

§ 11.83

accordance with § 11.72 of this part and compare those services with services now provided by the injured resources, that is, the with-a-discharge-or-release condition. All estimates of the with-a-discharge-or-release condition shall incorporate consideration of the ability of the resources to recover as determined in § 11.73 of this part.

(c) *Range of possible alternatives.* (1) The possible alternatives considered by the authorized official that return the injured resources to their baseline level of services could range from intensive action on the part of the authorized official to return the various resources and services provided by those resources to baseline conditions as quickly as possible, to natural recovery with minimal management actions. Possible alternatives within this range could reflect varying rates of recovery, combinations of management actions, and needs for resource replacements or acquisitions.

(2) An alternative considering natural recovery with minimal management actions, based upon the “No Action-Natural Recovery” determination made in § 11.73(a)(1) of this part, shall be one of the possible alternatives considered.

(d) *Factors to consider when selecting the alternative to pursue.* When selecting the alternative to pursue, the authorized official shall evaluate each of the possible alternatives based on all relevant considerations, including the following factors:

(1) Technical feasibility, as that term is used in this part.

(2) The relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits from the restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent resources.

(3) Cost-effectiveness, as that term is used in this part.

(4) The results of any actual or planned response actions.

(5) Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts, to the injured resources or other resources.

(6) The natural recovery period determined in § 11.73(a)(1) of this part.

(7) Ability of the resources to recover with or without alternative actions.

(8) Potential effects of the action on human health and safety.

(9) Consistency with relevant Federal, State, and tribal policies.

(10) Compliance with applicable Federal, State, and tribal laws.

(e) A Federal authorized official shall not select an alternative that requires acquisition of land for Federal management unless the Federal authorized official determines that restoration, rehabilitation, and/or other replacement of the injured resources is not possible.

[59 FR 14284, Mar. 25, 1994, as amended at 73 FR 57266, Oct. 2, 2008; 73 FR 65274, Nov. 3, 2008]

§ 11.83 Damage determination phase—use value methodologies.

(a) *General.* (1) This section contains guidance and methodologies for determining: The costs of the selected alternative for (i) the restoration or rehabilitation of the injured natural resources to a condition where they can provide the level of services available at baseline, or (ii) the replacement and/or acquisition of equivalent natural resources capable of providing such services; and the compensable value of the services lost to the public through the completion of the baseline restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent natural resources.

(2)(i) The authorized official shall select among the cost estimating and valuation methodologies set forth in this section, or methodologies that meet the acceptance criterion of either paragraph (b)(3) or (c)(3) of this section.

(ii) The authorized official shall define the objectives to be achieved by the application of the methodologies.

(iii) The authorized official shall follow the guidance provided in this section for choosing among the methodologies that will be used in the Damage Determination phase.

(iv) The authorized official shall describe his selection of methodologies and objectives in the Restoration and Compensation Determination Plan.

(3) The authorized official shall determine that the following criteria have been met when choosing among the cost estimating and valuation methodologies. The authorized official shall document this determination in

the Report of the Assessment. Only those methodologies shall be chosen:

(i) That are feasible and reliable for a particular incident and type of damage to be measured.

(ii) That can be performed at a reasonable cost, as that term is used in this part.

(iii) That avoid double counting or that allow any double counting to be estimated and eliminated in the final damage calculation.

(iv) That are cost-effective, as that term is used in this part.

(4) Factors that may be considered by trustees to evaluate the feasibility and reliability of methodologies can include:

(i) Is the methodology capable of providing information of use in determining the restoration cost or compensable value appropriate for a particular natural resource injury?

(ii) Does the methodology address the particular natural resource injury and associated service loss in light of the nature, degree, and spatial and temporal extent of the injury?

(iii) Has the methodology been subject to peer review, either through publication or otherwise?

(iv) Does the methodology enjoy general or widespread acceptance by experts in the field?

(v) Is the methodology subject to standards governing its application?

(vi) Are methodological inputs and assumptions supported by a clearly articulated rationale?

(vii) Are cutting edge methodologies tested or analyzed sufficiently so as to be reasonably reliable under the circumstances?

(5) All of the above factors may not be applicable to every case, and other factors may be considered to evaluate feasibility and reliability. The authorized official shall document any consideration of factors deemed applicable in the Report of Assessment.

(b) *Costs of restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent resources.* (1) Costs for restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent resources are the amount of money determined by the authorized official as necessary to complete all actions identified in the selected alternative for restoration, re-

habilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent resources, as selected in the Restoration and Compensation Determination Plan of § 11.81 of this part. Such costs shall include direct and indirect costs, consistent with the provisions of this section.

(i) Direct costs are those that are identified by the authorized official as attributed to the selected alternative. Direct costs are those charged directly to the conduct of the selected alternative including, but not limited to, the compensation of employees for the time and effort devoted to the completion of the selected alternative; cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of the action; equipment and other capital expenditures; and other items of expense identified by the authorized official that are expected to be incurred in the performance of the selected alternative.

(ii) Indirect costs are costs of activities or items that support the selected alternative, but that cannot practically be directly accounted for as costs of the selected alternative. The simplest example of indirect costs is traditional overhead, e.g., a portion of the lease costs of the buildings that contain the offices of trustee employees involved in work on the selected alternative may, under some circumstances, be considered as an indirect cost. In referring to costs that cannot practically be directly accounted for, this subpart means to include costs that are not readily assignable to the selected alternative without a level of effort disproportionate to the results achieved.

(iii) An indirect cost rate for overhead costs may, at the discretion of the authorized official, be applied instead of calculating indirect costs where the benefits derived from the estimation of indirect costs do not outweigh the costs of the indirect cost estimation. When an indirect cost rate is used, the authorized official shall document the assumptions from which that rate has been derived.

(2) *Cost estimating methodologies.* The authorized official may choose among the cost estimating methodologies listed in this section or may choose other

methodologies that meet the acceptance criterion in paragraph (b)(3) of this section. Nothing in this section precludes the use of a combination of cost estimating methodologies so long as the authorized official does not double count or uses techniques that allow any double counting to be estimated and eliminated in the final damage calculation.

(i) *Comparison methodology.* This methodology may be used for unique or difficult design and estimating conditions. This methodology requires the construction of a simple design for which an estimate can be found and applied to the unique or difficult design.

(ii) *Unit methodology.* This methodology derives an estimate based on the cost per unit of a particular item. Many other names exist for describing the same basic approach, such as order of magnitude, lump sum, module estimating, flat rates, and involve various refinements. Data used by this methodology may be collected from technical literature or previous cost expenditures.

(iii) *Probability methodologies.* Under these methodologies, the cost estimate represents an “average” value. These methodologies require information which is called certain, or deterministic, to derive the expected value of the cost estimate. Expected value estimates and range estimates represent two types of probability methodologies that may be used.

(iv) *Factor methodology.* This methodology derives a cost estimate by summing the product of several items or activities. Other terms such as ratio and percentage methodologies describe the same basic approach.

(v) *Standard time data methodology.* This methodology provides for a cost estimate for labor. Standard time data are a catalogue of standard tasks typically undertaken in performing a given type of work.

(vi) *Cost- and time-estimating relationships (CERs and TERs).* CERs and TERs are statistical regression models that mathematically describe the cost of an item or activity as a function of one or more independent variables. The regression models provide statistical relationships between cost or time and

physical or performance characteristics of past designs.

(3) *Other cost estimating methodologies.* Other cost estimating methodologies that are based upon standard and accepted cost estimating practices and are cost-effective are acceptable methodologies to determine the costs of restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, and/or acquisition of equivalent resources under this part.

(c) *Compensable value.* (1) *Compensable value* is the amount of money required to compensate the public for the loss in services provided by the injured resources between the time of the discharge or release and the time the resources are fully returned to their baseline conditions, or until the resources are replaced and/or equivalent natural resources are acquired. The compensable value can include the economic value of lost services provided by the injured resources, including both public use and nonuse values such as existence and bequest values. Economic value can be measured by changes in consumer surplus, economic rent, and any fees or other payments collectible by a Federal or State agency or an Indian tribe for a private party's use of the natural resources; and any economic rent accruing to a private party because the Federal or State agency or Indian tribe does not charge a fee or price for the use of the resources. Alternatively, compensable value can be determined utilizing a restoration cost approach, which measures the cost of implementing a project or projects that restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of natural resource services lost pending restoration to baseline.

(i) *Use value* is the economic value of the resources to the public attributable to the direct use of the services provided by the natural resources.

(ii) *Nonuse value* is the economic value the public derives from natural resources that is independent of any direct use of the services provided.

(iii) *Restoration cost* is the cost of a project or projects that restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of natural resource services lost pending restoration to baseline.

(2) *Valuation methodologies.* The authorized official may choose among the

Office of the Secretary, Interior

§ 11.84

valuation methodologies listed in this section to estimate appropriate compensation for lost services or may choose other methodologies provided that the methodology can satisfy the acceptance criterion in paragraph (c)(3) of this section. Nothing in this section

precludes the use of a combination of valuation methodologies so long as the authorized official does not double count or uses techniques that allow any double counting to be estimated and eliminated in the final damage calculation.

Type of Methodology	Description
(i) Market price	The authorized official may determine the compensable value of the injured resources using the diminution in the market price of the injured resources or the lost services. May be used only if: (A) The natural resources are traded in the market; and (B) The authorized official determines that the market for the resources, or the services provided by the resources, is reasonably competitive.
(ii) Appraisal	The measure of compensable value is the difference between the with- and without-injury appraisal value determined by the comparable sales approach as described in the Uniform Appraisal Standards. Must measure compensable value, to the extent possible, in accordance with the "Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisition," Interagency Land Acquisition Conference, Washington, DC, 1973 (incorporated by reference, see § 11.18).
(iii) Factor income (sometimes referred to as the "reverse value added" methodology).	May be used only if the injured resources are inputs to a production process, which has as an output a product with a well-defined market price. May be used to determine: (A) The economic rent associated with the use of resources in the production process; and (B) The in-place value of the resources.
(iv) Travel cost	May be used to determine a value for the use of a specific area. Uses an individual's incremental travel costs to an area to model the economic value of the services of that area. Compensable value of the area to the traveler is the difference between the value of the area with and without a discharge or release. Regional travel cost models may be used, if appropriate.
(v) Hedonic pricing	May be used to determine the value of nonmarketed resources by an analysis of private market choices. The demand for nonmarketed natural resources is thereby estimated indirectly by an analysis of commodities that are traded in a market.
(vi) Unit value/benefits transfer	Unit values are preassigned dollar values for various types of nonmarketed recreational or other experiences by the public. Where feasible, unit values in the region of the affected resources and unit values that closely resemble the recreational or other experience lost with the affected resources may be used.
(vii) Contingent valuation	Includes all techniques that set up hypothetical markets to directly elicit an individual's economic valuation of a natural resource. Can determine: (A) Use values and explicitly determine option and existence values; and (B) Lost use values of injured natural resources.
(viii) Conjoint Analysis	Like contingent valuation, conjoint analysis is a stated preference method. However, instead of seeking to value natural resource service losses in strictly economic terms, conjoint analysis compares natural resource service losses that arise from injury to natural resource service gains produced by restoration projects.
(ix) Habitat Equivalency Analysis.	May be used to compare the natural resource services produced by habitat or resource-based restoration actions to natural resource service losses.
(x) Resource Equivalency Analysis.	Similar to habitat equivalency analysis. This methodology may be used to compare the effects of restoration actions on specifically identified resources that are injured or destroyed.
(xi) Random Utility Model	Can be used to: (A) Compare restoration actions on the basis of equivalent resource services provided; and (B) Calculate the monetary value of lost recreational services to the public.

(3) *Other valuation methodologies.* Other methodologies that measure compensable value in accordance with the public's willingness to pay for the lost service, or with the cost of a project that restores, replaces, or acquires services equivalent of natural resource services lost pending restoration to baseline in a cost-effective manner, are acceptable methodologies to determine compensable value under this part.

[51 FR 27725, Aug. 1, 1986, as amended at 53 FR 5175, Feb. 22, 1988; 59 FR 14285, Mar. 25, 1994; 73 FR 57266, Oct. 2, 2008]

§ 11.84 Damage determination phase—implementation guidance.

(a) *Requirement.* The authorized official should use the cost estimating and valuation methodologies in § 11.83 of this part following the appropriate guidance in this section.

(b) *Determining uses.* (1) Before estimating damages for compensable value under § 11.83 of this part, the authorized official should determine the uses made of the resource services identified in the Quantification phase.