reuse Using Advanced Waste Treatment at a Meat Packing Plant." Proceedings of the 35th Industrial Wastes Conference. p617-624 (Study Number 32)

Kelley, Sharon and Harry W. Ayer, 1982 "Water Conservation Alternatives for California Agriculture." *USDA ERS Report No. AGES - 820417*, Washington, D.C. (Study Number 17)

Kelso, Maurice M., William E. Martin and Lawrence E. Mack, 1973 Water Supplies and Economic Growth in an Arid Environment. University of Arizona Press, Tucson (Study Number 18)

Kollar, K.L., Robert Brewer and Patrick H. McAuley, 1976 "An Analysis of Price/Cost Sensitivity of Water Use in Selected Manufacturing Industries." Bureau of Domestic Commerce Staff Study (Study Number 31)

Lacewell, Ronald D., J. Michael Sprott and Bruce R. Beattie, 1974 "Value of Irrigation Water with Alternative Input Prices, Product Prices and Yield Levels." *Texas Water Resources Institute Tech. Report No. 58* Texas A & M University (Study Number 19)

Martin, William E. and Gary B. Snyder, 1979 "Valuation of Water and Forage from the Salt-Verde Basin of Arizona." Report to the U.S. Forest Service (Study Number 20)

Rangesan, Narayan, 1986 "Evaluation of Recreational Benefits of Instream Flows." *Journal of Leisure Research* 18(2):116-128. (Study Number 5)

Russell, Clifford S., 1970 "Industrial Water Use." Report to the National Water Commission, sec.2 (Study Number 30)

Shulstad, Robert N., Eddie D. Cross and Ralph D. May., 1982 "The Estimated Value of Water in Arkansas." *Arkansas Farm Research* 27(6) (Study Number 21)

Shumway, C.R., 1973 "Derived Demand for Irrigation Water:The California Aqueduct." *Southern Journal of Agricultural Economics* 5(2) (Study Number 22)

Solley, Wayne B., Robert R. Pierce and Howard A. Perlman, 1993 Estimated Use of Water in the United States in 1992. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1081. U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver Colorado

References continued

Walsh, Richard G., Ray K. Ericson, Daniel J Arosteguy and Michael P. Hansen, 1980 "An Empirical Application of a Model for Estimating the Recreation Value of Instream Flow ." *Colorado Water Resources Institute Completion Report No. 101* Fort Collins, Colorado (Study Number 26)

Ward, Frank A., 1987 "Economics of Water Allocation to Instream Uses in a Fully Appropriated River Basin: Evidence From a New Mexico Wild River." *Water Resources Research* 23(3): 381-392. (Study Number 6)

Washington State University, 1972 "Irrigation Development Potential and Economic Impacts Related to Water Use in the Yakima River Basin." Paper for the Yakima Valley Natural Resources Development Association (Study Number 23)

Whittlesey, Norman K., 1981 "Energy Tradeoffs and Economic Feasibility of Irrigation Development in the Pacific Northwest." *Washington State University College of Agriculture Bulletin 0896,* tables 8, 9 and 10 (Study Number 35)

Willitt, Gayle S., Scott Hathorn and Charles E. Robertson, 1975 "The Economic Value of Water to Irrigate Field Crops in Central and South Arizona." *Dept. Agricultural Economics, Report No. 9.* University of Arizona, Tucson (Study Number 24)

Young, Robert A., 1984 Direct and Indirect Regional Economic Impacts of Competition for Irrigation Water, Water Scarcity: Impacts on Western Agriculture. University of California Press (Study Number 25)

Young, Robert A., 1973 "Price Elasticity of Demand for Municipal Water:Tuscon Arizona." *Water Resources Research* 9(4):1068-1072 (Study Number 27)

Young, Robert A. and S. Lee Gray, 1972 "Economic Value of Water: Concepts and Empirical Estimates." *Techical Report to the National Water Commission NTIS No. PB210356* (Study Number 29)