

**ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE
BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY**

The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis

**Ben Hoen, Ryan Wisler, Peter Cappers,
Mark Thayer, and Gautam Sethi**

**Environmental Energy
Technologies Division**

December 2009

Download from <http://eetd.lbl.gov/EA/EMP>

The work described in this report was funded by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind & Hydropower Technologies Program) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor The Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or The Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof, or The Regents of the University of California.

Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory is an equal opportunity employer.

**The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the
United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis**

Prepared for the

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
Wind & Hydropower Technologies Program
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C.

Principal Authors:

Ben Hoen, Ryan Wisser, Peter Cappers
Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Mark Thayer
San Diego State University

Gautam Sethi
Bard College

1 Cyclotron Road, MS 90R4000
Berkeley CA 94720-8136

December 2009

The work described in this report was funded by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind & Hydropower Technologies Program) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123.

Abstract

With wind energy expanding rapidly in the U.S. and abroad, and with an increasing number of communities considering wind power development nearby, there is an urgent need to empirically investigate common community concerns about wind project development. The concern that property values will be adversely affected by wind energy facilities is commonly put forth by stakeholders. Although this concern is not unreasonable, given property value impacts that have been found near high voltage transmission lines and other electric generation facilities, the impacts of wind energy facilities on residential property values had not previously been investigated thoroughly. The present research collected data on almost 7,500 sales of single-family homes situated within 10 miles of 24 existing wind facilities in nine different U.S. states. The conclusions of the study are drawn from eight different hedonic pricing models, as well as both repeat sales and sales volume models. The various analyses are strongly consistent in that none of the models uncovers conclusive evidence of the existence of any widespread property value impacts that might be present in communities surrounding wind energy facilities. Specifically, neither the view of the wind facilities nor the distance of the home to those facilities is found to have any consistent, measurable, and statistically significant effect on home sales prices. Although the analysis cannot dismiss the possibility that individual homes or small numbers of homes have been or could be negatively impacted, it finds that if these impacts do exist, they are either too small and/or too infrequent to result in any widespread, statistically observable impact.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
Executive Summary	ix
1. Introduction	1
2. Previous Research	4
2.1. Hedonic Models and Environmental Disamenities	4
2.2. Impacts of Wind Projects on Property Values	6
3. Data Overview	10
3.1. Site Selection	10
3.2. Data Collection	13
3.2.1. Tabular Data	13
3.2.2. GIS Data	15
3.2.3. Field Data	15
3.2.4. Field Data Collection	18
3.3. Data Summary	18
4. Base Hedonic Model	23
4.1. Dataset	23
4.2. Model Form	24
4.3. Analysis of Results	28
5. Alternative Hedonic Models	33
5.1. View and Distance Stability Models	33
5.1.1. Dataset and Model Form	34
5.1.2. Analysis of Results	35
5.2. Continuous Distance Model	36
5.2.1. Dataset and Model Form	36
5.2.2. Analysis of Results	37
5.3. All Sales Model	37
5.3.1. Dataset and Model Form	38
5.3.2. Analysis of Results	39
5.4. Temporal Aspects Model	42
5.4.1. Dataset and Model Form	42
5.4.2. Analysis of Results	44
5.5. Orientation Model	47
5.5.1. Dataset and Model Form	47
5.5.2. Analysis of Results	49
5.6. Overlap Model	50
5.6.1. Dataset and Model Form	51
5.6.2. Analysis of Results	52
6. Repeat Sales Analysis	55
6.1. Repeat Sales Models and Environmental Disamenities Literature	55

6.2.	Dataset.....	56
6.3.	Model Form	57
6.4.	Analysis of Results	59
7.	Sales Volume Analysis	63
7.1.	Dataset.....	63
7.2.	Model Form	65
7.3.	Analysis of Results	66
8.	Wind Projects and Property Values: Summary of Key Results.....	69
8.1.	Area Stigma	69
8.2.	Scenic Vista Stigma	71
8.3.	Nuisance Stigma	73
9.	Conclusions.....	75
	References.....	76
	Appendix A : Study Area Descriptions	82
	A.1 WAOR Study Area: Benton and Walla Walla Counties (Washington), and Umatilla County (Oregon).....	84
	A.2 TXHC Study Area: Howard County (Texas).....	87
	A.3 OKCC Study Area: Custer County (Oklahoma).....	90
	A.4 IABV Study Area: Buena Vista County (Iowa)	93
	A.5 ILLC Study Area: Lee County (Illinois).....	96
	A.6 WIKCDC Study Area: Kewaunee and Door Counties (Wisconsin)	99
	A.7 PASC Study Area: Somerset County (Pennsylvania).....	102
	A.8 PAWC Study Area: Wayne County (Pennsylvania).....	105
	A.9 NYMCOC Study Area: Madison and Oneida Counties (New York).....	108
	A.10 NYMC Study Area: Madison County (New York).....	111
	Appendix B : Methodology for Calculating Distances with GIS	114
	Appendix C : Field Data Collection Instrument	117
	Appendix D : Vista Ratings with Photos	120
	Appendix E : View Ratings with Photos	122
	Appendix F : Selecting the Primary (“Base”) Hedonic Model.....	124
	F.1 Discussion of Fully Unrestricted Model Form	124
	F.2 Analysis of Alternative Model Forms	127
	F.3 Selecting a Base Model	131
	Appendix G : OLS Assumptions, and Tests for the Base Model	132
	Appendix H : Alternative Models: Full Hedonic Regression Results	139

List of Tables

Table 1: Summary of Existing Literature on Impacts of Wind Projects on Property Values.....	9
Table 2: Summary of Study Areas.....	12
Table 3: Definition of VIEW Categories.....	16
Table 4: Definition of VISTA Categories.....	17
Table 5: Summary of Transactions across Study Areas and Development Periods.....	19
Table 6: Summary Statistics: All Sales and Post-Construction Sales.....	21
Table 7: Summary of Variables of Interest: All Sales and Post-Construction Sales.....	22
Table 8: List of Variables of Interest Included in the Base Model.....	25
Table 9: List of Home and Site Characteristics Included in the Base Model.....	27
Table 10: Results from the Base Model.....	32
Table 11: Frequency Crosstab of VIEW and DISTANCE Parameters.....	35
Table 12: Results from Distance and View Stability Models.....	35
Table 13: Results from Continuous Distance Model.....	37
Table 14: Frequency Summary for DISTANCE in All Sales Model.....	39
Table 15: Results from All Sales Model.....	41
Table 16: Results from Equality Test of VIEW Coefficients in the All Sales Model.....	41
Table 17: Results from Equality Test of DISTANCE Coefficients in the All Sales Model.....	42
Table 18: Frequency Crosstab of DISTANCE and PERIOD.....	44
Table 19: Results from Temporal Aspects Model.....	45
Table 20: Results from Equality Test of Temporal Aspects Model Coefficients.....	47
Table 21: Frequency Crosstab of VIEW and ORIENTATION.....	49
Table 22: Percentage Crosstab of VIEW and ORIENTATION.....	49
Table 23: Results from Orientation Model.....	50
Table 24: Definition of OVERLAP Categories.....	51
Table 25: Frequency Crosstab of OVERLAP and VIEW.....	52
Table 26: Results from Overlap Model.....	54
Table 27: List of Variables Included in the Repeat Sales Model.....	57
Table 28: Results from Repeat Sales Model.....	60
Table 29: Sales Volumes by PERIOD and DISTANCE.....	64
Table 30: Equality Test of Sales Volumes between PERIODS.....	67
Table 31: Equality Test of Volumes between DISTANCES using 3-5 Mile Reference.....	67
Table 32: Equality Test of Sales Volumes between DISTANCES using 1-3 Mile Reference.....	67
Table 33: Impact of Wind Projects on Property Values: Summary of Key Results.....	69
Table A - 1: Summary of Study Areas.....	83
Table A - 2: Summarized Results of Restricted and Unrestricted Model Forms.....	128
Table A - 3: Summary of VOI Standard Errors for Restricted and Unrestricted Models.....	130
Table A - 4: Summary of VOI Coefficients for Restricted and Unrestricted Models.....	130
Table A - 5: Summary of Significant VOI Above and Below Zero in Unrestricted Models.....	131
Table A - 6: Full Results for the Distance Stability Model.....	139
Table A - 7: Full Results for the View Stability Model.....	140
Table A - 8: Full Results for the Continuous Distance Model.....	141
Table A - 9: Full Results for the All Sales Model.....	142
Table A - 10: Full Results for the Temporal Aspects Model.....	143
Table A - 11: Full Results for the Orientation Model.....	145
Table A - 12: Full Results for the Overlap Model.....	146

List of Figures

Figure 1: Map of Study Areas and Potential Study Areas	12
Figure 2: Frequency of VISTA Ratings for All and Post-Construction Transactions	20
Figure 3: Frequency of DISTANCE Ratings for Post-Construction Transactions.....	20
Figure 4: Frequency of VIEW Ratings for Post-Construction Transactions	21
Figure 5: Results from the Base Model for VISTA.....	29
Figure 6: Results from the Base Model for VIEW	30
Figure 7: Results from the Base Model for DISTANCE.....	31
Figure 8: Results from the Temporal Aspects Model.....	46
Figure 9: Repeat Sales Model Results for VIEW	61
Figure 10: Repeat Sales Model Results for DISTANCE.....	61
Figure 11: Sales Volumes by PERIOD and DISTANCE	65
Figure A - 1: Map of Study Areas	83
Figure A - 2: Map of WAOR Study Area.....	84
Figure A - 3: Map of TXHC Study Area	87
Figure A - 4: Map of OKCC Study Area.....	90
Figure A - 5: Map of IABV Study Area	93
Figure A - 6: Map of ILLC Study Area	96
Figure A - 7: Map of WIKCDC Study Area.....	99
Figure A - 8: Map of PASC Study Area.....	102
Figure A - 9: Map of PAWC Study Area	105
Figure A - 10: Map of NYMCOC Study Area	108
Figure A - 11: Map of NYMC Study Area	111
Figure A - 12: Field Data Collection Instrument	117
Figure A - 13: Field Data Collection Instrument - Instructions - Page 1.....	118
Figure A - 14: Field Data Collection Instrument - Instructions - Page 2.....	119
Figure A - 15: Histogram of Standardized Residuals for Base Model	133
Figure A - 16: Histogram of Mahalanobis Distance Statistics for Base Model.....	133
Figure A - 17: Histogram of Standardized Residuals for All Sales Model	134
Figure A - 18: Histogram of Mahalanobis Distance Statistics for All Sales Model.....	134

Acknowledgements

The work described in this report was funded by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind & Hydropower Technologies Program) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. The authors would particularly like to thank Megan McCluer, Patrick Gilman, Jim Ahlgrimm, Michele Desautels, and Steve Lindenberg, all of the U.S. Department of Energy, for their long-term support of this work. For reviewing drafts of this report and/or for providing comments that helped shape the early thinking on this project, the authors thank Mark Bolinger, Galen Barbose, and Larry Dale (Berkeley Lab), Alejandro Moreno (US DOE), Larry Flowers and Eric Lantz (NREL), Peter Dent and Sally Sims (Oxford Brookes University), Sandy Bond (Curtin Business School), Randy Winter, Dave Loomis, and Jennifer Hinman (Illinois State University), Thomas Priestley (CH2M Hill), Barton DeLacy (Cushman & Wakefield), Dave Maturen (Maturen Appraisal), Mike McCann (McCann Appraisal), Tom Hewson (Energy Ventures Analysis), Kimberly Centera (AES), Jeff Peterson (NYSERDA), Charles Kubert (Clean Energy Group), Lisa Linowes (Industrial Wind Action), Chris Taylor (Element Power), Sam Enfield (MAP Royalty, Inc.), and Laurie Jodziewicz (AWEA). Of course, any remaining omissions or inaccuracies are those of the authors.

Executive Summary

Overview

Wind power development in the United States has expanded dramatically in recent years. If that growth is to continue it will require an ever-increasing number of wind power projects to be sited, permitted, and constructed. Most permitting processes in the U.S. require some form of environmental impact assessment as well as public involvement in the siting process. Though public opinion surveys generally show that acceptance towards wind energy is high, a variety of concerns with wind power development are often expressed on the local level during the siting and permitting process. One such concern is the potential impact of wind energy projects on the property values of nearby residences.

Concerns about the possible impact of wind power facilities on residential property values can take many forms, but can be divided into the following non-mutually exclusive categories:

- **Area Stigma:** A concern that the general area surrounding a wind energy facility will appear more developed, which may adversely affect home values in the local community regardless of whether any individual home has a view of the wind turbines.
- **Scenic Vista Stigma:** A concern that a home may be devalued because of the view of a wind energy facility, and the potential impact of that view on an otherwise scenic vista.
- **Nuisance Stigma:** A concern that factors that may occur in close proximity to wind turbines, such as sound and shadow flicker, will have a unique adverse influence on home values.

Although concerns about the possible impact of wind energy facilities on the property values of nearby homes are reasonably well established, the available literature¹ that has sought to quantify the impacts of wind projects on residential property values has a number of shortcomings:

- 1) Many studies have relied on surveys of homeowners or real estate professionals, rather than trying to quantify real price impacts based on market data;
- 2) Most studies have relied on simple statistical techniques that have limitations and that can be dramatically influenced by small numbers of sales transactions or survey respondents;
- 3) Most studies have used small datasets that are concentrated in only one wind project study area, making it difficult to reliably identify impacts that might apply in a variety of areas;
- 4) Many studies have not reported measurements of the statistical significance of their results, making it difficult to determine if those results are meaningful;
- 5) Many studies have concentrated on an investigation of the existence of Area Stigma, and have ignored Scenic Vista and/or Nuisance Stigmas;
- 6) Only a few studies included field visits to homes to determine wind turbine visibility and collect other important information about the home (e.g., the quality of the scenic vista); and
- 7) Only two studies have been published in peer-reviewed academic journals.

¹ This literature is briefly reviewed in Section 2 of the full report, and includes: Jordal-Jorgensen (1996); Jerabek (2001); Grover (2002); Jerabek (2002); Sterzinger et al. (2003); Beck (2004); Haughton et al. (2004); Khatri (2004); DeLacy (2005); Poletti (2005); Goldman (2006); Hoen (2006); Firestone et al. (2007); Poletti (2007); Sims and Dent (2007); Bond (2008); McCann (2008); Sims et al. (2008); and Kielisch (2009).

This report builds on the previous literature that has investigated the potential impact of wind projects on residential property values by using a hedonic pricing model and by avoiding many of the shortcomings enumerated above.

The hedonic pricing model is one of the most prominent and reliable methods for identifying the marginal impacts of different housing and community characteristics on residential property values (see side bar). This approach dates to the seminal work of Rosen (1974) and Freeman (1979), and much of the available literature that has investigated the impacts of potential disamenities on property values has relied on this method.²

To seed the hedonic model with appropriate market data, this analysis collects information on a large quantity of residential home sales (i.e., transactions) ($n = 7,459$) from ten communities surrounding 24 existing wind power facilities spread across multiple parts of the U.S. (e.g., nine states). Homes included in this sample are located from 800 ft to over five miles from the nearest wind energy facility, and were sold at any point from before wind facility announcement to over four years after the construction of the nearby wind project. Each of the homes that sold was visited to determine the degree to which the wind facility was likely to have been visible at the time of sale and to collect other essential data.

To assess the potential impacts of all three of the property value stigmas described earlier, a base hedonic model is applied as well as seven alternative hedonic models each designed to investigate the reliability of the results and to explore other aspects of the data (see Table ES - 1 below). In addition, a repeat sales model is analyzed, and an investigation of possible impacts on sales volumes is

What Is a Hedonic Pricing Model?

Hedonic pricing models are frequently used by economists and real estate professionals to assess the impacts of house and community characteristics on property values by investigating the sales prices of homes. A house can be thought of as a bundle of characteristics (e.g., number of square feet, number of bathrooms). When a price is agreed upon by a buyer and seller there is an implicit understanding that those characteristics have value. When data from a large number of residential transactions are available, the individual marginal contribution to the sales price of each characteristic for an average home can be estimated with a hedonic regression model. Such a model can statistically estimate, for example, how much an additional bathroom adds to the sale price of an average home. A particularly useful application of the hedonic model is to value non-market goods – goods that do not have transparent and observable market prices. For this reason, the hedonic model is often used to derive value estimates of amenities such as wetlands or lake views, and disamenities such as proximity to and/or views of high-voltage transmission lines, roads, cell phone towers, and landfills. It should be emphasized that the hedonic model is not typically designed to appraise properties (i.e., to establish an estimate of the market value of a home at a specified point in time), as would be done with an automated valuation model. Instead, the typical goal of a hedonic model is to estimate the marginal contribution of individual house or community characteristics to sales prices.

² Many of these studies are summarized in the following reviews: Kroll and Priestley (1992); McCann (1999); Bateman et al. (2001); Boyle and Kiel (2001); Jackson (2001); Simons and Saginor (2006); and Leonard et al. (2008). For further discussion of the hedonic model and its application to the quantification of environmental stigmas see Jackson (2005) and Simons (2006a).

conducted. Though some limitations to the analysis approach and available data are acknowledged, the resulting product is the most comprehensive and data-rich analysis to date in the U.S. or abroad on the impacts of wind projects on nearby property values.

Analysis Findings

Table ES - 1 describes the ten resulting statistical models that are employed to investigate the effects of wind facilities on residential sales prices, and the specific stigmas that those models investigate. Though all models test some combination of the three possible stigmas, they do so in different ways. For instance, the Base Model asks the question, “All else being equal, do homes near wind facilities sell for prices different than for homes located farther away?”, while the All Sales Model asks, “All else being equal, do homes near wind facilities that sell after the construction of the wind facility sell for prices different from similar homes that sold before the announcement and construction of the facility?” Each model is therefore designed to not only test for the reliability of the overall results, but also to explore the myriad of potential effects from a variety of perspectives. Table ES-2 summarizes the results from these models.

Table ES - 1: Description of Statistical Models

Statistical Model	Description
Base Hedonic Model	Using only "post-construction" transactions (those that occurred after the wind facility was built), this model investigates all three stigmas in a straightforward manner
Alternative Hedonic Models	
View Stability	Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates whether the Scenic Vista Stigma results from the Base Model are independent of the Nuisance and Area Stigma results
Distance Stability	Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates whether the Nuisance and Area Stigma results from the Base Model are independent of the Scenic Vista Stigma results
Continuous Distance	Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates Area and Nuisance Stigmas by applying a continuous distance parameter as opposed to the categorical variables for distance used in the previous models
All Sales	Using all transactions, this model investigates whether the results for the three stigmas change if transactions that occurred before the announcement and construction of the wind facility are included in the sample
Temporal Aspects	Using all transactions, this model further investigates Area and Nuisance Stigmas and how they change for homes that sold more than two years pre-announcement through the period more than four years post-construction
Orientation	Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates the degree to which a home’s orientation to the view of wind turbines affects sales prices
Overlap	Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates the degree to which the overlap between the view of a wind facility and a home’s primary scenic vista affects sales prices
Repeat Sales Model	Using paired transactions of homes that sold once pre-announcement and again post-construction, this model investigates the three stigmas, using as a reference transactions of homes located outside of five miles of the nearest wind turbine and that have no view of the turbines
Sales Volume Model	Using both pre-announcement and post-construction transactions, this model investigates whether the rate of home sales (not the price of those sales) is affected by the presence of nearby wind facilities

Table ES-2: Impact of Wind Projects on Property Values: Summary of Key Results

Statistical Model	Is there statistical evidence of:			Section Reference
	Area Stigma?	Scenic Vista Stigma?	Nuisance Stigma?	
Base Model	No	No	No	Section 4
View Stability	Not tested	No	Not tested	Section 5.1
Distance Stability	No	Not tested	No	Section 5.1
Continuous Distance	No	No	No	Section 5.2
All Sales	No	No	Limited	Section 5.3
Temporal Aspects	No	No	No	Section 5.4
Orientation	No	No	No	Section 5.5
Overlap	No	Limited	No	Section 5.6
Repeat Sales	No	Limited	No	Section 6
Sales Volume	No	Not tested	No	Section 7

"No"..... No statistical evidence of a negative impact
 "Yes"..... Strong statistical evidence of a negative impact
 "Limited"..... Limited and inconsistent statistical evidence of a negative impact
 "Not tested"..... This model did not test for this stigma

Base Model Results

The Base Model serves as the primary model and allows all three stigmas to be explored. In sum, this model finds no persuasive evidence of any of the three potential stigmas: neither the view of the wind facilities nor the distance of the home to those facilities is found to have any consistent, measurable, and statistically significant effect on home sales prices.

- **Area Stigma:** To investigate Area Stigma, the model tests whether the sales prices of homes situated anywhere outside of one mile and inside of five miles of the nearest wind facility are measurably different from the sales price of those homes located outside of five miles. No statistically significant differences in sales prices between these homes are found (see Figure ES-1).
- **Scenic Vista Stigma:** For Scenic Vista Stigma, the model is first used to investigate whether the sales prices of homes with varying scenic vistas - absent the presence of the wind facility - are measurably different. The model results show dramatic and statistically significant differences in this instance (see Figure ES-2); not surprisingly, home buyers and sellers consider the scenic vista of a home when establishing the appropriate sales price. Nonetheless, when the model tests for whether homes with minor, moderate, substantial, or extreme views of wind turbines have measurably different sales prices, no statistically significant differences are apparent (see Figure ES-3).
- **Nuisance Stigma:** Finally, for Nuisance Stigma, the model is used to test whether the sales prices of homes situated inside of one mile of the nearest wind energy facility are measurably different from those homes located outside of five miles. Although sample size is somewhat limited in this case,³ the model again finds no persuasive statistical evidence that wind

³ 125 homes were located inside of one mile of the nearest wind facility and sold post-construction.

facilities measurably and broadly impact residential sales prices (see Figure ES-1 and later results).

Figure ES-1: Base Model Results: Area and Nuisance Stigma




Figure ES-2: Base Model Results: Scenic Vista





Figure ES-3: Base Model Results: Scenic Vista Stigma



The reference category consists of transactions for homes without a view of the turbines, and that occurred after construction began on the wind facility

The seven alternative hedonic models and the additional analysis contained in the Repeat Sales and Sales Volume Models (see Table ES-2) provide a fuller picture of the three stigmas and the robustness of the Base Model results.

Area Stigma: Other Model Results

Concentrating first on Area Stigma, the results from all of the models are similar: there is no statistical evidence of a widespread Area Stigma among the homes in this sample. Homes in the study areas analyzed here do not appear to be measurably stigmatized by the arrival of a wind facility, regardless of when those homes sold in the wind project development process and regardless of whether the homes are located one mile or five miles away from the nearest facility.

In the All Sales Model, for example, after adjusting for inflation,⁴ homes that sold after wind facility construction and that had no view of the turbines are found to have transacted for higher prices - not lower - than those homes that sold prior to wind facility construction. Moreover, in the Temporal Aspects Model, homes that sold more than two years prior to the announcement of the wind facility and that were located more than five miles from where the turbines were eventually located are found to have transacted for lower prices - not higher - than homes situated closer to the turbines and that sold at any time after the announcement and construction of the wind facility (see Figure ES - 4). Further, in the Repeat Sales Model, homes located near the wind facilities that transacted more than once were found to have appreciated between those sales by an amount that was no different from that experienced by homes located in an area

⁴ All sales prices in all models are adjusted for inflation, but because this model (and the Temporal Aspects Model) deals with time explicitly, it is mentioned specifically here.

many miles away from the wind facilities. Finally, as shown in Table ES-2, none of the other models identified evidence of a broadly negative and statistically significant Area Stigma.

Scenic Vista Stigma: Other Model Results

With respect to Scenic Vista Stigma, the seven alternative hedonic models and the additional analysis contained in the Repeat Sales Model find little consistent evidence of a broadly negative and statistically significant impact. Although there are 730 residential transactions in the sample that involve homes that had views of a wind facility at the time of sale, 160 of which had relatively significant views (i.e., a rating higher than Minor), none of the various models finds strong statistical evidence that the view of a nearby wind facility impacts sales prices in a significant and consistent manner.

When concentrating only on the view of the wind facilities from a home (and not testing for Area and Nuisance Stigmas simultaneously), for example, the results from the View Stability Model are very similar to those derived from the Base Model, with no evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma. Similarly, the All Sales Model finds that homes that sold after wind facility construction and that had a view of the facility transacted for prices that are statistically indistinguishable from those homes that sold at any time prior to wind facility construction. The Orientation Model, meanwhile, fails to detect any difference between the sales prices of homes that had either a front, back, or side orientation to the view of the wind facility. As shown in Table ES-2, the Continuous Distance and Temporal Aspects models also do not uncover any evidence of a broadly negative and statistically significant Scenic Vista Stigma.

In the Repeat Sales Model, some limited evidence is found that a Scenic Vista Stigma may exist, but those effects are weak, fairly small, somewhat counter-intuitive, and are at odds with the results of other models. This finding is likely driven by the small number of sales pairs that are located within one mile of the wind turbines and that experience a dramatic view of those turbines. Finally, in the Overlap Model, where the degree to which a view of the wind facility overlaps the primary scenic vista from the home is accounted for, no statistically significant differences in sales prices are detected between homes with somewhat or strongly overlapping views when compared to those homes with wind turbine views that did not overlap the primary scenic vista. Though this model produces some weak evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma among homes with Minor views of wind facilities, the same model finds that the sales prices of those homes with views that barely overlap the primary scenic vista are positively impacted by the presence of the wind facility. When these two results are combined, the overall impact is negligible, again demonstrating no persuasive evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma.


Nuisance Stigma: Other Model Results

Results for Nuisance Stigma from the seven alternative hedonic models and the additional analysis contained in the Repeat Sales and Sales Volume Models support the Base Model results. Taken together, these models present a consistent set of results: homes in this sample that are within a mile of the nearest wind facility, where various nuisance effects have been posited, have not been broadly and measurably affected by the presence of those wind facilities. These results imply that Nuisance Stigma effects are either not present in this sample, or are too small and/or infrequent to be statistically distinguished.

In the Distance Stability Model, for example, when concentrating only on the distance from homes to the nearest wind turbine (and not testing for Scenic Vista Stigma simultaneously), the results are very similar to those derived from the Base Model, with no statistical evidence of a Nuisance Stigma. These results are corroborated by the Continuous Distance, Orientation, Overlap, and Repeat Sales Models, none of which find a statistically significant relationship between distance and either sales prices or appreciation rates. Relatedly, the Sales Volume analysis finds no evidence that homes located within one mile of the nearest wind turbine are sold any more or less frequently than homes located farther away from the wind facilities.

In the All Sales Model, a weakly significant difference is found between the sales prices of homes located between 3000 feet and one mile of the nearest wind facility and the homes that sold before the announcement of the wind facility. This effect, however, is largely explained by the results of the Temporal Aspects Model, shown in Figure ES - 4. The Temporal Aspects Model finds that homes located within one mile of where the wind turbines would eventually be located sold for depressed prices well before the wind facility was even announced or constructed. In all time periods following the commencement of wind facility construction, however, inflation-adjusted sales prices increased - not decreased - relative to pre-announcement levels, demonstrating no statistical evidence of a Nuisance Stigma. The results from the All Sales Model (and, for that matter, the negative, albeit statistically insignificant coefficients inside of one mile in the Base Model, see Figure ES-1) are therefore an indication of sales price levels that preceded wind facility announcement construction, and that are not sustained after construction.

Figure ES - 4: Temporal Aspects Model Results: Area and Nuisance Stigma



The reference category consists of transactions of homes situated more than five miles from where the nearest turbine would eventually be located and that occurred more than two years before announcement of the facility

Conclusions and Further Research Needs

Though each of the analysis techniques used in this report has strengths and weaknesses, the results as a whole are strongly consistent in that none of the models uncovers conclusive evidence of the presence of any of the three property value stigmas that might be present in communities surrounding wind power facilities. Therefore, based on the data sample and analysis presented here, no evidence is found that home prices surrounding wind facilities are consistently, measurably, and significantly affected by either the view of wind facilities or the distance of the home to those facilities. Although the analysis cannot dismiss the possibility that individual homes or small numbers of homes have been or could be negatively impacted, it finds that if these impacts do exist, they are either too small and/or too infrequent to result in any widespread, statistically observable impact. Moreover, to the degree that homes and wind facilities in this sample are similar to homes and facilities in other areas of the United States, the results presented here are expected to be transferable to other areas.

This work builds on the existing literature in a number of respects, but there remain a number of areas for further research. The primary goal of subsequent research should be to concentrate on those homes located closest to wind facilities, where the data sample herein was the most limited. Additional research of the nature reported in this paper could be pursued, but with a greater number of transactions, especially for homes particularly close to wind facilities. A more detailed analysis of sales volume impacts may also be fruitful, as would an assessment of the potential impact of wind facilities on the length of time homes are on the market in advance of an eventual sale. Finally, it would be useful to conduct a survey of those homeowners living close to existing wind facilities, and especially those residents who have bought and sold homes in proximity to wind facilities after facility construction, to assess their opinions on the impacts of wind project development on their home purchase and sales decisions.

1. Introduction

Wind power development has expanded dramatically in recent years (GWEC, 2009). Although the percent of electricity supplied to the U.S. and globally from wind power projects installed through 2008 remains relatively low (1.9% and 1.5%, respectively) (Wiser and Bolinger, 2009), there are expectations that those percentages will rise and that wind energy could contribute a significant percentage of future electricity supply (GWEC, 2008; Wiser and Hand, 2010). Most recently, President Obama, in his 2009 State of the Union address, called for a doubling of renewable energy in three years (by 2012), and in 2008 the U.S. Department of Energy produced a report that analyzed the feasibility of meeting 20% of U.S. electricity demand with wind energy by 2030 (US DOE, 2008).

To meet these goals, a significant amount of wind project development activity would be required. The average size of wind power projects built in the U.S. in 2007 and 2008 was approximately 100 MW (Wiser and Bolinger, 2009) and the total amount of capacity required to reach 20% wind electricity is roughly 300,000 MW (US DOE, 2008). Therefore, to achieve 20% wind electricity by 2030, a total of 3,000 wind facilities may need to be sited and permitted. Most permitting processes in the U.S. require some form of environmental impact assessment, and some form of public involvement in the siting process. Though surveys show that public acceptance is high in general for wind energy (e.g., Wolsink, 2000; Firestone and Kempton, 2006), a variety of concerns are often expressed on the local level that can impact the length and outcome of the siting and permitting process. These concerns range from the potential impacts of wind projects on wildlife habitat and mortality, radar and communications systems, ground transportation and historic and cultural resources, to aesthetic and property value concerns as well as potential nuisance and health impacts. As a result, a variety of siting and permitting guidelines (AWEA, 2008) and impact assessments (NAS, 2007) have been completed.

Surveys of local communities considering wind facilities have consistently ranked adverse impacts on aesthetics and property values in the top tier of concerns (e.g., BBC R&C, 2005; Firestone and Kempton, 2006). Developers of wind energy echo this assessment: they ranked aesthetics and property values as two of the top concerns (first and third respectively) for individuals or communities opposed to wind power development (Paul, 2006). Local residents have even brought suit against a developer over property values (Dale Rankin v. FPL, 2008), and some developers have responded to these concerns by offering “neighbor agreements” that compensate nearby homeowners for the potential impacts of wind projects.

The two concerns of aesthetics and property values are intrinsically linked. It is well established that a home’s value will be increased if a high-quality scenic vista is enjoyed from the property (e.g., Seiler et al., 2001). Alternatively, it is reasonable to assume that if a home’s scenic vista overlaps with a view of a disamenity, the home might be devalued, as has been found for high-voltage transmission lines (HVTL) (Kroll and Priestley, 1992; Des-Rosiers, 2002). Whether a view of wind turbines similarly impacts home values is a key topic of debate in local siting decisions. Aesthetics alone, however, is not the only pathway through which wind projects might impact residential property values. Distance to the nearest wind turbine, for example, might also have an impact if various nuisance effects are prominent, such as turbine noise,

shadow flicker,⁵ health or safety concerns, or other impacts, real or perceived. In this way, property values near wind turbines might be impacted in the same way as homes near roads might be devalued (Bateman et al., 2001). Additionally, there is evidence that proximity to a disamenity, even if that disamenity is not visible and is not so close as to have obvious nuisance effects, may still decrease a home's sales price, as has been found to be the case for landfills (Thayer et al., 1992).

Taken together, these general concerns about the possible impacts of wind projects on residential property values can be loosely categorized into three potential stigmas:

- **Area Stigma:** A concern that the general area surrounding a wind energy facility will appear more developed, which may adversely affect home values in the local community regardless of whether any individual home has a view of the wind turbines.
- **Scenic Vista Stigma:** A concern that a home may be devalued because of the view of a wind energy facility, and the potential impact of that view on an otherwise scenic vista.
- **Nuisance Stigma:** A concern that factors that may occur in close proximity to wind turbines, such as sound and shadow flicker, will have a unique adverse influence on home values.

These three potential stigmas are not mutually exclusive and could, in theory, be present in part or in combination for any single home. Consequently, all three potential impacts must be considered when analyzing the effects of wind facilities on residential sales prices.

Although concerns about the potential impact of wind projects on residential property values are often mentioned in siting cases, the state of the existing literature on this topic leaves much to be desired. To some extent, the growing body of research investigating this topic has come to opposing conclusions. The most recent and comprehensive of these studies have often concluded that no widespread impacts of wind projects on residential property values are apparent (Hoen, 2006; Sims and Dent, 2007; Sims et al., 2008). At the same time, pre-construction surveys of both homeowners and real estate experts have sometimes found an expectation of negative impacts (e.g. Haughton et al., 2004), and post-construction appraisals have sometimes come to similar conclusions (McCann, 2008; Kielisch, 2009). Given the state of the literature, it is not uncommon for local siting and permitting processes to involve contradicting testimony from experts, as occurred in 2004 when the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin heard opposing conclusions from two studies conducted by experienced home valuation experts (Poletti, 2005; Zarem, 2005).

This report contains the most comprehensive and data-rich analysis to date on the potential impacts of wind projects on nearby residential sales prices. Data from 7,459 residential transactions were collected from the surrounding communities of 24 individual wind projects in nine states and 14 counties in the United States.⁶ Because of the large sample size, the diversity of wind projects included in the analysis, and the depth of information collected, a number of different analyses were possible. Specifically, this report relies heavily on a hedonic regression

⁵ Shadow flicker occurs when the sun shines through the wind turbine blades when at a low angle to the horizon and shadows are cast on a window or interior wall of a residence (NAS, 2007).

⁶ The majority of the analysis only includes homes that sold after wind facility construction began, totaling 4,937 transactions.

model⁷ and uses various forms of that model to investigate potential effects and to confirm the robustness of the resulting findings. To further investigate the robustness of the results, a repeat sales model⁸ and a sales volume model⁹ are also utilized. In sum, this work builds and improves on the previous literature, and provides an in-depth assessment of the question of whether residential property values in the United States have been affected, in a statistically measurable way, by views of and proximity to wind power facilities.

The remainder of this report is structured as follows. The next section discusses the hedonic model in general, its application to environmental disamenities research, and some potentially analogous results drawn from these studies. This is followed by a summary of the existing literature that has investigated the effects of wind energy on residential property values. The report then turns to the data used in the analysis, a discussion of the primary (or “base”) hedonic model, and an analysis of the results from that statistical model. Following that, a set of alternative hedonic models are estimated, as well as a repeat sales model and sales volume model, to test for the robustness of the “base” model results and to explore other aspects of the data. Taking into account the full set of results presented earlier, the report then discusses the three stigmas that may lead to wind projects impacting residential property values, and summarizes how the analysis informs the existence and magnitude of these potential effects. The report ends with a brief conclusion, and a discussion of future research possibilities. A number of appendices follow the conclusion, and contain detailed information on each wind project study area, the data collection instrument and qualitative rating systems used in the field research, the investigation of the best “base” model, the hedonic model assumptions and related tests, and full results from all of the additional statistical models estimated in the report.

⁷ The hedonic regression model, which was briefly described in a sidebar in the Executive Summary, is described in detail in Section 2.1.

⁸ A repeat sales model uses, as its dataset, only those homes that have sold more than once. By comparing annual appreciation rates of homes that sold once before facility announcement, and again after construction, it can be tested, in an alternative fashion, if home values are affected by the distance to or view of nearby wind turbines.

⁹ Sales volume can be defined as the percentage of homes that fit a certain criteria (e.g. single family, on less than 25 acres, zoned residential, assessed for more than \$10,000) that actually did sell. By comparing sales volumes at various distances to wind facilities, before and after the facility was built, a further robustness test is possible.

2. Previous Research

Hedonic pricing models are frequently used to assess the marginal impacts of house and community characteristics on sales prices and by extension on property values in general. Because the hedonic model is the primary statistical method used in this report, this section begins by describing the model in more detail and providing some relevant examples of its use. The section then reviews the existing literature on the effects of wind energy facilities on surrounding property values, highlights the shortcomings of that literature, and outlines how the present research addresses those shortcomings.

2.1. Hedonic Models and Environmental Disamenities

A house can be thought of as a bundle of characteristics (e.g., number of square feet, number of bathrooms, number of fireplaces, and amount of acreage). When a price is agreed upon between a buyer and seller there is an implicit understanding that those characteristics have value. When data from a number of sales transactions are available, the individual marginal contribution to the sales price of each characteristic can be estimated with a hedonic regression model (Rosen, 1974; Freeman, 1979). This relationship takes the basic form:

$$\text{Sales price} = f(\text{house structural characteristics, other factors})$$

where “house structural characteristics” might include, but are not limited to, the number of square feet of living area, bathrooms, and fireplaces, the presence of central AC and the condition of the home, and “other factors” might include, but are not limited to, home site characteristics (e.g., number of acres), neighborhood characteristics (e.g., school district), market conditions at the time of sale (e.g., prevailing mortgage interest rates), and surrounding environmental conditions (e.g., proximity to a disamenity or amenity).

The relationship between the sales price of homes and the house characteristics and other factors can take various forms. The most common functional form is the semi-log construction where the dependent variable is the natural log of the inflation adjusted sales price, and the independent variables are unadjusted (not transformed) home characteristics and other factors. The usefulness of this form of hedonic model is well established (Malpezzi, 2003; Sirmans et al., 2005b; Simons and Saginor, 2006) assuming that certain threshold assumptions are met.¹⁰ The model is used commonly by academics, real estate assessors, appraisers, and realtors when large datasets are available on past residential sales transactions, and when estimates of the marginal impact of certain house characteristics and other factors on sales prices are desired.¹¹

¹⁰ These assumptions, which are discussed in greater detail in Section 4.2 and Appendix G, include absence of outliers and/or influencers, presence of homoskedastic variances, absence of spatial and temporal autocorrelation, and absence of collinearity between the variables of interest and other independent variables.

¹¹ It should be emphasized that a hedonic model is not designed to appraise properties (i.e., to establish an estimate of the market value of a home at a specified point in time), as would be done with an automated valuation model (AVM). Rather, hedonic models are designed to estimate the marginal contribution of individual house or community characteristics to sales prices, which requires hedonic models to rely upon large data sets with a sizable number of explanatory variables. Appraisal models, on the other hand, are generally based on small, localized data sets (i.e., “comps”) and a limited number of explanatory variables that pertain to nearby properties. Due to their higher level of accuracy through the use of significantly more information (e.g., diverse spatial, temporal, and

A particularly useful application of the hedonic regression model is to value non-market goods – goods that do not have transparent and observable market prices. For this reason, the hedonic model is often used to derive value estimates of amenities such as wetlands (e.g., Mahan et al., 2000) or lake views (e.g., Seiler et al., 2001), and disamenities, such as proximity to and/or views of high-voltage transmission lines (HVTLs) (e.g. Des-Rosiers, 2002), fossil fuel power plants (Davis, 2008), roads (e.g. Bateman et al., 2001), cell phone towers (e.g. Bond and Wang, 2007), and landfills (e.g., Thayer et al., 1992; Ready and Abdalla, 2005).

There are a number of useful reviews that describe the application of hedonic models in these circumstances (Kroll and Priestley, 1992; Farber, 1998; McCann, 1999; Bateman et al., 2001; Boyle and Kiel, 2001; Jackson, 2001; Ready and Abdalla, 2005; Simons and Saginor, 2006; Simons, 2006b; Leonard et al., 2008).¹² The large number of studies covered in these reviews demonstrate that hedonic models are regularly used to investigate the interplay between home values and distance to potential disamenities, teasing out if and how sales prices are adversely affected depending on the distance of a typical home from a disamenity. For example, Carroll et al. (1996) use a hedonic model to estimate a devaluation of 16% for homes “close to” a chemical plant, with a 6.5% increase in sales price per mile away out to 2.5 miles, at which point effects fade entirely. Dale et al. (1999) find a maximum effect of -4% near a lead smelter, with sales prices increasing 2% for each mile away out to two miles, where effects again fade. Ready and Abdalla (2005) find maximum effects near landfills of -12.4%, which fade entirely outside 2,400 feet, and maximum effects near confined animal feeding operations of -6.4%, which fade entirely outside of 1,600 feet. Meanwhile, studies of other energy infrastructure, such as HVTLs, find maximum effects of -5.7% for homes adjacent to a HVTL tower, and an increase in prices of 0.018% per foot away from the tower out to 300 feet (Hamilton and Schwann, 1995), and maximum effects of -14% for homes within 50 feet of a HVTL, but no effect for similar homes at 150 feet (Des-Rosiers, 2002). Further, for fossil fuel power plants, Davis (2008) finds average adverse effects of between 3 and 5% inside of two miles but that those effects fade entirely outside of that distance range.

In addition to investigating how sales prices change with distance to a disamenity, hedonic models have been used to investigate how prices have changed over time. For instance, sales prices have sometimes been found to rebound after the removal of a disamenity, such as a lead smelter (Dale et al., 1999), or to fade over time, as with HVTLs (Kroll and Priestley, 1992) or spent fuel storage facilities (Clark and Allison, 1999). Finally, hedonic models have been used to estimate how views of a disamenity affect sales prices. Des-Rosiers (2002), for example, finds that homes adjacent to a power line and facing a HVTL tower sell for as much as 20% less than similar homes that are not facing a HVTL tower.

characteristic information) and rigorous methodology, hedonic models can also be used as appraisal models. Automated valuation models cannot, however, be reliably used to measure marginal effects because they do not employ sufficient information to do so, and, more importantly, AVMs do not hold controlling characteristics constant, which could bias any resulting estimates of marginal effects.

¹² For further discussion of the hedonic model and its application to the quantification of environmental stigmas in comparison to other methods see Jackson (2005).

It is unclear how well the existing hedonic literature on other disamenities applies to wind turbines, but there are likely some similarities. For instance, in general, the existing literature seems to suggest that concerns about lasting health effects provide the largest diminution in sales prices, followed by concerns for one's enjoyment of the property, such as auditory and visual nuisances, and that all effects tend to fade with distance to the disamenity - as the perturbation becomes less annoying. This might indicate that property value effects from wind turbines are likely to be the most pronounced quite close to them, but fade quickly as their auditory and visual impacts fade. The existing hedonic literature also, in general, finds that effects fade with time as self-selecting buyers without prejudice towards the disamenity move into the area, or as the real or perceived risks of the disamenity are lessened (Jackson, 2001). This implies that any stigmas related to wind turbines might also fade over time as local communities come to accept their presence.

2.2. Impacts of Wind Projects on Property Values

Turning to the literature that has investigated the potential property value effects from wind facilities directly, it deserves note that few studies have been academically peer-reviewed and published; in some cases, the work has been performed for a party on one side or the other of the permitting process (e.g., the wind developer or an opposition group). Nonetheless, at a minimum, a brief review of this existing literature will set the stage for and motivate the later discussion of the methods and results of the present work. The literature described below is summarized in Table 1. To frame this discussion, where possible, the three potential stigmas discussed earlier are used:

- **Area Stigma:** A concern that the general area surrounding a wind energy facility will appear more developed, which may adversely affect home values in the local community regardless of whether any individual home has a view of the wind turbines.
- **Scenic Vista Stigma:** A concern that a home may be devalued because of the view of a wind energy facility, and the potential impact of that view on an otherwise scenic vista.
- **Nuisance Stigma:** A concern that factors that may occur in close proximity to wind turbines, such as sound and shadow flicker, will have a unique adverse influence on home values.

In one of the most recent studies, Sims et al. (2008) used a hedonic model to investigate Scenic Vista Stigma using 199 residential transactions within ¼ of a mile of the 16-turbine Bears Down wind facility in Cornwall, UK. They found both large positive and smaller negative significant relationships between views of the turbines and sales prices depending on whether the view is seen from the front or rear of the home, respectively, but found no relationship between the number of wind turbines visible and sales prices. Previously, Sims and Dent (2007) used a hedonic model to investigate Nuisance and Scenic Vista Stigma with 919 transactions for homes within five miles of two wind facilities in the UK, finding only limited evidence of a relationship between proximity to and views of turbines and sales prices, which local real estate experts attributed to other causes. Hoen (2006) investigated Scenic Vista Stigma using a hedonic model to analyze 280 residential transactions occurring near a wind facility in Madison County, NY, and found no evidence that views of turbines significantly affects prices. Jordal-Jorgensen (1996) investigated Nuisance Stigma in Denmark, and found an adverse effect for homes located “close” to the turbines, but no statistical significance was reported.¹³

¹³ A copy of this report could not be obtained and therefore its findings are reported based on other citations.

Using different statistical methods, Poletti (2005; 2007) used a *t*-Test to investigate Nuisance and Area Stigma by comparing the mean sales prices of 187 and 256 homes in Illinois and Wisconsin, respectively, located near wind facilities (target group) to those further away (control group).^{14, 15} He split these target and control groups into respective smaller and more-homogenous sub-groups, such as large and small tracts, with and without homes, finding no statistical evidence that homes near the wind facilities sold for different prices than those farther away. Sterzinger et al. (2003) analyzed roughly 24,000 residential transactions, which were divided between those within five miles of a wind facility and those outside of five miles in an effort to assess Area Stigma. They compared residential appreciation rates over time, and found no apparent difference between those homes within and outside of five miles from a wind facility, but the statistical significance of this comparison was not reported.

Other authors have used smaller samples of residential transactions and a variety of simple statistical techniques, without reporting statistical significance, and have found a lack of evidence of effects from Nuisance Stigma (Jerabek, 2001; Jerabek, 2002; Beck, 2004) and Area Stigma (DeLacy, 2005; Goldman, 2006). These results, however, are somewhat contrary to what one appraiser has found. In his investigation of Nuisance Stigma around a wind facility in Lee County, IL, McCann (2008) found that two homes nearby a wind facility had lengthy selling periods that, he believes, also adversely affected transaction prices. Additionally, Kielisch (2009) investigated Nuisance Stigma by comparing twelve transactions of undeveloped land near two wind facilities in Wisconsin (Blue Sky Green Field and Forward) to undeveloped land transactions farther away. He found that land tracts near the wind facilities sold for dramatically lower prices (\$/acre) than the comparable group, but the statistical significance of the comparison was not reported.

In addition to these revealed preference studies, a number of stated preference surveys (e.g., contingent valuation) and general opinion surveys have investigated the existence of potential effects.¹⁶ A survey of local residents, conducted after the wind facilities were erected, found no evidence of Area Stigma (Goldman, 2006), while another found limited evidence of these stigmas (Bond, 2008).¹⁷ Similarly, some surveys of real estate experts conducted after facility

¹⁴ A *t*-Test is used to compare two sample means by discerning if one is significantly different from the other.

¹⁵ The 2007 study used the data contained in the 2005 study in combination with new data consisting of transactions that occurred in the interim period.

¹⁶ Contingent valuation is a survey based technique to value non-market goods (e.g., an environmental disamenity) that asks respondents what their “willingness to pay” (or “willingness to accept”) is to have, for instance, a disamenity removed from (or to have it remain in) their neighborhood. This technique is distinct from a general opinion survey, which might ask whether respondents believe property values have been impacted by an environmental disamenity and, if so, “by how much.” Although there are important distinctions between the two techniques, with the contingent valuation method often preferred by economic practitioners, for simplicity no distinction is made here between these two approaches. Finally, another subset of the survey literature focuses on public acceptance (i.e., opinion). Though these public acceptance surveys sometimes cover possible impacts on property values, those impacts are not quantified in economic terms. As a result, public acceptance survey results are not reported here.

¹⁷ Bond (2008) asked respondents to declare if the wind facility, which is located roughly 7 miles away, would effect what they would be willing to pay for their house and 75% said either they would pay the same or more for their house, while the remainder would pay less. When those latter respondents were asked to estimate the percentage difference in value, their estimates averaged roughly 5%.

construction have found no evidence of Area or Nuisance Stigmas (Grover, 2002; Goldman, 2006). These results, however, are contrary to the expectations for Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance Stigma effects predicted by local residents (Haughton et al., 2004; Firestone et al., 2007) and real estate experts (Haughton et al., 2004; Khatri, 2004; Kielisch, 2009) prior to construction found elsewhere.¹⁸ The difference between predicted and actual effects might be attributable, at least in part, to the fear of the unknown. For instance, Wolsink (1989) found that public attitudes toward wind power, on average, are at their lowest for local residents during the wind project planning stage, but return almost to pre-announcement levels after the facilities are built. This result is echoed by Exeter-Enterprises-Ltd. (1993) and Palmer (1997), whose post-construction surveys found higher approval than those conducted pre-construction. Others, however, have found that perceptions do not always improve, attributing the lack of improvement to the perceived “success” or lack therefore of the project, with strong disapproval forming if turbines sit idle (Thayer and Freeman, 1987) or are perceived as a waste of taxpayer dollars (Devine-Wright, 2004).

When this literature is looked at as a whole, it appears as if wind projects have been predicted to negatively impact residential property values when pre-construction surveys are conducted, but that sizable, widespread, and statistically significant negative impacts have largely failed to materialize post-construction when actual transaction data become available for analysis. The studies that have investigated Area Stigma with market data have failed to uncover any pervasive effect. Of the studies focused on Scenic Vista and Nuisance Stigmas, only one is known to have found statistically significant adverse effects, yet the authors contend that those effects are likely driven by variables omitted from their analysis (Sims and Dent, 2007). Other studies that have relied on market data have sometimes found the possibility of negative effects, but the statistical significance of those results have rarely been reported.

Despite these findings, the existing literature leaves much to be desired. First, many studies have relied on surveys of homeowners or real estate professionals, rather than trying to quantify real price impacts based on market data. Second, a number of studies conducted rather simplified analyses of the underlying data, potentially not controlling for the many drivers of residential sales prices. Third, many of the studies have relied upon a very limited number of residential sales transactions, and therefore may not have had an adequate sample to statistically discern any property value effects, even if effects did exist. Fourth, and perhaps as a result, many of the studies did not conduct, or at least have not published, the statistical significance of their results. Fifth, when analyzed, there has been some emphasis on Area Stigma, and none of the studies have investigated all three possible stigmas simultaneously. Sixth, only a few of the studies (Hoen, 2006; Sims and Dent, 2007; Sims et al., 2008; Kielisch, 2009) conducted field visits to the homes to assess the quality of the scenic vista from the home, and the degree to which the wind facility might impact that scenic vista. Finally, with two exceptions (Sims and Dent, 2007; Sims et al., 2008), none of the studies have been academically peer-reviewed and published.

¹⁸ It should be noted that the samples used by both Khatri and Kielisch contained a subset of respondents who did have some familiarity with valuing homes near wind facilities.

Table 1: Summary of Existing Literature on Impacts of Wind Projects on Property Values

<u>Document Type</u> Author(s)	Year	Number of Transactions or Respondents	Before or After Wind Facility Construction Commenced	Area Stigma	Scenic Vista Stigma	Nuisance Stigma
<u>Homeowner Survey</u>						
Haughton et al.	2004	501	Before	- *	- *	
Goldman	2006	50	After	none		
Firestone et al.	2007	504	Before	- *	- *	
Bond	2008	~300	After		- ?	- ?
<u>Expert Survey</u>						
Grover	2002	13	After	none		none
Haughton et al.	2004	45	Before	- *	- *	
Khatri	2004	405	Before [†]	- ?		- ?
Goldman	2006	50	After	none		none
Kielisch	2009	57	Before [‡]			- ?
<u>Transaction Analysis - Simple Statistics</u>						
Jerabek	2001	25	After			none
Jerabek	2002	7	After			none
Sterzinger et al.	2003	24,000	After	none		
Beck	2004	2	After			none
Poletti	2005	187	After	none		none
DeLacy	2005	21	Before [†]	none		
Goldman	2006	4	After	none		
Poletti	2007	256	After	none		none
McCann	2008	2	After			- ?
Kielisch	2009	103	After			- ?
<u>Transaction Analysis - Hedonic Model</u>						
Jordal-Jorgensen	1996	?	After			- ?
Hoehn	2006	280	After		none	
Sims & Dent	2007	919	After			- *
Sims et al.	2008	199	After		-/+ *	
<i>" none " indicates the majority of the respondents do not believe properties have been affected (for surveys) or that no effect was detected at 10% significance level (for transaction analysis)</i>						
<i>" - ? " indicates a negative effect without statistical significance provided</i>						
<i>" - * " indicates statistically significant negative effect at 10% significance level</i>						
<i>" -/+ * " indicates positive and negative statistically significant effects at 10% significance level</i>						
<i>† Sales were collected after facility announcement but before construction</i>						
<i>‡ Some respondents had experience with valuations near facilities while others did not</i>						

3. Data Overview

The methods applied in the present work are intended to overcome many of the limitations of the existing literature. First, a large amount of data is collected from residential transactions within 10 miles of 24 different wind projects in the U.S., allowing for a robust statistical analysis across a pooled dataset that includes a diverse group of wind project sites. Second, all three potential stigmas are investigated by exploring the potential impact of wind projects on home values based both on the distance to and view of the projects from the homes. Third, field visits are made to every home in the sample, allowing for a solid assessment of the scenic vista enjoyed by each home and the degree to which the wind facility can be seen from the home, and to collect other value-influencing data from the field (e.g., if the home is situated on a cul-de-sac). Finally, a number of hedonic regression models are applied to the resulting dataset, as are repeat sales and sales volume analyses, in order to assess the robustness of the results.

Testing for the three potential stigmas requires a significant sample of residential transactions within close proximity to existing wind facilities. Unfortunately for the study, most wind power projects are not located near densely populated areas. As a result, finding a single wind project site with enough transaction data to rigorously analyze was not possible. Instead, the approach was to collect data from multiple wind project sites, with the resulting data then pooled together to allow for robust statistical analyses.¹⁹ The remainder of this section describes the site selection process that is used, and provides a brief overview of both the selected study areas and the data that were collected from these areas. Also provided is a description of how scenic vista, views of turbines, and distances from turbines were quantified for use in the hedonic analysis, and a summary of the field data collection effort. The section ends with a brief summary of the resulting dataset.

3.1. Site Selection

For the purpose of this study, an ideal wind project area would:

- 1) Have a large number of residential transactions both before and, more importantly, after wind facility construction, and especially in close proximity (e.g., within 2 miles) of the facility;
- 2) Have comprehensive data on home characteristics, sales prices, and locations that are readily available in electronic form; and
- 3) Be reasonably representative of the types of wind power projects being installed in the United States.

To identify appropriate sites that met these criteria, and that also provided a diversity of locations, the authors obtained from Energy Velocity, LLC a set of Geographic Information System (GIS) coordinates representing 241 wind projects in the U.S. that each had a total nameplate capacity greater than 0.6 megawatts (MW) and had gone online before 2006.²⁰ Also provided were facility capacity, number of turbines, and announcement, construction, and operational dates. These data were cross-checked with a similar dataset provided by the American Wind Energy Association (AWEA), which also included some turbine hub-height information.

¹⁹ A thorough discussion of this “pooled” approach is contained in Section 4.2 and in Appendix F.

²⁰ Energy Velocity, LLC was owned at the time by Global Energy Decisions, which was later purchased by Ventyx. The dataset is available as Velocity Suite 2008 from Ventyx.

By using a variety of different GIS sorting techniques involving nearby towns with populations greater than, for example, 2,500 people, using census tract population densities, and having discussions with wind energy stakeholders, a prospective list of 56 possible study areas was generated, which were then ranked using two scales: “highly desirable” to “least desirable,” and “feasible” to “potentially unfeasible.”²¹ Then, through an iterative process that combined calls to county officials to discuss the number of residential transactions and data availability, with investigations using mapping software to find the location of individual wind turbines, and, in some cases, preliminary visits, a list of 17 prospective study areas were chosen as both “highly desirable” and “feasible.” Ultimately, three of these proved to be “unfeasible” because of data availability issues and four “undesirable” because the study area was considered not representative. This effort ultimately resulted in a final set of ten study areas that encompass a total of 24 distinct wind facilities (see Figure 1 and Table 2).²² A full description of each study area is provided in Appendix A.

²¹ “Desirability” was a combination of a number of factors: the wind facility having more than one turbine; the study area having greater than 350 sales within 5 miles and within 10 years, 250 of which transacted following construction of the facility; having some transaction data old enough to pre-date facility announcement; having data on the core home and site characteristics (e.g., square feet, acres); and, where possible, having a concentration of sales within 1 mile of the facility. “Feasibility” was also a combination of factors: having home characteristic and sales data in electronic form; having GIS shapefiles of the parcel locations; and being granted ready access to this information.

²² The “unfeasible” study areas were Cerro Gordo County, IA, Bennington County, VT, and Atlantic County, NJ. Cerro Gordo County, IA contained multiple wind projects totaling 140 MW. Although the data at this site were available in electronic form, the county only agreed to share data in paper form, which would have created an enormous data entry burden. Because another site in the sample was considered similar to the Cerro Gordo site (IABV), Cerro Gordo County was dropped from the prospective sites. Bennington County, VT contained the 11 turbine Searsburg Wind Project (6 MW) but had no electronic records. Atlantic County, NJ contained the five turbine Jersey Atlantic Wind Farm (7.5 MW), but had data in paper records only and the county was unresponsive to inquiries regarding the study. The “undesirable” study areas were Plymouth County, MA, Wood County, OH, Cascade County, MT, and Riverside County, CA. Although the data in Plymouth County, MA were more than adequate, this small, on-land, yet coastal Hull Wind facility (2 turbines, 2.5 MW) was not considered to be particularly representative of wind development across the US. Wood County’s four turbine Bowling Green facility (7 MW) met the appropriate data requirements, but ultimately it was decided that this facility was too small and remote to be representative. Cascade County’s six turbine Horseshoe Bend Wind Park (9 MW) did not have enough transactions to justify study. Riverside, CA, where roughly 2500 turbines are located, had less-than-desired home characteristic data, had transactions that came more than 10 years after large scale development began, and despite having homes that were within 1 mile of the turbines, those homes typically had limited views because of high subdivision walls.

Figure 1: Map of Study Areas and Potential Study Areas




Table 2: Summary of Study Areas

Study Area Code	Study Area Counties, States	Facility Names	Number of Turbines	Number of MW	Max Hub Height (meters)	Max Hub Height (feet)
WAOR	Benton and Walla Walla Counties, WA and Umatilla County, OR	Vansycle Ridge, Stateline, Nine Canyon I & II, Combine Hills	582	429	60	197
TXHC	Howard County, TX	Big Spring I & II	46	34	80	262
OKCC	Custer County, OK	Weatherford I & II	98	147	80	262
IABV	Buena Vista County, IA	Storm Lake I & II, Waverly, Intrepid I & II	381	370	65	213
ILCC	Lee County, IL	Mendota Hills, GSG Wind	103	130	78	256
WIKCDC	Kewaunee and Door Counties, WI	Red River, Lincoln	31	20	65	213
PASC	Somerset County, PA	Green Mountain, Somerset, Meyersdale	34	49	80	262
PAWC	Wayne County, PA	Waymart	43	65	65	213
NYMCO	Madison and Oneida Counties, NY	Madison	7	12	67	220
NYMC	Madison County, NY	Fenner	20	30	66	218
		TOTAL	1345	1286		

These 10 study areas and 24 projects are located in nine separate states, and include projects in the Pacific Northwest, upper Midwest, the Northeast, and the South Central region. The wind projects included in the sample total 1,286 MW, or roughly 13% of total U.S. wind power capacity installed at the time (the end of 2005). Turbine hub heights in the sample range from a

minimum of 164 feet (50 meters) in the Washington/Oregon (WAOR) study area, to a maximum of 262 (80 meters) (TXHC, OKCC and PASC), with nine of the ten study areas having hub heights of at least 213 feet (65 meters). The sites include a diverse variety of land types, including combinations of ridgeline (WAOR, PASC, and PAWC), rolling hills (ILLC, WIKCDC, NYMCOC, and NYMC), mesa (TXHC), and windswept plains (OKCC, IABV).²³

3.2. Data Collection

In general, for each study area, residential transaction data in as close proximity to the wind turbines as possible was sought, from both before and after wind facility construction. To balance the cost and quantity of data collection in each study area with the desire to cover as many study areas as possible, the research effort sought to collect data on 400 to 1,250 transactions in each study area.²⁴ In some instances, this meant including all residential transactions within ten miles of the wind turbines. In others, only transactions within five miles were included. In some extreme instances, when the number of transactions inside of five miles far exceeded the 1,250 limit, all transactions in close proximity to the wind turbines (e.g., inside three miles) were included in combination with a random sample of transactions outside of that distance band (e.g., between three and five miles).²⁵ The data selection processes for each Study Area are contained in Appendix A.

Three primary sets of data are used in the analysis: tabular data, GIS data, and field data, each of which is discussed below. Following that, this subsection highlights the two qualitative variables that are essential to this analysis and that therefore require special attention, scenic vista and views of turbines, and then discusses the field data collection process.

3.2.1. Tabular Data

Berkeley Lab obtained tabular transaction data from participating counties²⁶ containing 7,459 “valid”²⁷ transactions of single family residential homes, on less than 25 acres,²⁸ which were

²³ Some areas, such as PASC, had both a ridgeline and rolling hills on which wind facilities were located.

²⁴ This range was chosen to ensure that a minimum of data were present in each study area to allow for a robust analysis, and yet not too much so as to make data collection (e.g., the visiting of each home) inordinately time and resource consuming in any individual study area.

²⁵ An alternative method would have been to collect data on every sale that occurred. Although in most cases this would be preferred, in ours it would not have added one additional transaction within close proximity or with dramatic views of wind turbine, the focus of the study. Rather, it would have added an overwhelming majority of transactions of homes without views and at distances outside of three miles from the turbines, all of which would have come at considerably cost and, more importantly, would not likely have influenced the results significantly while perhaps necessitating a reduction in the total number of study areas that could be included in the sample.

²⁶ In some cases, the county officials, themselves, extracted data from their database, and in some cases a company engaged to manage a county’s data provided the necessary information. In either case the provider is referred to as “county.” Detailed descriptions of the providers are presented in Appendix A.

²⁷ Validity was determined by each individual county data provider. A sale that is considered “valid” for county purposes would normally meet the minimum requirements of being arm’s length; being a transfer of all rights and warrants associated with the real estate; containing an insignificant amount of personal property so as not to affect the price; demonstrating that neither party in the sale acting under duress or coercion; not being the result of a liquidation of assets or any other auction, a mortgage foreclosure, a tax sale, or a quit claim; and being appropriate for use in calculating the sales price to assessed value ratios that are reported to the state. Due to the formal requirements associated with this calculation, “validity” is often defined by a state’s Department of Revenue, as shown, for example, here: <http://www.orps.state.ny.us/assessor/manuals/vol6/rfv/index.htm>. In addition, though the

sold for a price of more than \$10,000,²⁹ which occurred after January 1, 1996,³⁰ and which had fully populated “core” home characteristics. These core characteristics are: number of square feet of the living area (not including finished basement), acres of land, bathrooms, and fireplaces, the year the home was built,³¹ if the home had exterior walls that were stone, a central air conditioning unit, and/or a finished basement, and the exterior condition of the home. The 7,459 residential transactions in the sample consist of 6,194 homes (a number of the homes in the sample sold more than once in the selected study period). Because each transaction had a corresponding set of the core home characteristic data, they could all be pooled into a single model. In addition to the home characteristic data, each county provided, at a minimum, the home’s physical address and sales price. The counties often also provided data on homes in the study area that did not sell in the study period.³² Finally, market-specific quarterly housing inflation indexes were obtained from Freddie Mac, which allowed nominal sales prices to be adjusted to 1996 dollars.³³

sample originally contained 7,498 sales, 34 homes sold twice in a 6 month period and, after discussions with local officials, these transactions were considered likely to have been “invalid” despite the county coding them to the contrary. Additionally, five transactions produced standardized residuals that were more than six standard deviations away from the mean, indicating that these sales were abnormal and likely not valid. Both of these sets of transactions, totaling 39, were removed from the final dataset. Of the 39 sales, 32 sold following construction, 10 were concentrated in IABV and nine in TXHC with the others spread between seven of the remaining eight study areas. One of the homes was inside of one mile from the turbines at the time of sale, and two had views of the turbines (both of which were MINOR). The home that was located within one mile was surrounded by a number of other homes – at similar distances from the turbines - that transacted both before and after the wind facilities were built and were included in the sample. A more thorough discussion of the screening techniques used to ensure the appropriateness of the final data set are presented in detail in Appendix G under “Outliers/Influencers.” Finally, it should be noted that the authors are aware of four instances in the study areas when homes were sold to wind developers. In two cases the developer did not resell the home; in the other two, the developer resold the home at a lower price than which it was purchased. But, because the sales were to a related party, these transactions were not considered “valid” and are therefore not included here. One might, however, reasonably expect that the property values of these homes were impacted by the presence of the wind turbines.

²⁸ Single family residences on more than 25 acres were considered to be likely candidates for alternative uses, such as agricultural and recreational, which could have an influence on sales price that was outside of the capabilities of the model to estimate. Because all records were for parcels that contained a residence, the model did not contain any “land-only” transactions. Further, none of the transactions provided for this research were for parcels on which a turbine was located.

²⁹ A sales price of \$10,000 was considered the absolute minimum amount an improved parcel (one containing a residential structure) would sell for in any of the study areas and study periods. This provided an additional screen over and above the “valid” screen that the counties performed.

³⁰ This provided a maximum of 12 years of data. Some counties did not have accessible data back to 1996 but in all cases these countries had data on transactions that occurred before the wind facilities were erected.

³¹ “Year Built” was used to construct a variable for the age of the home at the time of the sale.

³² These data were used to calculate the “Sales Volume” percentages referred to in Section 7.

³³ Freddie Mac Conventional Mortgage Home Price Index: municipal statistical area (MSA) series data are available from the following site: <http://www.freddiemac.com/finance/cmhpi/>. Because most of the study areas do not fall within the MSAs, a collection of local experts was relied upon, including real estate agents, assessors, and appraisers, to decide which MSA most-closely matched that of the local market. In all cases the experts had consensus as to the best MSA to use. In one case (NYMCOC) the sample was split between two MSAs. These indexes are adjusted quarterly, and span the entire sample period. Therefore, during the housing boom, insofar as a boom occurred in the sample areas, the indexes increased in value. Subsequently when the market began falling, the index retracted.

3.2.2. GIS Data

GIS data on parcel location and shape were also required, and were obtained from the counties. The counties also often provided GIS layers for roads, water courses, water bodies, wind turbines (in some cases), house locations, and school district and township/town/village delineations. GIS data on census tract and school district delineations were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau, if not provided by the county.³⁴ GIS data were obtained on water courses, water bodies, land elevations, and satellite imagery, as was necessary, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture.³⁵ Combined, these data allowed each home to be identified in the field, the construction of a GIS layer of wind turbine locations for each facility, and the calculation of the distance from each home to the nearest wind turbine.³⁶ Determining the distance from each home to the nearest wind turbine was a somewhat involved process, and is discussed in detail in Appendix B. Suffice it to say that each transaction had a unique distance (“DISTANCE”)³⁷ that was determined as the distance between the home and nearest wind turbine at the time of sale, and that these distances are grouped into five categories: inside of 3000 feet (0.57 miles), between 3000 feet and one mile, between one and three miles, between three and five miles, and outside of five miles.³⁸ Finally, the GIS data were used to discern if the home was situated on a cul-de-sac and had water frontage, both of which were corroborated in the field.

3.2.3. Field Data

Additional data had to be collected through field visits to all homes in the sample. Two qualitative measures in particular – for scenic vista and for view of the wind turbines – are worth discussing in detail because each is essential to the analysis and each required some amount of professional judgment in its creation.

The impact or severity of the view of wind turbines (“VIEW”)³⁹ may be related to some combination of the number of turbines that are visible, the amount of each turbine that is visible (e.g., just the tips of the blades or all of the blades and the tower), the distance to the nearest turbines, the direction that the turbines are arrayed in relation to the viewer (e.g., parallel or perpendicular), the contrast of the turbines to their background, and the degree to which the turbine arrays are harmoniously placed into the landscape (Gipe, 2002). Recent efforts have made some progress in developing quantitative measures of the aesthetic impacts of wind turbines (Torres-Sibillea et al., 2009),⁴⁰ but, at the time this project began, few measures had

³⁴ These data were sourced from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Cartographic Boundary Files Webpage: http://www.census.gov/geo/www/cob/bdy_files.html.

³⁵ These data were sourced from the USDA Geospatial Data Gateway: <http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/GatewayHome.html>.

³⁶ Although in some cases the county provided a GIS layer containing wind turbine points, often this was not available. A description of the turbine mapping process is provided in Appendix B.

³⁷ Distance measures are collectively and individually referred to as “DISTANCE” from this point forward.

³⁸ The minimum distance of “inside 3000 feet” was chosen because it was the closest cutoff that still provided an ample supply of data for analysis.

³⁹ View of turbines ratings are collectively and individually referred to as “VIEW” from this point forward.

⁴⁰ In addition to these possible field techniques, previous studies have attempted to use GIS to estimate wind turbine visibility using “line-of-sight” algorithms. For example, Hoen (2006) used these algorithms after adding ground cover to the underlying elevation layer. He found that the GIS method differed substantially from the data collected in the field. Seemingly, small inaccuracies in the underlying elevation model, errors in the software’s algorithm, and the existence of ground cover not fully accounted for in the GIS, substantially biased GIS-based assessments of

been developed, and what had been developed was difficult to apply in the field (e.g., Bishop, 2002). As a result, the authors opted to develop an ordered qualitative VIEW rating system that consisted of placing the view of turbines into one of five possible categories: NO VIEW, MINOR, MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL, and EXTREME. These ratings were developed to encompass considerations of distance, number of turbines visible, and viewing angle into one ordered categorical scale, and each rating is defined in Table 3:⁴¹

Table 3: Definition of VIEW Categories

NO VIEW	The turbines are not visible at all from this home.
MINOR VIEW	The turbines are visible, but the scope (viewing angle) is narrow, there are many obstructions, or the distance between the home and the facility is large.
MODERATE VIEW	The turbines are visible, but the scope is either narrow or medium, there might be some obstructions, and the distance between the home and the facility is most likely a few miles.
SUBSTANTIAL VIEW	The turbines are dramatically visible from the home. The turbines are likely visible in a wide scope and most likely the distance between the home and the facility is short.
EXTREME VIEW	This rating is reserved for sites that are unmistakably dominated by the presence of the wind facility. The turbines are dramatically visible from the home and there is a looming quality to their placement. The turbines are often visible in a wide scope or the distance to the facility is very small.

Photographic examples of each of the categories are contained in Appendix E.

visibility. This was corroborated elsewhere by Maloy and Dean (2001) and Riggs and Dean (2007). As a result of these findings, it was determined that field collection of VIEW data was essential.

⁴¹In addition to the qualitative rating system that was ultimately used in this study, a variety of quantitative data were collected that might describe the nature of the view of wind turbines, including the total number of turbines visible, the distance of the home to the nearest wind turbine, and the view scope/viewing angle (i.e., the degree to which the turbines spread out in front of the home: narrow, medium, or wide). To explore the validity of the qualitative rating scale two tests were conducted. First, a pre-study survey was conducted by showing 10 different off-site respondents 15 randomly selected photographs from the field representing the various rated VIEW categories. The higher VIEW ratings were oversampled to create a roughly equal distribution among the categories. The respondents rated the views into one of the qualitative categories. The on-site / field collected ratings matched the off-site responses 65% of the time, with 97% of the rankings differing by no more than one category. Ninety-eight percent of the on-site-ranked MINOR VIEWS and 89% of the EXTREME VIEWS were similarly ranked by off-site respondents. The on-site rankings were less than the off-site rankings 97% of the time; it is assumed that this is because on-site ratings took into account a greater portion of the panorama than were captured in the photos, which translated into a lower ranking. Secondly, a post hoc Multinomial Logistic Regression model was created that used the qualitative on-site VIEW ratings as the dependent variable and the quantitative measures of distance to nearest turbine, number of turbines visible, and view scope as the independent variables. This model produced high Pseudo R² statistics (Cox and Snell 0.88, Nagelkerke 0.95, and McFadden 0.79) and predicted values that were highly correlated with the actual qualitative rating (Pearson's 0.88). Therefore, both tests corroborated the appropriateness of the simpler qualitative VIEW rankings used herein.

In addition to the qualitative VIEW measurements, a rating for the quality of the scenic vista (“VISTA”)⁴² from each home, absent the existence of the wind facilities, was also collected in the field. An assessment of the quality of the VISTA from each home was needed because VIEW and VISTA are expected to be correlated; for example, homes with a PREMIUM VISTA are more likely to have a wide viewing angle in which wind turbines might also be seen. Therefore, to accurately measure the impacts of the VIEW of wind turbines on property values a concurrent control for VISTA (independent of any views of turbines) is required. Drawing heavily on the landscape-quality rating system developed by Buhyoff et al. (1994) and to a lesser degree on the systems described by others (Daniel and Boster, 1976; USDA, 1995), an ordered VISTA rating system consisting of five categories was developed: POOR, BELOW AVERAGE, AVERAGE, ABOVE AVERAGE, and PREMIUM, with each rating defined in Table 4:⁴³

Table 4: Definition of VISTA Categories

POOR VISTA	These vistas are often dominated by visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines), or are uncomfortable spaces for people, lack interest, or have virtually no recreational potential.
BELOW AVERAGE VISTA	These scenic vistas contain visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines) but are not dominated by them. They are not inviting spaces for people, but are not uncomfortable. They have little interest or mystery and have minor recreational potential.
AVERAGE VISTA	These scenic vistas include interesting views that can be enjoyed often only in a narrow scope. These vistas may contain some visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines), are moderately comfortable spaces for people, have some interest, and have minor recreational potential.
ABOVE AVERAGE VISTA	These scenic vistas include interesting views that often can be enjoyed in a medium to wide scope. They might contain some man-made alterations (not considering turbines), yet still possess significant interest and mystery, are moderately balanced and have some potential for recreation.
PREMIUM VISTA	These scenic vistas would include "picture postcard" views that can be enjoyed in a wide scope. They are often free or largely free of any discordant man made alterations (not considering turbines), possess significant interest, memorable qualities, and mystery and are well balanced and likely have a high potential for recreation.

Photographic examples of each of the categories are contained in Appendix D.

⁴² Scenic vista ratings are individually and collectively referred to as “VISTA” from this point forward.

⁴³ The appropriateness of these rankings were tested in two ways. First, a set of 34 pictures taken on-site and representing various categories of VISTA were shown to 10 off-site respondents who were asked to rank them using the same categories, and then explain why they rated them as such. Although the off-site ratings matched the on-site ratings only 51% of the time, 94% of on- and off-site rankings differed by no more than one category, with 17% of the off-site rankings below the on-site and 26% ranked above. The descriptions of why the rankings were chosen by the off-site respondents illuminated the fact that off-site ratings did not take into account a number of aspects that were not adequately captured in the photos, but that were apparent in the field. This finding was borne out by a second test that had five individuals visit seven homes in the field to rank their scenic vistas. When all respondents were on-site, they similarly ranked the vista 72% of the time, with a ranking that differed by no more than one category occurring one hundred percent of the time.

In addition to the VIEW and VISTA ratings, it was assumed that the orientation of the home to the view of turbines (e.g., front, back, or side) (“ORIENTATION”), and the degree to which the view of the turbines overlapped the primary scenic vista (e.g., not at all, barely, somewhat or strongly) (“OVERLAP”), might influence residential property values. As such, information on ORIENTATION and OVERLAP were also collected in the field.

3.2.4. Field Data Collection

Field data collection was conducted on a house-by-house basis. Each of the 6,194 homes was visited by the same individual to remove bias among field ratings. Data collection was conducted in the fall of 2006, and the spring, summer, and fall of 2007 and 2008. Each house was photographed and, when appropriate, so too were views of turbines and the prominent scenic vista.⁴⁴ Data on VIEW were collected only for those homes that sold after at least one wind power facility had been erected in the study area. When multiple wind facilities, with different construction dates, were visible from a home, field ratings for VIEW were made by taking into account which turbines had been erected at the time of sale. Additionally, if the season at the time of sale differed from that of data collection and, for example, if leaves were off the trees for one but on for the other, an effort was made to modulate the VIEW rating accordingly if necessary.⁴⁵

Both VIEW and VISTA field ratings were arrived at through a Q-Sort method (Pitt and Zube, 1979), which is used to distinguish relatively similar rankings. For views of turbines, the rater first determined if the ranking was MINOR or EXTREME. If neither of these two rankings was appropriate, then only a choice between MODERATE and SUBSTANTIAL was required. Similarly, for VISTA rankings, first POOR and PREMIUM were distinguished from the others; if neither applied then BELOW AVERAGE or ABOVE AVERAGE could be selected. If neither of those were appropriate the VISTA, by default, was considered AVERAGE. In all cases, if wind turbines were visible from the home, the VISTA rankings were made as if those turbines did not exist.

3.3. Data Summary

The final dataset consists of 7,459 valid and screened residential transactions occurring between January 2, 1996 and June 30, 2007. Those transactions are arrayed across time and the ten wind project study areas as shown in Table 5. The sample of valid residential transactions ranges from 412 in Lee County, Illinois (ILLC) to 1,311 in Howard County, Texas (TXHC).⁴⁶ Of the total 7,459 transactions, 4,937 occurred after construction commenced on the relevant wind facilities. More specifically, 23% of the transactions ($n=1,755$) took place before any wind facility was announced and 10% occurred after announcement but before construction commenced ($n=767$),

⁴⁴ In many cases the prominent VISTA was homogenous across groups of home, for instance urban homes on the same road. In those cases a picture of the VISTA of one home was applied to all of the homes. All pictures were taken with a Canon EOS Rebel XTi Single Lens Reflex Camera with a 18-55mm lens. VIEW and VISTA pictures were taken with the lens set to 18mm, with the camera at head height, and with the center of the camera pointed at the center of the prominent VISTA or VIEW. Examples of the various VISTA and VIEW categories are contained in Appendices D and E respectively.

⁴⁵ This “modulation” occurred only for trees in the foreground, where, for instance, a single tree could obscure the view of turbines; this would not be the case for trees nearer the horizon.

⁴⁶ See description of “valid” in footnote 27 on page 13.

with the rest of the transactions occurring after construction commenced (66%, $n=4,937$).⁴⁷ Of that latter group, 17% ($n=824$, 11% of total) sold in the first year following the commencement of construction, 16% in the second year ($n=811$, 11% of total), and the remainder (67%) sold more than two years after construction commenced ($n=3,302$, 44% of total).

Table 5: Summary of Transactions across Study Areas and Development Periods


	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Benton/Walla Walla, WA & Umatilla, OR (WAOR)	226	45	76	59	384	790
Howard, TX (TXHC)	169	71	113	131	827	1311
Custer, OK (OKCC)	484	153	193	187	96	1113
Buena Vista, IA (IABV)	152	65	80	70	455	822
Lee, IL (ILLC)	115	84	62	71	80	412
Kewaunee/Door, WI (WIKCDC)	44	41	68	62	595	810
Somerset, PA (PASC)	175	28	46	60	185	494
Wayne, PA (PAWC)	223	106	64	71	87	551
Madison/Oneida, NY (MYMCOC)	108	9	48	30	268	463
Madison, NY (NYMC)	59	165	74	70	325	693
TOTAL	1755	767	824	811	3302	7459

A basic summary of the resulting dataset, including the many independent variables used in the hedonic models described later, is contained in Table 6 and Table 7. These tables present summary information for the full dataset (7,459 transactions) as well as the post-construction subset of that dataset (4,937 transactions); the latter is provided because much of the analysis that follows focuses on those homes that sold after wind facility construction. The mean nominal residential transaction price in the sample is \$102,968, or \$79,114 in 1996 dollars. The average house in the sample can be described as follows: it is 46 years old, has 1,620 square feet of finished living area above ground, is situated on 1.13 acres, has 1.74 bathrooms, and has a

⁴⁷ The announcement date (as well as construction and online dates) was provided by Energy Velocity with the GIS files as described in footnote 20 on page 10. The date corresponds to the first time the facility appears in the public record, which was often the permit application date. This constitutes the first well established date when the existing wind facility would have been likely known by the public, and therefore is appropriate to use for this analysis, but there remain a number of areas for potential bias in this date. First, the permit application date might be preceded by news reports of the impending application; alternatively, if the public record was not published online (that Energy Velocity used to establish their date), the “announcement” date – as used here - could, in fact, follow the permit application date. To address this, when possible, the authors had discussions with the developer of the facility. In most cases, the Energy Velocity dates were found to be accurate, and when they were not they were adjusted to reflect the dates provided by the developer. A second potential source of bias is the possibility that a different project was proposed but never built, but that influenced the residential market in the study area prior to the “announcement” date. Although this is likely rarer, we are aware of at least a few projects that fit that description in the study areas. A final source of bias might revolve around the likelihood that awareness of a project could occur even before the facility is formally announced. For example, a community member might know that a wind facility is being considered because they had been approached by the wind development company well ahead of a public announcement. In turn, they might have had private discussions regarding the facility with other members of the community. Taken together, it is appropriate to assume that there is some bias in the “announcement” date, and that awareness of the project might precede the date used in this analysis. How this bias might affect the results in this report is addressed further in Section 5.3 and footnote 74 on page 38.


slightly better than average condition.⁴⁸ Within the full sample, 6% and 58% of homes had a poor or below average VISTA rating, respectively; 26% of homes received an average rating on this scale, with 9% above average and 2% experiencing premium vistas (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Frequency of VISTA Ratings for All and Post-Construction Transactions



With respect to the variables of interest, among the post-construction subset of 4,937 transactions, the frequency of the DISTANCE categories is found to follow geometry with the smallest numbers of transactions occurring near the wind turbines and ever increasing numbers further away (see Figure 3). 67 transactions (1%) are situated inside of 3,000 feet (< 0.57 Miles), 58 (1%) are between 3,000 feet and one mile (0.57-1 mile), 2,019 (41%) occur outside of one mile but inside of three miles (1-3 miles), 1,923 (39%) occur between three and five miles (3-5 miles), and 870 (18%) occur outside of five miles (>5 miles).⁴⁹ In this same post-construction group, a total of 730 homes that sold (15%) have a view of the wind turbines (see Figure 4). A large majority of those homes have MINOR view ratings ($n = 561$, 11% of total), with 2% having MODERATE ratings ($n=106$) and the remaining transactions roughly split between SUBSTANTIAL and EXTREME ratings ($n=35$, 0.6%, and $n=28$, 0.5%, respectively). A full description of the variables of interest and how they are arrayed at the study area level is contained in Appendix A.

Figure 3: Frequency of DISTANCE Ratings for Post-Construction Transactions



⁴⁸ The variable for the condition of the home was not uniform across study areas because, in some cases, it took into account construction grade while in others it did not.

⁴⁹ These numbers and percentages are skewed slightly from the overall population of transactions because homes outside of three miles were often under-sampled to reduce field data collection burdens. Further, higher numbers of homes fall into each of the categories when the post-announcement-pre-construction transactions are included, as they are in some models. These additional transactions are described below in Table 7 under “All Sales.”

Figure 4: Frequency of VIEW Ratings for Post-Construction Transactions




Table 6: Summary Statistics: All Sales and Post-Construction Sales

Variable Name	Description	All Sales			Post Construction Sales		
		Freq. *	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq. *	Mean	Std. Dev.
SalePrice	The unadjusted sale price of the home (in US dollars)	7,459	102,968	64,293	4,937	110,166	69,422
SalePrice96	The sale price of the home adjusted to 1996 US dollars	7,459	79,114	47,257	4,937	80,156	48,906
LN_SalePrice96	The natural log transformation of the sale price of the home adjusted to 1996 US dollars	7,459	11.12	0.58	4,937	11.12	0.60
AgeatSale	The age of the home at the time of sale	7,459	46	37	4,937	47	36
AgeatSale_Sqrd	The age of the home at the time of sale squared	7,459	3,491	5,410	4,937	3,506	5,412
Sqft_1000	The number of square feet of above grade finished living area (in 1000s)	7,459	1.623	0.59	4,937	1.628	0.589
Acres	The number of Acres sold with the residence	7,459	1.13	2.42	4,937	1.10	2.40
Baths	The number of Bathrooms (Full Bath = 1, Half Bath = 0.5)	7,459	1.74	0.69	4,937	1.75	0.70
ExtWalls_Stone	If the home has exterior walls of stone, brick or stucco (Yes = 1, No = 0)	2,287	0.31	0.46	1,486	0.30	0.46
CentralAC	If the home has a Central AC unit (Yes = 1, No = 0)	3,785	0.51	0.50	2,575	0.52	0.50
Fireplace	The number of fireplace openings	2,708	0.39	0.55	1,834	0.40	0.55
Cul_De_Sac	If the home is situated on a cul-de-sac (Yes = 1, No = 0)	990	0.13	0.34	673	0.14	0.34
FinBsmnt	If finished basement square feet is greater than 50% times first floor square feet (Yes = 1, No = 0)	1,472	0.20	0.40	992	0.20	0.40
Water_Front	If the home shares a property line with a body of water or river (Yes = 1, No = 0)	107	0.01	0.12	87	0.02	0.13
Cnd_Low	If the condition of the home is Poor (Yes = 1, No = 0)	101	0.01	0.12	69	0.01	0.12
Cnd_BAvg	If the condition of the home is Below Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	519	0.07	0.25	359	0.07	0.26
Cnd_Avg	If the condition of the home is Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	4,357	0.58	0.49	2,727	0.55	0.50
Cnd_AAVg	If the condition of the home is Above Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	2,042	0.27	0.45	1,445	0.29	0.46
Cnd_High	If the condition of the home is High (Yes = 1, No = 0)	440	0.06	0.24	337	0.07	0.25
Vista_Poor	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Poor (Yes = 1, No = 0)	470	0.06	0.24	310	0.06	0.24
Vista_BAvg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Below Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	4,301	0.58	0.49	2,857	0.58	0.49
Vista_Avg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	1,912	0.26	0.44	1,247	0.25	0.44
Vista_AAVg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Above Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	659	0.09	0.28	448	0.09	0.29
Vista_Prem	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Premium (Yes = 1, No = 0)	117	0.02	0.12	75	0.02	0.12
SaleYear	The year the home was sold	7,459	2002	2.9	4,937	2004	2.3

* "Freq." applies to the number of cases the parameter's value is not zero

Table 7: Summary of Variables of Interest: All Sales and Post-Construction Sales

Variable Name	Description	All Sales			Post Construction Sales		
		Freq. *	Mean	Std. Dev.	Freq. *	Mean	Std. Dev.
View_None	If the home sold after construction began and had no view of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	4,207	0.56	0.50	4,207	0.85	0.36
View_Minor	If the home sold after construction began and had a Minor View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	561	0.08	0.26	561	0.11	0.32
View_Mod	If the home sold after construction began and had a Moderate View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	106	0.01	0.12	106	0.02	0.15
View_Sub	If the home sold after construction began and had a Substantial View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	35	-	0.07	35	0.01	0.08
View_Extrm	If the home sold after construction began and had an Extreme View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	28	-	0.06	28	0.01	0.08
DISTANCE †	Distance to nearest turbine if the home sold after facility "announcement", otherwise 0	5,705	2.53	2.59	4,895	3.57	1.68
Mile_Less_0.57 †	If the home sold after facility "announcement" and was within 0.57 miles (3000 feet) of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	80	0.01	0.09	67	0.01	0.12
Mile_0.57to1 †	If the home sold after facility "announcement" and was between 0.57 miles (3000 feet) and 1 mile of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	65	0.01	0.09	58	0.01	0.11
Mile_1to3 †	If the home sold after facility "announcement" and was between 1 and 3 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	2,359	0.27	0.44	2,019	0.41	0.49
Mile_3to5 †	If the home sold after facility "announcement" and was between 3 and 5 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	2,200	0.26	0.44	1,923	0.39	0.49
Mile_Gtr5 †	If the home sold after facility "announcement" and was outside 5 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	1,000	0.12	0.32	870	0.18	0.38

* "Freq." applies to the number of cases the parameter's value is not zero

† "All Sales" freq., mean and standard deviation DISTANCE and DISTANCE fixed effects variables (e.g., Mile_1to3) include transactions that occurred after facility "announcement" and before "construction" as well as those that occurred post-construction

4. Base Hedonic Model

This section uses the primary hedonic model (“Base Model”) to assess whether residential sales prices are affected, in a statistically measurable way, by views of and proximity to wind power facilities. In so doing, it simultaneously tests for the presence of the three potential property value stigmas associated with wind power facilities: Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance. This section begins with a discussion of the dataset that is used and the form of the model that is estimated, and then turns to the results of the analysis. Various alternative hedonic models are discussed and estimated in Section 5, with Sections 6 and 7 providing a discussion of and results from the repeat sales and sales volume models.

4.1. Dataset

The data used for the Base Model were described in Section 3.3. A key threshold question is whether or not to include the residential transactions that pre-date the relevant wind facility. Specifically, though the complete dataset consists of 7,459 residential transactions, a number of these transactions ($n = 2,522$) occurred before the wind facility was constructed. Should these homes which, at the time of sale, would not have had any view of or distance to the wind facility, be included? Two approaches could be applied to address this issue. First, pre-construction transactions could be included in the hedonic model either as part of the reference category within which no wind-project property value impacts are assumed to exist, or instead by specifically identifying these pre-construction transactions through an indicator variable. Second, and alternatively, pre-construction transactions could simply be excluded from the analysis altogether.

For the purpose of the Base Model, the latter approach is used, therefore relying on only the post-construction subset of 4,937 residential transactions. This approach, as compared to the others, results in somewhat more intuitive findings because all homes have a distance greater than zero and have a possibility of some view of the turbines. More importantly, this approach minimizes the chance of inaccuracies that may otherwise exist due to inflation adjustment concerns or outdated home characteristics information.⁵⁰ Nonetheless, to test for the implications of this choice of datasets, alternative hedonic models that use the full dataset were estimated, and are discussed in detail in Sections 5.3 and 5.4.

⁵⁰ Home characteristics were obtained as of the last property assessment. The timing of that assessment relative to the timing of the home sale transaction dictates how representative the assessed home characteristics are of the subject home when it was sold. For example, if a home sold early in the study period but subsequently had significant improvements made that are reflected in the current assessment data used in the analysis, the model would assign value to these home characteristics at the time of sale when, in fact, those characteristics were inaccurate. Additionally, the inflation adjustment index used in this analysis to translate home values to real 1996 dollars came from the nearest or more appropriate municipal statistical area (MSA). Many of the wind projects in the analysis are located in relatively rural parts of the country, and the housing market in the nearest metropolitan area could be different than the market surrounding wind projects. Although these areas have – in many instances – recently begun to attract home buyers willing to commute back to the metropolitan areas on which the index is based, the older index adjustments are likely less accurate than the more recent adjustments. Using a subset of the data for the majority of the analyses that removes the older, pre-construction, homes minimizes both of these biases.

4.2. Model Form

A standard semi-log functional form is used for the hedonic models (as was discussed in Section 2.1), where the dependent variable (sales price in inflation-adjusted 1996 dollars) is transformed to its natural log form and the independent variables (e.g., square feet and acres) are not transformed. Using this form to examine the effect that views of, and distance to, wind facilities have on sales prices, the following basic model is estimated:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where

P represents the inflation-adjusted sales price,

N is the spatially weighted neighbors' predicted sales price,

S is the vector of s Study Area fixed effects variables (e.g., WAOR, OKCC, etc.),

X is a vector of k home and site characteristics (e.g., acres, square feet, number of bathrooms, condition of the home, age of home, VISTA, etc.),

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view of turbine variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),

DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance to turbine variables (e.g., less than 3000 feet, between one and three miles, etc.),

β_0 is the constant or intercept across the full sample,

β_1 is a parameter estimate for the spatially weighted neighbor's predicted sales price,

β_2 is a vector of s parameter estimates for the study area fixed effects as compared to homes sold in the Washington/Oregon (WAOR) study area,

β_3 is a vector of k parameter estimates for the home and site characteristics,

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables as compared to homes sold with no view of the turbines,

β_5 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to homes sold situated outside of five miles, and

ε is a random disturbance term.

As such, this model, and all subsequent hedonic models, has four primary groups of parameters: variables of interest, spatial adjustments, study-area fixed effects, and home and site characteristics.

The variables of interest, VIEW and DISTANCE, are the focus of this study, and allow the investigation of the presence of Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance Stigmas. These variables were defined in Section 3, and are summarized in Table 8. Both VIEW and DISTANCE appear in the model together because a home's value may be affected in part by the magnitude of the view of the wind turbines, and in part by the distance from the home to those turbines, and both variables appear in the Base Model as ordered categorical values. The coefficients associated with these two vectors of variables (β_4 and β_5) represent the marginal impact of views of, and distances to, wind turbines on sales prices, as compared to a "reference" category of residential transactions, and should be ordered monotonically from low to high.⁵¹ This form of variable was used to

⁵¹ "Reference category" refers to the subset of the sample to which other observations are compared, and is pertinent when using categorical or "fixed effect" variables.

impose the least structure on the underlying data.⁵² For the purpose of the Base Model, the reference category for the DISTANCE variables are those transactions of homes that were situated outside of five miles from the nearest wind turbine. The reference category for the VIEW variables are those transactions of homes that did not have a view of the wind facility upon sale. Among the post-construction sample of homes, these reference homes are considered the least likely to be affected by the presence of the wind facilities.⁵³

Table 8: List of Variables of Interest Included in the Base Model

Variable Name	Description	Type	Expected Sign
View_None	If the home sold after construction began and had no view of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Reference	n/a
View_Minor	If the home sold after construction began and had a Minor View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
View_Mod	If the home sold after construction began and had a Moderate View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
View_Sub	If the home sold after construction began and had a Substantial View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
View_Extrm	If the home sold after construction began and had an Extreme View of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Mile_Less_0.57	If the home sold after facility "construction" and was within 0.57 miles (3000 feet) of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Mile_0.57to1	If the home sold after facility "construction" and was between 0.57 miles (3000 feet) and 1 mile of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Mile_1to3	If the home sold after facility "construction" and was between 1 and 3 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Mile_3to5	If the home sold after facility "construction" and was between 3 and 5 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Mile_Gtr5	If the home sold after facility "construction" and was outside 5 miles of the turbines (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Reference	n/a

"OC" Ordered Categorical (1 = yes, 0 = no) values are interpreted in relation to the reference categorical case and are expected to have a monotonic order from low to high.

The three stigmas are investigated through these VIEW and DISTANCE variables. Scenic Vista Stigma is investigated through the VIEW variables. Area and Nuisance Stigmas, on the other hand, are investigated through the DISTANCE variables. To distinguish between Area and

⁵² In place of the ordered categorical DISTANCE variables, practitioners often rely on a continuous DISTANCE form (e.g., Sims et al., 2008). Similar to ordered categorical variables, continuous variables have a natural ordering, either ascending or descending, but, unlike categorical variables, these "continuous" values are on a scale. Therefore, given any two of its values X_1 and X_2 and a specific functional form, the ratio " X_1/X_2 " and the distance " $X_1 - X_2$ " have a fixed meaning. Examples of continuous variables other than DISTANCE that are commonly used include the number of square feet of living area (in 1000s) in a home (SQFT_1000) or the acres in the parcel (ACRES). A continuous functional form of this nature "imposes structure" because practitioners must decide how price is related to the underlying variables through the selection of a specific functional relationship between the two. For instance, in the case of DISTANCE, is there a linear relationship (which would imply a similar marginal difference between two distances both near and far from the turbines), does it decay slowly as distance grows, or does it fade completely at some fixed distance? Because of the lack of literature in this area, no *a priori* expectations for which functional form is the best were established, and therefore unstructured categorical variables are used in the Base Model. Nonetheless, a continuous DISTANCE form is explored in Section 5.2.

⁵³ It is worth noting that these reference homes are situated in both rural and urban locales and therefore are not uniquely affected by influences from either setting. This further reinforces their worthiness as a reference category.

Nuisance Stigma, it is assumed that Nuisance effects are concentrated within one mile of the nearest wind turbine, while Area effects will be considered for those transactions outside of one mile. Any property value effects discovered outside of one mile and based on the DISTANCE variables are therefore assumed to indicate the presence of Area Stigma, while impacts within a mile may reflect the combination of Nuisance and Area Stigma.

The second set of variables in the Base Model - spatial adjustments - correct for the assumed presence of spatial autocorrelation in the error term (ϵ). It is well known that the sales price of a home can be systematically influenced by the sales prices of those homes that have sold nearby. Both the seller and the buyer use information from comparable surrounding sales to inform them of the appropriate transaction price, and nearby homes often experience similar amenities and disamenities. This lack of independence of home sale prices could bias hedonic regression results and, to help correct for this bias, a spatially (i.e., distance) weighted neighbors' sales price (N) is included in the model. Empirically, the neighbors' price has been found to be a strong (and sometimes even the strongest) predictor of home values (Leonard and Murdoch, forthcoming), and the coefficient β_1 is expected to be positive, indicating a positive correlation between the neighbors' and subject home's sales price. A more-detailed discussion of the importance of this variable, and how it was created, is contained in Appendix G.

The third group of variables in the Base Model - study area fixed effects - control for study area influences and the differences between them. The vector's parameters β_2 represent the marginal impact of being in any one of the study areas, as compared to a reference category. In this case, the reference category is the Washington/Oregon (WAOR) study area.⁵⁴ The estimated coefficients for this group of variables represent the combined effects of school districts, tax rates, crime, and other locational influences across an entire study area. Although this approach greatly simplifies the estimation of the model, because of the myriad of influences captured by these study-area fixed effects variables, interpreting the coefficient can be difficult. In general, though, the coefficients simply represent the mean difference in sales prices between the study areas and the reference study area (WAOR). These coefficients are expected to be strongly influential, indicating significant differences in sales prices across study areas.

The fourth group of variables in the Base Model are the core home and site characteristics (X), and include a range of continuous ("C"),⁵⁵ discrete ("D"),⁵⁶ binary ("B"),⁵⁷ and ordered categorical ("OC") variables. The specific home and site variables included in the Base Model are listed in Table 9 along with the direction of expected influence.⁵⁸ Variables included are age

⁵⁴ Because there is no intent to focus on the coefficients of the study area fixed effect variables, the reference case is arbitrary. Further, the results for the other variables in the model are completely independent of this choice.

⁵⁵ See discussion in footnote 52 on previous page.

⁵⁶ Discrete variables, similar to continuous variables, are ordered and the distance between the values, such as X_1 and X_2 , have meaning, but for these variables, there are only a relatively small number of discrete values that the variable can take, for example, the number of bathrooms in a home (BATHROOMS).

⁵⁷ Binary variables have only two conditions: "on" or "off" (i.e., "1" or "0" respectively). Examples are whether the home has central air conditioning ("CENTRAL_AC") or if the home is situated on a cul-de-sac ("CUL_DE_SAC"). The coefficients for these variables are interpreted in relation to when the condition is "off."

⁵⁸ For those variables with a "+" sign it is expected that as the variable increases in value (or is valued at "1" as would be the case for fixed effects variables) the price of the home will increase, and the converse is true for the variables with a "-" sign. The expected signs of the variables all follow conventional wisdom (as discussed in

of the home, home and lot size, number of bathrooms and fireplaces, the condition of the home, the quality of the scenic vista from the home, if the home has central AC, a stone exterior, and/or a finished basement, and whether the home is located in a cul-de-sac and/or on a water way.⁵⁹

Table 9: List of Home and Site Characteristics Included in the Base Model

Variable Name	Description	Type	Expected Sign
AgeatSale	The age of the home at the time of sale in years	C	-
AgeatSale_Sqrd	The age of the home at the time of sale squared	C	+
Sqft_1000	The number of square feet of above grade finished living area (in 1000s)	C	+
Acres	The number of Acres sold with the residence	C	+
Baths	The number of Bathrooms (Full Bath = 1, Half Bath = 0.5)	D	+
ExtWalls_Stone	If the home has exterior walls of stone, brick or stucco (Yes = 1, No = 0)	B	+
CentralAC	If the home has a Central AC unit (Yes = 1, No = 0)	B	+
Fireplace	The number of fireplace openings	D	+
Cul_De_Sac	If the home is situated on a cul-de-sac (Yes = 1, No = 0)	B	+
FinBsmt	If finished basement sqft > 50% times first floor sqft (Yes = 1, No = 0)	B	+
Water_Front	If the home shares a property line with a body of water or river (Yes = 1, No = 0)	B	+
Cnd_Low	If the condition of the home is Poor (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Cnd_BAveg	If the condition of the home is Below Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Cnd_Avg	If the condition of the home is Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Reference	n/a
Cnd_AAveg	If the condition of the home is Above Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	+
Cnd_High	If the condition of the home is High (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	+
Vista_Poor	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Poor (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Vista_BAveg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Below Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-
Vista_Avg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Reference	n/a
Vista_AAveg	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Above Average (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	+
Vista_Prem	If the Scenic Vista from the home is Premium (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	+

"C" Continuous, "D" Discrete, and "B" Binary (1 = yes, 0 = no) values are interpreted in relation to "No"

"OC" Ordered Categorical (1 = yes, 0 = no) values are interpreted in relation to the reference categorical case and are expected to have a monotonic order from low to high.

Sirmans et al., 2005a), save AgeatSale and AgeatSale_Sqrd, which are expected to be negative and positive, respectively. The magnitude of the coefficient of AgeatSale is expected to be larger than that of AgeatSale_Sqrd indicating an initial drop in value as a home increases in age, and then an increase in value as the home becomes considerably older and more "historic."

⁵⁹ Some characteristics, such as whether the home had a deck, a pool, or is located on a public sewer, are not available consistently across the dataset and therefore are not incorporated into the model. Other characteristics, such as the number of bedrooms, the number of stories, or if the home had a garage, are available but are omitted from the final model because they are highly correlated with characteristics already included in the model and therefore do not add significantly to the model's explanatory power. More importantly, and as discussed in Appendix G, when their inclusion or exclusion are tested, the results are stable with those derived from the Base Model.

It should be emphasized that in the Base Hedonic Model - equation (1) - and in all subsequent models presented in Section 5, all variables of interest, spatial adjustments, and home and site characteristics are pooled, and therefore their estimates represent the average across all study areas. Ideally, one would have enough data to estimate a model at the study area level - a fully unrestricted model - rather than pooled across all areas. This fully unrestricted model form, along with 15 other model forms (with some variables restricted and others not), are discussed in detail in Appendix F. In total, these 16 different models were estimated to explore which model was the most parsimonious (had the fewest parameters), performed the best (e.g., had the highest adjusted R^2 and the lowest Schwarz information criterion⁶⁰), and had the most stable coefficients and standard errors. The basic pooled model described by equation (1) is found to fit that description, and that model is therefore chosen as the Base Model to which others are compared. By making this choice the effort concentrates on identifying the presence of potential property value impacts across all of the study areas in the sample as opposed to any single study area.⁶¹

Finally, to assure that the model produces the best linear unbiased parameter estimates, the underlying assumptions of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression techniques must be verified:

- 1) Homoskedastic error term;
- 2) Absence of temporal serial correlation;
- 3) Reasonably limited multicollinearity; and
- 4) Appropriate controls for outliers and influencers.⁶²

These assumptions, and the specific approaches that are used to address them, are discussed in detail in Appendix G.

4.3. Analysis of Results

Table 10 (on page 32) presents the results of the Base Model (equation 1).⁶³ The model performs well, with an adjusted R^2 of 0.77.⁶⁴ The spatial adjustment coefficient (β_1) of 0.29 (p value 0.00) indicates that a 10% increase in the spatially weighted neighbor's price increases the subject home's value by an average of 2.9%. The study-area fixed effects (β_2) variables are all significant at the one percent level, demonstrating important differences in home valuations

⁶⁰ The Schwarz information criterion measures relative parsimony between similar models (Schwarz, 1978).

⁶¹ Because effects might vary between study areas, and the models estimate an average across all study areas, the full range of effects in individual study areas will go undetermined. That notwithstanding, there is no reason to suspect that effects will be completely "washed out." For that to occur, an effect in one study area would have to be positive while in another area it would have to be negative, and there is no reason to suspect that sales prices would increase because of the turbines in one community while decreasing in other communities.

⁶² The absence of spatial autocorrelation is often included in the group of assumptions, but because it was discussed above (and in Appendix G), and is addressed directly by the variable (N_i) included in the model, it is not included in this list.


⁶³ This model and all subsequent models were estimated using the PROC REG procedure of SAS Version 9.2 TS1M0, which produces White's corrected standard errors.

⁶⁴ The appropriateness of the R^2 of 0.77 for this research is validated by the extensive hedonic literature that precedes it (see e.g., Kroll and Priestley, 1992; Boyle and Kiel, 2001; Simons, 2006b).

between the reference study area (WAOR) and the other nine study areas.⁶⁵ The sign and magnitudes of the home and site characteristics are all appropriate given the *a priori* expectations, and all are statistically significant at the one percent level.⁶⁶

Of particular interest are the coefficient estimates for scenic vista (VISTA) as shown in Figure 5. Homes with a POOR vista rating are found, on average, to sell for 21% less (*p* value 0.00) than homes with an AVERAGE rating, while BELOW AVERAGE homes sell for 8% less (*p* value 0.00). Conversely, homes with an ABOVE AVERAGE vista are found to sell for 10% more (*p* value 0.00) than homes with an AVERAGE vista, while PREMIUM vista homes sell for 13% more than AVERAGE homes (*p* value 0.00). Based on these results, it is evident that home buyers and sellers capitalize the quality of the scenic vista in sales prices.⁶⁷

Figure 5: Results from the Base Model for VISTA




⁶⁵ The reference category WAOR study area has the highest mean and median house values in the sample (as shown in Appendix A) so the negative coefficients for all the study area fixed effect variables are appropriate.

⁶⁶ To benchmark the results against those of other practitioners the research by Sirmans et al. (2005a; 2005b) was consulted. They conducted a meta-analysis of 64 hedonic studies carried out in multiple locations in the U.S. during multiple time periods, and investigated the coefficients of ten commonly used characteristics, seven of which were included in the model. The similarities between their mean coefficients (i.e., the average across all 64 studies) and those estimated in the present Base Model are striking. The analysis presented here estimates the effect of square feet (in 1000s) on log of sales price at 0.28 and Sirmans et al. provide an estimate of 0.34, while ACRES was similarly estimated (0.02 to 0.03, Base Model and Sirmans et al., respectively). Further, AGEATSALE (age at the time of sale) (-0.006 to -0.009), BATHROOMS (0.09 to 0.09), CENTRALAC (0.09 to 0.08), and FIREPLACE (0.11 to 0.09) all similarly compare. As a group, the Base Model estimates differ from Sirmans et al. estimates in all cases by no more than a third of the Sirmans et al. mean estimate's standard deviation. This, taken with the relatively high adjusted R^2 of the Base Model, demonstrates the appropriateness of the model's specification.

⁶⁷ To benchmark these results they are compared to the few studies that have investigated the contribution of inland scenic vistas to sales prices. Benson et al. (2000) find that a mountain vista increases sales price by 8%, while Bourassa et al. (2004) find that wide inland vistas increase sales price by 7.6%. These both compare favorably to the 10% and 14% above average and premium rated VISTA estimates. Comparable studies for below average and poor VISTA were not found and therefore no benchmarking of those coefficients is conducted. Finally, it should again be noted that a home's scenic vista, as discussed in Section 3.2.3, was ranked without taking the presence of the wind turbines into consideration, even if those turbines were visible at the time of home sale.

Despite this finding for scenic vista, however, no statistically significant relationship is found between views of wind turbines and sales prices.⁶⁸ The coefficients for the VIEW parameters (β_4) are all relatively small, none are statistically significant, and they are not monotonically ordered (see Figure 6). Homes with EXTREME or SUBSTANTIAL view ratings, for which the Base Model is expected to find the largest differences, sell for, on average, 2.1% more (p value 0.80) and 0.5% less (p value 0.94) than NO VIEW homes that sold in the same post-construction period. Similarly, homes with MODERATE or MINOR view ratings sell, on average, for 1.7% more (p value 0.58) and 1.2% less (p value 0.40) than NO VIEW homes, respectively. None of these coefficients are sizable, and none are statistically different from zero. These results indicate that, among this sample at least, a statistically significant relationship between views of wind turbines and residential property values is not evident. In other words, there is an absence of evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma in the Base Model.

Figure 6: Results from the Base Model for VIEW




The reference category consists of transactions for homes without a view of the turbines, and that occurred after construction began on the wind facility

The coefficients for the DISTANCE parameters (β_5) are also all relatively small and none are statistically significant (see Figure 7). Homes that are situated within 3000 feet (0.57 miles) of the nearest wind turbine, at the time of sale, are found to sell for 5.3% less (p value 0.40), on average, than homes outside of 5 miles that sold in the same “post-construction” period. Meanwhile, homes between 3000 feet and 1 mile sold for 5.5% less (p value 0.30), on average, than homes more than 5 miles away. Homes that are within 1 to 3 miles of the nearest turbine, as compared to homes outside of 5 miles, sold for essentially the same, on average (coefficient = 0.004, p value 0.80), while homes between 3 and 5 miles sold for 1.6% more (p value 0.23).

⁶⁸ A significance level of 10% is used throughout this report, which corresponds to a p -value at or above 0.10. Although this is more liberal than the often used 5% (p -value at or above 0.05), it was chosen to give more opportunities for effects that might be fairly weak to be considered significant.

Figure 7: Results from the Base Model for DISTANCE



Looking at these results as a whole, a somewhat monotonic order from low to high is found as homes are situated further away from wind facilities, but all of the coefficients are relatively small and none are statistically different from zero. This suggests that, for homes in the sample at least, there is a lack of statistical evidence that the distance from a home to the nearest wind turbine impacts sales prices, and this is true regardless of the distance band.⁶⁹ As such, an absence of evidence of an Area or Nuisance Stigma is found in the Base Model. That notwithstanding, the -5% coefficients for homes that sold within one mile of the nearest wind turbine require further scrutiny. Even though the differences are not found to be statistically significant, they might point to effects that exist but are too small for the model to deem statistically significant due to the relatively small number of homes in the sample within 1 mile of the nearest turbine. Alternatively, these homes may simply have been devalued even before the wind facility was erected, and that devaluation may have carried over into the post construction period (the period investigated by the Base Model). To explore these possibilities, transactions that occurred well before the announcement of the wind facility to well after construction are investigated in the Temporal Aspects Model in the following “Alternative Models” section.

⁶⁹ It is worth noting that the number of cases in each of these categories (e.g., $n = 67$ for homes inside of 3000 feet and $n = 58$ between 3000 feet and one mile) are small, but are similar to the numbers of cases for other variables in the same model (e.g., LOW CONDITION, $n = 69$; PREMIUM VISTA, $n = 75$), the estimates of which were found to be significant above the 1% level.

Table 10: Results from the Base Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	7.62	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmnt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.33	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.45	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.14	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.23	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.03	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.44	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.24	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.09	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.31	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.07	0.03	0.01	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
Post Con NoView	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
View Minor	-0.01	0.01	0.40	561
View Mod	0.02	0.03	0.58	106
View Sub	-0.01	0.07	0.94	35
View Extrm	0.02	0.09	0.80	28
Mile Less 0 57	-0.05	0.06	0.40	67
Mile 0 57to1	-0.05	0.05	0.30	58
Mile 1to3	0.00	0.02	0.80	2,019
Mile 3to5	0.02	0.01	0.23	1,923
Mile Gtr5	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1
Dependent Variable	LN SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	37
F Statistic	442.8
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

5. Alternative Hedonic Models

The Base Hedonic Model presented in Section 4 found that residential property values have, on average, not been measurably affected by the presence of nearby wind facilities. To test the robustness of this result and to test for other possible impacts from nearby wind projects, the report now turns to a number of other hedonic models. These Alternative Models were created to investigate different approaches to exploring the impact of the variables of interest (#1 and #2, below) and to assess the presence of impacts that are not otherwise fully captured by the Base Model (#3 through #6, below).

- 1) **View and Distance Stability Models:** Using only post-construction transactions (the same as the Base Model) these models investigate whether the Scenic Vista Stigma (as measured with VIEW) results are independent of the Nuisance and Area Stigma results (as measured by DISTANCE) and vice versa.⁷⁰
- 2) **Continuous Distance Model:** Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates Area and Nuisance Stigmas by applying a continuous distance parameter as opposed to the categorical variables for distance used in the previous models.
- 3) **All Sales Model:** Using all transactions, this model investigates whether the results for the three stigmas change if transactions that occurred before the announcement and construction of the wind facility are included in the sample.
- 4) **Temporal Aspects Model:** Using all transactions, this model further investigates Area and Nuisance Stigmas and how they change for homes that sold more than two years pre-announcement through the period more than four years post-construction.
- 5) **Home Orientation Model:** Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates the degree to which a home's orientation to the view of wind turbines affects sales prices.
- 6) **View and Vista Overlap Model:** Using only post-construction transactions, this model investigates the degree to which the overlap between the view of a wind facility and a home's primary scenic vista affects sales prices.

Each of these models is described in more depth in the pages that follow. Results are shown for the variables of interest only; full results are contained in Appendix H.

5.1. View and Distance Stability Models

The Base Model (equation 1) presented in Section 4 includes both DISTANCE and VIEW variables because a home's value might be affected in part by the magnitude of the view of a nearby wind facility and in part by the distance from the home to that facility. These two variables may be related, however, in-so-far as homes that are located closer to a wind facility are likely to have a more-dominating view of that facility. To explore the degree to which these two sets of variables are independent of each other (i.e. not collinear) and to further test the robustness of the Base Model results two alternative hedonic models are run, each of which includes only one of the sets of parameters (DISTANCE or VIEW). Coefficients from these models are then compared to the Base Model results.

⁷⁰ Recall that the qualitative VIEW variable incorporated the visible distance to the nearest wind facility.

5.1.1. Dataset and Model Form

The same dataset is used as in the Base Model, focusing again on post-construction transactions ($n = 4,937$). To investigate DISTANCE effects alone the following model is estimated:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

where

P represents the inflation-adjusted sales price,

N is the spatially weighted neighbors' predicted sales price,

S is the vector of s Study Area fixed effects variables (e.g., WAOR, OKCC, etc.),

X is a vector of k home and site characteristics (e.g., acres, square feet, number of bathrooms, condition of the home, age of home, VISTA, etc.),

DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance variables (e.g., less than 3000 feet, between one and three miles, etc.),

β_0 is the constant or intercept across the full sample,

β_1 is a parameter estimate for the spatially weighted neighbor's predicted sales price,

β_2 is a vector of s parameter estimates for the study area fixed effects as compared to transactions of homes in the WAOR study area,

β_3 is a vector of k parameter estimates for the home and site characteristics,

β_5 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to transactions of homes situated outside of five miles, and

ε is a random disturbance term.

The parameters of primary interest are β_5 , which represent the marginal differences between home values at various distances from the wind turbines as compared to the reference category of homes outside of five miles. These coefficients can then be compared to the same coefficients estimated from the Base Model.

Alternatively, to investigate the VIEW effects alone, the following model is estimated:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

where

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables, and

all other components are as defined in equation (2).

The parameters of primary interest in this model are β_4 , which represent the marginal differences between home values for homes with varying views of wind turbines at the time of sale as compared to the reference category of homes without a view of those turbines. Again, these coefficients can then be compared to the same coefficients estimated from the Base Model.

Our expectation for both of the models described here is that the results will not be dramatically different from the Base Model, given the distribution of VIEW values across the DISTANCE values, and vice versa, as shown in Table 11. Except for EXTREME view, which is

concentrated inside of 3000 feet, all view ratings are adequately distributed among the distance categories.

Table 11: Frequency Crosstab of VIEW and DISTANCE Parameters

	Inside 3000 Feet	Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles	Outside 5 Miles	Total
No View	6	12	1653	1695	841	4207
Minor View	14	24	294	202	27	561
Moderate View	8	13	62	21	2	106
Substantial View	11	9	10	5	0	35
Extreme View	28	0	0	0	0	28
TOTAL	67	58	2019	1923	870	4937

5.1.2. Analysis of Results

Summarized results for the variables of interest from the Base Model and the two Alternative Stability Models are presented in Table 12. (For brevity, the full set of results for the models is not shown in Table 12, but is instead included in Appendix H.) The adjusted R² for the View and Distance Stability Models is the same as for the Base Model, 0.77. All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at or above the one percent level and are similar in magnitude to the estimates presented earlier for the Base Model.

The DISTANCE and VIEW coefficients, β_5 and β_4 , are stable, changing no more than 3%, with most (7 out of 8) not experiencing a change greater than 1%. In all cases, changes to coefficient estimates for the variables of interest are considerably less than the standard errors. Based on these results, there is confidence that the correlation between the VIEW and DISTANCE variables is not responsible for the findings and that these two variables are adequately independent to be included in the same hedonic model regression. As importantly, no evidence of Area, Scenic Vista, or Nuisance Stigma is found in the sample, as none of the VIEW or DISTANCE variables are found to be statistically different from zero.

Table 12: Results from Distance and View Stability Models

Variables of Interest	n	Base Model			Distance Stability			View Stability		
		Coef	SE	p Value	Coef	SE	p Value	Coef	SE	p Value
No View	4207	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted				Omitted	Omitted	Omitted
Minor View	561	-0.01	0.01	0.39				-0.02	0.01	0.24
Moderate View	106	0.02	0.03	0.57				0.00	0.03	0.90
Substantial View	35	-0.01	0.07	0.92				-0.04	0.06	0.45
Extreme View	28	0.02	0.09	0.77				-0.03	0.06	0.58
Inside 3000 Feet	67	-0.05	0.06	0.31	-0.04	0.04	0.25			
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	58	-0.05	0.05	0.20	-0.06	0.05	0.17			
Between 1 and 3 Miles	2019	0.00	0.02	0.80	-0.01	0.02	0.71			
Between 3 and 5 Miles	1923	0.02	0.01	0.26	0.01	0.01	0.30			
Outside 5 Miles	870	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted			

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables. "n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1	2	3
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96	LN_SalePrice96	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937	4937	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	37	33	33
F Statistic	442.8	496.7	495.9
Adjusted R Squared	0.77	0.77	0.77

5.2. Continuous Distance Model

The potential impact of wind facilities on residential property values based on Area and Nuisance effects was explored with the Base Model by using five ordered categorical DISTANCE variables. This approach was used in order to impose the least restriction on the functional relationship between distance and property values (as discussed in footnote 52 on page 25). The literature on environmental disamenities, however, more commonly uses a continuous distance form (e.g., Sims et al., 2008), which imposes more structure on this relationship. To be consistent with the literature and to test if a more rigid structural relationship might uncover an effect that is not otherwise apparent with the five distance categories used in the Base Model, a hedonic model that relies upon a continuous distance variable is presented here. One important benefit of this model is that a larger amount of data (e.g., $n = 4,937$) is used to estimate the continuous DISTANCE coefficient then was used to estimate any of the individual categorical estimates in the Base Model (e.g., $n = 67$ inside 3000 feet, $n = 2019$ between one and three miles). The Continuous Distance Model therefore provides an important robustness test to the Base Model results.

5.2.1. Dataset and Model Form

A number of different functional forms can be used for a continuous DISTANCE variable, including linear, inverse, cubic, quadratic, and logarithmic. Of the forms that are considered, an inverse function seemed most appropriate.⁷¹ Inverse functions are used when it is assumed that any effect is most pronounced near the disamenity and that those effects fade asymptotically as distance increases. This form has been used previously in the literature (e.g., Leonard et al., 2008) to explore the impact of disamenities on home values, and is calculated as follows:

$$\text{InvDISTANCE} = 1 / \text{DISTANCE} \quad (4)$$

where

DISTANCE is the distances to the nearest turbine from each home as calculated at the time of sale for homes that sold in the post-construction period.

For the purpose of the Continuous Distance Model, the same dataset is used as in the Base Model, focusing again on post-construction transactions ($n = 4,937$). InvDISTANCE has a maximum of 6.67 (corresponding to homes that were 0.15 miles, or roughly 800 feet, from the nearest wind turbine), a minimum of 0.09 (corresponding to a distance of roughly 11 miles), and a mean of 0.38 (corresponding to a distance of 2.6 miles). This function was then introduced into the hedonic model in place of the DISTANCE categorical variables as follows:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \beta_5 \text{InvDISTANCE} + \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

where

InvDISTANCE_{*i*} is the inverse of the distance to the nearest turbine,

β_5 is a parameter estimate for the inverse of the distance to the nearest turbine, and

⁷¹ The other distance functions (e.g., linear, quadratic, cubic & logarithmic) were also tested. Additionally, two-part functions with interactions between continuous forms (e.g., linear) and categorical (e.g., less than one mile) were investigated. Results from these models are briefly discussed below in footnote 72.

all other components are as defined in equation (1).

The coefficient of interest in this model is β_5 , which, if effects exist, would be expected to be negative, indicating an adverse effect from proximity to the wind turbines.

5.2.2. Analysis of Results

Results for the variables of interest in the Continuous Distance Model and the Base Model are shown in Table 13. (For brevity, the full set of results for the model is not shown in Table 13, but is instead included in Appendix H.) The model performs well with an adjusted R^2 of 0.77. All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at the one percent level. The coefficients for VIEW are similar to those found in the Base Model, demonstrating stability in results, and none are statistically significant. These results support the previous findings of a lack of evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma.

Our focus variable InvDISTANCE produces a coefficient (β_5) that is slightly negative at -1%, but that is not statistically different from zero (p value 0.41), implying again that there is no statistical evidence of a Nuisance Stigma effect nor an Area Stigma effect and confirming the results obtained in the Base Model.⁷²

Table 13: Results from Continuous Distance Model

Variables of Interest	Base Model				Continuous Distance			
	Coef	SE	p Value	<i>n</i>	Coef	SE	p Value	<i>n</i>
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
Minor View	-0.01	0.01	0.39	561	-0.01	0.01	0.32	561
Moderate View	0.02	0.03	0.57	106	0.01	0.03	0.77	106
Substantial View	-0.01	0.07	0.92	35	-0.02	0.07	0.64	35
Extreme View	0.02	0.09	0.77	28	0.01	0.10	0.85	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.05	0.06	0.31	67				
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.20	58				
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.80	2,019				
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.26	1,923				
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870				
InvDISTANCE					-0.01	0.02	0.41	4,937

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables. "n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	37
F Statistic	442.8
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

5
LN_SalePrice96
4937
34
481.3
0.77

5.3. All Sales Model

The Base Model presented earlier relied on only those transactions that occurred after the construction of the relevant wind facility. This approach, however, leaves open two key questions. First, it is possible that the property values of all of the post-construction homes in the

⁷² As mentioned in footnote 71 on page 36, a number of alternative forms of the continuous distance function were also explored, including two-part functions, with no change in the results presented here. In all cases the resulting continuous distance function was not statistically significant.

sample have been affected by the presence of a wind facility, and therefore that the reference homes in the Base Model (i.e., those homes outside of five miles with no view of a wind turbine) are an inappropriate comparison group because they too have been impacted.⁷³ Using only those homes that sold before the announcement of the wind facility (pre-announcement) as the reference group would, arguably, make for a better comparison because the sales price of those homes are not plausibly impacted by the presence of the wind facility.⁷⁴ Second, the Base Model does not consider homes that sold in the post-announcement but pre-construction period, and previous research suggests that property value effects might be very strong during this period, during which an assessment of actual impacts is not possible and buyers and sellers may take a more-protective and conservative stance (Wolsink, 1989). This subsection therefore presents the results of a hedonic model that uses the full set of transactions in the dataset, pre- and post-construction.

5.3.1. Dataset and Model Form

Unlike the Base Model, in this instance the full set of 7,459 residential transactions is included. The following model is then estimated:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \quad (6)$$

where

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view variables (e.g., NONE, MINOR, MODERATE, etc.), DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance variables (e.g., less than 3000 feet, between one and three miles, outside of five mile, etc.),

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables as compared to pre-construction transactions,

β_5 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to pre-announcement transactions, and

all other components are as defined in equation (1).

It is important to emphasize that the VIEW and DISTANCE parameters in equation (6) have different reference categories than they do in the Base Model - equation (1). In the Base Model, DISTANCE and VIEW are estimated in the post-construction period in reference to homes that sold outside of five miles and with no view of the turbines respectively.⁷⁵ In the All Sales Model, on the other hand, the coefficients for VIEW (β_4) are estimated in reference to all pre-construction transactions (spanning the pre-announcement and post-announcement-pre-construction periods) and the coefficients for DISTANCE (β_5) are estimated in reference to all pre-announcement transactions. In making a distinction between the reference categories for VIEW and DISTANCE, it is assumed that awareness of the view of turbines and awareness of

⁷³ This might be the case if there is an Area Stigma that includes the reference homes.

⁷⁴ As discussed in footnote 47 on page 19, it is conceivable that awareness might occur prior to the “announcement” date used for this analysis. If true, this bias is likely to be sporadic in nature and less of an issue in this model, when all pre-announcement transactions are pooled (e.g., both transactions near and far away from where the turbines were eventually located) than in models presented later (e.g., temporal aspects model). Nonetheless, if present, this bias may weakly draw down the pre-announcement reference category.

⁷⁵ See Section 4.1 and also footnote 51 on page 24 for more information on why the post-construction dataset and five-mile-no-view homes reference category are used in the Base Model.

the distance from them might not occur at the same point in the development process. Specifically, it is assumed that VIEW effects largely occur after the turbines are erected, in the post-construction period, but that DISTANCE effects might occur in the post-announcement-pre-construction timeframe. For example, after a wind facility is announced, it is not atypical for a map of the expected locations of the turbines to be circulated in the community, allowing home buyers and sellers to assess the distance of the planned facility from homes. Because of this assumed difference in when awareness begins for VIEW and DISTANCE, the DISTANCE variable is populated for transactions occurring in the post-announcement-pre-construction period as well as the post-construction period (see Table 14 below), but the VIEW variable is populated only for transactions in the post-construction period – as they were in the Base Model.⁷⁶

Table 14: Frequency Summary for DISTANCE in All Sales Model

	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Post-Construction	67	58	2019	1923	870	4937
Post-Announcement-Pre-Construction	13	7	340	277	130	767
TOTAL	80	65	2359	2200	1000	5704

One beneficial consequence of the differences in reference categories for the VIEW and DISTANCE variables in this model, as opposed to the Base Model, is that this model can accommodate all of the possible VIEW and DISTANCE categories, including NO VIEW transactions and transactions of homes outside of five miles. Because of the inclusion of these VIEW and DISTANCE categories, the tests to investigate Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance Stigmas are slightly different in this model than in the Base Model. For Area Stigma, for example, how homes with no view of the turbines fared can now be tested; if they are adversely affected by the presence of the wind facility, then this would imply a pervasive Area Stigma impact. For Scenic Vista Stigma, the VIEW coefficients (MINOR, MODERATE, etc.) can be compared (using a *t*-Test) to the NO VIEW results; if they are significantly different, a Scenic Vista Stigma would be an obvious culprit. Finally, for Nuisance Stigma, the DISTANCE coefficients inside of one mile can be compared (using a *t*-Test) to those outside of five miles; if there is a significant difference between these two categories of homes, then homes are likely affected by their proximity to the wind facility.

5.3.2. Analysis of Results

Results for the variables of interest for this hedonic model are summarized in Table 15, and Base Model results are shown for comparison purposes. (For brevity, the full set of results for the model is not shown in Table 15, but is instead included in Appendix H.) The adjusted R² for the model is 0.75, down slightly from 0.77 for the Base Model, and indicating that this model has slightly more difficulty (i.e. less explanatory power) modeling transactions that occurred pre-

⁷⁶ It is conceivable that VIEW effects could occur before the turbines are constructed. In some cases, for example, developers will simulate what the project will look like after construction during the post-announcement but pre-construction timeframe. In these situations, home buyers and sellers might adjust home values accordingly based on the expected views of turbines. It is assumed, however, that such adjustments are likely to be reasonably rare, and VIEW effects are therefore estimated using only post-construction sales.

construction.⁷⁷ All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at or above the one percent level and are similar in sign and magnitude to the estimates derived from the post-construction Base Model.

The VIEW coefficients (β_4) are clearly affected by the change in reference category. All of the VIEW parameter estimates are higher than the Base Model estimates for the same categories. Of particular interest is the NO VIEW coefficient, which represents the values of homes without a view of the turbines and that sold in the post-construction period, as compared to the mean value of homes that sold in the pre-construction period, all else being equal. These homes, on average, are estimated to sell for 2% (p value 0.08) more than similar pre-construction homes. If an Area Stigma existed, a negative coefficient for these NO VIEW homes would be expected. Instead, a positive and statistically significant coefficient is found.⁷⁸ It is outside the ability of this study to determine whether the increase is directly related to the wind turbines, or whether some other factor is impacting these results, but in either instance, no evidence of a pervasive Area Stigma associated with the presence of the wind facilities is found.

To test for the possibility of Scenic Vista Stigma, the coefficients for MINOR, MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL, and EXTREME views can be compared to the NO VIEW coefficient using a simple t -Test. Table 16 presents these results. As shown, no significant difference is found for any of the VIEW coefficients when compared to NO VIEW transactions. This reinforces the findings earlier that, within the sample at least, there is no evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma.

The DISTANCE parameter estimates (β_5) are also found to be affected by the change in reference category, and all are lower than the Base Model estimates for the same categories. This result likely indicates that the inflation-adjusted mean value of homes in the pre-announcement period is slightly higher, on average, than for those homes sold outside of five miles in the post-construction period. This difference could be attributed to the inaccuracy of the inflation index, a pervasive effect from the wind turbines, or to some other cause. Because the coefficients are not systematically statistically significant, however, this result is not pursued further. What is of interest, however, is the negative 8% estimate for homes located between 3000 feet and one mile of the nearest wind turbine (p value 0.03). To correctly interpret this result, and to compare it to the Base Model, one needs to discern if this coefficient is significantly different from the estimate for homes located outside of five miles, using a t -Test.

The results of this t -Test are shown in Table 17. The coefficient differences are found to be somewhat monotonically ordered. Moving from homes within 3000 feet (-0.06, p value 0.22), and between 3000 feet and one mile (-0.08, p value 0.04), to between one and three miles (0.00, p value 0.93) and between three and five miles (0.01, p value 0.32) the DISTANCE coefficients are found to generally increase. Nonetheless, none of these coefficients are statistically significant except one, homes that sold between 3000 feet and one mile. The latter finding suggests the possibility of Nuisance Stigma. It is somewhat unclear why an effect would be found in this model, however, when one was not evident in the Base Model. The most likely

⁷⁷ This slight change in performance is likely due to the inaccuracies of home and site characteristics and the inflation adjustment for homes that sold in the early part of the study period. This is discussed in more detail in footnote 50 on page 23.

⁷⁸ For more on the significance level used for this report, see footnote 68 on page 30.

explanation is that the additional homes that are included in this model, specifically those homes that sold post-announcement but pre-construction, are driving the results. A thorough investigation of these “temporal” issues is provided in the next subsection.

In summation, no evidence is found of an Area or Scenic Vista Stigma in this alternative hedonic model, but some limited not-conclusive evidence of a Nuisance Stigma is detected. To further explore the reliability of this latter result, the analysis now turns to the Temporal Aspects Model.

Table 15: Results from All Sales Model

Variables of Interest	Base Model				All Sales			
	Coef	SE	p Value	n	Coef	SE	p Value	n
Pre-Construction Sales	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,522
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207	0.02	0.01	0.08	4,207
Minor View	-0.01	0.01	0.39	561	0.00	0.02	0.77	561
Moderate View	0.02	0.03	0.57	106	0.03	0.03	0.41	106
Substantial View	-0.01	0.07	0.92	35	0.03	0.07	0.53	35
Extreme View	0.02	0.09	0.77	28	0.06	0.08	0.38	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.05	0.06	0.31	67	-0.06	0.05	0.18	80
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.20	58	-0.08	0.05	0.03	65
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.80	2,019	0.00	0.01	0.80	2,359
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.26	1,923	0.01	0.01	0.59	2,200
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870	0.00	0.02	0.78	1,000
Pre-Announcement Sales	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,755

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables. "n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1	6
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937	7459
Number of Predictors (k)	37	39
F Statistic	442.8	579.9
Adjusted R Squared	0.77	0.75

Table 16: Results from Equality Test of VIEW Coefficients in the All Sales Model

	No View	Minor View	Moderate View	Substantial View	Extreme View
n	4,207	561	106	35	28
Coefficient	0.02	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.06
Coefficient Difference *	Reference	-0.02	0.00	0.01	0.04
Variance	0.0001	0.0003	0.0009	0.0030	0.0050
Covariance	n/a	0.00011	0.00010	0.00009	0.00008
Df	n/a	7419	7419	7419	7419
t -Test	n/a	-1.20	0.17	0.23	0.58
Significance	n/a	0.23	0.87	0.82	0.57

* Differences are rounded to the nearest second decimal place.

"n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

Table 17: Results from Equality Test of DISTANCE Coefficients in the All Sales Model

	Inside 3000 Feet	Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles	Outside 5 Miles
<i>n</i>	80	65	2,359	2,200	1,000
Coefficient	-0.06	-0.08	0.00	0.01	0.00
Coefficient Difference *	-0.05	-0.08	0.00	0.01	Reference
Variance	0.0019	0.0015	0.0002	0.0002	0.0003
Covariance	0.00010	0.00013	0.00013	0.00015	n/a
Df	7419	7419	7419	7419	n/a
<i>t</i> Test	-1.23	-2.06	0.09	1.00	n/a
Significance	0.22	0.04	0.93	0.32	n/a

* Differences are rounded to the nearest second decimal place.

"n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

5.4. Temporal Aspects Model

Based on the results of the All Sales Model, a more thorough investigation of how Nuisance and Area Stigma effects might change throughout the wind project development period is warranted. As discussed previously, there is some evidence that property value impacts may be particularly strong after the announcement of a disamenity, but then may fade with time as the community adjusts to the presence of that disamenity (e.g., Wolsink, 1989). The Temporal Aspects Model presented here allows for an investigation of how the different periods of the wind project development process affect estimates for the impact of DISTANCE on sales prices.

5.4.1. Dataset and Model Form

Here the full set of 7,459 residential transactions is used, allowing an exploration of potential property value impacts (focusing on the DISTANCE variable) throughout time, including in the pre-construction period. The following model is then estimated:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_y \beta_5 (\text{DISTANCE} \cdot \text{PERIOD}) + \varepsilon \quad (7)$$

where

DISTANCE is a vector of categorical distance variables (e.g., less than one mile, between one and three miles, etc.),

PERIOD is a vector of categorical development period variables (e.g., after announcement and before construction, etc.),

β_5 is a vector of γ parameter estimates for each DISTANCE and PERIOD category as compared to the transactions more than two years before announcement and outside of five miles, and all other components are as defined in equation (1).

The PERIOD variable contains six different options:

- 1) More than two years before announcement;
- 2) Less than two years before announcement;
- 3) After announcement but before construction;
- 4) Less than two years after construction;
- 5) Between two and four years after construction; and

6) More than four years after construction.

In contrast to the Base Model, the two DISTANCE categories inside of one mile are collapsed into a single “less than one mile” group. This approach increases the number of transactions in each crossed subcategory of data, and therefore enhances the stability of the parameter estimates and decreases the size of the standard errors, thus providing an increased opportunity to discover statistically significant effects. Therefore, in this model the DISTANCE variable contains four different options:

- 1) Less than one mile;
- 2) Between one and three miles;
- 3) Between three and five miles; and
- 4) Outside of five miles.⁷⁹

The number of transactions in each of the DISTANCE and PERIOD categories is presented in Table 18.

The coefficients of interest are β_5 , which represent the vector of marginal differences between homes sold at various distances from the wind facility (DISTANCE) during various periods of the development process (PERIOD) as compared to the reference group. The reference group in this model consists of transactions that occurred more than two years before the facility was announced for homes that were situated more than five miles from where the turbines were ultimately constructed. It is assumed that the value of these homes would not be affected by the future presence of the wind facility. The VIEW parameters, although included in the model, are not interacted with PERIOD and therefore are treated as controlling variables.⁸⁰

Although the comparisons of these categorical variables between different DISTANCE and PERIOD categories is be interesting, it is the comparison of coefficients within each PERIOD and DISTANCE category that is the focus of this section. Such comparisons, for example, allow one to compare how the average value of homes inside of one mile that sold two years before announcement compare to the average value of homes inside of one mile that sold in the post-announcement-pre-construction period. For this comparison, a *t*-Test similar to that in the All Sales Model is used.

⁷⁹ For homes that sold in the pre-construction time frame, no turbines yet existed, and therefore DISTANCE is created using a proxy: the Euclidian distance to where the turbines were eventually constructed. This approach introduces some bias when there is more than one facility in the study area. Conceivably, a home that sold in the post-announcement-pre-construction period of one wind facility could also be assigned to the pre-announcement period of another facility in the same area. For this type of sale, it is not entirely clear which PERIOD and DISTANCE is most appropriate, but every effort was made to apply the sale to the wind facility that was most likely to have an impact. In most cases this meant choosing the closest facility, but in some cases, when development periods were separated by many years, simply the earliest facility was chosen. In general, any bias created by these judgments is expected to be minimal because, in the large majority of cases, the development process in each study area was more-or-less continuous and focused in a specific area rather than being spread widely apart.

⁸⁰ As discussed earlier, the VIEW variable was considered most relevant for the post-construction period, so delineations based on development periods that extended into the pre-construction phase were unnecessary. It is conceivable, however, that VIEW effects vary in periods following construction, such as in the first two years or after that. Although this is an interesting question, the numbers of cases for the SUBSTANTIAL and EXTREME ratings – even if combined – when divided into the temporal periods were too small to be fruitful for analysis.

Table 18: Frequency Crosstab of DISTANCE and PERIOD

	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	After Announcement Before Construction	Less Than 2 Years After Construction	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	More Than 4 Years After Construction	Total
Less Than 1 Mile	38	40	20	39	45	43	225
Between 1 and 3 Miles	283	592	340	806	502	709	3,232
Between 3 and 5 Miles	157	380	277	572	594	757	2,737
Outside of 5 Miles	132	133	130	218	227	425	1,265
TOTAL	610	1,145	767	1,635	1,368	1,934	7,459

5.4.2. Analysis of Results

Results for the variables of interest for this hedonic model are presented in Table 19; as with previous models, the full set of results is contained in Appendix H. Similar to the All Sales Model discussed in the previous section, the adjusted R^2 for the model is 0.75, down slightly from 0.77 for the Base Model, and indicating that this model has slightly more difficulty (i.e., less explanatory power) modeling transactions that occurred before wind facility construction. All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at or above the one percent level, are of the appropriate sign, and are similar in magnitude to the estimates derived from the post-construction Base Model.

All of the DISTANCE / PERIOD interaction coefficients for distances outside of one mile are relatively small ($-0.04 < \beta_5 < 0.02$) and none are statistically significant. This implies that there are no statistically significant differences in property values between the reference category homes – homes sold more than two years before announcement that were situated outside of five miles from where turbines were eventually erected – and any of the categories of homes that sold outside of one mile at any other period in the wind project development process. These comparisons demonstrate, arguably more directly than any other model presented in this report that Area Stigma effects likely do not exist in the sample.

The possible presence of a Nuisance Stigma is somewhat harder to discern. For homes that sold inside of one mile of the nearest wind turbine, in three of the six periods there are statistically significant negative differences between average property values when compared to the reference category. Transactions completed more than two years before facility announcement are estimated to be valued at 13% less (p value 0.02) than the reference category, transactions less than two years before announcement are 10% lower (p value 0.06), and transactions after announcement but before construction are 14% lower (p value 0.04). For other periods, however, these marginal differences are considerably smaller and are not statistically different from the reference category. Sales prices in the first two years after construction are, on average, 9% less (p value 0.15), those occurring between three and four years following construction are, on average, 1% less (p value 0.86), and those occurring more than four years after construction are, on average, 7% less (p value 0.37).

Table 19: Results from Temporal Aspects Model

Variables of Interest		Temporal Aspects			
		Coef	SE	p Value	n
Inside 1 Mile	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	-0.13	0.06	0.02	38
	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	-0.10	0.05	0.06	40
	After Announcement Before Construction	-0.14	0.06	0.04	21
	2 Years After Construction	-0.09	0.07	0.11	39
	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	-0.01	0.06	0.85	44
	More Than 4 Years After Construction	-0.07	0.08	0.22	42
Between 1-3 Miles	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	-0.04	0.03	0.18	283
	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	0.00	0.03	0.91	592
	After Announcement Before Construction	-0.02	0.03	0.54	342
	2 Years After Construction	0.00	0.03	0.90	807
	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	0.01	0.03	0.78	503
	More Than 4 Years After Construction	0.00	0.03	0.93	710
Between 3-5 Miles	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	0.00	0.04	0.92	157
	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	0.00	0.03	0.97	380
	After Announcement Before Construction	0.00	0.03	0.93	299
	2 Years After Construction	0.02	0.03	0.55	574
	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	0.01	0.03	0.65	594
	More Than 4 Years After Construction	0.01	0.03	0.67	758
Outside 5 Miles	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	132
	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	-0.03	0.04	0.33	133
	After Announcement Before Construction	-0.03	0.03	0.39	105
	2 Years After Construction	-0.03	0.03	0.44	215
	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	0.03	0.03	0.44	227
	More Than 4 Years After Construction	0.01	0.03	0.73	424

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables.

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"


Model Information

Model Equation Number	7
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	7459
Number of Predictors (k)	56
F Statistic	404.5
Adjusted R Squared	0.75

What these results suggest (as shown in Figure 8) is that homes inside of one mile in the sample, on average, were depressed in value (in relation to the reference category) before and after the announcement of the wind facility and up to the point that construction began, but that those values rebounded somewhat after construction commenced.⁸¹ This conclusion also likely explains why a significant and negative effect for homes that sold between 3000 feet and one mile is found in the All Sales Model presented in Section 5.3: homes within this distance range that sold prior to facility construction were depressed in value and most likely drove the results for homes that sold after announcement. Regardless, these results are not suggestive of a pervasive Nuisance Stigma.

⁸¹ As discussed in footnotes 47 (on page 19) and 74 (on page 38), the “announcement date” often refers to the first time the proposed facility appeared in the press. “Awareness” of the project in the community may precede this date, however, and therefore transactions occurring in the period “less than two years before announcement” could conceivably have been influenced by the prospective wind project, but it is considerably less likely that those in the period more than two years before announcement would have been influenced.

Figure 8: Results from the Temporal Aspects Model



To explore Nuisance Stigma further, the analysis again turns to the *t*-Test and compares the coefficients for transactions that occurred more than two years before wind facility announcement (during which time the future wind facility is not expected to have any impact on sales prices) to the estimates for the DISTANCE coefficients in the periods that follow. These results are shown in Table 20. Focusing on those transactions inside of one mile, it is found that all coefficients are greater in magnitude than the reference category except during the post-announcement-pre-construction period (which is 1% less and is not statistically significant; *p* value 0.90), indicating, on average, that home values are increasing or staying stable from the pre-announcement reference period onward. These increases, however, are not statistically significant except in the period of two to four years after construction (0.12, *p* value 0.08). With respect to Nuisance Stigma, the more important result is that, relative to homes that sold well before the wind facility was announced, no statistically significant adverse effect is found in any period within a one mile radius of the wind facility. Therefore, the -5% (albeit not statistically significant) average difference that is found in the Base Model, and the -8% (statistically significant) result that is found in the All Sales Model (for homes between 3000 feet and one mile) appear to both be a reflection of depressed home prices that preceded the construction of the relevant wind facilities. If construction of the wind facilities were downwardly influencing the sales prices of these homes, as might be deduced from the Base or All Sales Models alone, a diminution in the inflation adjusted price would be seen as compared to pre-announcement levels. Instead, an increase is seen. As such, no persuasive evidence of a Nuisance Stigma is evident among this sample of transactions.⁸²

⁸² It should be noted that the numbers of study areas represented for homes situated inside of one mile but in the periods “more than two years before announcement” and “more than four years after construction” are fewer (*n* = 5) than in the other temporal categories (*n* = 8). Further, the “more than two years before announcement – inside of one mile” category is dominated by transactions from one study area (OKCC). For these reasons, there is less

Turning to the coefficient differences for distances greater than one mile in Table 20, again, no statistical evidence of significant adverse impacts on home values is uncovered. Where statistically significant differences are identified, the coefficients are greater than the reference category. These findings corroborate the earlier Area Stigma results, and re-affirm the lack of evidence for such an effect among the sample of residential transactions included in this analysis.

Table 20: Results from Equality Test of Temporal Aspects Model Coefficients

	More Than 2 Years Before Announcement	Less Than 2 Years Before Announcement	After Announcement Before Construction	Less Than 2 Years After Construction	Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	More Than 4 Years After Construction
Less Than 1 Mile	Reference	0.03 (0.45)	-0.01 (-0.13)	0.04 (0.56)	0.12 (1.74)*	0.06 (0.88)
Between 1 and 3 Miles	Reference	0.04 (1.92)*	0.02 (0.86)	0.05 (2.47)**	0.05 (2.27)**	0.04 (1.82)*
Between 3 and 5 Miles	Reference	0.01 (0.37)	0.01 (0.34)	0.02 (0.77)	0.02 (0.78)	0.02 (0.79)
Outside of 5 Miles †	Reference	-0.04 (-0.86)	-0.03 (-0.91)	-0.03 (-0.77)	0.03 (0.81)	0.01 (0.36)

Numbers in parenthesis are t-Test statistics. Significance = *** 1% level, ** 5% level, * 10% level, <blank> below the 10% level.

† For homes outside of 5 miles, the coefficient differences are equal to the coefficients in the Temporal Aspects Model, and therefore the t-values were produced via the OLS.

5.5. Orientation Model

All of the hedonic models presented to this point use a VIEW variable that effectively assumes that the impact of a view of wind turbines on property values will not vary based on the orientation of the home to that view; the impact will be the same whether the view is seen from the side of the home or from the back or front. Other literature, however, has found that the impact of wind projects on property values may be orientation-dependent (Sims et al., 2008). To investigate this possibility further a parameter for orientation is included in the model.

5.5.1. Dataset and Model Form

The same dataset is used as in the Base Model, focusing on post-construction transactions ($n = 4,937$). To investigate whether the orientation of a home to the turbines (ORIENTATION) has a marginal impact on residential property values, over and above that of the VIEW impacts alone, the following hedonic model is estimated:⁸³

confidence in these two estimates (-13% and -7% respectively) than for the estimates for other temporal periods inside of one mile. Based on additional sensitivity analysis not included here, it is believed that if they are biased, both of these estimates are likely biased downward. Further, as discussed in footnote 47 on page 19, there is a potential for bias in the “announcement” date in that awareness of a project may precede the date that a project enters the public record (i.e., the “announcement” date used for this analysis). Taken together, these two issues might imply that the curve shown in Figure 8 for “less than one mile” transactions, instead of having a flat and then increasing shape, may have a more of an inverse parabolic (e.g., “U”) shape. This would imply that a relative minimum in sales prices is reached in the period after awareness began of the facility but before construction commenced, and then, following construction, prices recovered to levels similar to those prior to announcement (and awareness). These results would be consistent with previous studies (e.g., Wolsink, 1989; Devine-Wright, 2004) but cannot be confirmed without the presence of more data. Further research on this issue is warranted. In either case, such results would not change the conclusion here of an absence of evidence of a pervasive Nuisance Stigma in the post-construction period.

⁸³ The various possible orientations of the home to the view of turbines will be, individually and collectively, referred to as “ORIENTATION” in this report.

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \sum_o \beta_6 \text{ORIENTATION} + \varepsilon \quad (8)$$

where

ORIENTATION is a vector of o ORIENTATION variables (e.g., SIDE, FRONT, and BACK), β_6 is a vector of o parameter estimates for ORIENTATION variables, and all other components are as defined in equation (1).⁸⁴

The ORIENTATION categories include FRONT, BACK, and SIDE, and are defined as follows:

- SIDE: The orientation of the home to the view of the turbines is from the side.
- FRONT: The orientation of the home to the view of the turbines is from the front.
- BACK: The orientation of the home to the view of the turbines is from the back.

The orientation of the home to the view of the wind facilities was determined in the course of the field visits to each home. If more than one orientation to the turbines best described the home (e.g., back and side, or front, back, and side) they were coded as such (e.g., turbines visible from back and side: SIDE = 1; BACK = 1; FRONT = 0).⁸⁵

Not surprisingly, ORIENTATION is related to VIEW. Table 21 and Table 22 provide frequency and percentage crosstabs of ORIENTATION and VIEW. As shown, those homes with more dramatic views of the turbines generally have more ORIENTATION ratings applied to them. For instance, 25 out of 28 EXTREME VIEW homes have all three ORIENTATION ratings (i.e., FRONT, BACK, and SIDE). Virtually all of the MINOR VIEW homes, on the other hand, have only one ORIENTATION. Further, MINOR VIEW homes have roughly evenly spread orientations to the turbines across the various possible categories of FRONT, BACK, and SIDE. Conversely, a majority of the MODERATE and SUBSTANTIAL VIEW ratings coincide with an ORIENTATION from the back of the house.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ Ideally, one would enter ORIENTATION in the model through an interaction with VIEW. There are two ways that could be accomplished: either with the construction of multiple fixed effects (“dummy”) variables, which capture each sub-category of VIEW and ORIENTATION, or through a semi-continuous interaction variable, which would be created by multiplying the ordered categorical variable VIEW by an ordered categorical variable ORIENTATION. Both interaction scenarios are problematic, the former because it requires increasingly small subsets of data, which create unstable coefficient estimates, and the latter because there are no *a priori* expectations for the ordering of an ordered categorical ORIENTATION variable and therefore none could be created and used for the interaction. As a result, no interaction between the two variables is reported here.

⁸⁵ An “Angle” orientation was also possible, which was defined as being between Front and Side or Back and Side. An Angle orientation was also possible in combination with Back or Front (e.g., Back-Angle or Front-Angle). In this latter case, the orientation was coded as one of the two prominent orientations (e.g., Back or Front). An Angle orientation, not in combination with Front or Back, was coded as Side.

⁸⁶ The prevalence of BACK orientations for MODERATE and SUBSTANTIAL VIEW homes may be because BACK views might more-frequently be kept without obstruction, relative to SIDE views.

Table 21: Frequency Crosstab of VIEW and ORIENTATION

		VIEW				Total
		Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	
ORIENTATION	Front	217	33	17	27	294
	Back	164	67	24	25	280
	Side	194	17	15	27	253
	Total	561	106	35	28	730

Note: Total of ORIENTATION does not sum to 730 because multiple orientations are possible for each VIEW.

Table 22: Percentage Crosstab of VIEW and ORIENTATION

		VIEW				Total
		Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	
ORIENTATION	Front	39%	31%	49%	96%	40%
	Back	29%	63%	69%	89%	38%
	Side	35%	16%	43%	96%	35%

Note: Percentages are calculated as a portion of the total for each VIEW ratings (e.g., 24 of the 35 SUBSTANTIAL rated homes have a BACK ORIENTATION = 69%). Columns do not sum to 100% because multiple orientations are possible for each VIEW.

The parameter estimates of interest in this hedonic model are those for ORIENTATION (β_6) and VIEW (β_4). β_6 represent the marginal impact on home value, over and above that of VIEW alone, of having a particular orientation to the turbines. In the Base Model the VIEW coefficients effectively absorb the effects of ORIENTATION, but in this model they are estimated separately. Because a home’s surrounding environment is typically viewed from the front or back of the house, one would expect that, to the extent that wind facility VIEW impacts property values, that impact would be especially severe for homes that have FRONT or BACK orientations to those turbines. If this were the case, the coefficients for these categories would be negative, while the coefficient for SIDE would be to be close to zero indicating little to no incremental impact from a SIDE ORIENTATION.

5.5.2. Analysis of Results

Results for the variables of interest for this hedonic model are shown in Table 23; as with previous models, the full set of results is contained in Appendix H. The model performs well with an adjusted R^2 of 0.77. All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at or above the one percent level, are of the appropriate sign, and are similar in magnitude to the estimates derived from the post-construction Base Model. The coefficients for DISTANCE and VIEW are stable, in sign and magnitude, when compared to the Base Model results, and none of the marginal effects are statistically significant.

The coefficients for the variables of interest (β_6) do not meet the *a priori* expectations. The estimated effect for SIDE ORIENTATION, instead of being close to zero, is -3% (*p* value 0.36), while BACK and FRONT, instead of being negative and larger, are estimated at 3% (*p* value 0.37) and -1% (*p* value 0.72), respectively. None of these variables are found to be even marginally statistically significant, however, and based on these results, it is concluded that there is no evidence that a home's orientation to a wind facility affects property values in a measurable way. Further, as with previous models, no statistical evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma is found among this sample of sales transactions.

Table 23: Results from Orientation Model

Variables of Interest	Base Model				Orientation Model			
	Coef	SE	p Value	<i>n</i>	Coef	SE	p Value	<i>n</i>
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4207	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4207
Minor View	-0.01	0.01	0.39	561	-0.01	0.06	0.88	561
Moderate View	0.02	0.03	0.57	106	0.00	0.06	0.96	106
Substantial View	-0.01	0.07	0.92	35	-0.01	0.09	0.85	35
Extreme View	0.02	0.09	0.77	28	0.02	0.17	0.84	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.05	0.06	0.31	67	-0.04	0.07	0.46	67
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.20	58	-0.05	0.05	0.26	58
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.80	2019	0.00	0.02	0.83	2019
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.26	1923	0.02	0.01	0.26	1923
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870
Front Orientation					-0.01	0.06	0.72	294
Back Orientation					0.03	0.06	0.37	280
Side Orientation					-0.03	0.06	0.36	253

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables. "n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	37
F Statistic	442.8
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

8
LN_SalePrice96
4937
40
410.0
0.77

5.6. Overlap Model

The Orientation Model, presented above, investigated, to some degree, how the potential effects of wind turbines might be impacted by how a home is oriented to the surrounding environment. In so doing, this model began to peel back the relationship between VIEW and VISTA, but stopped short of looking at the relationship directly. It would be quite useful, though, to understand the explicit relationship between the VISTA and VIEW variables. In particular, one might expect that views of wind turbines would have a particularly significant impact on residential property values when those views strongly overlap (“OVERLAP”) the prominent scenic vista from a home. To investigate this possibility directly, and, in general, the relationship between VIEW and VISTA, a parameter for OVERLAP is included in the model.

5.6.1. Dataset and Model Form

Data on the degree to which the view of wind turbines overlaps with the prominent scenic vista from the home (OVERLAP) were collected in the course of the field visits to each home.⁸⁷ The categories for OVERLAP included NONE, BARELY, SOMEWHAT, and STRONGLY, and are described in Table 24:⁸⁸

Table 24: Definition of OVERLAP Categories

OVERLAP - NONE	The scenic vista does not contain any view of the turbines.
OVERLAP - BARELY	A small portion (~ 0 - 20%) of the scenic vista is overlapped by the view of turbines, and might contain a view of a few turbines, only a few of which can be seen entirely.
OVERLAP - SOMEWHAT	A moderate portion (~20-50%) of the scenic vista contains turbines, and likely contains a view of more than one turbine, some of which are likely to be seen entirely.
OVERLAP - STRONGLY	A large portion (~50-100%) of the scenic vista contains a view of turbines, many of which likely can be seen entirely.

A crosstab describing the OVERLAP designations and the VIEW categories is shown in Table 25. As would be expected, the more dramatic views of wind turbines, where the turbines occupy more of the panorama, are coincident with the OVERLAP categories of SOMEWHAT or STRONGLY. Nonetheless, STRONGLY are common for all VIEW categories. Similarly, SOMEWHAT is well distributed across the MINOR and MODERATE rated views, while BARELY is concentrated in the MINOR rated views.

The same dataset is used as in the Base Model, focusing on post-construction transactions ($n = 4,937$). To investigate whether the overlap of VIEW and VISTA has a marginal impact on residential property values, over and above that of the VIEW and VISTA impacts alone, the following hedonic model is estimated:⁸⁹

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \sum_t \beta_6 \text{VISTA} + \sum_p \beta_7 \text{OVERLAP} + \varepsilon \quad (9)$$

where

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),
VISTA is a vector of t categorical scenic vista variables (e.g., POOR, BELOW-AVERAGE, etc.),
OVERLAP is a vector of p categorical overlap variables (e.g., BARELY, SOMEWHAT, etc.),

⁸⁷ Scenic vista was rated while taking into account the entire panorama surrounding a home. But, for each home, there usually was a prominent direction that offered a preferred scenic vista. Often, but not always, the home was orientated to enjoy that prominent scenic vista. Overlap is defined as the degree to which the view of the wind facility overlaps with this prominent scenic vista.

⁸⁸ "...can be seen entirely" refers to being able to see a turbine from the top of the sweep of its blade tips to below the nacelle of the turbine where the sweep of the tips intersects the tower.

⁸⁹ Although VISTA appears in all models, and is usually included in the vector of home and site characteristics represented by X, it is shown separately here so that it can be discussed directly in the text that follows.

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for VIEW fixed effects variables as compared to transactions of homes without a view of the turbines,
 β_6 is a vector of t parameter estimates for VISTA fixed effect variables as compared to transactions of homes with an AVERAGE scenic vista,
 β_7 is a vector of o parameter estimates for OVERLAP fixed effect variables as compared to transactions of homes where the view of the turbines had no overlap with the scenic vista, and all other components are as defined in equation (1).

The variables of interest in this model are VIEW, VISTA and OVERLAP, and the coefficients β_4 , β_6 , and β_7 are therefore the primary focus. Theory would predict that the VISTA coefficients in this model would be roughly similar to those derived in the Base Model, but that the VIEW coefficients may be somewhat more positive as the OVERLAP variables explain a portion of any negative impact that wind projects have on residential sales prices. In that instance, the OVERLAP coefficients would be negative, indicating a decrease in sales price when compared to those homes that experience no overlap between the view of wind turbines and the primary scenic vista.

Table 25: Frequency Crosstab of OVERLAP and VIEW

		VIEW					Total
		None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	
OVERLAP	None	4,207	317	3	0	0	4,527
	Barely	0	139	10	1	0	150
	Somewhat	0	81	42	7	2	132
	Strongly	0	24	51	27	26	128
	Total	4,207	561	106	35	28	4,937

5.6.2. Analysis of Results

Results for the variables of interest for this hedonic model are shown in Table 26; as with previous models, the full set of results is contained in Appendix H. The model performs well with an adjusted R^2 of 0.77. All study area, spatial adjustment, and home and site characteristics are significant at or above the one percent level, are of the appropriate sign, and are similar in magnitude to the estimates derived from the post-construction Base Model.

As expected from theory, the VISTA parameters are stable across models with no change in coefficient sign, magnitude, or significance. Counter to expectations, however, the VIEW coefficients, on average, decrease in value. MINOR VIEW is now estimated to adversely affect a home's sale price by 3% (p value 0.10) and is weakly significant, but none of the other VIEW categories are found to be statistically significant. Oddly, the OVERLAP rating of BARELY is found to significantly increase home values by 5% (p value 0.08), while none of the other OVERLAP ratings are found to have a statistically significant impact.

Taken at face value, these results are counterintuitive. For instance, absent any overlap of view with the scenic vista (NONE), a home with a MINOR view sells for 3% less than a home with no view of the turbines. If, alternatively, a home with a MINOR view BARELY overlaps the prominent scenic vista, it not only enjoys a 2% increase in value over a home with NO VIEW of the turbines but a 5% increase in value over homes with views of the turbines that do not overlap

with the scenic vista. In other words, the sales price increases when views of turbines overlap the prominent scenic vista, at least in the BARELY category. A more likely explanation for these results are that the relatively high correlation (0.68) between the VIEW and OVERLAP parameters is spuriously driving one set of parameters up and the other down. More importantly, when the parameters are combined, they offer a similar result as was found in the Base Model. Therefore, it seems that the degree to which the view of turbines overlaps the scenic vista has a negligible effect on sales prices among the sample of sales transactions analyzed here.⁹⁰

Despite these somewhat peculiar results, other than MINOR, none of the VIEW categories are found to have statistically significant impacts, even after accounting for the degree to which those views overlap the scenic vista. Similarly, none of the OVERLAP variables are simultaneously negative and statistically significant. This implies, once again, that a Scenic Vista Stigma is unlikely to be present in the sample. Additionally, none of the DISTANCE coefficients are statistically significant, and those coefficients remain largely unchanged from the Base Model, reaffirming previous results in which no significant evidence of either an Area or a Nuisance Stigma was found.

⁹⁰ An alternative approach to this model was also considered, one that includes an interaction term between VIEW and VISTA. For this model it is assumed that homes with higher rated scenic vistas might have higher rated views of turbines, and that these views of turbines would decrease the values of the scenic vista. To construct the interaction, VISTA, which can be between one and five (e.g., POOR=1,...PREMIUM=5), was multiplied by VIEW, which can be between zero and four (e.g. NO VIEW=0, MINOR=1,...EXTREME=4). The resulting interaction (VIEW*VISTA) therefore was between zero and sixteen (there were no PREMIUM VISTA homes with an EXTREME VIEW), with zero representing homes without a view of the turbines, one representing homes with a POOR VISTA and a MINOR VIEW, and sixteen representing homes with either a PREMIUM VISTA and a SUBSTANTIAL VIEW or an ABOVE AVERAGE VISTA and an EXTREME VIEW. The interaction term, when included in the model, was relatively small (-0.013) and weakly significant (p value 0.10 – not White’s corrected). The VISTA estimates were unchanged and the VIEW parameters were considerably larger and positive. For instance, EXTREME was 2% in the Base Model and 16% in this “interaction” model. Similarly, SUBSTANTIAL was -1% in the Base Model and 13% in this model. Therefore, although the interaction term is negative and weakly significant, the resulting VIEW estimates, to which it would need to be added, fully offset this negative effect. These results support the idea that the degree to which a VIEW overlaps VISTA has a likely negligible effect on sales prices, while also confirming that there is a high correlation between the interaction term and VIEW variables.

Table 26: Results from Overlap Model

Variables of Interest	Base Model				Overlap Model			
	Coef	SE	p Value	n	Coef	SE	p Value	n
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
Minor View	-0.01	0.01	0.39	561	-0.03	0.02	0.10	561
Moderate View	0.02	0.03	0.57	106	-0.02	0.04	0.65	106
Substantial View	-0.01	0.07	0.92	35	-0.05	0.09	0.43	35
Extreme View	0.02	0.09	0.77	28	-0.03	0.10	0.73	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.05	0.06	0.31	67	-0.05	0.06	0.32	67
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.20	58	-0.05	0.05	0.27	58
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.80	2,019	0.00	0.02	0.82	2,019
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.26	1,923	0.02	0.01	0.26	1,923
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870
Poor Vista	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Below Average Vista	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Average Vista	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Above Average Vista	0.10	0.02	0.00	448	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Premium Vista	0.13	0.04	0.00	75	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
View Does Not Overlap Vista					Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	320
View Barely Overlaps Vista					0.05	0.03	0.08	150
View Somewhat Overlaps Vista					0.01	0.03	0.66	132
View Strongly Overlaps Vista					0.05	0.05	0.23	128

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables. "n" = number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	1
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	37
F Statistic	442.8
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

Model Equation Number	9
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	40
F Statistic	409.7
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

6. Repeat Sales Analysis

In general, the Base and Alternative Hedonic Models presented in previous sections come to the same basic conclusion: wind power facilities in this sample have no demonstrable, widespread, sizable, and statistically significant affect on residential property values. These hedonic models contain 29 or more controlling variables (e.g., house and site characteristics) to account for differences in home values across the sample. Although these models perform well and explain nearly 80% of the variation in sales prices among homes in the sample, it is always possible that variables not included in (i.e., “omitted from”) the hedonic models could be correlated with the variables of interest, therefore biasing the results.

A common method used to control for omitted variable bias in the home assessment literature is to estimate a repeat sales model (Palmquist, 1982). This technique focuses on just those homes that have sold on more than one occasion, preferably once before and once after the introduction of a possible disamenity, and investigates whether the price appreciation between these transactions is affected by the presence of that disamenity. In this section a repeat sales analysis is applied to the dataset, investigating in a different way the presence of the three possible property value stigmas associated with wind facilities, and therefore providing an important cross-check to the hedonic model results. The section begins with a brief discussion of the general form of the Repeat Sales Model and a summary of the literature that has employed this approach to investigate environmental disamenities. The dataset and model used in the analysis is then described, followed by a summary of the results from that analysis.

6.1. Repeat Sales Models and Environmental Disamenities Literature

Repeat sales models use the annual sales-price appreciation rates of homes as the dependent variable. Because house, home site, and neighborhood characteristics are relatively stable over time for any individual home, many of those characteristics need not be included in the repeat sales model, thereby increasing the degrees of freedom and allowing sample size requirements to be significantly lower and coefficient estimates to be more efficient (Crone and Voith, 1992). A repeat sales analysis is not necessarily preferred over a traditional hedonic model, but is rather an alternative analysis approach that can be used to test the robustness of the earlier results (for further discussion see Jackson, 2003). The repeat sales model takes the basic form:

Annual Appreciation Rate (AAR) = f (TYPE OF HOUSE, OTHER FACTORS)

where

TYPE OF HOUSE provides an indication of the segment of the market in which the house is situated (e.g., high end vs. low end), and

OTHER FACTORS include, but are not limited to, changes to the environment (e.g., proximity to a disamenity).

The dependent variable is the adjusted annual appreciation rate and is defined as follows:

$$\text{AAR} = \exp \left[\frac{\ln(P_1 / P_2)}{t_1 - t_2} \right] - 1 \quad (10)$$

where

P_1 is the adjusted sales price at the first sale (in 1996 dollars),
 P_2 is the adjusted sales price at the second sale (in 1996 dollars),
 t_1 is the date of the first sale,
 t_2 is the date of the second sale, and
 $(t_1 - t_2)$ is determined by calculating the number of days that separate the sale dates and dividing by 365.

As with the hedonic regression model, the usefulness of the repeat sales model is well established in the literature when investigating possible disamenities. For example, a repeat sales analysis was used to estimate spatial and temporal sales price effects from incinerators by Kiel and McClain (1995), who found that appreciation rates, on average, are not sensitive to distance from the facility during the construction phase but are during the operation phase. Similarly, McCluskey and Rausser (2003) used a repeat sales model to investigate effects surrounding a hazardous waste site. They found that appreciation rates are not sensitive to the home's distance from the disamenity before that disamenity is identified by the EPA as hazardous, but that home values are impacted by distance after the EPA's identification is made.

6.2. Dataset

The 7,459 residential sales transactions in the dataset contain a total of 1,253 transactions that involve homes that sold on more than one occasion (i.e., a "pair" of sales of the same home). For the purposes of this analysis, however, the key sample consists of homes that sold once before the announcement of the wind facility, and that subsequently sold again after the construction of that facility. Therefore any homes that sold twice in either the pre-announcement or post-construction periods were not used in the repeat sales sample.⁹¹ These were excluded because either they occurred before the effect would be present (for pre-announcement pairs) or after (for post-announcement pairs). This left a total of 368 pairs for the analysis, which was subsequently reduced to 354 usable pairs.⁹²

The mean AAR for the sample is 1.0% per year, with a low of -10.5% and a high of 13.4%. Table 27 summarizes some of the characteristics of the homes used in the repeat sales model. The average house in the sample has 1,580 square feet of above-ground finished living area, sits on a parcel of 0.67 acres, and originally sold for \$70,483 (real 1996 dollars). When it sold a second time, the average home in the sample was located 2.96 miles from the nearest wind turbine (14 homes were within one mile, 199 between one and three miles, 116 between three and five miles, and 25 outside of five miles). Of the 354 homes, 14% ($n = 49$) had some view of the facility (35 were rated MINOR, five MODERATE, and nine either SUBSTANTIAL or EXTREME). Because of the restriction to those homes that experienced repeat sales, the sample is relatively small for those homes in close proximity to and with dramatic views of wind facilities.

⁹¹ 752 pairs occurred after construction began, whereas 133 pairs occurred before announcement.

⁹² Of the 368 pairs, 14 were found to have an AAR that was either significantly above or below the mean for the sample (mean +/- 2 standard deviations). These pairs were considered highly likely to be associated with homes that were either renovated or left to deteriorate between sales, and therefore were removed from the repeat sales model dataset. Only two of these 14 homes had views of the wind turbines, both of which were MINOR. All 14 of the homes were situated either between one and three miles from the nearest turbine ($n = 8$) or between three and five miles away ($n = 6$).

Table 27: List of Variables Included in the Repeat Sales Model

Variable Name	Description	Type	Sign	Freq.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.
SalePrice96_Pre	The Sale Price (adjusted for inflation into 1996 dollars) of the home as of the first time it had sold	C	+	354	\$ 70,483	\$ 37,798	\$ 13,411	\$ 291,499
SalePrice96_Pre_Sqr	SalePrice96_Pre Squared (shown in millions)	C	-	354	\$ 6,393	\$ 8,258	\$ 180	\$ 84,972
Acres	Number of Acres that sold with the residence	C	+	354	0.67	1.34	0.07	10.96
Sqft_1000	Number of square feet of finished above ground living area (in 1000s)	C	+	354	1.58	0.56	0.59	4.06
No View	If the home had no view of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Omitted	n/a	305	0.86	0.35	0	1
Minor View	If the home had a Minor View of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	35	0.10	0.30	0	1
Moderate View	If the home had a Moderate View of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	5	0.01	0.12	0	1
Substantial/Extreme View	If the home had a Substantial or Extreme View of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	9	0.03	0.12	0	1
Less than 1 Mile	If the home was within 1 mile (5280 feet) of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	14	0.02	0.13	0	1
Between 1 and 3 Miles	If the home was between 1 and 3 miles of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	199	0.56	0.50	0	1
Between 3 and 5 Miles	If the home was between 3 and 5 miles of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	OC	-	116	0.33	0.47	0	1
Outside 5 Miles	If the home was outside 5 miles of the turbines when it sold for the second time (Yes = 1, No = 0)	Omitted	n/a	25	0.07	0.26	0	1

"C" Continuous, "OC" Ordered Categorical (1 = yes, 0 = no) values are interpreted in relation to the "Omitted" category. This table does not include the study area fixed effects variables that are included in the model (e.g., WAOR, TXHC, NYMC). The reference case for these variables is the WAOR study area.

6.3. Model Form

To investigate the presence of Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance Stigmas, the adjusted annual appreciation rate (AAR) is calculated for the 354 sales pairs in the manner described in equation (10), using inflation adjusted sales prices. The following model is then estimated:

$$AAR = \beta_0 + \sum_s \beta_1 S + \sum_k \beta_2 X + \sum_v \beta_3 VIEW + \sum_d \beta_4 DISTANCE + \varepsilon \quad (11)$$

where

AAR represents the inflation-adjusted Annual Appreciation Rate for repeat sales,

S is the vector of s Study Area fixed effects variables (e.g., WAOR, OKCC, etc.),

X is a vector of k home, site and sale characteristics (e.g., acres, square feet, original sales price),

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),

DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance variables (e.g., less than one mile, between one and three miles, etc.),

β_0 is the constant or intercept across the full sample,

β_1 is a vector of s parameter estimates for the study area fixed effects as compared to sales that occurred in the WAOR study area,

β_2 is a vector of k parameter estimates for the home, site, and sale characteristics,

β_3 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables as compared to transactions of homes with no view of the turbines,

β_4 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to transactions of homes outside of five miles, and

ε is a random disturbance term.

Effectively, this model seeks to identify reasons that AARs vary among those sales pairs in the sample. Reasons for such differences in AARs might include variations in home and site characteristics, the study area in which the sale occurs, or the degree to which the home is in proximity to or has a dramatic view of a wind facility. As such, the model as shown by equation (11) has three primary groups of parameters: variables of interest; home, site, and sale characteristics; and study area fixed effects.

The variables of interest are VIEW and DISTANCE, and the coefficients β_3 and β_4 are therefore the primary focus of this analysis. Because of the small numbers of homes in the sample situated inside of 3000 feet and between 3000 feet and one mile, they are collapsed into a single category (inside one mile). For the same reason, homes with SUBSTANTIAL or EXTREME VIEWS are collapsed into a single category (SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME). In this model, therefore, the influence on appreciation rates of the following variables of interest is estimated: MINOR, MODERATE, and SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME VIEWS, and less than one mile, between one and three mile, and between three and five mile DISTANCES. For the VIEW fixed-effects variables, the reference category is NO VIEW; for DISTANCE, it is homes outside of five miles. As with previous models, if effects exist, it is expected that all of the coefficients would be negative and monotonically ordered.

The number of home, site, and sale characteristics included in a repeat sales model is typically substantially lower than in a hedonic model. This is to be expected because, as discussed earlier, the repeat sales model explores variations in AARs for sales pairs from individual homes, and home and site characteristics are relatively stable over time for any individual home. Nonetheless, various characteristics have been found by others (e.g., Kiel and McClain, 1995; McCluskey and Rausser, 2003) to affect appreciation rates. For the purposes of the Repeat Sales Model, these include the number of square feet of living space (SQFT_1000), the number of acres (ACRES), the inflation-adjusted price of the home at the first sale (SalePrice96_Pre), and that sales price squared (SalePrice96_Pre_Sqr). Of those characteristics, the SQFT_1000 and ACRES coefficients are expected to be positive indicating that, all else being equal, an increase in living area and lot size increases the relative appreciation rate. Conversely, it is expected that the combined estimated effect of the initial sales prices (SalePrice96_Pre and SalePrice96_Pre_Sqr) will trend downward, implying that as the initial sales price of the house increases the appreciation rate decreases. These expectations are in line with the previous literature (Kiel and McClain, 1995; McCluskey and Rausser, 2003).

Finally, the study-area fixed effects variables (β_l) are included in this model to account for differences in inflation adjusted appreciation rates that may exist across study areas (e.g., WAOR, TXHC, NYMC). The WAOR study area is the reference category, and all study-area coefficients therefore represent the marginal change in AARs compared to WAOR (the intercept represents the marginal change in AAR for WAOR by itself). These study area parameters provide a unique look into Area Stigma effects. Recall that the appreciation rates used in this model are adjusted for inflation by using an inflation index from the nearby municipal statistical area (MSA). These MSAs are sometimes quite far away (as much as 20 miles) and therefore would be unaffected by the wind facility. As such, any variation in the study area parameters (and the intercept) would be the result of local influences not otherwise captured in the inflation

adjustment, and represent another test for Area Stigma; if effects exist, it is expected that the β_0 and β_1 coefficients will be negative.

As with the hedonic models presented earlier, the assumptions of homoskedasticity, absence of spatial autocorrelation, reasonably little multicollinearity, and appropriate controls for outliers are addressed as described in the associated footnote and in Appendix G.⁹³

6.4. Analysis of Results

The results from the Repeat Sales Model are presented in Table 28. The model performs relatively poorly overall, with an Adjusted R^2 of just 0.19 (and an F -test statistic of 5.2). Other similar analyses in the literature have produced higher performance statistics but have done so with samples that are considerably larger or more homogenous than ours.⁹⁴ The low R^2 found here should not be cause for undue concern, however, given the relatively small sample spread across ten different study areas. Moreover, many of the home and site characteristics are found to be statistically significant, and of the appropriate sign. The coefficient for the adjusted initial sales price (SalePrice96_Pre), for example, is statistically significant, small, and negative (-0.000001, p value 0.00), while the coefficient for the adjusted initial sales price squared (SalePrice96_Pre_Sqr) is also statistically significant and considerably smaller (<0.000000, p value 0.00). These results imply, consistent with the prior literature, that for those homes in the sample, an increase in initial adjusted sales price decreases the average percentage appreciation rate. ACRES (0.002, p value 0.10) and SQFT_1000 (0.02, p value 0.00) are both positive, as expected, and statistically significant.

Of particular interest are the intercept term and the associated study-area fixed effect coefficients, and what they collectively say about Area Stigma. The coefficient for the intercept (β_0) is 0.005 (p value 0.81), which is both extremely small and not statistically significant. Likewise, the study-area fixed effects are all relatively small (less than 0.03 in absolute terms) and none are statistically significant. As discussed above, if a pervasive Area Stigma existed, it would be expected to be represented in these coefficients. Because all are small and statistically insignificant, it can again be concluded that there is no persuasive evidence of an Area Stigma among this sample of home transactions.

⁹³ All results are produced using White's corrected standard errors to control for heteroskedasticity. Spatial autocorrelation, with this small sample, is impossible to control. Because of the small sample, an even smaller number of neighboring sales exist, which are required to construct the spatial matrix. As such, spatial autocorrelation is not addressed in the repeat sales model. As with the hedonic models, some multicollinearity might exist, but that multicollinearity is unlikely to be correlated with the variables of interest. Outliers are investigated and dealt with as discussed in footnote 91 on page 56.

⁹⁴ McCluskey and Rausser (2003) had a sample of over 30,000 repeat sales and had an F -test statistic of 105; Kiel and McClain (1995) produced an R^2 that ranged from 0.40 to 0.63 with samples ranging from 53 to 145, but all sales took place in North Andover, MA.

Table 28: Results from Repeat Sales Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	0.005	0.02	0.81	354
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	6
TXHC	-0.01	0.02	0.63	57
OKCC	0.03	0.02	0.11	102
IABV	0.02	0.02	0.14	59
ILLC	-0.01	0.02	0.38	18
WIKCDC	0.02	0.03	0.50	8
PASC	-0.01	0.02	0.67	32
PAWC	0.02	0.02	0.16	35
NYMCOC	0.02	0.02	0.23	24
NYMC	0.03	0.02	0.13	13
SalePrice96 Pre	-0.000001	0.0000002	0.00	354
SalePrice96 Pre Sqr	0.0000000	0.0000000	0.00	354
Acres	0.002	0.001	0.10	354
Sqft 1000	0.02	0.01	0.00	354
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	305
Minor View	-0.02	0.01	0.02	35
Moderate View	0.03	0.03	0.29	5
Substantial/Extreme View	-0.02	0.01	0.09	9
Less than 1 Mile	0.03	0.01	0.01	14
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.01	0.01	0.59	199
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.01	0.01	0.53	116
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	25

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	11
Dependent Variable	SalePrice96 AAR
Number of Cases	354
Number of Predictors (k)	19
F Statistic	5.2
Adjusted R2	0.19

Turning to the variables of interest, mixed results (see Figure 9 and Figure 10) are found. For homes with MINOR or SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME VIEWS, despite small sample sizes, appreciation rates after adjusting for inflation are found to decrease by roughly 2% annually (p values of 0.02 and 0.09, respectively) compared to homes with NO VIEW. Though these findings initially seem to suggest the presence of Scenic Vista Stigma, the coefficients are not monotonically ordered, counter to what one might expect: homes with a MODERATE rated view appreciated on average 3% annually (p value 0.29) compared to homes with NO VIEW. Adding to the suspicion of these VIEW results, the DISTANCE coefficient for homes situated inside of one mile, where eight out of the nine SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME rated homes are located, is positive and statistically significant (0.03, p value 0.01). If interpreted literally, these results suggest that a home inside of one mile with a SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME rated view would experience a decrease in annual appreciation of 2% compared to homes with no views of turbines, but simultaneously would experience an increase of 3% in appreciation compared to homes outside of five miles. Therefore, when compared to those homes outside of five miles and with no view of the wind facilities, these homes would experience an overall increase in AAR by 1%. These results are counterintuitive and are likely driven by the small number of sales pairs

that are located within one mile of the wind turbines and experience a dramatic view of those turbines.

Figure 9: Repeat Sales Model Results for VIEW





Figure 10: Repeat Sales Model Results for DISTANCE



Regardless of the reason for this result, again no persuasive evidence of consistent and widespread adverse effects is found from the presence of the wind facilities in the sample, reinforcing the findings from the previous hedonic analysis. Specifically, there is no evidence that an Area Stigma exists in that homes outside of one mile and inside of five miles do not appreciate differently than homes farther away. Similarly, there is no evidence of a Nuisance Stigma. Appreciation rates for homes inside of one mile are not adversely affected; in fact, significantly higher appreciation rates are found for these homes than for those homes located outside of five miles from the nearest wind facility. Finally, though some evidence is found that a Scenic Vista Stigma may exist in the sample of repeat sales, it is weak, fairly small, and

somewhat counter-intuitive. This result is likely driven by the small number of sales pairs that are located within one mile of the wind turbines and that experience a dramatic view of those turbines.

7. Sales Volume Analysis

The analysis findings to this point suggest that, among the sample of sales transactions analyzed in this report, wind facilities have had no widespread and statistically identifiable impact on residential property values. A related concern that has not yet been addressed is that of sales volume: does the presence of wind facilities either increase or decrease the rate of home sales transactions? On the one hand, a decrease in sales volumes might be expected. This might occur if homeowners expect that their property values will be impacted by the presence of the wind facility, and therefore simply choose not to sell their homes as a result, or if they try to sell but are not easily able to find willing buyers. Alternatively, an increase in sales volume might be expected if homeowners that are located near to or have a dominating view of wind turbines are uncomfortable with the presence of those turbines. Though those homes may sell at a market value that is not impacted by the presence of the wind facilities, self-selection may lead to accelerated transaction volumes shortly after facility announcement or construction as homeowners who view the turbines unfavorably sell their homes to individuals who are not so stigmatized. To address the question of whether and how sales volumes are impacted by nearby wind facilities, sales volumes are analyzed for those homes located at various distances from the wind facilities in the sample, during different facility development periods.

7.1. Dataset

To investigate whether sales volumes are affected by the presence of wind facilities two sets of data are assembled: (1) the number of homes available to sell annually within each study area, and (2) the number of homes that actually did sell annually in those areas. Homes potentially “available to sell” are defined as all single family residences within five miles of the nearest turbine that are located on a parcel of land less than 25 acres in size, that have only one residential structure, and that had a market value (for land and improvements) above \$10,000.⁹⁵ Homes that “did sell” are defined as every valid sale of a single family residence within five miles of the nearest turbine that are located on a parcel of land less than 25 acres in size, that have only one residential structure, and that sold for more than \$10,000.

The sales data used for this analysis are slightly different from those used in the hedonic analysis reported earlier. As mentioned in Section 3.3, a number of study areas were randomly sampled to limit the transactions outside of 3 miles if the total number of transactions were to exceed that which could efficiently be visited in the field ($n \sim 1,250$). For the sales volume analysis, however, field data collection was not required, and all relevant transactions could therefore be used. Secondly, two study areas did not provide the data necessary for the sales volume analysis (WAOR and OKCC), and are therefore excluded from the sample. Finally, data for some homes that were “available to sell” were not complete, and rather than including only a small selection of these homes, these subsets of data were simply excluded from the analysis. These excluded homes include those located outside of five miles of the nearest wind turbine, and those available to sell or that did sell more than three years before wind facility announcement.⁹⁶ The resulting

⁹⁵ “Market value” is the estimated price at which a home would sell as of a given point in time.

⁹⁶ For instance, some providers supplied sales data out to ten miles, but only provided homes available to sell out to five miles. As well, data on homes that did sell were not consistently available for periods many years before announcement.

dataset spans the period starting three years prior to facility announcement and ending four years after construction. All homes in this dataset are situated inside of five miles, and each is located in one of the eight represented study areas.⁹⁷

The final set of homes potentially “available to sell” and that actually “did sell” are then segmented into three distance categories: inside of one mile, between one and three miles, and between three and five miles. For each of these three distance categories, in each of the eight study areas, and for each of the three years prior to announcement, the period between announcement and construction, and each of the four years following construction, the number of homes that sold as a percentage of those available to sell is calculated.⁹⁸ This results in a total of 24 separate sales volume calculations in each study area, for a total of 192 calculations across all study areas. Finally, these sales volumes are averaged across all study areas into four development period categories: less than three years before announcement, after announcement but before construction, less than two years after construction, and between two and four years after construction.⁹⁹ The resulting average annual sales volumes, by distance band and development period, are shown in Table 29 and Figure 11.

Table 29: Sales Volumes by PERIOD and DISTANCE


	Inside 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles
Less Than 3 Years Before Announcement	2.2%	1.8%	2.3%
After Announcement Before Construction	3.0%	2.5%	3.7%
Less Than 2 Years After Construction	2.1%	3.0%	4.2%
Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	2.8%	2.8%	4.2%

⁹⁷ The number of homes “available to sell” is constructed for each year after 1996 based on the year the homes in each study area were built. For many homes in the sample, the year built occurred more than three years before wind facility announcement, and therefore those homes are “available to sell” in all subsequent periods. For some homes, however, the home was built during the wind facility development process, and therefore becomes “available” some time after the first period of interest. For those homes, the build year is matched to the development dates so that it becomes “available” during the appropriate period. For this reason, the number of homes “available to sell” increases in later periods.

⁹⁸ For the period after announcement and before construction, which in all study areas was not exactly 12 months, the sales volume numbers are adjusted so that they corresponded to an average over a 12 month period.

⁹⁹ These temporal groupings are slightly different from those used in the hedonic Temporal Aspects Model. Namely, the period before announcement is not divided into two parts – more than two years before announcement and less than two years before announcement – but rather only one – less than three years before announcement. This simplification is made to allow each of the interaction categories to have enough data to be meaningful.

Figure 11: Sales Volumes by PERIOD and DISTANCE



7.2. Model Form

To investigate whether the rate of sales transactions is measurably affected by the wind facilities, the various resulting sales volumes shown above in Table 29 and Figure 11 are compared using a *t*-Test, as follows:

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}} \quad (12)$$

where

\bar{x}_1 and \bar{x}_2 are the mean sales volumes from the two categories being compared,

s_1^2 and s_2^2 are variances of the sales volumes from the two categories being compared, and

n_1 and n_2 are numbers of representative volumes in the two categories.¹⁰⁰

The degrees of freedom used to calculate the *p*-value of the *t* statistic equals the lower of ($n_1 - 1$) or ($n_2 - 1$).

Three sets of *t*-Tests are conducted. First, to test whether sales volumes have changed with time and are correlated with wind facility construction, the volumes for each DISTANCE group in later periods (x_1) are compared to the volume in that same group in the pre-announcement period (x_2). Second, to test whether sales volumes are impacted by distance to the nearest wind turbine, the volumes for each PERIOD group at distances closer to the turbines (x_1) are compared to the volume in that same group in the three to five mile distance band (x_2). Finally, for reasons that will become obvious later, the sales volumes for each PERIOD group at distances within one

¹⁰⁰ The number of representative volumes could differ between the two categories. For instance, the “less than three years before announcement” category represents three years – and therefore three volumes – for each study area for each distance band, while the “less than two years after construction” category represents two years – and therefore two volumes – for each study area for each distance band.

mile and outside of three miles of the turbines (x_1) are compared to the sales volume in that same group in the one to three mile distance band (x_2). These three tests help to evaluate whether sales volumes are significantly different after wind facilities are announced and constructed, and whether sales volumes near the turbines are affected differently than for those homes located farther away.¹⁰¹

7.3. Analysis of Results

Table 29 and Figure 11 above show the sales volumes in each PERIOD and DISTANCE category, and can be interpreted as the percentage of homes that are available to sell that did sell in each category, on an annual average basis. The sales volume between one and three miles and before facility announcement is the lowest, at 1.8%, whereas the sales volumes for homes located between three and five miles in both periods following construction are the highest, at 4.2%.

The difference between these two sales volumes can be explained, in part, by two distinct trends that are immediately noticeable from the data presented in Figure 11. First, sales volumes in all periods are highest for those homes located in the three to five mile distance band. Second, sales volumes at virtually all distances are higher after wind facility announcement than they were before announcement.¹⁰²

To test whether these apparent trends are borne out statistically the three sets of t -Tests described earlier are performed, the results of which are shown in Table 30, Table 31, and Table 32. In each table, the difference between the subject volume (x_1) and the reference volume (x_2) is listed first, followed by the t statistic, and whether the statistic is significant at or above the 90% level (“*”).

Table 30 shows that mean sales volumes in the post-announcement periods are consistently greater than those in the pre-announcement period, and that those differences are statistically significant in four out of the nine categories. For example, the post-construction sales volumes for homes in the three to five mile distance band in the period less than two years after construction (4.2%) and between three and four years after construction (4.2%) are significantly greater than the pre-announcement volume of 2.3% (1.9%, $t = 2.40$; 1.9%, $t = 2.31$). Similarly, the post-construction sales volumes between one and three miles are significantly greater than the pre-announcement volume. These statistically significant differences, it should be noted, could be as much related to the low reference volume (i.e., sales volume in the period less than

¹⁰¹ An alternative method to this model would be to pool the homes that “did sell” with the homes “available to sell” and construct a Discrete Choice Model where the dependent variable is zero (for “no sale”) or one (for “sale”) and the independent variables would include various home characteristics and the categorical distance variables. This would allow one to estimate the probability that a home sells dependent on distance from the wind facility. Because home characteristics data for the homes “available to sell,” was not systematically collected it was not possible to apply this method to the dataset.

¹⁰² It is not entirely clear why these trends exist. Volumes may be influenced upward in areas farther from the wind turbines, where homes, in general, might be more densely sited and homogenous, both of which might be correlated with greater home sales transactions. The converse might be true in more rural areas, nearer the wind turbines, where homes may be more unique or homeowners less prone to move. The increasing sales volumes seen in periods following construction, across all distance bands, may be driven by the housing bubble, when more transactions were occurring in general.

three years before announcement), as they are to the sales volumes to which the reference category is compared. Finally, when comparing post-construction volumes inside of a mile, none are statistically different than the 2.2% pre-announcement level.

Table 30: Equality Test of Sales Volumes between PERIODS

	Inside 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles
Less Than 3 Years Before Announcement	Reference	Reference	Reference
After Announcement Before Construction	0.8% (0.72)	0.7% (0.99)	1.5% (1.49)
Less Than 2 Years After Construction	-0.1% (-0.09)	1.2% (2.45) *	1.9% (2.4) *
Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	0.6% (0.54)	1% (2.24) *	1.9% (2.31) *

Numbers in parenthesis represent t-Test statistics. "" = significantly different at or below the 10% level*

Turning to sales volumes in the same development period but between the different distance bands, consistent but less statistically significant results are uncovered (see Table 31). Although all sales volumes inside of three miles, for each period, are less than their peers outside of three miles, those differences are statistically significant in only two out of eight instances. Potentially more important, when one compares the sales volumes inside of one mile to those between one and three miles (see Table 32), small differences are found, none of which are statistically significant. In fact, on average, the sales volumes for homes inside of one mile are greater or equal to the volumes of those homes located between one and three miles in two of the three post-announcement periods. Finally, it should be noted that the volumes for the inside one mile band, in the period immediately following construction, are less than those in the one to three mile band in the same period. Although not statistically significant, this difference might imply an initial slowing of sales activity that, in later periods, returns to more normal levels. This possibility is worth investigating further and is therefore recommended for future research.

Table 31: Equality Test of Volumes between DISTANCES using 3-5 Mile Reference

	Inside 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles
Less Than 3 Years Before Announcement	-0.1% (-0.09)	-0.5% (-0.88)	Reference
After Announcement Before Construction	-0.7% (-0.56)	-1.2% (-1.13)	Reference
Less Than 2 Years After Construction	-2.1% (-2.41) *	-1.2% (-1.48)	Reference
Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	-1.4% (-1.27)	-1.4% (-1.82) *	Reference

Numbers in parenthesis represent t-Test statistics. "" = significantly different at or below the 10% level*

Table 32: Equality Test of Sales Volumes between DISTANCES using 1-3 Mile Reference

	Inside 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Between 3 and 5 Miles
Less Than 3 Years Before Announcement	0.4% (0.49)	Reference	0.5% (0.88)
After Announcement Before Construction	0.5% (0.47)	Reference	1.2% (1.13)
Less Than 2 Years After Construction	-0.9% (-1.38)	Reference	1.2% (1.48)
Between 2 and 4 Years After Construction	0% (0.01)	Reference	1.4% (1.82) *

Numbers in parenthesis represent t-Test statistics. "" = significantly different at or below the 10% level*

Taken together, these results suggest that sales volumes are not conclusively affected by the announcement and presence of the wind facilities analyzed in this report. At least among this sample, sales volumes increased in all distance bands after the announcement and construction of the wind facilities. If this result was driven by the presence of the wind facilities, however, one would expect that such impacts would be particularly severe for those homes in close proximity to wind facilities. In other words, sales volumes would be the most affected inside of one mile, where views of the turbines are more frequent and where other potential nuisances are more noticeable than in areas farther away. This is not borne out in the data - no statistically significant differences are found for sales volumes inside of one mile as compared to those between one and three miles, and sales volumes outside of three miles are higher still. Therefore, on the whole, this analysis is unable to find persuasive evidence that wind facilities have a widespread and identifiable impact on overall residential sales volumes. It is again concluded that neither Area nor Nuisance Stigma are in evidence in this analysis.

8. Wind Projects and Property Values: Summary of Key Results

This report has extensively investigated the potential impacts of wind power facilities on the value (i.e., sales prices) of residential properties that are in proximity to and/or that have a view of those wind facilities. In so doing, three different potential impacts of wind projects on property values have been identified and analyzed: Area Stigma, Scenic Vista Stigma, and Nuisance Stigma. To assess these potential impacts, a primary (Base) hedonic model has been applied, seven alternative hedonic models have been explored, a repeat sales analysis has been conducted, and possible impacts on sales volumes have been evaluated. Table 33 outlines the resulting ten tests conducted in this report, identifies which of the three potential stigmas those tests were designed to investigate, and summarizes the results of those investigations. This section synthesizes these key results, organized around the three potential stigmas.

Table 33: Impact of Wind Projects on Property Values: Summary of Key Results

Statistical Model	<u>Is there statistical evidence of:</u>			Section Reference
	Area Stigma?	Scenic Vista Stigma?	Nuisance Stigma?	
Base Model	No	No	No	<i>Section 4</i>
View Stability	Not tested	No	Not tested	<i>Section 5.1</i>
Distance Stability	No	Not tested	No	<i>Section 5.1</i>
Continuous Distance	No	No	No	<i>Section 5.2</i>
All Sales	No	No	Limited	<i>Section 5.3</i>
Temporal Aspects	No	No	No	<i>Section 5.4</i>
Orientation	No	No	No	<i>Section 5.5</i>
Overlap	No	Limited	No	<i>Section 5.6</i>
Repeat Sales	No	Limited	No	<i>Section 6</i>
Sales Volume	No	Not tested	No	<i>Section 7</i>

"No"..... *No statistical evidence of a negative impact*

"Yes"..... *Strong statistical evidence of a negative impact*

"Limited"..... *Limited and inconsistent statistical evidence of a negative impact*

"Not tested"..... *This model did not test for this stigma*

8.1. Area Stigma

Area Stigma is defined as a concern that the general area surrounding a wind energy facility will appear more developed, which may adversely affect home values in the local community regardless of whether any individual home has a view of the wind turbines. Though these impacts might be expected to be especially severe at close range to the turbines, the impacts could conceivably extend for a number of miles around a wind facility. Modern wind turbines are visible from well outside of five miles in many cases, so if an Area Stigma exists, it is possible that all of the homes in the study areas inside of five miles would be affected.

As summarized in Table 33, Area Stigma is investigated with the Base, Distance Stability, Continuous Distance, All Sales, Temporal Aspects, Orientation, and Overlap hedonic models. It is also tested, somewhat differently, with the Repeat Sales and Sales Volume analyses. In each case, if an Area Stigma exists, it is expected that the sales prices (and/or sales volume) of homes

located near wind facilities would be broadly affected by the presence of those facilities, with effects decreasing with distance.

The Base Model finds little evidence of an Area Stigma, as the coefficients for the DISTANCE variables are all relatively small and none are statistically different from zero. For homes in this sample, at least, there is no statistical evidence from the Base Model that the distance from a home to the nearest wind turbine impacts sales prices, regardless of the distance band. Perhaps a more direct test of Area Stigma, however, comes from the Temporal Aspects Model. In this model, homes in all distance bands that sold after wind facility announcement are found to sell, on average, for prices that are not statistically different from those for homes that sold more than two years prior to wind facility announcement. Again, no persuasive evidence of an Area Stigma is evident.

The Repeat Sales and Sales Volume Models also investigate Area Stigma. The Repeat Sales Model's 354 homes, each of which sold once before facility announcement and again after construction, show average inflation-adjusted annual appreciation rates that are small and not statistically different from zero. If homes in all study areas were subject to an Area Stigma, one would expect a negative and statistically significant intercept term. Similarly, if homes in any individual study area experienced an Area Stigma, the fixed effect terms would be negative and statistically significant. Neither of these expectations is borne out in the results. The Sales Volume Model tells a similar story, finding that the rate of residential transactions is either not significantly different between the pre- and post-announcement periods, or is greater in later periods, implying, in concert with the other tests, that increased levels of transactions do not signify a rush to sell, and therefore lower prices, but rather an increase in the level of transactions with no appreciable difference in the value of those homes.

The All Sales, Distance Stability, Continuous Distance, Orientation, and Overlap Models corroborate these basic findings. In the All Sales and Distance Stability Models, for example, the DISTANCE coefficients for homes that sold outside of one mile but within five miles, compared to those that sold outside of five miles, are very similar: they differ by no more than 2%, and this small disparity is not statistically different from zero. The same basic findings resulted from the Orientation and Overlap Models. Further, homes with No View as estimated in the All Sales Model are found to appreciate in value, after adjusting for inflation, when compared to homes that sold before wind facility construction (0.02, *p* value 0.06); an Area Stigma effect should be reflected as a negative coefficient for this parameter. Finally, despite using all 4,937 cases in a single distance variable and therefore having a correspondingly small standard error, the Continuous Distance Model discovers no measurable relationship between distance from the nearest turbine and the value of residential properties.

Taken together, the results from these models are strikingly similar: there is no evidence of a widespread and statistically significant Area Stigma among the homes in this sample. Homes in these study areas are not, on average, demonstrably and measurably stigmatized by the arrival of a wind facility, regardless of when they sold in the wind project development process and regardless of whether those homes are located one mile or five miles away from the nearest wind facility.

Drawing from the previous literature on environmental disamenities discussed in Section 2.1, one likely explanation for this result is simply that any effects that might exist may have faded to a level indistinguishable from zero at distances outside of a mile from the wind facilities. For other disamenities, some of which would seemingly be more likely to raise concerns, effects have been found to fade quickly with distance. For example, property value effects near a chemical plant have been found to fade outside of two and a half miles (Carroll et al., 1996), near a lead smelter (Dale et al., 1999) and fossil fuel plants (Davis, 2008) outside of two miles, and near landfills and confined animal feeding operations outside of 2,400 feet and 1,600 feet, respectively (Ready and Abdalla, 2005). Further, homes outside of 300 feet (Hamilton and Schwann, 1995) or even as little as 150 feet (Des-Rosiers, 2002) from a high voltage transmission line have been found to be unaffected. A second possible explanation for these results could be related to the view of the turbines. In the sample used for this analysis, a large majority of the homes outside of one mile ($n = 4,812$) that sold after wind-facility construction commenced cannot see the turbines ($n = 4,189$, 87%), and a considerably larger portion have – at worst – a minor view of the turbines ($n = 4,712$, 98%). Others have found that the sales prices for homes situated at similar distances from a disamenity (e.g., HVTL) depend, in part, on the view of that disamenity (Des-Rosiers, 2002). Similarly, research has sometimes found that annoyance with a wind facility decreases when the turbines cannot be seen (Pedersen and Wayne, 2004). Therefore, for the overwhelming majority of homes outside of a mile that have either a minor rated view or no view at all of the turbines, the turbines may simply be out of sight, and therefore, out of mind.

8.2. Scenic Vista Stigma

Scenic Vista Stigma is defined as concern that a home may be devalued because of the view of a wind energy facility, and the potential impact of that view on an otherwise scenic vista. It has as its basis an admission that home values are, to some degree, derived from the quality of what can be seen from the property and that if those vistas are altered, sales prices might be measurably affected. The Base, View Stability, Continuous Distance, All Sales, Temporal Aspects, Orientation, Overlap, and Repeat Sales Models each test whether Scenic Vista Stigma is present in the sample.

The Base Model, as well as subsequent Alternative Hedonic Models, demonstrates persuasively that the quality of the scenic vista – absent wind turbines – impacts sales prices. Specifically, compared to homes with an AVERAGE VISTA, those having a POOR or a BELOW AVERAGE rating are estimated to sell for 21% (p value 0.00) and 8% (p value 0.00) less, on average. Similarly, homes with an ABOVE AVERAGE or PREMIUM rating are estimated to sell for 10% (p value 0.00) and 13% (p value 0.00) more than homes with an AVERAGE vista rating. Along the same lines, homes in the sample with water frontage or situated on a cul-de-sac sell for 33% (p value 0.00) and 10% (p value 0.00) more, on average, than those homes that lack these characteristics. Taken together, these results demonstrate that home buyers and sellers consistently take into account what can be seen from the home when sales prices are established, and that the models presented in this report are able to clearly identify those impacts.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ Of course, cul-de-sacs and water frontage bestow other benefits to the home owner beyond the quality of the scenic vista, such as safety and privacy in the case of a cul-de-sac, and recreational potential and privacy in the case of water frontage.

Despite this finding, those same hedonic models are unable to identify a consistent and statistically significant Scenic Vista Stigma associated with wind facilities. Home buyers and sellers, at least among this sample, do not appear to be affected in a measurable way by the visual presence of wind facilities. Regardless of which model was estimated, the value of homes with views of turbines that were rated MODERATE, SUBSTANTIAL, or EXTREME are found to be statistically indistinguishable from the prices of homes with no view of the turbines. Specifically, the 25 homes with EXTREME views in the sample, where the home site is “unmistakably dominated by the [visual] presence of the turbines,” are not found to have measurably different property values, and neither are the 31 homes with a SUBSTANTIAL view, where “the turbines are dramatically visible from the home.”¹⁰⁴ The same finding holds for the 106 homes that were rated as having MODERATE views of the wind turbines. Moreover, the Orientation and Overlap Models show that neither the orientation of the home with respect to the view of wind turbines, nor the overlap of that view with the prominent scenic vista, have measurable impacts on home prices.

The All Sales Model compares homes with views of the turbines (in the post-construction period) to homes that sold before construction (when no views were possible), and finds no statistical evidence of adverse effects within any VIEW category. Moreover, when a *t*-Test is performed to compare the NO VIEW coefficient to the others, none of the coefficients for the VIEW ratings are found to be statistically different from the NO VIEW homes. The Repeat Sales Model comes to a similar result, with homes with MODERATE views appreciating at a rate that was not measurably different from that of homes with no views (0.03, *p* value 0.29). The same model also finds that homes with SUBSTANTIAL/EXTREME views appreciate at a rate 2% slower per year (*p* value 0.09) than their NO VIEW peers. Homes situated inside of one mile, however, are found to appreciate at a rate 3% more (*p* value 0.01) than reference homes located outside of five miles. Eight of the nine homes situated inside of one mile had either a SUBSTANTIAL or EXTREME view. Therefore, to correctly interpret these results, one would add the two coefficients for these homes, resulting in a combined 1% increase in appreciation as compared to the reference homes situated outside of five miles with no view of turbines, and again yielding no evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma.

Although these results are consistent across most of the models, there are some individual coefficients from some models that differ. Specifically, homes with MINOR rated views in the Overlap and Repeat Sales Models are estimated to sell for 3% less (*p* value 0.10) and appreciate at a rate 2% less (*p* value 0.02) than NO VIEW homes. Taken at face value, these MINOR VIEW findings imply that homes where “turbines are visible, but, either the scope is narrow, there are many obstructions, or the distance between the home and the facility is large” are systematically impacted in a modest but measurable way. Homes with more dramatic views of a wind facility in the same models, on the other hand, are found to not be measurably affected. Because of the counterintuitive nature of this result, and because it is contradicted in the results of other models presented earlier, it is more likely that there is some aspect of these homes that was not modeled appropriately in the Overlap and Repeat Sales Models, and that the analysis is picking up the effect of omitted variable(s) rather than a systematic causal effect from the wind facilities.

¹⁰⁴ See Section 3.2.3 and Appendix C for full description of VIEW ratings.

Taken together, the results from all of the models and all of the VIEW ratings support, to a large degree, the Base Model findings of no evidence of a Scenic Vista Stigma. Although there are 160 residential transactions in the sample with more dramatic views than MINOR, none of the model specifications is able to find any evidence that those views of wind turbines measurably impacted average sales prices, despite the fact that those same models consistently find that home buyers and sellers place value on the quality of the scenic vista.

8.3. Nuisance Stigma

Nuisance Stigma is defined as a concern that factors that may occur in close proximity to wind turbines, such as sound and shadow flicker, will have a unique adverse influence on home values. If these factors impact residential sales prices, those impacts are likely to be concentrated within a mile of the wind facilities. The Base, Distance Stability, Continuous Distance, All Sales, Temporal Aspects, Orientation, Overlap, Repeat Sales, and Sales Volume Models all investigate the possible presence of a Nuisance Stigma.

The Base Model finds that those homes within 3000 feet and those between 3000 feet and one mile of the nearest wind turbine sold for roughly 5% less than similar homes located more than five miles away, but that these differences are not statistically significant (p values of 0.40 and 0.30, respectively). These results remain unchanged in the Distance Stability Model, as well as in the Orientation and Overlap Models. Somewhat similarly, in the All Sales Model, when all transactions occurring after wind facility announcement are assumed to potentially be impacted (rather than just those occurring after construction, as in the Base Model), and a comparison is made to the average of all transactions occurring pre-announcement (rather than the average of all transactions outside of five miles, as in the Base Model), these same coefficients grow to -6% (p value 0.23) and -8% (p value 0.08) respectively. Although only one of these coefficients was statistically significant, they are large enough to warrant further scrutiny.

The Temporal Aspects Model provides a clearer picture of these findings. It finds that homes that sold prior to wind facility announcement and that were situated within one mile of where the turbines were eventually located sold, on average, for between 10% and 13% less than homes located more than five miles away and that sold in the same period. Therefore, the homes nearest the wind facility's eventual location were already depressed in value before the announcement of the facility. Most telling, however, is what occurred after construction. Homes inside of one mile are found to have inflation-adjusted sales prices that were either statistically undistinguishable from, or in some cases greater than, pre-announcement levels. Homes sold in the first two years after construction, for example, have higher prices (0.07, p value 0.32), as do those homes that sold between two and four years after construction (0.13, p value 0.06) and more than four years after construction (0.08, p value 0.24). In other words, there is no indication that these homes experienced a decrease in sales prices after wind facility construction began. Not only does this result fail to support the existence of a Nuisance Stigma, but it also indicates that the relatively large negative coefficients estimated in the Base and All Sales Models are likely caused by conditions that existed prior to wind facility construction and potentially prior to facility announcement.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ See footnote 82 on page 46 for a discussion of possible alternative explanations to this scenario.

These results are corroborated by the Continuous Distance Model, which finds no statistically significant relationship between an inverse DISTANCE function and sales prices (-0.01, sig 0.46). Similarly, in the Repeat Sales Model, homes within one mile of the nearest turbine are not found to be adversely affected; somewhat counter-intuitively, they are found to appreciate faster (0.03, *p* value 0.01) than their peers outside of five miles. Finally, the Sales Volume analysis does not find significant and consistent results that would suggest that the ability to sell one's home within one mile of a wind facility is substantially impacted by the presence of that facility.

Taken together, these models present a consistent set of results: the sales prices of homes in this sample that are within a mile of wind turbines, where various nuisance effects have been posited, are not measurably affected compared to those homes that are located more than five miles away from the facilities or that sold well before the wind projects were announced. These results imply that widespread Nuisance Stigma effects are either not present in the sample, or are too small or sporadic to be statistically identifiable.

Though these results may appear counterintuitive, it may simply be that property value impacts fade rapidly with distance, and that few of the homes in the sample are close enough to the subject wind facilities to be substantially impacted. As discussed earlier, studies of the property value impacts of high voltage transmission lines often find that effects fade towards zero at as little distance as 200 feet (see, e.g., Gallimore and Jayne, 1999; Watson, 2005). None of the homes in the present sample are closer than 800 feet to the nearest wind turbine, and all but eight homes are located outside of 1000 feet of the nearest turbine. It is therefore possible that, if any effects do exist, they exist at very close range to the turbines, and that those effects are simply not noticeable outside of 800 feet. Additionally, almost half of the homes in the sample that are located within a mile of the nearest turbine have either no view or a minor rated view of the wind facilities, and some high voltage transmission line (HVTL) studies have found a decrease in adverse effects if the towers are not visible (Des-Rosiers, 2002) and, similarly, decreases in annoyance with wind facility sounds if turbines cannot be seen (Pedersen and Waye, 2004). Finally, effects that existed soon after the announcement or construction of the wind facilities might have faded over time. More than half of the homes in the sample sold more than three years after the commencement of construction, while studies of HVTLs have repeatedly found that effects fade over time (Kroll and Priestley, 1992) and studies of attitudes towards wind turbines have found that such attitudes often improve after facility construction (Wolsink, 1989). Regardless of the explanation, the fact remains that, in this sizable sample of residential transactions, no persuasive evidence of a widespread Nuisance Stigma is found, and if these impacts do exist, they are either too small or too infrequent to result in any widespread and consistent statistically observable impact.

9. Conclusions

Though surveys generally show that public acceptance towards wind energy is high, a variety of concerns with wind development are often expressed at the local level. One such concern that is often raised in local siting and permitting processes is related to the potential impact of wind projects on the property values of nearby residences.

This report has investigated the potential impacts of wind power facilities on the sales prices of residential properties that are in proximity to and/or that have a view of those wind facilities. It builds and improves on the previous literature that has investigated these potential effects by collecting a large quantity of residential transaction data from communities surrounding a wide variety of wind power facilities, spread across multiple parts of the U.S. Each of the homes included in this analysis was visited to clearly determine the degree to which the wind facility was visible at the time of home sale and to collect other essential data. To frame the analysis, three potentially distinct impacts of wind facilities on property values are considered: Area, Scenic Vista, and Nuisance Stigma. To assess these potential impacts, the authors applied a base hedonic model, explored seven alternative hedonic models, conducted a repeat sales analysis, and evaluated possible impacts on sales volumes. The result is the most comprehensive and data-rich analysis to date on the potential impacts of wind projects on nearby property values.

Although each of the analysis techniques used in this report has strengths and weaknesses, the results are strongly consistent in that each model fails to uncover conclusive evidence of the presence of any of the three property value stigmas. Based on the data and analysis presented in this report, no evidence is found that home prices surrounding wind facilities are consistently, measurably, and significantly affected by either the view of wind facilities or the distance of the home to those facilities. Although the analysis cannot dismiss the possibility that individual or small numbers of homes have been or could be negatively impacted, if these impacts do exist, they are either too small and/or too infrequent to result in any widespread and consistent statistically observable impact. Moreover, to the degree that homes in the present sample are similar to homes in other areas where wind development is occurring, the results herein are expected to be transferable.

Finally, although this work builds on the existing literature in a number of respects, there remain a number of areas for further research. The primary goal of subsequent research should be to concentrate on those homes located closest to wind facilities, where the least amount of data are available. Additional research of the nature reported in this paper could be pursued, but with a greater number of transactions, especially for homes particularly close to wind facilities. Further, it is conceivable that cumulative impacts might exist whereby communities that have seen repetitive development are affected uniquely, and these cumulative effects may be worth investigating. A more detailed analysis of sales volume impacts may also be fruitful, as would an assessment of the potential impact of wind facilities on the length of time homes are on the market in advance of an eventual sale. Finally, it would be useful to conduct a survey of those homeowners living close to existing wind facilities, and especially those residents who have bought and sold homes in proximity to wind facilities after facility construction, to assess their opinions on the impacts of wind project development on their home purchase and sales decisions.

References

- American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) (2008) Wind Energy Siting Handbook. American Wind Energy Association, Washington, DC. February, 2008. 183 pages.
- Bateman, I., Day, B. and Lake, I. (2001) The Effect of Road Traffic on Residential Property Values: A Literature Review and Hedonic Pricing Study. Prepared for Scottish Executive and The Stationary Office, Edinburgh, Scotland. January, 2001. 207 pages.
- BBC Research & Consulting (BBC R&C) (2005) Wind Power Facility Siting Case Studies: Community Response. BBC Research & Consulting. Prepared for National Wind Coordinating Committee, c/o RESOLVE, Washington, DC. June, 2005. 51 pages.
- Beck, D. (2004) How Hull Wind "I" Impacted Property Values in Pemberton. Letter sent to C. McCabe. July 28, 2004.
- Benson, E. D., Hansen, J. L. and Aurthur L. Schwartz, J. (2000) Water Views and Residential Property Values. *The Appraisal Journal*. 68(3): 260-270.
- Bishop, I. (2002) Determination of Thresholds of Visual Impact: The Case of Wind Turbines. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*. 29: 707-718.
- Bond, S. (2008) Attitudes Towards the Development of Wind Farms in Australia. *Journal of Environmental Health Australia*. 8(3): 19-32.
- Bond, S. and Wang, K. K. (2007) The Impact of Cell Phone Towers on House Prices in Residential Neighborhoods. *The Appraisal Journal*. 75(4): 362-370.
- Bourassa, S. C., Hoesli, M. and Sun, J. (2004) What's in a View? *Environment and Planning*. 36(8): 1427-1450.
- Boyle, M. A. and Kiel, K. A. (2001) A Survey of House Price Hedonic Studies of the Impact of Environmental Externalities. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 9(2): 117-144.
- Buhyoff, G. J., Miller, P. A., Roach, J. W., Zhou, D. and Fuller, L. G. (1994) An AI Methodology for Landscape Visual Assessments. *AI Applications*. 8(1): 1-13.
- Carroll, T. M., Clauretje, T. M., Jensen, J. and Waddoups, M. (1996) The Economic Impact of a Transient Hazard on Property Values: The 1988 PEPCON Explosion in Henderson, Nevada. *Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*. 13(2): 143-167.
- Case, B., Clapp, J., Dubin, R. and Rodriguez, M. (2004) Modeling Spatial and Temporal House Price Patterns: A Comparison of Four Models. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*. 29(2): 167-191.
- Clark, D. E. and Allison, T. (1999) Spent Nuclear Fuel and Residential Property Values: The Influence of Proximity, Visual Cues and Public Information. *Papers in Regional Science*. 78(4): 403-421.
- Crone, T. M. and Voith, R. P. (1992) Estimating House Price Appreciation: A Comparison of Methods. *Journal of Housing Economics*. 2(4): 324-338.
- Dale, L., Murdoch, J. C., Thayer, M. A. and Waddell, P. A. (1999) Do Property Values Rebound from Environmental Stigmas? Evidence from Dallas. *Land Economics*. 75(2): 311-326.
- Dale Rankin et al. v. FPL Energy LLC et al. (Dale Rankin v. FPL) (2008). 42nd District Court - Taylor County TX. August 21, 2008. 11-07-00074-CV.
- Daniel, T. C. and Boster, R. S. (1976) Measuring Landscape Aesthetics: The Scenic Beauty Estimation Method. Forest Service - Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station in Fort Collins Colorado. Prepared for U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 66 pages.

- Davis, L. W. (2008) The Effect Of Power Plants On Local Housing Values And Rents: Evidence From Restricted Census Microdata. Prepared for Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research (CEEPR), Cambridge, MA. June 18, 2008. 34 pages. 08-009.
- DeLacy, B. (2005) Technical Memorandum: Impacts of The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project on Local Property Values. Cushman & Wakefield of Oregon. Prepared for Sagebrush Power Partners, LLC. December 29, 2005. 15 pages. File Number 06-34001-9012.
- Des-Rosiers, F. (2002) Power Lines, Visual Encumbrance and House Values: A Microspatial Approach to Impact Measurement. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 23(3): 275-301.
- Devine-Wright, P. (2004) Beyond NIMBYism: Towards an Integrated Framework for Understanding Public Perceptions of Wind Energy. *Wind Energy*. 8(2): 125 - 139.
- Dubin, R. A. (1998) Spatial Autocorrelation: A Primer. *Journal of Housing Economics*. 7(4): 304-327.
- Durbin, J. and Watson, G. S. (1951) Testing for Serial Correlation in Least-Squares Regression. *Biometrika*. 38(1-2): 159-178.
- Espey, M., Fakhruddin, F., Gering, L. R. and Lin, H. (2007) Living on the Edge: Residential Property Values in the Urban-Rural Interface. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 39(3): 689-699.
- Exeter-Enterprises-Ltd. (1993) Attitudes to Wind Power: A Survey of Opinion in Cornwall and Devon. Prepared for Department of Trade and Industry as Cited in Devine-Wright (2004). ETSU Report W/13/00354/038/REP.
- Farber, S. (1998) Undesirable Facilities and Property Values: A Summary of Empirical Studies. *Ecological Economics*. 24(1): 1-14.
- Firestone, J. and Kempton, W. (2006) Public Opinion about Large Offshore Wind Power: Underlying Factors. *Energy Policy*. 35(3): 1584-1598.
- Firestone, J., Kempton, W. and Krueger, A. (2007) Delaware Opinion on Offshore Wind Power - Interim Report. University of Delaware College of Marine and Earth Studies, Newark, DE. January, 2007. 16 pages.
- Freeman, A. M. (1979) Hedonic Prices, Property Values and Measuring Environmental Benefits: A Survey of the Issues. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*. 81(2): 154-173.
- Gallimore, P. and Jayne, M. R. (1999) Public and Professional Perceptions of HVOTL Risks: The Problem of Circularity. *Journal of Property Research*. 16(3): 243-255. Cited by Elliott and Wadley, 2002.
- Gipe, P. (2002) Design as if People Matter: Aesthetic Guidelines for a Wind Power Future. Section in Wind Power in View: Energy Landscapes in a Crowded World. Academic Press. Davis, CA. pp. 173-212 of 234 pages. ISBN 0-12-546334-0.
- Global Wind Energy Council (GWEC) (2008) Global Wind Energy Outlook. Global Wind Energy Council, Brussels, Belgium, and Greenpeace, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. October, 2008. 60 pages.
- Global Wind Energy Council (GWEC) (2009) Global Wind 2008 Report. Global Wind Energy Council, Brussels, Belgium, and Greenpeace, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. 60 pages.
- Goldberger, A. S. (1991) A Course in Econometrics. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA. 178 pages.
- Goldman, J. C. (2006) A Study in the Impact of Windmills on Property Values in Tucker County, West Virginia for the Proposed Beech Ridge Energy, L.L.C. project in Greenbrier County, West Virginia. Goldman Associates Inc. Prepared for Spilman Thomas & Battle, P.L.L.C., Charleston, WV. April, 2006. 51 pages. West Virginia Case No. 05-1590-E-CS.

- Grover, D. S. (2002) Economic Impacts of Wind Power in Kittitas County, WA. ECONorthwest. Prepared for Phoenix Economic Development Group, Ellensburg, WA. November, 2002. 18 pages.
- Gujarati, D. N. (2003) Basic Econometrics: Fourth Edition. McGraw-Hill/Irwin. New York, NY. 1002 pages. ISBN 0-07-233542-4.
- Hamilton, S. and Schwann, G. (1995) Do High Voltage Electric Transmission Lines Affect Property Value? *Land Economics*. 71(4): 436-444.
- Haughton, J., Giuffre, D., Barrett, J. and Tuerck, D. G. (2004) An Economic Analysis of a Wind Farm in Nantucket Sound. Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University, Boston, MA. May, 2004. 83 pages.
- Hoen, B. (2006) Impacts of Windfarm Visibility on Property Values in Madison County, New York. Thesis Prepared for Masters Degree in Environmental Policy. Bard College, Annandale-On-Hudson, NY. April, 2006. 73 pages.
- Jackson, T. O. (2001) The Effects of Environmental Contamination on Real Estate: A Literature Review. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 9(2): 93-116.
- Jackson, T. O. (2003) Methods and Techniques for Contaminated Property Valuation. *The Appraisal Journal*. 71(4): 311-320.
- Jackson, T. O. (2005) Evaluating Environmental Stigma with Multiple Regression Analysis. *The Appraisal Journal*. 73(4): 363-369.
- Jerabek, J. (2001) Property Values and their Relationship to the Town of Lincoln's Wind Turbine Projects. Letter sent to R. Bingen. January 30, 2001.
- Jerabek, J. (2002) Property Values Respective to Wind Turbine Locations. Letter sent to Township of Lincoln Wind Turbine Moratorium Study Committee. January 29, 2002.
- Jordal-Jorgensen, J. (1996) Visual Effect and Noise from Windmills - Quantifying and Valuation. Social Assessment of Wind Power in Denmark. J. Munksgaard and A. Larsen. Prepared for The Institute of Local Government Studies (AKF), Copenhagen, Denmark. April 1996.
- Khatri, M. (2004) RICS Wind Farm Research: Impact of Wind Farms on the Value of Residential Property and Agricultural Land. Prepared for Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, London, UK. November 3, 2004. 11 pages.
- Kiel, K. A. and McClain, K. T. (1995) The Effect Of An Incinerator Siting On Housing Appreciation Rates. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 37(3): 311-323.
- Kielisch, K. (2009) Wind Turbine Impact Study: Dodge and Fond Du Lac Counties, WI. Appraisal Group One. Prepared for Calumet County Citizens for Responsible Energy (CCCRE), Calumet County, WI. September 9, 2009. 73 pages.
- Kleinbaum, D. G., Kupper, L. L. and Muller, K. E. (1988) Applied Analysis and other Multivariate Methods, Second Edition. PWS-Kent. Boston, MA. 210 pages.
- Kroll, C. A. and Priestley, T. (1992) The Effects of Overhead Transmission Lines on Property Values: A Review and Analysis of the Literature. Prepared for Edison Electric Institute, Washington, DC. July, 1992. 99 pages.
- Leonard, T. and Murdoch, J. (forthcoming) The Neighborhood Effects of Foreclosure. *Journal of Geographical Systems*.
- Leonard, T., Murdoch, J. and Thayer, M. (2008) The Price Effects of Environmental Disamenities in Residential Real-Estate Markets: A Review of the Literature. Working Paper. September, 2008: 14 pages.

- LeSage, J. P. (1999) The Theory and Practice of Spatial Econometrics. University of Toledo. Toledo, Ohio. 284 pages.
- Mahalanobis, P. C. (1936) On the Generalized Distance in Statistics. *Proceedings of the National Institute of Sciences of India*. 2(1): 49-55.
- Mahan, B. L., Polasky, S. and Adams, R. M. (2000) Valuing Urban Wetlands: A Property Price Approach. *Land Economics*. 76(1): 100-113.
- Maloy, M. A. and Dean, D. J. (2001) An Accuracy Assessment of Various GIS-Based Viewshed Delineation Techniques. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing*. 67(11): 1293-1298.
- Malpezzi, S. (2003) Hedonic Pricing Models: A Selective and Applied Review. Section in Housing Economics and Public Policy: Essays in Honor of Duncan MacLennan. Wiley-Blackwell. Hoboken, NJ. pp. 67-85 of 328 pages. ISBN 978-0-632-06461-8.
- McCann, M. S. (2008) Real Estate Impact Evaluation of the Horizon Wind Energy Proposed Rail Splitter Wind Farm. Prepared for Hinshaw & Culbertson, LLP, Rockford, IL. May, 2008. 24 pages.
- McCann, R. J. (1999) A Review of the Literature on Property Value Impacts from Industrial Activities. *M. Cubed* (Working Paper): 16 pages.
- McCluskey, J. J. and Rausser, G. C. (2003) Hazardous Waste Sites and Housing Appreciation Rates. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. 45(2): 166-176.
- National Academy of Sciences (NAS) (2007) Environmental Impacts of Wind-Energy Projects. Committee on Environmental Impacts of Wind Energy Projects - National Research Council. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, DC. 394 pages. ISBN: 0-309-10831-4.
- Newman, J. (1956) The World of Mathematics, Volume 2. Simon & Schuster. New York. 1247 pages. ISBN# 0-486-41150-8.
- Palmer, J. (1997) Public Acceptance Study of the Searsburg Wind Power Project - One Year Post Construction. Prepared for Vermont Environmental Research Associates, Inc., Waterbury Center, VT. December 1997. 58 pages.
- Palmquist, R. B. (1982) Measuring Environmental Effects on Property Values Without Hedonic Regressions. *Journal of Urban Economics*. 11(3): 333-347.
- Paul, T. (2006) Understanding and Predicting Community Responses to Wind Energy Development Applications. Thesis Prepared for Master of Science. Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY. April, 2006. 76 pages.
- Pedersen, E. and Waye, K. P. (2004) Perception and Annoyance due to Wind Turbine Noise: A Dose-Response Relationship. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*. 116(6): 3460-3470.
- Pitt, D. G. and Zube, E. H. (1979). The Q-Sort Method: Use in Landscape Assessment Research and Landscape Planning. Presented at Applied Techniques for Analysis and Management of the Visual Resource, Incline Village, Nevada. April 23-25, 1979.
- Poletti, P. (2005) A Real Estate Study of the Proposed Forward Wind Energy Center Dodge and Fond Du Lac Counties, Wisconsin. Poletti and Associates. Prepared for Invenergy Wind LLC, Chicago, IL. May, 2005. 106 pages.
- Poletti, P. (2007) A Real Estate Study of the Proposed White Oak Wind Energy Center, Mclean & Woodford Counties, Illinois. Polletti and Associates. Prepared for Invenergy Wind LLC, Chicago, IL. January, 2007. 63 pages.

- Ready, R. C. and Abdalla, C. W. (2005) The Amenity and Disamenity Impacts of Agriculture: Estimates from a Hedonic Pricing Model. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 87(2): 314-326.
- Riggs, P. D. and Dean, D. J. (2007) An Investigation into the Causes of Errors and Inconsistencies in Predicted Viewsheds. *Transactions in GIS*. 11(2): 175-196.
- Rosen, S. (1974) Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Product Differentiation in Pure Competition. *Journal of Political Economy*. 82(1): 34-55.
- Schwarz, G. E. (1978) Estimating the Dimension of a Model. *Annals of Statistics*. 6(2): 461-464.
- Seiler, M. J., Bond, M. T. and Seiler, V. L. (2001) The Impact of World Class Great Lakes Water Views on Residential Property Values. *The Appraisal Journal*. 69(3): 287-295.
- Simons, R. (2006a) When Bad Things Happen To Good Property. Environmental Law Institute Press. Washington DC. 350 pages. ISBN: 9781585761012.
- Simons, R. (2006b) Peer Reviewed Evidence on Property Value Impacts by Source of Contamination. Section in When Bad Things Happen To Good Property. Environmental Law Institute Press. Washington DC. p. 350. ISBN: 9781585761012.
- Simons, R. A. and Saginor, J. D. (2006) A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Environmental Contamination and Positive Amenities on Residential Real Estate Values. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 28(1): 71-104.
- Sims, S. and Dent, P. (2007) Property Stigma: Wind Farms Are Just The Latest Fashion. *Journal of Property Investment & Finance*. 25(6): 626-651.
- Sims, S., Dent, P. and Oskrochi, G. R. (2008) Modeling the Impact of Wind Farms on House Prices in the UK. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*. 12(4): 251-269.
- Sirmans, G. S., Lynn, M., Macpherson, D. A. and Zietz, E. N. (2005a). The Value of Housing Characteristics: A Meta Analysis. Presented at Mid Year Meeting of the American Real Estate and Urban Economics Association. May 2005.
- Sirmans, G. S., Macpherson, D. A. and Zietz, E. N. (2005b) The Composition of Hedonic Pricing Models. *Journal of Real Estate Literature*. 13(1): 3-42.
- Sterzinger, G., Beck, F. and Kostiuk, D. (2003) The Effect of Wind Development on Local Property Values. Renewable Energy Policy Project, Washington, DC. May, 2003. 77 pages.
- Thayer, M., Albers, H. and Rhamation, M. (1992) The Impact of Landfills on Residential Property Values. *Journal of Real Estate Research*. 7(3): 265-282.
- Thayer, R. L. and Freeman, C. N. (1987) Altamont: Public Perceptions of a Wind Energy Landscape. *Landscape and Urban Planning*. 14(1987): 379-398.
- Torres-Sibillea, A., V. Cloquell-Ballester and Darton, R. (2009) Development and Validation of a Multicriteria Indicator for the Assessment of Objective Aesthetic Impact of Wind Farms. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 13(1): 40-66.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (1995) Landscape Aesthetics: A Handbook for Scenic Management. United States Department of Agriculture - Forest Service, Washington, DC. December 1995.
- United States Department of Energy (US DOE) (2008) 20% Wind Energy by 2030: Increasing Wind Energy's Contribution to U.S. Electricity Supply. U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. May, 2008. 248 pages.

- Watson, M. (2005) Estimation of Social and Environmental Externalities for Electricity Infrastructure in the Northwest Sector. Reviewed by Martin Hill. Prepared for Prepared for Parsons Brinckerhoff by Integral Energy, Sydney, Australia. August 2005. 73 pages.
- White, H. (1980) A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica*. 48(4): 817-838.
- Wiser, R. and Bolinger, M. (2009) 2008 Wind Technologies Market Report. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Prepared for U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, DC. July, 2009. 68 pages. DOE/GO-102009-2868.
- Wiser, R. and Hand, M. (2010) Wind Power: How Much, How Soon, and At What Cost? Section in Generating Electricity in a Carbon-Constrained World. Elsevier. Oxford, UK. p. 632. ISBN-13: 978-1-85617-655-2.
- Wolsink, M. (1989) Attitudes and Expectancies about Wind Turbines and Wind Farms. *Wind Engineering*. 13(4): 196-206.
- Wolsink, M. (2000) Wind Power and the NIMBY-Myth: Institutional Capacity and the Limited Significance of Public Support. *Renewable Energy*. 21(1): 49-64.
- Zarem, K. L. (2005) Direct Testimony Regarding Forward Wind Project, Dodge and Fond Du Lac Counties, Wisconsin. Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin. June, 2005. 12 pages. Docket No. 9300-CE-100.

Appendix A: Study Area Descriptions

The analysis reported in the body of the report used data from ten different wind-project study areas, across nine different states and 14 counties, and surrounding 24 different wind facilities. Each of the study areas is unique, but as a group they provide a good representation of the range of wind facility sizes, hub heights, and locations of recent wind development activity in the U.S. (see Figure A - 1 and Table A - 1). This appendix describes each of the ten study areas, and provides the following information: a map of the study area; a description of the area; how the data were collected; statistics on home sales prices in the sample and census-reported home values for the towns, county, and state that encompass the area; data on the wind facilities contained within the study area; and frequency tables for the variables of interest (i.e., views of turbines, distance to nearest turbine ,and development period).

Figure A - 1: Map of Study Areas





Table A - 1: Summary of Study Areas

Study Area Code	Study Area Counties, States	Facility Names	Number of Turbines	Number of MW	Max Hub Height (meters)	Max Hub Height (feet)
WAOR	Benton and Walla Walla Counties, WA and Umatilla County, OR	Vansycle Ridge, Stateline, Nine Canyon I & II, Combine Hills	582	429	60	197
TXHC	Howard County, TX	Big Spring I & II	46	34	80	262
OKCC	Custer County, OK	Weatherford I & II	98	147	80	262
IABV	Buena Vista County, IA	Storm Lake I & II, Waverly, Intrepid I & II	381	370	65	213
ILLC	Lee County, IL	Mendota Hills, GSG Wind	103	130	78	256
WIKCDC	Kewaunee and Door Counties, WI	Red River, Lincoln	31	20	65	213
PASC	Somerset County, PA	Green Mountain, Somerset, Meyersdale	34	49	80	262
PAWC	Wayne County, PA	Waymart	43	65	65	213
NYMCO	Madison and Oneida Counties, NY	Madison	7	12	67	220
NYMC	Madison County, NY	Fenner	20	30	66	218
		TOTAL	1345	1286		

A.1 WAOR Study Area: Benton and Walla Walla Counties (Washington), and Umatilla County (Oregon)

Figure A - 2: Map of WAOR Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area combines data from the three counties - Benton and Walla Walla in Washington, and Umatilla in Oregon - that surround the Vansycle Ridge, Stateline, Combine Hills, and Nine Canyon wind projects. Wind development began in this area in 1997 and, within the sample of wind projects, continued through 2003. In total, the wind facilities in this study area include 582 turbines and 429 MW of nameplate capacity, with hub heights that range from 164 feet to almost 200 feet. The wind facilities are situated on an East-West ridge that straddles the Columbia River, as it briefly turns South. The area consists of undeveloped highland/plateau grassland, agricultural tracks for winter fruit, and three towns: Kennewick (Benton County), Milton-Freewater (Umatilla County), and Walla Walla (Walla Walla County). Only the first two of these towns are represented in the dataset because Walla Walla is situated more than 10 miles from the nearest wind turbine. Also in the area are Touchet and Wallula, WA, and Athena, OR,

all very small communities with little to no services. Much of the area to the North and South of the ridge, and outside of the urban areas, is farmland, with homes situated on small parcels adjoining larger agricultural tracts.

Data Collection and Summary

Data for this study area were collected from a myriad of sources. For Benton County, sales and home characteristic data and GIS parcel shapefiles were collected with the assistance of county officials Eric Beswick, Harriet Mercer, and Florinda Paez, while state official Deb Mandeville (Washington Department of State) provided information on the validity of the sales. In Walla Walla County, county officials Bill Vollendorff and Tiffany Laposi provided sales, house characteristic, and GIS data. In Umatilla County, county officials Jason Nielsen, Tracie Diehl, and Tim McElrath provided sales, house characteristic, and GIS data.

Based on the data collection, more than 8,500 homes are found to have sold within ten miles of the wind turbines in this study area from January 1996 to June 2007. Completing field visits to this number of homes would have been overly burdensome; as a result, only a sample of these home sales was used for the study. Specifically, all valid sales within three miles of the nearest turbine are used, and a random sample of those homes outside of three miles but inside of five miles in Benton County and inside ten miles in Walla Walla and Umatilla Counties. This approach resulted in a total of 790 sales, with prices that ranged from \$25,000 to \$647,500, and a mean of \$134,244. Of those 790 sales, 519 occurred after wind facility construction commenced, and 110 could see the turbines at the time of sale, though all but four of these homes had MINOR views. No homes within this sample were located within one mile of the nearest wind turbine, with the majority occurring outside of three miles.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
1/23/1996	6/29/2007	790	\$ 125,803	\$ 134,244	\$ 25,000	\$ 647,500

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Vansycle Ridge	25	38	Aug-97	Feb-98	Aug-98	Vestas	50
Stateline Wind Project, Phase I (OR)	83	126	Jun-00	Sep-01	Dec-01	Vestas	50
Stateline Wind Project, Phase I (WA)	177	268	Jun-00	Feb-01	Dec-01	Vestas	50
Stateline Wind Project, Phase II	40	60	Jan-02	Sep-02	Dec-02	Vestas	50
Nine Canyon Wind Farm	48	37	Jun-01	Mar-02	Sep-02	Bonus	60
Combine Hills Turbine Ranch I	41	41	Apr-02	Aug-03	Dec-03	Mitsubishi	55
Nine Canyon Wind Farm II	16	12	Jun-01	Jun-03	Dec-03	Bonus	60

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total	
Benton/Walla Walla, WA & Umatilla, OR (WAOR)	226	45	76	59	384	790	
View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Benton/Walla Walla, WA & Umatilla, OR (WAOR)	271	409	106	4	0	0	790
Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Benton/Walla Walla, WA & Umatilla, OR (WAOR)	271	0	0	20	277	222	790


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Kennewich, WA	City	62,182	12.5%	2,711	32.3	\$ 45,085	\$ 155,531	46%
Walla Walla, WA	City	30,794	4.0%	2,847	33.8	\$ 38,391	\$ 185,706	91%
Milton Freewater, OR	Town	6,335	-2.0%	3,362	31.7	\$ 30,229	\$ 113,647	47%
Touchet, WA	Town	413	n/a	340	33.6	\$ 47,268	\$ 163,790	81%
Benton	County	159,414	3.6%	94	34.4	\$ 51,464	\$ 162,700	46%
Walla Walla	County	57,709	1.0%	45	34.9	\$ 43,597	\$ 206,631	89%
Umatilla	County	73,491	0.6%	23	34.6	\$ 38,631	\$ 138,200	47%
Washington	State	6,488,000	10.1%	89	35.3	\$ 55,591	\$ 300,800	79%
Oregon	State	3,747,455	9.5%	36	36.3	\$ 48,730	\$ 257,300	69%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

A.2 TXHC Study Area: Howard County (Texas)

Figure A - 3: Map of TXHC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area is entirely contained within Howard County, Texas, and includes the city of Big Spring, which is situated roughly 100 miles South of Lubbock and 275 miles West of Dallas in West Texas. On top of the Northern end of the Edwards Plateau, which runs from the Southeast to the Northwest, sits the 46 turbine (34 MW) Big Spring wind facility, which was constructed in 1998 and 1999. Most of the wind turbines in this project have a hub height of 213 feet, but four are taller, at 262 feet. The plateau and the wind facility overlook the city of Big Spring which, when including its suburbs, wraps around the plateau to the South and East. Surrounding the town are modest farming tracks and arid, undeveloped land. These lands, primarily to the South of the facility towards Forсан (not shown on map), are dotted with small oil rigs. Many of the homes in Big Spring do not have a view of the wind facility, but others to the South and East do have such views.

Data Collection and Summary

County officials Brett McKibben, Sally Munoz, and Sheri Proctor were extremely helpful in answering questions about the data required for this project, and the data were provided by two firms that manage it for the county. Specifically, Erin Welch of the Capital Appraisal Group provided the sales and house characteristic data and Paul Brandt of MIMS provided the GIS data.

All valid single-family home sales transactions within five miles of the nearest turbine and occurring between January 1996 and March 2007 were included in the dataset, resulting in 1,311 sales.¹⁰⁶ These sales ranged in price from \$10,492 to \$490,000, with a mean of \$74,092. Because of the age of the wind facility, many of the sales in the sample occurred after wind facility construction had commenced ($n = 1,071$). Of those, 104 had views of the turbines, with 27 having views more dramatic than MINOR. Four homes sold within a mile of the facility, with the rest falling between one and three miles ($n = 584$), three to five miles ($n = 467$), and outside of five miles ($n = 16$).

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
1/2/1996	3/30/2007	1,311	\$66,500	\$74,092	\$10,492	\$490,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Big Spring I	27.7	42	Jan-98	Jul-98	Jun-99	Vestas	65
Big Spring II	6.6	4	Jan-98	Jul-98	Jun-99	Vestas	80

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total	
Howard, TX (TXHC)	169	71	113	131	827	1311	
View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Howard, TX (TXHC)	240	967	77	22	5	0	1311
Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Howard, TX (TXHC)	240	0	4	584	467	16	1311

¹⁰⁶ If parcels intersected the five mile boundary, they were included in the sample, but were coded as being outside of five miles.


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Big Spring	City	24,075	-5.4%	1,260	35.1	\$ 32,470	\$ 54,442	50%
Forsan	Town	220	-4.0%	758	36.8	\$ 50,219	\$ 64,277	84%
Howard	County	32,295	-1.9%	36	36.4	\$ 36,684	\$ 60,658	58%
Texas	State	23,904,380	14.6%	80	32.3	\$ 47,548	\$ 120,900	47%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants.

A.3 OKCC Study Area: Custer County (Oklahoma)

Figure A - 4: Map of OKCC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area is entirely contained within Custer County, Texas, and includes the Weatherford wind facility, which is situated near the city of Weatherford, 70 miles due west of Oklahoma City and near the western edge of the state. The 98 turbine (147 MW) Weatherford wind facility straddles Highway 40, which runs East-West, and U.S. County Route 54, which runs North-South, creating an "L" shape that is more than six miles long and six miles wide. Development began in 2004, and was completed in two phases ending in 2006. The turbines are some of the largest in the sample, with a hub height of 262 feet. The topography of the study area is mostly flat plateau, allowing the turbines to be visible from many parts of the town and the surrounding rural lands. There are a number of smaller groupings of homes that are situated to the North and South of the city, many of which are extremely close to the turbines and have dramatic views of them.

Data Collection and Summary

County Assessor Debbie Collins and mapping specialist Karen Owen were extremely helpful in gathering data and answering questions at the county level. Data were obtained directly from the county and from Visual Lease Services, Inc and OK Assessor, where representatives Chris Mask, Terry Wood, Tracy Leniger, and Heather Brown helped with the request.

All valid single-family residential transactions within five miles of the nearest wind turbine and occurring between July 1996 and June 2007 were included in the dataset, resulting in 1,113 sales.¹⁰⁷ These sales ranged in price from \$11,000 to \$468,000, with a mean of \$100,445. Because of the relatively recent construction of the facility, 58% of the sales ($n = 637$) occurred before construction, leaving 476 sales with possible views of the turbines. Of those 476 sales, 25 had more-dramatic view ratings than MINOR and 17 sales occurred inside of one mile.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
7/7/1996	6/29/2007	1,113	\$91,000	\$100,445	\$11,000	\$468,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Weatherford Wind Energy Center	106.5	71	Mar-04	Dec-04	May-05	GE Wind	80
Weatherford Wind Energy Center Expansion	40.5	27	May-05	Oct-05	Jan-06	GE Wind	80

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Custer, OK (OKCC)	484	153	193	187	96	1113

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Custer, OK (OKCC)	637	375	76	6	7	12	1113

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Custer, OK (OKCC)	637	16	1	408	50	1	1113

¹⁰⁷ Portions of the town of Weatherford, both North and South of the town center, were not included in the sample due to lack of available data. The homes that were mapped, and for which electronic data were provided, however, were situated on all sides of these unmapped areas and were similar in character to those that were omitted. None of the unmapped homes were within a mile of the nearest wind turbine.


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Weatherford	City	10,097	1.2%	1,740	24.1	\$ 32,543	\$ 113,996	45%
Hydro	Town	1,013	-3.7%	1,675	39.2	\$ 35,958	\$ 66,365	68%
Custer	County	26,111	3.6%	26	32.7	\$ 35,498	\$ 98,949	52%
Oklahoma	State	3,617,316	4.8%	53	35.5	\$ 41,567	\$ 103,000	46%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants.

A.4 IABV Study Area: Buena Vista County (Iowa)

Figure A - 5: Map of IABV Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area includes the sizable Storm Lake and Intrepid wind facilities, which are mostly situated in Buena Vista County, located in Northwestern Iowa, 75 miles East of Sioux City. The facilities also stretch into Sac County to the South and Cherokee County to the West. The facilities total 381 turbines (370 MW) and are more than 30 miles long North to South and eight miles wide East to West. Development began on the first Storm Lake facility in 1998 and the last of the Intrepid development was completed in 2006. The largest turbines have a hub height of 213 feet at the hub, but most are slightly smaller at 207 feet. The majority of the homes in the sample surround Storm Lake (the body of water), but a large number of homes are situated on small residential plots located outside of the town and nearer to the wind facility. Additionally, a number of sales occurred in Alta - a small town to the East of Storm Lake - that is straddled by the

wind facilities and therefore provides dramatic views of the turbines. In general, except for the depression in which Storm Lake sits, the topography is very flat, largely made up corn fields, and the turbines are therefore visible from quite far away. The housing market is driven, to some extent, by the water body, Storm Lake, which is a popular recreational tourist destination, and therefore development is occurring to the East and South of the lake. Some development is also occurring, to a lesser degree, to the East of Alta.

Data Collection and Summary

County Assessor Kathy A. Croker and Deputy Assessor Kim Carnine were both extremely helpful in answering questions and providing GIS data. Sales and home characteristic data were provided by Vanguard Appraisals, Inc., facilitated by the county officials. David Healy from MidAmerican provided some of the necessary turbine location GIS files.

The county provided data on valid single-family residential transactions between 1996 and 2007 for 1,743 homes inside of five miles of the nearest wind turbine. This sample exceeded the number for which field data could reasonably be collected; as a result, only a sample of these homes sales was used for the study. Specifically, all transactions that occurred within three miles of the nearest turbine were used, in combination with a random sample (totaling roughly 10%) of those homes between three and five miles. This approach resulted in 822 sales, with prices that ranged from \$12,000 to \$525,000, and a mean of \$94,713. Development of the wind facilities in this area occurred relatively early in the sample period, and therefore roughly 75% of the sales ($n = 605$) occurred after project construction had commenced. Of those 605 sales, 105 had views of the turbines, 37 of which were ranked with a view rating more dramatic than MINOR, and 30 sales occurred within one mile of the nearest wind turbine.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
1/2/1996	3/30/2007	822	\$79,000	\$94,713	\$12,000	\$525,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Storm Lake I	112.5	150	Feb-98	Oct-98	Jun-99	Enron	63
Storm Lake II	80.3	107	Feb-98	Oct-98	Apr-99	Enron	63
Waverly	1.5	2	Feb-98	Oct-98	Jun-99	Enron	65
Intrepid	160.5	107	Mar-03	Oct-04	Dec-04	GE Wind	65
Intrepid Expansion	15.0	15	Jan-05	Apr-05	Dec-05	Mitsubishi	65

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Buena Vista, IA (IABV)	152	65	80	70	455	822

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Buena Vista, IA (IABV)	217	500	68	18	8	11	822

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Buena Vista, IA (IABV)	217	22	8	472	101	2	822


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Storm Lake	City	9,706	-3.9%	2,429	31.7	\$ 39,937	\$ 99,312	41%
Alta	Town	1,850	-1.0%	1,766	35.1	\$ 40,939	\$ 98,843	48%
Buena Vista	County	19,776	-3.1%	36	36.4	\$ 42,296	\$ 95,437	45%
Iowa	State	3,002,555	2.6%	52	36.6	\$ 47,292	\$ 117,900	43%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants.

A.5 ILLC Study Area: Lee County (Illinois)

Figure A - 6: Map of ILLC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area is situated roughly 80 miles due West of Chicago, in Lee County, Illinois, and includes two wind facilities. The 63 turbine (53 MW) Mendota Hills Wind Project sits just West of North-South Highway 39, and 10 miles South of East-West Highway 88. Development began on the facility in 2001 and was completed in 2003. The second facility, the 40 turbine (80 MW) GSG Wind Farm is South and West of the Mendota Hills facility, and is broken into two parts: roughly one third of the turbines are situated two miles due north of the small town of Sublette, with the remainder located roughly six miles to the southeast and spanning the line separating Lee from La Salle County. Development began on this project in the fall of 2006 and was completed in April of the following year. The town of Paw Paw, which is East of Highway 38 and both facilities, is the largest urban area in the study area, but is further away from the

facilities than the towns of Compton, West Brooklyn, Scarboro, and Sublette. Also, to the North of the facilities are the towns of Lee, to the East of Highway 38, and Steward, just to the West. Although many home sales occurred in these towns, a significant number of additional sales occurred on small residential tracts in more-rural areas or in small developments. The topography of the area is largely flat, but falls away slightly to the East towards Paw Paw. The area enjoyed significant development during the real estate boom led by commuters from the Chicago metropolitan area, which was focused in the Paw Paw area but was also seen in semi-rural subdivisions to the Southwest and North of the wind facility.

Data Collection and Summary

County Supervisor Wendy Ryerson was enormously helpful in answering questions and providing data, as were Carmen Bollman and GIS Director, Brant Scheidecker, who also work in the county office. Wendy and Carmen facilitated the sales and home characteristic data request and Brant provided the GIS data. Additionally, real estate brokers Neva Grevenoged of LNG Realtor, Alisa Stewart of AC Corner Stone, and Beth Einsely of Einsely Real Estate were helpful in understanding the local market.

The county provided information on 412 valid single-family transactions that occurred between 1998 and 2007 within 10 miles of the nearest wind turbine, all of which were included in the sample.¹⁰⁸ These sales ranged in price from \$14,500 to \$554,148, with a mean of \$128,301. Of those sales, 213 occurred after construction commenced on the wind facility and, of those, 36 had views of the turbines – nine of which were rated more dramatically than MINOR. Only two sales occurred within one mile of the nearest wind turbine.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
5/1/1998	3/2/2007	412	\$113,250	\$128,301	\$14,500	\$554,148

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Mendota Hills	50.4	63	Nov-01	Aug-03	Nov-03	Gamesa	65
GSG Wind Farm	80	40	Dec-05	Sep-06	Apr-07	Gamesa	78

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

¹⁰⁸ This county was not able to provide data electronically back to 1996, as would have been preferred, but because wind project development did not occur until 2001, there was ample time in the study period to establish pre-announcement sale price levels.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Lee, IL (ILLC)	115	84	62	71	80	412

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Lee, IL (ILLC)	199	177	27	7	1	1	412

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Lee, IL (ILLC)	199	1	1	85	69	57	412


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Paw Paw	Town	884	2.6%	1,563	38.0	\$ 48,399	\$ 151,954	n/a
Compton	Town	337	-2.9%	2,032	32.8	\$ 44,023	\$ 114,374	n/a
Steward	Town	263	-3.0%	2,116	35.2	\$ 59,361	\$ 151,791	n/a
Sublette	Town	445	-2.4%	1,272	37.7	\$ 55,910	\$ 133,328	n/a
Lee	County	35,450	-1.7%	49	37.9	\$ 47,591	\$ 136,778	64%
Illinois	State	12,852,548	3.5%	223	34.7	\$ 54,124	\$ 208,800	60%
US	Country	301,139,947	7.0%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

A.6 WIKCDC Study Area: Kewaunee and Door Counties (Wisconsin)

Figure A - 7: Map of WIKCDC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area includes the Red River (17 turbines, 14 MW) and Lincoln (14 turbines, 9 MW) wind facilities. It is situated on the "thumb" jutting into Lake Michigan, Northeast of Green Bay, Wisconsin, and spans two counties, Kewaunee and Door. There is a mix of agricultural, small rural residential, waterfront, and urban land use in this area. The three largest towns are Algoma to the East of the facilities and on the lake, Casco, which is six miles due South of the turbines, and Luxemburg, four miles West of Casco. There is a smaller village, Brussels, to the North in Door County. The remainder of the homes is situated on the water or in small rural residential parcels between the towns. Topographically, the "thumb" is relatively flat except for a slight crown in the middle, and then drifting lower to the edges. The East edge of the "thumb" ends in bluffs over the water, and the western edge drops off more gradually, allowing those parcels to

enjoy small beaches and easy boat access. There is some undulation of the land, occasionally allowing for relatively distant views of the wind turbines, which stand at a hub height of 213 feet.

Data Collection and Summary

Kewaunee and Door Counties did not have a countywide system of electronic data storage for either sales or home characteristic data. Therefore, in many cases, data had to be collected directly from the town or city assessor. In Kewaunee County, Joseph A. Jerabek of the town of Lincoln, Gary Taicher of the town of Red River, Melissa Daron of the towns of Casco, Pierce, and West Kewaunee, Michael Muelver of the town of Ahnapee and the city of Algoma, William Gerrits of the town of Casco, Joseph Griesbach Jr. of the town of Luxemburg, and David Dorschner of the city of Kewaunee all provided information. In Door County, Scott Tennesen of the town of Union and Gary Maccoux of the town of Brussels were similarly very helpful in providing information. Additionally, Andy Pelkey of Impact Consultants, Inc., John Holton of Associated Appraisal Consultants, Andy Bayliss of Dash Development Group, and Lue Van Asten of Action Appraisers & Consultants all assisted in extracting data from the myriad of storage systems used at the town and city level. The State of Wisconsin provided additional information on older sales and sales validity, with Mary Gawryleski, James Bender, and Patrick Strabala from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue being extremely helpful. GIS data were obtained from Steve Hanson from Kewaunee County and Tom Haight from Door County.

After collecting data from each municipality, a total of 810 valid single-family home sales transactions were available for analysis, ranging in time from 1996 to 2007. These sales ranged in price from \$20,000 to \$780,000, with a mean of \$116,698. Because development of the wind facilities occurred relatively early in the study period, a large majority of the sales transactions, 75% ($n = 725$), occurred after project construction had commenced. Of those, 64 had views of the turbines, 14 of which had more dramatic than MINOR views, and 11 sales occurred within one mile.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
2/2/1996	6/30/2007	810	\$98,000	\$116,698	\$20,000	\$780,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Red River	11.2	17	Apr-98	Jan-99	Jun-99	Vestas	65
Lincoln	9.2	14	Aug-98	Jan-99	Jun-99	Vestas	65

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Kewaunee/Door, WI (WIKCDC)	44	41	68	62	595	810

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Kewaunee/Door, WI (WIKCDC)	85	661	50	9	2	3	810

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Kewaunee/Door, WI (WIKCDC)	85	7	4	63	213	438	810


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Algoma	Town	3,186	-4.7%	1,305	41.8	\$ 39,344	\$ 112,295	51%
Casco	Town	551	-2.8%	985	35.6	\$ 53,406	\$ 141,281	n/a
Luxemburg	Town	2,224	15.3%	1,076	32.0	\$ 53,906	\$ 167,403	n/a
Kewaunee	County	20,533	1.4%	60	37.5	\$ 50,616	\$ 148,344	57%
Door	County	27,811	2.4%	58	42.9	\$ 44,828	\$ 193,540	57%
Wisconsin	State	5,601,640	0.3%	103	36.0	\$ 50,578	\$ 168,800	50%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

A.7 PASC Study Area: Somerset County (Pennsylvania)

Figure A - 8: Map of PASC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area includes three wind facilities, Somerset (6 turbines, 9 MW, 210 ft hub height) to the North, Meyersdale (20 turbines, 30 MW, 262 ft hub height) to the South, and Green Mountain (8 turbines, 10 MW, 197 ft hub height) between them. All of the projects are located in Somerset County, roughly 75 miles southeast of Pittsburg in the Southwest section of Pennsylvania. None of the three facilities are separated by more than 10 miles, so all were included in one study area. To the North of the facilities is East-West U.S. Highway 70, which flanks the city of Somerset. Connecting Somerset with points South is County Route 219, which zigzags Southeast out of Somerset to the smaller towns of Berlin (not included in the data), Garret to the Southwest, and Meyersdale, which is Southeast of Garret. These towns are flanked by two ridges that run from the Southwest to the Northeast. Because of these ridges and the

relatively high elevations of all of the towns, this area enjoys winter recreation, though the coal industry, which once dominated the area, is still an integral part of the community with mining occurring in many places up and down the ridges. Although many of the home sales in the sample occurred in the towns, a number of the sales are for homes situated outside of town corresponding to either rural, rural residential, or suburban land uses.

Data Collection and Summary

The County Assessor, Jane Risso, was extremely helpful, and assisted in providing sales and home characteristic data. Glen Wagner, the IT director, worked with Gary Zigler, the county GIS specialist, to extract both GIS and assessment data from the county records. Both Gary and Jane were extremely helpful in fielding questions and providing additional information as needs arose.

The county provided a total of 742 valid residential single-family home sales transactions within four miles of the nearest wind turbine. All of the sales within three miles were used ($n = 296$), and a random sample (~ 44%) of those between three and four miles were used, yielding a total of 494 sales that occurred between May 1997 and March 2007. These sales ranged in price from \$12,000 to \$360,000, with a mean of \$69,770. 291 sales (~ 60% of the 494) occurred after construction commenced on the nearest wind facility. Of these 291 sales, 73 have views of the turbines, 18 of which are more dramatic than MINOR, and 35 sales occurred within one mile.¹⁰⁹

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
5/1/1997	3/1/2007	494	\$62,000	\$69,770	\$12,000	\$360,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
GreenMountain Wind Farm	10.4	8	Jun-99	Dec-99	May-00	Nordex	60
Somerset	9.0	6	Apr-01	Jun-01	Oct-01	Enron	64
Meyersdale	30.0	20	Jan-03	Sep-03	Dec-03	NEG Mico	80

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

¹⁰⁹ This study area was one of the earliest to have field work completed, and therefore the field data collection process was slower resulting in a lower number of transactions than many other study areas.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Somerset, PA (PASC)	175	28	46	60	185	494

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Somerset, PA (PASC)	203	218	55	15	2	1	494

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Somerset, PA (PASC)	203	17	18	132	124	0	494


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Somerset	Town	6,398	-4.8%	2,333	40.2	\$ 35,293	\$ 123,175	n/a
Berlin	Town	2,092	-4.0%	2,310	41.1	\$ 35,498	\$ 101,704	n/a
Garrett	Town	425	-4.7%	574	34.5	\$ 29,898	\$ 54,525	n/a
Meyersdale	Town	2,296	-6.6%	2,739	40.9	\$ 29,950	\$ 79,386	n/a
Somerset Co	County	77,861	-2.7%	72	40.2	\$ 35,293	\$ 94,500	41%
Pennsylvania	State	12,440,621	1.3%	277	38.0	\$ 48,576	\$ 155,000	60%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

A.8 PAWC Study Area: Wayne County (Pennsylvania)

Figure A - 9: Map of PAWC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area includes the Waymart wind facility, which sits atop the North-South ridge running along the line separating Wayne County from Lackawanna and Susquehanna Counties in Northeast Pennsylvania. The 43 turbine (65 MW, 213 ft hub height) facility was erected in 2003, and can be seen from many locations in the study area and especially from the towns of Waymart, which sits East of the facility, and Forest City, which straddles Wayne and Susquehanna Counties North of the facility. The study area is dominated topographically by the ridgeline on which the wind turbines are located, but contains rolling hills and many streams, lakes, and natural ponds. Because of the undulating landscape, views of the wind facility can be

maintained from long distances, while some homes relatively near the turbines have no view of the turbines whatsoever. The area enjoys a substantial amount of second home ownership because of the bucolic scenic vistas, the high frequency of lakes and ponds, and the proximity to larger metropolitan areas such as Scranton, roughly 25 miles to the Southwest, and Wilkes-Barre a further 15 miles Southwest.

Data Collection and Summary

John Nolan, the County Chief Assessor, was very helpful in overseeing the extraction of the data from county records. GIS specialist Aeron Lankford provided the GIS parcel data as well as other mapping layers, and Bruce Grandjean, the IT and Data Specialist, provided the sales and home characteristic data as well as fielding countless questions as they arose. Additionally, real estate brokers Dotti Korpics of Bethany, Kent Swartz of Re Max, and Tom Cush of Choice #1 Country Real Estate were instrumental providing context for understanding the local market.

The county provided data on 551 valid single-family transactions that occurred between 1996 and 2007, all of which were included in the sample. These sales ranged in price from \$20,000 to \$444,500, with a mean of \$111,522. Because of the relatively recent development of the wind facility, only 40% ($n = 222$) of the sales transaction occurred after the construction of the facility had commenced. Of those sales, 43 (19%) had views of the turbines, ten of which had more dramatic than MINOR views, and 11 were situated within one mile.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
7/12/1996	9/25/2006	551	\$96,000	\$111,522	\$20,000	\$444,500

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Waymart Wind Farm	64.5	43	Feb-01	Jun-03	Oct-03	GE Wind	65

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Wayne, PA (PAWC)	223	106	64	71	87	551

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Wayne, PA (PAWC)	329	179	33	8	2	0	551

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Wayne, PA (PAWC)	329	1	10	95	55	61	551


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Waymart	Town	3,075	116.0%	1,111	41.7	\$ 43,797	\$ 134,651	56%
Forest City	Town	1,743	-5.2%	1,929	45.6	\$ 32,039	\$ 98,937	67%
Prompton	Town	237	-1.6%	149	41.9	\$ 30,322	\$ 162,547	56%
Wayne	County	51,708	5.9%	71	40.8	\$ 41,279	\$ 163,060	57%
Lackawanna	County	209,330	-1.9%	456	40.3	\$ 41,596	\$ 134,400	48%
Pennsylvania	State	12,440,621	1.3%	277	38.0	\$ 48,576	\$ 155,000	60%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants.

A.9 NYMCOC Study Area: Madison and Oneida Counties (New York)

Figure A - 10: Map of NYMCOC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area surrounds the seven turbine (12 MW, 220 ft hub height) Madison wind facility, which sits atop an upland rise in Madison County, New York. The area is roughly 20 miles Southwest of Utica and 40 miles Southeast of Syracuse. The facility is flanked by the towns moving from the Southwest, clockwise around the rise, from Hamilton and Madison in Madison County, NY, to Oriskany Falls, Waterville, and Sangerfield in Oneida County, NY. Hamilton is the home of Colgate University, whose staff lives throughout the area around Hamilton and stretching up into the town of Madison. Accordingly, some development is occurring near the college. To the Northeast, in Oneida County, the housing market is more depressed and less development is apparent. The study area in total is a mix of residential, rural residential, and

rural landscapes, with the largest portion being residential homes in the towns or immediately on their outskirts. The topography, although falling away from the location of the wind facility, does not do so dramatically, so small obstructions can obscure the views of the facility.

Data Collection and Summary

Data were obtained from both Madison and Oneida Counties for this study area. In Madison County, Kevin Orr, Mike Ellis, and Carol Brophy, all of County’s Real Property Tax Services Department, were extremely helpful in obtaining the sales, home characteristic, and GIS data. In Oneida County, Jeff Quackenbush and Richard Reichert in the Planning Department were very helpful in obtaining the county data. Additionally, discussions with real estate brokers Susanne Martin of Martin Real Estate, Nancy Proctor of Prudential, and Joel Arsenault of Century 21 helped explain the housing market and the differences between Madison and Oneida Counties.

Data on 463 valid sales transactions of single family residential homes that occurred between 1996 and 2006 were obtained, all of which were located within seven miles of the wind facility. These sales ranged in price from \$13,000 to \$380,000, with a mean of \$98,420. Roughly 75% (*n* = 346) of these sales occurred after construction commenced on the wind facility, of which 20 could see the turbines, all of which were rated as having MINOR views, except one which had a MODERATE rating; only two sales involved homes that were situated inside of one mile.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
1/6/1996	12/26/2006	463	\$77,500	\$98,420	\$13,000	\$380,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Madison Windpower	11.6	7	Jan-00	May-00	Sep-00	Vestas	67

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction		1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Madison/Oneida, NY (MYMCOC)	108	9		48	30	268	463
View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Madison/Oneida, NY (MYMCOC)	117	326	19	1	0	0	463
Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Madison/Oneida, NY (MYMCOC)	117	1	1	80	193	71	463


Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Madison	Town	304	-2.9%	605	38.1	\$ 36,348	\$ 94,734	n/a
Hamilton	Town	3,781	7.9%	1,608	20.8	\$ 48,798	\$ 144,872	n/a
Oriskany Falls	Town	1,413	-2.9%	1,703	40.8	\$ 47,689	\$ 105,934	n/a
Waterville	Town	1,735	-3.2%	1,308	37.8	\$ 46,692	\$ 104,816	n/a
Sangerfield	Town	2,626	-1.4%	85	37.6	\$ 47,563	\$ 106,213	n/a
Madison	County	69,829	0.6%	106	36.1	\$ 53,600	\$ 109,000	39%
Oneida	County	232,304	-1.3%	192	38.2	\$ 44,636	\$ 102,300	40%
New York	State	19,297,729	1.7%	408	35.9	\$ 53,514	\$ 311,000	109%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

A.10 NYMC Study Area: Madison County (New York)

Figure A - 11: Map of NYMC Study Area



Note: "Sold Homes" include all sold homes both before and after construction.

Area Description

This study area surrounds the 20 turbine (30 MW, 218 ft hub height) Fenner wind facility in Madison County, New York, roughly 20 miles East of Syracuse and 40 miles West of Utica in the middle of New York. The study area is dominated by two roughly parallel ridges. One, on which the Fenner facility is located, runs Southeast to Northwest and falls away towards the town of Canastota. The second ridge runs roughly North from Cazenovia, and falls away just South of the town of Chittenango. Surrounding these ridges is an undulating landscape with many water features, including the Chittenango Falls and Lake Cazenovia. A number of high-priced homes are situated along the ridge to the North of Cazenovia, some of which are afforded

views of the lake and areas to the West, others with views to the East over the wind facility, and a few having significant panoramic views. The west side of the study area has a number of drivers to its real estate economy: it serves as a bedroom community for Syracuse, is the home to Cazenovia College, and enjoys a thriving summer recreational population. Canastota to the North, and Oneida to the East, are older industrial towns, both of which now serve as feeder communities for Syracuse because of easy access to Highway 90. Between the towns of Cazenovia and Canastota are many rural residential properties, some of which have been recently developed, but most of which are homes at least a half century old.

Data Collection and Summary

Data were obtained from the Madison County Real Property Tax Services department directed by Carol Brophy. As the first study area that was investigated, IT and mapping specialists Kevin Orr and Mike Ellis were subjected to a large number of questions from the study team and were enormously helpful in helping shape what became the blueprint for other study areas.

Additionally, real estate brokers Nancy Proctor of Prudential, Joel Arsenault of Century 21, Don Kinsley of Kingsley Real Estate, and Steve Harris of Cazenovia Real Estate were extremely helpful in understanding the local market.

Data on 693 valid sales transactions of single family residential structures that occurred between 1996 and 2006 were obtained, most of which were within five miles of the wind facility. These sales ranged in price from \$26,000 to \$575,000, with a mean of \$124,575. Roughly 68% of these sales ($n = 469$) occurred after construction commenced on the wind facility, 13 of which were inside of one mile, and 74 of which had views of the turbines. Of that latter group, 24 have more dramatic than MINOR views of the turbines.

Area Statistics

Study Period Begin	Study Period End	Number of Sales	Median Price	Mean Price	Minimum Price	Maximum Price
1/31/1996	9/29/2006	693	\$109,900	\$124,575	\$26,000	\$575,000

Facility Statistics

Facility Name	Number of MW	Number of Turbines	Announce Date	Construction Begin Date	Completion Date	Turbine Maker	Hub Height (Meters)
Fenner Wind Power Project	30	20	Dec-98	Mar-01	Nov-01	Enron	66

Source: AWEA & Ventyx Inc.

Variables of Interest Statistics

Development Period	Pre Announcement	Post Announcement Pre Construction	1st Year After Construction	2nd Year After Construction	2+ Years After Construction	Total
Madison, NY (NYMC)	59	165	74	70	325	693

View of Turbines	Pre Construction	None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
Madison, NY (NYMC)	224	395	50	16	8	0	693

Distance to Nearest Turbine	Pre Construction	< 0.57 Miles	0.57 - 1 Miles	1 - 3 Miles	3 - 5 Miles	> 5 Miles	Total
Madison, NY (NYMC)	224	2	11	80	374	2	693

Census Statistics

Name	Type	2007 Population	% Change Since 2000	Population Per Mile ²	Median Age	Median Income	Median House 2007	% Change Since 2000
Cazenovia	Town	2,835	8.6%	1,801	32.3	\$ 58,172	\$ 159,553	n/a
Chittenango	Town	4,883	-0.5%	2,000	36.0	\$ 58,358	\$ 104,845	n/a
Canastota	Town	4,339	-1.7%	1,306	37.3	\$ 45,559	\$ 93,349	n/a
Oneida	City	10,791	-1.7%	490	36.9	\$ 47,173	\$ 99,305	n/a
Morrisville	Town	2,155	0.6%	1,869	20.4	\$ 45,852	\$ 102,352	n/a
Madison	County	69,829	0.6%	106	36.1	\$ 53,600	\$ 109,000	39%
New York	State	19,297,729	1.7%	408	35.9	\$ 53,514	\$ 311,000	109%
US	Country	301,139,947	6.8%	86	37.9	\$ 50,233	\$ 243,742	46%

Source: City-Data.com & Wikipedia. “% Change Since 2000” refers to the percentage change between 2000 and 2007 for the figures in the column to the left (population or median house price). “Town” signifies any municipality with less than 10,000 inhabitants. “n/a” signifies data not available.

Appendix B: Methodology for Calculating Distances with GIS

For each of the homes in the dataset, accurate measurements of the distance to the nearest wind turbine at the time of sale were needed, and therefore the exact locations of both the turbines and the homes was required. Neither of these locations was available from a single source, but through a combination of techniques, turbine and home locations were derived. This section describes the data and techniques used to establish accurate turbine and home locations, and the process for then calculating distances between the two.

There were a number of possible starting points for mapping accurate wind turbine locations. First, the Energy Velocity data, which covered all study areas, provided a point estimate for project location, but did not provide individual turbine locations. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), because of permitting and aviation maps, maintains data on turbine locations, but at the time of this study, that data source did not cover all locations, contained data on structures that no longer exist, and was difficult to use.¹¹⁰ Finally, in some cases, the counties had mapped the wind turbines into GIS.

In the end, because no single dataset was readily available to serve all study areas, instead the variety of data sources described above was used to map and/or confirm the location of every turbine in the 10 study areas. The process began with high-resolution geocoded satellite and aerial ortho imagery that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) collects and maintains under its National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP), and which covers virtually all of the areas in this investigation. Where needed, older ortho imagery from the USDA was used. Combining these data with the Energy Velocity data, and discussions with local officials, and maps provided by the county or the developer, locating and mapping all of the turbines in each study area was possible.

Home locations were provided directly by some counties; in other cases, a parcel centroid was created as a proxy.¹¹¹ In some situations, the centroid did not correspond to the actual house location, and therefore required further refinement. This refinement was only required and conducted if the parcel was near the wind turbines, where the difference of a few hundred feet, for example, could alter its distance rating in a meaningful fashion, or when the parcel included a considerable amount of acreage, where inaccuracy in home location could be considerable. Therefore, parcels inside of 1.5 miles of the nearest wind turbine and of any size, and parcels outside of 1.5 miles and larger than 5 acres, were both examined using the USDA NAIP imagery to determine the exact home location. In cases where the parcel centroid was not centered over the home, the location was adjusted, using the ortho image as a guide, to the actual house location.

With both turbine and home locations identified, the next step was to determine distances between the two. To do so, the date when each transaction in the sample occurred was taken into

¹¹⁰ A newer FAA database is now available that clears up many of these earlier concerns.

¹¹¹ A “parcel centroid” is the mathematical center point of a polygon, and was determined by XTools Pro (www.xtoolspro.com).

account, combined with the determination of which turbines were in existence at what time.¹¹² This required breaking the transactions in the sample into three categories: 1) those occurring before any wind facility was announced in the study area, 2) those occurring after the first wind facility was announced in the area but before all development was complete in the area, and 3) those occurring after all wind development in the area was complete. Any sale that occurred before wind development was announced in the study area was coded with a distance to the nearest turbine derived from the actual turbine locations after all wind development had occurred.¹¹³ Homes that sold after all wind development had occurred were treated similarly, with distances derived from the set of turbines in place after all development had taken place. The final set of homes - those that sold after announcement of the first facility, but before the construction of the last - had to be treated, essentially, on a case by case basis. Some homes were located within five miles of one wind facility but more than five miles from another wind facility in the same study area (e.g., many homes in PASC). In this case the distance to that closer facility could be applied in a similar fashion as would be the case if only one facility was erected (e.g., NYMC or PAWC). Another group of homes, those that sold during the development of the first facility in the study area, were given the distance to that facility, regardless of distance to the other facilities in the study area. The final and most complicated group of homes consisted of those that were within five miles of multiple wind facilities, and that sold after the first facility had been erected. In those cases, the exact configuration of turbines was determined for each stage of the development process. In study areas with multiple facilities that were developed over multiple periods, there might be as many as six possible configurations (e.g., IABV). In this final scenario, the distance to the closest turbine was used, assuming it had been “announced” at the time of sale.

Once the above process was complete, the mechanics of calculating distances from the turbines to the homes was straightforward. After establishing the location of a set of turbines, for instance those constructed in the first development in the area, a euclidian distance raster was derived that encompassed every home in the study area.¹¹⁴ The calculations were made using a 50-foot resolution state-plane projection and North American Datum from 1983 (NAD83). As discussed above, similar rasters were created for each period in the development cycle for each study area, depending on the turbine configuration at that time. Ultimately, a home’s sale date was matched to the appropriate raster, and the underlying distance was extracted. Taking everything into account discussed above, it is expected that these measurements are accurate to

¹¹² It is recognized that the formal date of sale will follow the date at which pricing decisions were made. It is also recognized, as mentioned in Section 3, that wind facility announcement and construction dates are likely to be preceded by “under the radar” discussions in the community. Taken together, these two factors might have the effect, in the model, of creating some apparent lag in when effects are shown, compared to the earlier period in which effects may begin to occur. For this to bias the results, however, effects would have to disappear or dramatically lessen with time (e.g., less than one year after construction) such that the effects would not be uncovered with the models in later periods. Based on evidence from other potentially analogous infrastructure (e.g., HVTL), any fading of effects would likely occur over many years, so it is assumed that any bias is likely minimal.

¹¹³ These distances were used to compare homes sold, for instance, within 1 mile of where the turbines were eventually erected with similar homes sold after the turbines were erected (see, for example, the Temporal Aspects Model).

¹¹⁴ A “Raster” is a grid of, in this case, 50 feet by 50 feet squares, each of which contains a number representing the number of feet from the center of the square to the nearest turbine.

within roughly 150 feet inside of 1.5 miles and within a maximum of roughly 1150 feet outside of 1.5 miles.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ The resolution of the raster is 50 feet, so the hypotenuse is 70 feet. If the home is situated in the top left of a raster cell and the turbine is situated in the bottom right of a diagonally adjacent cell, they could be separated by as much as 140 feet, yet the raster distance would only be 50 feet, a difference of 90 feet. Moreover, the resolution of the Ortho image is 40 feet so that location could additionally be off by another 55 feet along the diagonal. These two uncertainties total to roughly 150 feet for homes inside of 1.5 miles. Outside of 1.5 miles the variation between centroid and house location for parcels smaller than 5 acres could be larger still. If a 4.9 acre parcel had a highly irregular rectangular shape of 102 by 2100 feet, for instance, the centroid could be as much as 1050 feet from the property line. If the home was situated 50 feet from the property line then the actual house location could be off by as much as 1000 feet. Adding this to the 150 feet from above leads to a total discrepancy of 1150 feet (0.22 miles) for homes outside of 1.5 miles on parcels smaller than 5 acres. Of course, these extreme scenarios are highly unlikely to be prevalent.

Appendix C: Field Data Collection Instrument

Figure A - 12: Field Data Collection Instrument

House # (Control/ Key #)		County		
House Address				
<u>Home Characteristics</u>			House Photo Number(s)	
Cul-De-Sac?	No(0) / Yes(1)		Waterfront?	No(0) / Yes(1)
<u>Scenic Vista Characteristics</u>			Vista Photo Numbers	
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), Premium (5)				
<u>View of Turbines Characteristics</u>			View Photo Numbers	
Total # of Turbines visible			Orientation of Home to View: See Below	
# of Turbines- blade tips only visible			Side (S), Front (F), Back (B), Angled (A)	
# of Turbines- nacelle/hub visible				
# of Turbines- tower visible			View Scope: Narrow(1), Medium(2), Wide(3)	
The Degree to which the View of Turbines Dominate the Site?				
Non-Existent (0), Minor (1), Moderate (2), Substantial (3), Extreme (4)				
Degree to which the Turbines Overlap the Prominent Scenic Vista?				
Not at all (0), Barely (1), Somewhat (2), Strongly (3), Entirely (4)				
<u>Notes:</u>				

Figure A - 13: Field Data Collection Instrument - Instructions - Page 1

Home Characteristics

Cul-De-Sac? No(0)/Yes(1)	Is the home situated on a cul-de-sac?
Waterfront? No(0)/Yes(1)	Is the home situated on the waterfront?

"Vista" Characteristics

Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Poor (1)	This rating is reserved for vistas of unmistakably poor quality. These vistas are often dominated by visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines), or are uncomfortable spaces for people, lack interest, or have virtually no recreational potential.
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Below Average (2)	The home's vista is of the below average quality. These vistas contain visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines) but are not dominated by them. They are not inviting spaces for people, but are not uncomfortable. They have little interest, mystery and have minor recreational potential.
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Average (3)	The home's vista is of the average quality. These vistas include interesting views which can be enjoyed often only a narrow scope. These vistas may contain some visually discordant man-made alterations (not considering turbines), are moderately comfortable spaces for people, have some interest, and have minor recreational potential.
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Above Average (4)	The vista from the home is of above average quality. These vistas include interesting views which often can be enjoyed in a medium to wide scope. They might contain some man made alterations (not considering turbines), yet still possess significant interest and mystery, are moderately balanced and have some potential for recreation.
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Premium (5)	This rating is reserved for vistas of unmistakably premium quality. These vistas would include "picture post card" views which can be enjoyed in a wide scope. They are often free or largely free of any discordant man made alterations (not considering turbines), possess significant interest, memorable qualities, mystery and are well balanced and likely have a high potential for recreation.
Degree Turbines Overlap Prominent Vista? Not at all (0)	The vista does not contain any view of the turbines.
Degree Turbines Overlap Prominent Vista? Barely (1)	A small portion (~ 0 - 20%) of the vista is overlapped by the view of turbines therefore the vista might contain a view of a few turbines, only a few of which can be seen entirely (from below the sweep of the blades to the top of their tips).
Degree Turbines Overlap Prominent Vista? Somewhat (2)	A moderate portion (~20-50%) of the vista contains turbines, and likely contains a view of more than one turbine, some of which are likely to be seen entirely (from below the sweep of the blades to the top of their tips).
Degree Turbines Overlap Prominent Vista? Strongly (3)	A large portion (~50-80%) of the vista contains a view of turbines, many of which likely can be seen entirely (from below the sweep of the blades to the top of their tips).
Degree Turbines Overlap Prominent Vista? Entirely (4)	This rating is reserved for situations where the turbines overlap virtually the entire (~80-100%) vista from the home. The vista likely contains a view of many turbines, virtually all of which can be seen entirely (from below the sweep of the blades to the top of their tips).

Figure A - 14: Field Data Collection Instrument - Instructions - Page 2

View of Turbines Characterist

House Orientation to View of Turbines: Side (S)	Orientation of home to the view of the turbines is from the side.
House Orientation to View of Turbines: Front (F)	Orientation of home to the view of the turbines is from the front.
House Orientation to Vista of Turbines: Back (B)	Orientation of home to the view of the turbines is from the back.
House Orientation to Vista of Turbines: Angled (A)	Orientation of home to the view of the turbines is from an angle.
View of Turbines Scope: Narrow(1)	The view of the turbines is largely blocked by trees, large shrubs or man made features in the foreground (0-300 feet) allowing 0 - 30 degrees of view of the wind facility
View of Turbines Scope: Medium(2)	The view of turbines is partially blocked by trees, large shrubs or man made features in the foreground (0-300 feet) allowing only 30-90 degrees of view of the wind facility.
View of Turbines Scope: Wide(3)	The view of the turbines is free or almost free from blockages by trees, large shrubs or man made features in the foreground (0-300 feet) allowing at least 90 degrees of view of the wind facility.
Degree to which View of Turbines Dominates the Site? None (0)	The turbines are not visible at all from this home.
Degree to which View of Turbines Dominates the Site? Minor (1)	The turbines are visible but either the scope is narrow, there are many obstructions, or the distance between the home and the facility is large.
Degree to which View of Turbines Dominates the Site? Moderate (2)	The turbines are visible but the scope is either narrow or medium, there might be some obstructions, and the distance between the home and the facility is most likely a few miles.
Degree to which View of Turbines Dominates the Site? Substantial (3)	The turbines are dramatically visible from the home. The turbines are likely visible in a wide scope, and most likely the distance between the home and the facility is short.
Degree to which View of Turbines Dominates the Site? Extreme (4)	This rating is reserved for sites that are unmistakably dominated by the presence of the windfarm. The turbines are dramatically visible from the home and there is a looming quality to their placement. The turbines are often visible in a wide scope, or the distance to the facility is very small.

Appendix D: Vista Ratings with Photos

POOR VISTA



BELOW AVERAGE VISTA



AVERAGE VISTA



ABOVE AVERAGE VISTA



PREMIUM VISTA



Appendix E: View Ratings with Photos

MINOR VIEW



3 turbines visible from front orientation, nearest 1.4 miles (TXHC)



5 turbines visible from front orientation, nearest 0.9 miles (NYMC)

MODERATE VIEW



18 turbines visible from back orientation, nearest 1.6 miles (ILLC)



6 turbines visible from back orientation, nearest 0.8 miles (PASC)

SUBSTANTIAL VIEW



90 turbines visible from all orientations, nearest 0.6 miles (IABV)



27 turbines visible from multiple orientations, nearest 0.6 miles (TXHC)

EXTREME VIEW



6 turbines visible from multiple orientations, nearest 0.2 miles (WIKCDC)



212 turbines visible from all orientations, nearest 0.4 miles (IABV)

Appendix F: Selecting the Primary (“Base”) Hedonic Model

Equation (1) as described in Section 4.2 is presented in this report as the primary (or “Base”) model to which all other models are compared. As noted earlier, in the Base Hedonic Model and in all subsequent models presented in Section 5 all variables of interest, spatial adjustments, and home and site characteristics are pooled, and therefore their estimates represent the average across all study areas. Ideally, one would have enough data to estimate a model at the study area level - a fully unrestricted model - rather than pooled across all areas. In this appendix, alternative model forms are presented that unrestrict these variables at the level of study areas. As shown here, these investigations ultimately encouraged the selection of the somewhat simpler pooled Base Model as the primary model, and to continue to use restricted or pooled models in the alternative hedonic analyses.

F.1 Discussion of Fully Unrestricted Model Form

The Base Model described by equation (1) has variables that are pooled, and the coefficients for these variables therefore represent the average across all study areas (after accounting for study area fixed effects). An alternative (and arguably superior) approach would be to estimate coefficients at the level of each study area, thereby allowing coefficient values to vary among study areas.¹¹⁶ This fully interacted – or unrestricted – model would take the following form:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \sum_s \beta_1(N \cdot S) + \sum_c \beta_2(Y) + \sum_k \beta_3(X \cdot S) + \sum_v \beta_4(\text{VIEW} \cdot S) + \sum_d \beta_5(\text{DISTANCE} \cdot S) + \varepsilon \quad (\text{F13})$$

where

P represents the inflation-adjusted sale price,

N is the spatially weighted neighbors’ predicted sale price,

S is a vector of s study areas (e.g., WAOR, OKCC, etc.),

Y is a vector of c study area locational characteristics (e.g., census tract, school district, etc.),

X is a vector of k home and site characteristics (e.g., acres, square feet, number of bathrooms, condition of the home, age of home, VISTA, etc.),

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view of turbine variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),

DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance to turbine variables (e.g., less than 3000 feet, between one and three miles, etc.),

β_0 is the constant or intercept across the full sample,

β_1 is a vector of s parameter estimates for the spatially weighted neighbor’s predicted sale price for S study areas,

β_2 is a vector of c parameter estimates for the study area locational fixed effect variables,

β_3 is a vector of k parameter estimates for the home and site characteristics for S study areas,

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables as compared to homes sold with no view of the turbines for S study areas,

¹¹⁶ For instance, the marginal contribution of Acres (the number of acres) to the selling price would be estimated for each study area (i.e., Acres_WAOR, Acres_TXHC etc.), as would the variables of interest: VIEW and DISTANCE.

β_5 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to homes sold situated outside of five miles for S study areas, and ε is a random disturbance term.

To refresh, the fully restricted equation (1) takes the following form:

$$\ln(P) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 N + \sum_s \beta_2 S + \sum_k \beta_3 X + \sum_v \beta_4 \text{VIEW} + \sum_d \beta_5 \text{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where

P represents the inflation-adjusted sale price,

N is the spatially weighted neighbors' predicted sale price,

S is the vector of s Study Area fixed effects variables (e.g., WAOR, OKCC, etc.),

X is a vector of k home and site characteristics (e.g., acres, square feet, number of bathrooms, condition of the home, age of home, VISTA, etc.),

VIEW is a vector of v categorical view of turbine variables (e.g., MINOR, MODERATE, etc.),

DISTANCE is a vector of d categorical distance to turbine variables (e.g., less than 3000 feet, between one and three miles, etc.),

β_0 is the constant or intercept across the full sample,

β_1 is a parameter estimate for the spatially weighted neighbor's predicted sale price,

β_2 is a vector of s parameter estimates for the study area fixed effects as compared to homes sold in the Washington/Oregon (WAOR) study area,

β_3 is a vector of k parameter estimates for the home and site characteristics,

β_4 is a vector of v parameter estimates for the VIEW variables as compared to homes sold with no view of the turbines,

β_5 is a vector of d parameter estimates for the DISTANCE variables as compared to homes sold situated outside of five miles, and

ε is a random disturbance term.

The significant change between equations (1) and (F13) is that each of the primary groups of variables in equation (F13) is interacted with the study areas (S) so that parameters can be estimated at the study area level. For example, whereas ACRES is estimated in equation (1) across all study areas, in equation (F13) it is estimated for each study area (i.e., Acres_WAOR, Acres_TXHC, etc.).¹¹⁷ Similarly, when considering the possible impact of wind facilities on residential sales prices, equation (1) seeks average effects that exist over the entire sample, while equation (F13) instead looks for differential effects in each individual study area. Additionally, in equation (F13), instead of estimating fixed effects using inter-study area parameters alone (e.g., WAOR, TXHC), a set of intra-study area effects (Y) - school district and census tract delineations - are added.¹¹⁸ These latter coefficients represent not only effects that are presumed

¹¹⁷ This change is made because, theoretically, the contribution to sales prices of home or site characteristics may differ between study areas – for instance Central_AC in Texas vs. New York – and therefore estimating them at the study area level may increase the explanatory power of the model.

¹¹⁸ In the evaluation and selection of the best model to use as the “Base Model” a set of census tract and school district delineations were used instead of the study area fixed effects. These more-granular fixed effects were extracted from GIS using house locations and census tract and school district polygons. Often, the school district and census tract delineations were not mutually exclusive. For example, in Wisconsin the WIKCDC study area contains four school districts and six census tracts, none of which completely overlap. Alternatively, in some study

to exist over each entire study area (inter-study area effects), but also intra-study area effects such as differences in home valuation due to school districts, distances to amenities, and other locationally bound influences. As with the inter-study area coefficients, because of the myriad influences captured by these variables, interpretation of any single coefficient can be difficult. However, it is expected that such coefficients would be influential, indicating significant differences in value between homes in each study area and across study areas due to school district quality and factors that differ between census tracts (e.g., crime rates).

Although the fully unrestricted model described by equation (F13) is arguably superior to the fully restricted model described in equation (1) because of its ability to resolve differences between and within study areas that are not captured by the Base Model, there are three potential drawbacks:

- Model parsimony and performance;
- Standard error magnitudes; and
- Parameter estimate stability.

Each of these potential drawbacks is discussed in turn below:

Model parsimony and performance: In general, econometricians prefer a simpler, more parsimonious statistical model. In this instance, variables should be added to a model only if their addition is strongly supported by theory and if the performance of the model is substantially improved by their inclusion. As such, if a model with a relatively small number of parameters performs well, it should be preferred to a model with more parameters unless the simple model can be “proven to be inadequate” (Newman, 1956). To prove the inadequacy of a simpler model requires a significant increase in performance to be exhibited from the more complex model. In this case, as presented later, performance is measured using the combination of Adjusted R^2 , Modified R^2 , and the Schwarz information criterion (see footnote 119 on page 127).

Standard error magnitudes: The magnitude of the standard errors for the variables of interest, as well as the other controlling variables, are likely to increase in the unrestricted model form because the number of cases for each variable will decrease when they are estimated at the study area level. Within each study area, there are a limited number of home transactions that meet the criteria for inclusion in the model, but even more limiting is the number of home transactions within each study area that have the characteristics of interest. For example, in Lee County, IL (ILLC), there are 205 post-construction home sales, while in Wayne County, PA (PAWC) there are 222. More importantly, in those areas, the data include a total of one and eleven sales inside of one mile, respectively, and a total of one and two homes with either EXTREME or SUBSTANTIAL rated views of turbines. With so few observations, there is increased likelihood that a single or small group of observations will strongly influence the sample mean of an independent variable. Since the standard error is derived from the variance of the parameter estimate, which in turn is derived from the summed deviation of each observation’s actual level relative to its sample mean, this standard error is more likely to be larger than if a larger sample were considered. If the presence of wind facilities does have a detrimental effect on property

areas the school district and census tracts perfectly overlapped, and in those cases either both were omitted as the reference category or one was included and the other withdrawn from the model to prevent perfect collinearity.

values, that effect seems likely to be relatively small, at least outside of the immediate vicinity of the wind turbines. The smaller sample sizes for the independent variables that come with the unrestricted model, which may decrease statistical precision by producing larger standard errors, would likely decrease the ability to accurately identify these possible effects statistically. To explore the magnitude of this concern, the difference in standard errors of the variables of interest is investigated among the restricted and unrestricted models.

Parameter estimate stability: In an unrestricted model, parameter estimates are more likely to be unstable because the sample of home transactions with any particular characteristic may be small and thus not representative of the population as a whole. As mentioned above, there are a limited number of transactions within each study area that have the characteristics of interest. Restricting the sample size by using an unrestricted model increases the likelihood that a limited number of observations, which in the population as a whole represent a very small segment, will drive the results in one direction or another, thereby leading to erroneous conclusions. The difference in parameter estimates is investigated by comparing the coefficients for the unrestricted variables of interest to those for the restricted variables of interest. Additionally, the sign of any significant variables will be investigated for the unrestricted models, which might help uncover potentially spurious results.

F.2 Analysis of Alternative Model Forms

Here the spectrum of alternative models is explored, from the fully restricted equation (1) to the fully unrestricted equation (F13). To do so, not only are these two ends of the spectrum estimated, but also 14 intermediate models are estimated that consist of every combination of restriction of the four variable groups (i.e., variables of interest, spatial adjustments, study area delineations, and home and site characteristics). This produces a total of 16 models over which to assess model parsimony and performance, standard error size, and coefficient stability. This process allows for an understanding of model performance but, more importantly, to ultimately define a “Base Model” that is parsimonious (i.e., has the fewest parameters), robust (i.e., high adjusted R^2), and best fits the purpose of investigating wind facility impacts on home sales prices.

Table A - 2 presents the performance statistics for each of the 16 models defined above, moving from the fully restricted model equation (1) (“Model 1”) to the fully unrestricted model equation (F13) (“Model 16”). In columns 2 – 5 of the table, the “R” represents a restriction for this variable group (i.e., not crossed with the study areas) and the “U” represents the case when the variable group is unrestricted (i.e., crossed with the study areas). Also shown are summary model statistics (i.e., Adjusted R^2 , Modified R^2 , and Schwarz information criterion - “SIC”), as well as the number of estimated parameters (k).¹¹⁹ All models were run using the post-construction data subset of the sample of home sales transactions ($n = 4,937$).

¹¹⁹ Goldberger (1991), as cited by Gujarati (2003), suggests using a Modified $R^2 = (1 - k/n) * R^2$ to adjust for added parameters. For example, Models 1 and 14 have Modified R^2 of 0.76, yet Adjusted R^2 of 0.77 and 0.78 respectively. Therefore the Modified R^2 penalizes their measure of explanatory power more than the Adjusted R^2 when taking into account the degrees of freedom. Similarly, the Schwarz information criterion penalizes the models for increased numbers of parameters (Schwarz, 1978). More importantly, practitioners often rely on the Schwarz criterion – over the Modified or Adjusted R^2 statistics - to rank models with the same dependent variable by their relative parsimony (Gujarati, 2003). Therefore it will be used for that purpose here.

Model Parsimony and Performance

Overall, the fully restricted model (1) performs well with only 37 independent variables, producing an Adjusted R^2 of 0.77. Despite the limited number of explanatory variables, the model explains ~77% of the variation in home prices in the sample. When the fully unrestricted model 16 (equation F13) is estimated, which lies at the other end of the spectrum, it performs only slightly better, with an Adjusted R^2 of 0.81, but with an additional 285 explanatory variables. It is therefore not surprising that the Modified R^2 is 0.76 for Model 1 and is only 0.77 for Model 16. Similarly, the Schwarz information criterion (SIC) increases from 0.088 to 0.110 when moving from model 1 to model 16 indicating relatively less parsimony. Combined, these metrics show that the improvement in the explanatory power of model 16 over model 1 is not enough to overcome the lack of parsimony. Turning to the 14 models that lie between Models 1 and 16, in general, little improvement in performance is found over Model 1, and considerably less parsimony, providing little initial justification to pursue a more complex specification than equation (1).

Table A - 2: Summarized Results of Restricted and Unrestricted Model Forms

Model ¹	Study Area ²	Spatial Adjustment	Home and Site Characteristics	Variables of Interest	Adj R^2	Modified R^2	SIC	k †
1	R	R	R	R	0.77	0.76	0.088	37
2	U	R	R	R	0.74	0.73	0.110	111
3	R	U	R	R	0.77	0.76	0.088	46
4	R	R	U	R	0.80	0.78	0.095	188
5	R	R	R	U	0.77	0.76	0.093	88
6	U	U	R	R	0.78	0.76	0.094	120
7	R	U	U	R	0.80	0.77	0.096	197
8	R	R	U	U	0.80	0.77	0.101	239
9	U	R	U	R	0.80	0.77	0.107	262
10	U	R	R	U	0.76	0.75	0.107	162
11	R	U	R	U	0.77	0.76	0.094	97
12	U	U	U	R	0.81	0.77	0.103	271
13	R	U	U	U	0.80	0.77	0.103	248
14	U	U	R	U	0.78	0.76	0.100	171
15	U	R	U	U	0.80	0.76	0.113	313
16	U	U	U	U	0.81	0.77	0.110	322

"R" indicates parameters are pooled ("restricted") across the study areas.

"U" indicates parameters are not pooled ("unrestricted"), and are instead estimated at the study area level.

1 - Model numbers do not correspond to equation numbers listed in the report; equation (1) is Model 1, and equation (F1) is Model 16.

2 - In its restricted form "Study Area" includes only inter-study area delineations, while unrestricted "Study Area" includes intra-study area delineations of school district and census tract.

† - Numbers of parameters do not include intercept or omitted variables.

The individual contributions to model performance from unrestricting each of the variable groups in turn (as shown in Models 2-5) further emphasizes the small performance gains that are earned despite the sizable increases in the number of parameters. As a single group, the

unrestricted Home and Site Characteristics model (Model 4) makes the largest impact on model performance, at least with respect to the Adjusted R^2 (0.80), but this comes with the addition of 151 estimated parameters a slight improvement in the Modified R^2 (0.78) and a worsening SIC (0.095). Adding unrestricted Study Area delineations (Model 2), on the other hand, adversely affects performance (Adj. $R^2 = 0.74$, Modified $R^2 = 0.73$) and adds 74 estimated parameters (SIC = 0.110). Similarly, unrestricted the Spatial Adjustments (Model 3) offers little improvement in performance (Adj. $R^2 = 0.77$, Modified $R^2 = 0.76$) despite adding nine additional variables (SIC = 0.088). Finally, unrestricted the Variables of Interest (Model 5) does not increase model performance (Adj. $R^2 = 0.77$, Modified $R^2 = 0.76$) and adds 51 variables to the model (SIC = 0.093). This pattern of little model improvement yet considerable increases in the number of estimated parameters (i.e., less parsimony) continues when pairs or trios of variable groups are unrestricted. With an Adjusted R^2 of 0.77, the fully restricted equation (1) performs more than adequately, and is, by far, the most parsimonious.

Standard Error Magnitudes

Table A - 3 summarizes the standard errors for the variables of interest for all of the 16 models, grouped into restricted and unrestricted model categories. The table specifically compares the medians, minimums, and maximums of the standard errors for the models with restricted variables of interest (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12) to those with unrestricted variables of interest (5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16).¹²⁰ The table demonstrates that the unrestricted standard errors for the variables of interest are significantly larger than the restricted standard errors. In fact, the minimum standard errors in the unrestricted models are often higher than the maximum standard errors produced in the restricted models. For example, the maximum standard error for an EXTREME VIEW in the restricted models is 0.09, yet the minimum in the unrestricted models is 0.12, with a maximum of 0.34. To put this result in a different light, a median standard error for the unrestricted EXTREME VIEW variable of 0.25 would require an effect on house prices larger than 50% to be considered statistically significant at the 90% level. Clearly, the statistical power of the unrestricted models is weak.¹²¹ Based on other disamenities, as discussed in Section 2.1, an effect of this magnitude is very unlikely. Therefore, based on these standard errors, there is no apparent reason to unrestricted the variables of interest.

¹²⁰ For the restricted models, the medians, minimums, and maximums are derived across all eight models for each variable of interest. For the unrestricted models, they are derived across all study areas and all eight models for each variable of interest.

¹²¹ At 90% confidence a standard error of 0.25 would produce a confidence interval of roughly +/- 0.42 (0.25 * 1.67). An effect of this magnitude represents a 52% change in sales prices because sales price is in a natural log form ($e^{0.42} - 1 = 0.52$).

Table A - 3: Summary of VOI Standard Errors for Restricted and Unrestricted Models

Standard Errors	Restricted Models			Unrestricted Models		
	Standard Errors			Standard Errors		
	Median	Min	Max	Median	Min	Max
Minor View	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.07
Moderate View	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.06	0.18
Substantial View	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.19	0.10	0.29
Extreme View	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.25	0.12	0.34
Inside 3000 Feet	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.21	0.09	0.33
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.13	0.08	0.40
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.11
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.10

Parameter Estimate Stability

Table A - 4 summarizes the coefficient estimates for the variables of interest for all of the 16 models. The table specifically compares the medians, minimums, and maximums of the coefficients for the models with restricted variables of interest (1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 12) to those with unrestricted variables of interest (5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16). As shown, the coefficients in the unrestricted models diverge significantly from those in the restricted models. For example, in the restricted models, the median coefficient for homes inside of 3000 feet is -0.03, with a minimum of -0.06 and a maximum of -0.01, yet in the unrestricted models the median coefficient is 0.06, with a minimum of -0.38 and a maximum of 0.32. Similarly, a MODERATE VIEW in the restricted models has a median of 0.00, with a minimum of -0.01 and a maximum of 0.03, whereas the unrestricted models produce coefficients with a median of -0.05 and with a minimum of -0.25 and a maximum of 0.35.

Table A - 4: Summary of VOI Coefficients for Restricted and Unrestricted Models

Parameters	Restricted Models			Unrestricted Models		
	Coefficients			Coefficients		
	Median	Min	Max	Median	Min	Max
Minor View	-0.02	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	-0.16	0.24
Moderate View	0.00	-0.01	0.03	-0.05	-0.25	0.35
Substantial View	-0.01	-0.04	0.02	-0.08	-0.31	0.13
Extreme View	0.03	0.02	0.05	-0.03	-0.23	0.09
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.03	-0.06	-0.01	0.06	-0.38	0.32
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.04	-0.06	-0.01	-0.10	-0.44	0.52
Between 1 and 3 Miles	-0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.00	-0.23	0.40
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.05	-0.05	0.32

Turning from the levels of the coefficients to the stability of their statistical significance and sign across models more reasons for concern are found. Table A - 5 summarizes the results of the unrestricted models, and presents the number of statistically significant variables of interest as a percent of the total estimated. The table also breaks these results down into two groups, those

with coefficients above zero and those with coefficients below zero.¹²² It should be emphasized here that it is the *a priori* expectation that, if effects exist, all of these coefficients would be less than zero, indicating an adverse effect on home prices from proximity to and views of wind turbines. Despite that expectation, when the variables of interest are unrestricted it is found that they are as likely to be above zero as they are below.¹²³ In effect, the small numbers of cases available for analysis at the study area level produce unstable results, likely because the estimates are being unduly influenced by either study area specific effects that are not captured by the model or by a limited number of observations that represents a larger fraction of the overall sample in that model.¹²⁴

Table A - 5: Summary of Significant VOI Above and Below Zero in Unrestricted Models

Significant Variables	Unrestricted Models		
	Total	Below Zero	Above Zero
Minor View	32%	14%	18%
Moderate View	23%	11%	13%
Substantial View	4%	4%	0%
Extreme View	0%	0%	0%
Inside 3000 Feet	23%	15%	8%
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	30%	14%	16%
Between 1 and 3 Miles	56%	32%	24%
Between 3 and 5 Miles	45%	3%	43%

F.3 Selecting a Base Model

To conclude, it was found that all three concerns related to the estimation and use of an unrestricted model form are borne out in practice. Despite experimenting with 16 different combinations of interactions, little overall improvement in performance is discovered. Where performance gains are found they are at the expense of parsimony as reflected in the lack of increase in the Modified R^2 and the relatively higher Schwartz information criterion. Further, divergent and spurious coefficients of interest and large standard errors are associated with those coefficients. Therefore the fully restricted model, equation (1), is used in this report as the “Base Model”.

¹²² The “Total” percentage of significant coefficients is calculated by counting the total number of significant coefficients across all 8 unrestricted models for each variable of interest, and dividing this total by the total number of coefficients. Therefore, a study area that did not have any homes in a group (for example, homes with EXTREME VIEWS) was not counted in the “total number of coefficients” sum. Any differences between the sum of “above” and “below” zero groups from the total are due to rounding errors.

¹²³ The relatively larger number of significant variables for the MINOR rated view, MODERATE rated view, Mile 1 to 3, and Mile 3 to 5 parameters are likely related to the smaller standard errors for those categories, which result from larger numbers of cases.

¹²⁴ Another possible explanation for spurious results in general is measurement error, when parameters do not appropriately represent what one is testing for. In this case though, the VIEW variables have been adequately “ground truthed” during the development of the measurement scale, and are similar to the VISTA variables, which were found to be very stable across study areas. DISTANCE, or for that matter, distance to any disamenity, has been repeatedly found to be an appropriate proxy for the size of effects. As a result, it is not believed that measurement error is a likely explanation for the results presented here.

Appendix G: OLS Assumptions, and Tests for the Base Model

A number of criteria must be met to ensure that the Base Model and Alternative Hedonic Models produce unbiased coefficient estimates and standard errors: 1) appropriate controls for outliers and influencers; 2) homoskedasticity; 3) absence of serial or spatial autocorrelation; and 4) reasonably limited multicollinearity. Each of these criteria, and how they are addressed, is discussed below.

Outliers and Influencers: Home sale prices that are well away from the mean, also called outliers and influencers, can cause undue influence on parameter estimates. A number of formal tests are available to identify these cases, the most common being Mahalanobis' Distance ("M Distance") (Mahalanobis, 1936) and standardized residual screening. M Distance measures the degree to which individual observations influence the mean of the residuals. If any single observation has a strong influence on the residuals, it should be inspected and potentially removed. An auxiliary, but more informal, test for identifying these potentially influential observations is to see when the standardized absolute value of the residual exceeds some threshold. Both the Base Model and the All Sales Model were run using the original dataset of 7,464 transactions and the 4,940 transactions which occurred post-construction respectively. For both models the standardized residuals and the M Distance statistics were saved.¹²⁵ The histograms of these two sets of statistics from the two regressions are shown in Figure A - 15 through Figure A - 18.

¹²⁵ For the M Distance statistics all variables of interest were removed from the model. If they were left in the M-Distance statistics could be influenced by the small numbers of cases in the variables of interest. If these parameters were strongly influenced by a certain case, it could drive the results upward. Inspecting the controlling variables in the model, and how well they predicted the sale prices of the transactions in the sample, was of paramount importance therefore the variables of interest were not included.

Figure A - 15: Histogram of Standardized Residuals for Base Model




Figure A - 16: Histogram of Mahalanobis Distance Statistics for Base Model




Figure A - 17: Histogram of Standardized Residuals for All Sales Model





Figure A - 18: Histogram of Mahalanobis Distance Statistics for All Sales Model



The M Distance histograms suggested that a cutoff of 150 may be appropriate, which would exclude 15 cases from the All Sales Model and seven cases from the Base Model (all of the latter of which were among the 15 outliers in the All Sales Model). The Standardized Residual histograms suggested a cutoff of 4, 5, or 6, which would exclude 13, 8, and 3 cases from the Base Model, and 22, 12, and 5 cases from the All Sales Model. A case-by-case investigation of each of these sales transactions was then conducted by comparing their home characteristics (e.g., square feet, baths, age, etc.) against their study area and panel model cohorts to ensure that none had been inappropriately coded. None of the M Distance flagged cases seemed to be inappropriately coded, and none of those cases were removed from the final dataset as a result. Five cases that were flagged from the All Sales Model (which corresponded to three cases in the Base Model) with a Standardized Residual greater than six, however, were clearly outliers. One had a sale price that was more than \$200,000 more than any other transaction in the model, and the other four had exceptionally low prices, yet high numbers of corresponding characteristics that would suggest higher home sales prices (such as over 2000 square feet – all four cases – or more than two bathrooms – three cases).

As a result of these investigations, these five cases were removed from the model. One of the five cases occurred prior to announcement, one occurred after announcement and before construction, and the other three occurred after construction began. None were within three miles of the nearest wind turbine except one, which was 0.6 miles from the nearest turbine and had a MINOR view of the wind facility. The other two had no views of the turbines. Although there was hesitancy in removing any cases from the model, these transactions were considered appropriately influential and keeping them in the model would bias the results inappropriately. Further, the one home that was situated inside of one mile was surrounded by five other transactions in the same study area that also occurred after construction began and were a similar distance from the turbines, but that were not flagged by the outliers screen. Therefore, its removal was considered appropriate given that other homes in the sample would likely experience similar effects.

After removing these five cases, the sensitivity of the model results were tested to the inclusion or exclusion of the “greater than five” and “greater than four” Standardized Residuals observations and the cases flagged by the M Distance screen, finding that parameter estimates for the variables of interest moved slightly with these cases removed but not enough to change the results significantly. Because they did not show a unique grouping across the variables of interest, nor any unusual potentially inappropriate coding, and, more importantly, did not substantially influence the results, no substantive reason was found to remove any additional transactions from the sample. Therefore, the final dataset included a total of 7,459 cases, of which 4,937 occurred post-construction.

Homoskedasticity: A standard formal test for the presence of homoskedastic error terms is the White's statistic (White, 1980). However, the requirements to perform this test were overly burdensome for the computing power available. Instead, an informal test was applied, which plots the regression errors against predicted values and various independent variables to observe whether a "heteroskedastic pattern" is in evidence (Gujarati, 2003). Although no evidence of heteroskedasticity was found using this method, to be conservative, nonetheless all models were

run with White's heteroskedasticity correction to the parameter estimates' standard errors (which will not adversely influence the errors if they are homoskedastic).

Serial Autocorrelation: A standard formal test for the presence of serial autocorrelation in the error term is the Durbin-Watson statistic (Durbin and Watson, 1951). Applying this test as proposed by Durbin and Watson to the full panel dataset was problematic because the test looks at the error structure based on the order that observations are included in the statistical regression model. Any ordering choice over the entire panel data set invariably involves mixing home transactions from various study areas. Ideally, one would segment the data by study area for purposes of calculating this test, but that method was not easily implemented with the statistical software package used for this analysis (i.e., SAS). Instead, study area specific regression models were run with the data chronologically ordered in each to produce twelve different Durbin-Watson statistics, one for each study area specific model. The Durbin-Watson test statistics ranged from 1.98–2.16, which are all within the acceptable range.¹²⁶ Given that serial autocorrelation was not found to be a significant concern for each study area specific model, it is assumed that the same holds for the full dataset used in the analysis presented in this report.

Spatial Autocorrelation: It is well known that the sales price of a home can be systematically influenced by the sales prices of those homes that have sold nearby (Dubin, 1998; LeSage, 1999). Both the seller and the buyer use information from comparable surrounding sales to inform them of the appropriate transaction price, and nearby homes often experience similar amenities and disamenities. Therefore, the price for any single home is likely to be weakly dependent of the prices of homes in close temporal and spatial proximity. This lack of independence of home sale prices could bias the hedonic results (Dubin, 1998; LeSage, 1999), if not adequately addressed. A number of techniques are available to address this concern (Case et al., 2004; Espey et al., 2007), but because of the large sample and computing limits, a variation of the Spatial Auto Regressive Model (SAR) was chosen (Espey et al., 2007).

Specifically, an independent variable is included in the models: the predicted values of the weighted nearest neighbor's natural log of sales price in 1996 dollars.¹²⁷ To construct this vector of predicted prices, an auxiliary regression is developed using the spatially weighted average natural log of sales price in 1996 dollars as the independent variable and the spatially weighted average set of home characteristics as the dependent variables. This regression was used to produce the predicted weighted nearest neighbor's natural log of sales price in 1996 dollars that is then included in the Base and Alternative Models. This process required the following steps:

- 1) Selecting the neighbors for inclusion in the calculation;
- 2) Calculating a weighted sales price from these neighbors' transactions;
- 3) Selecting and calculating the weighted neighbors home characteristics; and
- 4) Forecasting the weighted average neighbor's sales price.

- **Selecting the neighbors:** To select the neighbors whose home transactions would most likely have affected the sales price of the subject home under review, all of the homes that

¹²⁶ The critical values for the models were between 1.89 and 2.53, assuming 5% significance, greater than 20 variables, and more than 200 cases (Gujarati, 2003).

¹²⁷ The predicted value was used, instead of the actual value, to help correct for simultaneity or endogeneity problems that might otherwise exist.

sold within the preceding six months of a subject home's sale date in the same study area are identified and, from those, the five nearest neighbors based on Euclidian distance are selected. The inverse of each selected nearest neighbors' distance (in quarter miles) to the subject home was then calculated. Each of these values was then divided by the sum of the five nearest neighbor's inverse distance values to create a neighbor's distance weight (NDW) for each of the five nearest neighbors.¹²⁸

- **Creating the weighted sales price:** Each of the neighbor's natural log of sales price in 1996 dollars (LN_Saleprice96) is multiplied by its distance weight (NDW). Then, each weighted neighbor's LN_Saleprice96 is summed to create a weighted nearest neighbor LN_Saleprice96 (Nbr_LN_Saleprice96).
- **Selecting and calculating the weighted neighbors home characteristics:** Nine independent variables are used from each of the neighbor's homes: square feet, age of the home at the time of sale, age of the home at the time of sale squared, acres, number of full baths, and condition (1-5, with Poor = 1, Below Average = 2, etc.). A weighted average is created of each of the characteristics by multiplying each of the neighbor's individual characteristics by their NDW, and then summing those values across the five neighbors to create the weighted average nearest neighbors' home characteristic.¹²⁹ Then each of the independent variables is interacted with the study area to allow each one to be independently estimated for each study area.
- **Forecasting the weighted average neighbors sales price:** To create the final predicted neighbor's price, the weighted nearest neighbor LN_Saleprice96 is regressed on the weighted average nearest neighbors' home characteristics to produce a predicted weighted nearest neighbor LN_Saleprice96 (Nbr_LN_SalePrice96_hat). These predicted values are then included in the Base and Alternative Models as independent variables to account for the spatial and temporal influence of the neighbors' home transactions.

In all models, the coefficient for this spatial adjustment parameter meets the expectations for sign and magnitude and is significant well above the 99% level, indicating both the presence of spatial autocorrelation and the appropriateness of the control for it.

Multicollinearity: There are several standard formal tests for detecting multicollinearity within the independent variables of a regression model. The Variance-Inflation Factor and Condition Index is applied to test for this violation of OLS assumptions. Specifically, a Variance-Inflation Factor (VIF) greater than 4 and/or a Condition Index of greater than 30 (Kleinbaum et al., 1988) are strong indicators that multicollinearity may exist. Multicollinearity is found in the model using both tests. Such a result is not uncommon in hedonic models because a number of characteristics, such as square feet or age of a home, are often correlated with other characteristics, such as the number of acres, bathrooms, and fireplaces. Not surprisingly, age of the home at the time of sale (AgeofHome) and the age of the home squared (AgeatHome_Sqrd)

¹²⁸ Put differently, the weight is the contribution of that home's inverse distance to the total sum of the five nearest neighbors' inverse distances.

¹²⁹ Condition requires rounding to the nearest integer and then creating a dummy from the 1-5 integers.

exhibited some multicollinearity (VIF equaled 11.8 and 10.6, respectively). Additionally, the home condition shows a fairly high Condition Index with square feet, indicating collinearity. More importantly, though, are the collinearity statistics for the variables of interest. The VIF for the VIEW variables range from 1.17 to 1.18 and for the DISTANCE variables they range from 1.2 to 3.6, indicating little collinearity with the other variables in the model. To test for this in another way, a number of models are compared with various identified highly collinear variables removed (e.g., AgeatSale, Sqft) and found that the removal of these variables had little influence on the variables of interest. Therefore, despite the presence of multicollinearity in the model, it is not believed that the variables of interest are inappropriately influenced. Further, any corrections for these issues might cause more harm to the model's estimating efficiency than taking no further action (Gujarati, 2003); as such, no specific adjustments to address the presence of multicollinearity are pursued further.

Appendix H: Alternative Models: Full Hedonic Regression Results

Table A - 6: Full Results for the Distance Stability Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	7.61	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.33	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.45	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.23	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.03	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.44	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.24	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.08	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.30	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.07	0.03	0.01	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
Mile Less 0 57	-0.04	0.04	0.29	67
Mile 0 57to1	-0.06	0.05	0.27	58
Mile 1to3	-0.01	0.02	0.71	2,019
Mile 3to5	0.01	0.01	0.26	1,923
Mile Gtr5	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	2
Model Name	Distance Stability
Dependent Variable	LN SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	33
F Statistic	496.7
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

Table A - 7: Full Results for the View Stability Model

	Coef.	SE	Sig	n
Intercept	7.64	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmnt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.34	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.45	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.23	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.02	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.45	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.25	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.09	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.31	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.08	0.03	0.00	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
Post Con NoView	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
View Minor	-0.02	0.01	0.25	561
View Mod	0.00	0.03	0.90	106
View Sub	-0.04	0.06	0.56	35
View Extrm	-0.03	0.06	0.61	28

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	3
Model Name	View Stability
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	33
F Statistic	495.9
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

Table A - 8: Full Results for the Continuous Distance Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	7.64	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.34	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.45	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.23	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.02	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.44	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.25	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.09	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.31	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.07	0.03	0.00	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
Minor View	-0.01	0.01	0.33	561
Moderate View	0.01	0.03	0.77	106
Substantial View	-0.02	0.07	0.72	35
Extreme View	0.01	0.10	0.88	28
InvDISTANCE	-0.01	0.02	0.46	4,937

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	5
Model Name	Continuous Distance Model
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	34
F Statistic	481.3
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

Table A - 9: Full Results for the All Sales Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	9.08	0.14	0.00	
Nbr LN SP96 hat All OI	0.16	0.01	0.00	7,459
AgeatSale	-0.007	0.0003	0.00	7,459
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00003	0.000002	0.00	7,459
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	7,459
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	7,459
Baths	0.08	0.01	0.00	7,459
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.01	0.00	2,287
CentralAC	0.12	0.01	0.00	3,785
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	2,708
FinBsmnt	0.09	0.01	0.00	990
Cul De Sac	0.09	0.01	0.00	1,472
Water Front	0.35	0.03	0.00	107
Cnd Low	-0.43	0.04	0.00	101
Cnd BAvg	-0.21	0.02	0.00	519
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,357
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	2,042
Cnd High	0.22	0.02	0.00	440
Vista Poor	-0.25	0.02	0.00	470
Vista BAvg	-0.09	0.01	0.00	4,301
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,912
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.01	0.00	659
Vista Prem	0.09	0.03	0.00	117
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	790
TXHC	-0.82	0.02	0.00	1,311
OKCC	-0.53	0.02	0.00	1,113
IABV	-0.31	0.02	0.00	822
ILLC	-0.05	0.02	0.02	412
WIKCDC	-0.17	0.01	0.00	810
PASC	-0.37	0.03	0.00	494
PAWC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	551
NYMCOC	-0.25	0.02	0.00	463
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	693
Pre-Construction Sales	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,522
No View	0.02	0.01	0.06	4,207
Minor View	0.00	0.02	0.76	561
Moderate View	0.03	0.03	0.38	106
Substantial View	0.03	0.07	0.63	35
Extreme View	0.06	0.08	0.43	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.06	0.05	0.23	80
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.08	0.05	0.08	65
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.01	0.79	2,359
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.01	0.01	0.58	2,200
Outside 5 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.76	1,000
Pre-Announcement Sales	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,755

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	6
Model Name	All Sales Model
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	7459
Number of Predictors (k)	39
F Statistic	579.9
Adjusted R Squared	0.75

Table A - 10: Full Results for the Temporal Aspects Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	9.11	0.14	0.00	
Nbr LN SP96 hat All OI	0.16	0.01	0.00	7,459
AgeatSale	-0.007	0.0003	0.00	7,459
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00003	0.000002	0.00	7,459
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	7,459
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	7,459
Baths	0.08	0.01	0.00	7,459
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.01	0.00	2,287
CentralAC	0.12	0.01	0.00	3,785
Fireplace	0.12	0.01	0.00	2,708
FinBsmnt	0.09	0.01	0.00	990
Cul De Sac	0.09	0.01	0.00	1,472
Water Front	0.35	0.03	0.00	107
Cnd Low	-0.43	0.04	0.00	101
Cnd BAvg	-0.21	0.02	0.00	519
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,357
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	2,042
Cnd High	0.22	0.02	0.00	440
Vista Poor	-0.25	0.02	0.00	470
Vista BAvg	-0.09	0.01	0.00	4,301
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,912
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.01	0.00	659
Vista Prem	0.09	0.03	0.00	117
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	790
TXHC	-0.82	0.02	0.00	1,311
OKCC	-0.52	0.02	0.00	1,113
IABV	-0.30	0.02	0.00	822
ILLC	-0.04	0.02	0.05	412
WIKCDC	-0.17	0.02	0.00	810
PASC	-0.37	0.03	0.00	494
PAWC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	551
NYMCOG	-0.25	0.02	0.00	463
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	693

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Note: Results for variables of interest shown on following page

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	6,729
Minor View	-0.02	0.01	0.20	561
Moderate View	0.00	0.03	0.97	106
Substantial View	0.01	0.07	0.87	35
Extreme View	0.04	0.07	0.59	28
Pre_Anc_Gtr2Yr_Lt1Mile	-0.13	0.06	0.02	38
Pre_Anc_2Yr_Lt1Mile	-0.10	0.05	0.06	40
Post_Anc_Pre_Con_Lt1Mile	-0.14	0.06	0.02	21
Post_Con_2Yr_Lt1Mile	-0.09	0.07	0.15	39
Post_Con_2_4Yr_Lt1Mile	-0.01	0.06	0.86	44
Post_Con_Gtr5Yr_Lt1Mile	-0.07	0.08	0.37	42
Pre_Anc_Gtr2Yr_1_3Mile	-0.04	0.03	0.19	283
Pre_Anc_2Yr_1_3Mile	0.00	0.03	0.91	592
Post_Anc_Pre_Con_1_3Mile	-0.02	0.03	0.53	342
Post_Con_2Yr_1_3Mile	0.00	0.03	0.90	807
Post_Con_2_4Yr_1_3Mile	0.01	0.03	0.78	503
Post_Con_Gtr5Yr_1_3Mile	0.00	0.03	0.93	710
Pre_Anc_Gtr2Yr_3_5Mile	0.00	0.04	0.93	157
Pre_Anc_2Yr_3_5Mile	0.00	0.03	0.98	380
Post_Anc_Pre_Con_3_5Mile	0.00	0.03	0.93	299
Post_Con_2Yr_3_5Mile	0.02	0.03	0.56	574
Post_Con_2_4Yr_3_5Mile	0.01	0.03	0.66	594
Post_Con_Gtr5Yr_3_5Mile	0.01	0.03	0.68	758
Pre_Anc_Gtr2Yr_Gtr5Mile	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	132
Pre_Anc_2Yr_Gtr5Mile	-0.03	0.04	0.39	133
Post_Anc_Pre_Con_Gtr5Mile	-0.03	0.03	0.36	105
Post_Con_2Yr_Gtr5Mile	-0.03	0.03	0.44	215
Post_Con_2_4Yr_Gtr5Mile	0.03	0.03	0.42	227
Post_Con_Gtr5Yr_Gtr5Mile	0.01	0.03	0.72	424

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	7
Model Name	Temporal Aspects Model
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	7459
Number of Predictors (k)	56
F Statistic	404.5
Adjusted R2	0.75

Table A - 11: Full Results for the Orientation Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	7.62	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.33	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.44	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.24	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.03	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.44	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.24	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.08	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.31	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.07	0.03	0.01	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
Minor View	-0.01	0.06	0.92	561
Moderate View	0.00	0.06	0.97	106
Substantial View	-0.01	0.09	0.87	35
Extreme View	0.02	0.17	0.89	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.04	0.07	0.55	67
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.37	58
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.83	2,019
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.22	1,923
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870
Front Orientation	-0.01	0.06	0.82	294
Back Orientation	0.03	0.06	0.55	280
Side Orientation	-0.03	0.06	0.55	253

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	8
Model Name	Orientation Model
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	40
F Statistic	410.0
Adjusted R Squared	0.77

Table A - 12: Full Results for the Overlap Model

	Coef.	SE	p Value	n
Intercept	7.61	0.18	0.00	
Nbr LN SalePrice96 hat	0.29	0.02	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale	-0.006	0.0004	0.00	4,937
AgeatSale Sqrd	0.00002	0.000003	0.00	4,937
Sqft 1000	0.28	0.01	0.00	4,937
Acres	0.02	0.00	0.00	4,937
Baths	0.09	0.01	0.00	4,937
ExtWalls Stone	0.21	0.02	0.00	1,486
CentralAC	0.09	0.01	0.00	2,575
Fireplace	0.11	0.01	0.00	1,834
FinBsmnt	0.08	0.02	0.00	673
Cul De Sac	0.10	0.01	0.00	992
Water Front	0.34	0.04	0.00	87
Cnd Low	-0.45	0.05	0.00	69
Cnd BAvg	-0.24	0.02	0.00	350
Cnd Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	2,727
Cnd AAvg	0.13	0.01	0.00	1,445
Cnd High	0.24	0.02	0.00	337
Vista Poor	-0.21	0.02	0.00	310
Vista BAvg	-0.08	0.01	0.00	2,857
Vista Avg	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	1,247
Vista AAvg	0.10	0.02	0.00	448
Vista Prem	0.13	0.04	0.00	75
WAOR	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	519
TXHC	-0.75	0.03	0.00	1,071
OKCC	-0.44	0.02	0.00	476
IABV	-0.24	0.02	0.00	605
ILLC	-0.09	0.03	0.00	213
WIKCDC	-0.14	0.02	0.00	725
PASC	-0.31	0.03	0.00	291
PAWC	-0.07	0.03	0.00	222
NYMCOC	-0.20	0.03	0.00	346
NYMC	-0.15	0.02	0.00	469
No View	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	4,207
Minor View	-0.03	0.02	0.10	561
Moderate View	-0.02	0.04	0.67	106
Substantial View	-0.05	0.09	0.57	35
Extreme View	-0.03	0.10	0.77	28
Inside 3000 Feet	-0.05	0.06	0.41	67
Between 3000 Feet and 1 Mile	-0.05	0.05	0.38	58
Between 1 and 3 Miles	0.00	0.02	0.82	2,019
Between 3 and 5 Miles	0.02	0.01	0.22	1,923
Outside 5 Miles	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	870
View Does Not Overlap Vista	Omitted	Omitted	Omitted	320
View Barely Overlaps Vista	0.05	0.03	0.09	150
View Somewhat Overlaps Vista	0.01	0.03	0.67	132
View Strongly Overlaps Vista	0.05	0.05	0.31	128

"Omitted" = reference category for fixed effects variables

"n" indicates number of cases in category when category = "1"

Model Information

Model Equation Number	9
Model Name	Overlap Model
Dependent Variable	LN_SalePrice96
Number of Cases	4937
Number of Predictors (k)	40
F Statistic	409.7
Adjusted R Squared	0.77