

Manuscript: Incorporating Impact Assessment for Low Water Conditions on the Great Lakes

Author(s): Coastal Zone Technical Working Group

Name of Reviewer: Dr. R. Derek Bjonback

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Are the objectives of the work clearly stated? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Are the methods employed valid, appropriate and sufficient to address the questions, hypotheses or the problem? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Are the observations, conclusions and recommendations supported by the material presented in the manuscript (e.g., data, model and analyses)? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Are the assumptions used valid and are the mathematics presented correct? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Is the manuscript well organized, material precise and to the point, and clearly written using correct grammar and syntax? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Are all of the figures and tables useful, clear, and necessary? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. What is the quality of the overall work? | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Recommendation (please circle your response)

A - acceptable

B - acceptable with suggestions for revision (this is my choice)

C - acceptable if adequately revised

D - unacceptable

If you have selected **C**, do you wish to receive the revised manuscript for further review?

yes no

Rating (Circle the rating you would like to give this manuscript. Unacceptable work should be given a score of 40 or less.)

100 90 80 **70** 60 50 40 30 20 10 0

Comments (limit responses to one paragraph for each question; reference pages, charts, and data. Please distinguish if responses are of major or minor concerns.)

- A. What is the best/most unique part of the analysis?
- B. What is the most critical aspect of the study/analysis? Why?
- C. Which aspect of the analysis/modeling is weakest? Why? How can it be improved?
- D. Are there any other suggestions that are related to how this analysis may be used more effectively or the results explicated in a more understandable manner?

Please indicate any confidential comments to the Co-Chair(s) of the Independent Peer Review Group in the space below. Comments for transmission to the author(s) should be on a separate sheet attached.

Please see my attached comments. I hope these are sufficient to address A through D.

Signature: R.D. Bjonback Date: March 11, 2011

Comments for Transmission to Authors

Please see my attached comments dated February 12, 2011.

In summary, the report does an adequate and thorough job in reviewing the literature that could be applied to the economic assessment of implications for low water conditions on the Great Lakes. I would support the overall thrust of the report which recommends the use of the hedonic pricing method (HPM). My comments on the report make some suggestions how the report could be improved to make this case even stronger. For example my comments in the paragraph beginning "Also the effect ...", and comments on pages 9, 51, and 54 are intended to strengthen the analyses and conclusions. I also make a recommendation that Contingent Value studies be undertaken at all sites as a check to the HPM results. I understand that this may not be supported by the study budgets that are in place. I would support sharing my comments here and within the attachment with the authors.