LBNL-6362E

ERNEST ORLANDO LAWRENCE BERKELEY NATIONAL LABORATORY

A Spatial Hedonic Analysis of the Effects of Wind Energy Facilities on Surrounding Property Values in the United States

Ben Hoen, Jason P. Brown, Thomas Jackson, Ryan Wiser, Mark Thayer and Peter Cappers

Environmental Energy Technologies Division

August 2013

This work was supported by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind and Water Power Technologies Office) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123.

LBNL-6362E

A Spatial Hedonic Analysis of the Effects of Wind Energy Facilities on Surrounding Property Values in the United States

Prepared for the

Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
Wind and Water Power Technologies Office
U.S. Department of Energy

Principal Authors:

Ben Hoen[†], Ryan Wiser, Peter Cappers
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,
1 Cyclotron Road, MS 90R4000, Berkeley, CA 94720-8136

Jason P. Brown
Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City
1 Memorial Drive, Kansas City, MO 64198-0001

Thomas Jackson, AICP, MAI, CRE, FRICS
Real Analytics Inc. and Texas A&M University
4805 Spearman Drive, College Station, TX 77845-4412

Mark A. Thayer
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Dr., San Diego, CA 92182-4485

August 2013

This work was supported by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind and Water Power Technologies Office) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH1123.

[†] Corresponding author: Phone: 845-758-1896; Email: bhoen@lbl.gov; Mailing address: 20 Sawmill Road, Milan NY 12571.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (Wind and Water Power Technologies Office) of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. For funding and supporting this work, we especially thank Patrick Gilman, Cash Fitzpatrick, and Mark Higgins (U.S. DOE). For providing the data that were central to the analysis contained herein, we thank Cameron Rogers (Fiserv) and Joshua Tretter (CoreLogic Inc.), both of whom were highly supportive and extremely patient throughout the complicated data-aquistion process. Finally, we would like to thank the many external reviewers for providing valuable comments on an earlier draft version of the report. Of course, any remaining errors or omissions are our own.

Abstract

Previous research on the effects of wind energy facilities on surrounding home values has been limited by small samples of relevant home-sale data and the inability to account adequately for confounding home-value factors and spatial dependence in the data. This study helps fill those gaps. We collected data from more than 50,000 home sales among 27 counties in nine states. These homes were within 10 miles of 67 different wind facilities, and 1,198 sales were within 1 mile of a turbine—many more than previous studies have collected. The data span the periods well before announcement of the wind facilities to well after their construction. We use OLS and spatial-process difference-in-difference hedonic models to estimate the home-value impacts of the wind facilities; these models control for value factors existing before the wind facilities' announcements, the spatial dependence of unobserved factors effecting home values, and value changes over time. A set of robustness models adds confidence to our results. Regardless of model specification, we find no statistical evidence that home values near turbines were affected in the post-construction or post-announcement/pre-construction periods. Previous research on potentially analogous disamenities (e.g., high-voltage transmission lines, roads) suggests that the property-value effect of wind turbines is likely to be small, on average, if it is present at all, potentially helping to explain why no evidence of an effect was found in the present research.

Table of Contents

Tables

Figures

1. Introduction

In 2012, approximately 13 gigawatts (GW) of wind turbines were installed in the United States, bringing total U.S. installed wind capacity to approximately 60 GW from more than 45,000 turbines (AWEA, 2013). Despite uncertainty about future extensions of the federal production tax credit, U.S. wind capacity is expected by some to continue growing by approximately 5–6 GW annually owing to state renewable energy standards and areas where wind can compete with natural gas on economics alone (Bloomberg, 2013); this translates into approximately 2,750 turbines per year.[1] Much of that development is expected to occur in relatively populated areas (e.g., New York, New England, the Mid-Atlantic and upper Midwest) (Bloomberg, 2013).

In part because of the expected wind development in more-populous areas, empirical investigations into related community concerns are required. One concern is that the values of properties near wind developments may be reduced; after all, it has been demonstrated that in some situations market perceptions about an area's disamenities (and amenities)[2] are capitalized into home prices (e.g., Boyle and Kiel, 2001; Jackson, 2001; Simons and Saginor, 2006). The published research about wind energy and property values has largely coalesced around a finding that homes sold after nearby wind turbines have been constructed do not experience statistically significant property value impacts. Additional research is required, however, especially for homes located within about a half mile of turbines, where impacts would be expected to be the largest. Data and studies are limited for these proximate homes in part because setback requirements generally result in wind facilities being sited in areas with relatively few houses, limiting available sales transactions that might be analyzed.

This study helps fill the research gap by collecting and analyzing data from 27 counties across nine U.S. states, related to 67 different wind facilities. Specifically, using the collected data, the study constructs a pooled model that investigates average effects near the turbines across the sample while controlling for the local effects of many potentially correlated independent variables. Property-value effect estimates are derived from two types of models: (1) an ordinary

---

[1] Assuming 2-MW turbines, the 2012 U.S. average (AWEA, 2013), and 5.5 GW of annual capacity growth.

[2] Disamenities and amenities are defined respectively as disadvantages (e.g., a nearby noxious industrial site) and advantages (e.g., a nearby park) of a location.

least squares (OLS) model, which is standard for this type of disamenity research (see, e.g., discussion in Jackson, 2003; Sirmans et al., 2005), and (2) a spatial-process model, which accounts for spatial dependence. Each type of model is used to construct a difference-in-difference (DD) specification—which simultaneously controls for preexisting amenities or disamenities in areas where turbines were sited and changes in the community after the wind facilities' construction was announced—to estimate effects near wind facilities after the turbines were announced and, later, after the turbines were constructed.[3]

The remainder of the report is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the current literature. Section 3 details our methodology. Section 4 describes the study data. Section 5 presents the results, and Section 6 provides a discussion and concluding remarks.

2. Previous Literature

Although the topic is relatively new, the peer-reviewed literature investigating impacts to home values near wind facilities is growing. To date, results largely have coalesced around a common set of non-significant findings generated from home sales after the turbines became operational. Previous Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) work in this area (Hoen et al., 2009, 2011) found no statistical evidence of adverse property-value effects due to views of and proximity to wind turbines after the turbines were constructed (i.e., post-construction or PC). Other peer-reviewed and/or academic studies also found no evidence of PC effects despite using a variety of techniques and residential transaction datasets. These include homes surrounding wind facilities in Cornwall, United Kingdom (Sims and Dent, 2007; Sims et al., 2008); multiple wind facilities in McLean County, Illinois (Hinman, 2010); near the Maple Ridge Wind Facility in New York (Heintzelman and Tuttle, 2011); and, near multiple facilities in Lee County, Illinois (Carter, 2011). Analogously, a 2012 Canadian case found a lack of evidence near a wind facility in Ontario to warrant the lowering of surrounding assessments (Kenney v MPAC, 2012). In contrast, one recent study did find impacts to land prices near a facility in North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany (Sunak and Madlener, 2012). Taken together, these results imply that the

[3] Throughout this report, the terms "announced/announcement" and "constructed/construction" represent the dates on which the proposed wind facility (or facilities) entered the public domain and the dates on which facility construction began, respectively. Home transactions can either be pre-announcement (PA), post-announcement/pre-construction (PAPC), or post-construction (PC).

PC effects of wind turbines on surrounding home values, if they exist, are often too small for detection or sporadic (i.e., a small percentage overall), or appearing in some communities for some types of properties but not others.

In the post-announcement, pre-construction period (i.e., PAPC), however, recent analysis has found more evidence of potential property value effects: by theorizing the possible existence of, but not finding, an effect (Laposa and Mueller, 2010; Sunak and Madlener, 2012); potentially finding an effect (Heintzelman and Tuttle, 2011)[4]; and, consistently finding what the author terms an "anticipation stigma" effect (Hinman, 2010). The studies that found PAPC property-value effects appear to align with earlier studies that suggested lower community support for proposed wind facilities before construction—potentially indicating a risk-averse (i.e., fear of the unknown) stance by community members—but increased support after facilities began operation (Gipe, 1995; Palmer, 1997; Devine-Wright, 2005; Wolsink, 2007; Bond, 2008, 2010). Similarly, researchers have found that survey respondents who live closer to turbines support the turbines more than respondents who live farther away (Braunholtz and MORI Scotland, 2003; Baxter et al., 2013), which could also indicate more risk-adverse / fear of the unknown effects (these among those who live farther away). Analogously, a recent case in Canada, although dismissed, highlighted the fears that nearby residents have for a planned facility (Wiggins v. WPD Canada Corporation, 2013)

Some studies have examined property-value conditions existing before wind facilities were announced (i.e., pre-announcement or PA). This is important for exploring correlations between wind facility siting and pre-existing home values from an environmental justice perspective and also for measuring PAPC and PC effects more accurately. Hoen et al. (2009, 2011) and Sims and Dent (2007) found evidence of depressed values for homes that sold before a wind facility's announcement and were located near the facility's eventual location, but they did not adjust their PC estimates for this finding. Hinman (2010) went further, finding value reductions of 12%–20% for homes near turbines in Illinois, which sold prior to the facilities' announcements; then using these findings to deflate their PC home-value-effect estimates.

[4] Heintzelman and Tuttle do not appear convinced that the effect they found is related to the PAPC period, yet the two counties in which they found an effect (Clinton and Franklin Counties, NY) had transaction data produced almost entirely in the PAPC period.

Some research has linked wind-related property-value effects with the effects of better-studied disamenities (Hoen et al., 2009). The broader disamenity literature (e.g., Boyle and Kiel, 2001; Jackson, 2001; Simons and Saginor, 2006) suggests that, although property-value effects might occur near wind facilities as they have near other disamenities, those effects (if they do exist) are likely to be relatively small, are unlikely to persist some distance from a facility, and might fade over time as home buyers who are more accepting of the condition move into the area (Tiebout, 1956).

For example, a review of the literature investigating effects near high-voltage transmission lines (a largely visual disturbance, as turbines may be for many surrounding homes) found the following: property-value reductions of 0%–15%; effects that fade with distance, often only affecting properties crossed by or immediately adjacent to a line or tower; effects that can increase property values when the right-of-way is considered an amenity; and effects that fade with time as the condition becomes more accepted (Kroll and Priestley, 1992). While potentially much more objectionable to residential communities than turbines, a review of the literature on landfills (which present odor, traffic, and groundwater-contamination issues) indicates effects that vary by landfill size (Ready, 2010). Large-volume operations (accepting more than 500 tons per day) reduce adjacent property values by 13.7% on average, fading to 5.9% one mile from the landfill. Lower-volume operations reduce adjacent property values by 2.7% on average, fading to 1.3% one mile away, with 20%–26% of lower-volume landfills not having any statistically significant impact. A study of 1,600 toxic industrial plant openings found adverse impacts of 1.5% within a half mile, which disappeared if the plants closed (Currie et al., 2012). Finally, a review of the literature on road noise (which might be analogous to turbine noise) shows property-value reductions of 0% –11% (median 4%) for houses adjacent to a busy road that experience a 10-dBA noise increase, compared with houses on a quiet street (Bateman et al., 2001).

It is not clear where wind turbines might fit into these ranges of impacts, but it seems unlikely that they would be considered as severe a disamenity as a large-volume landfill, which present odor, traffic, and groundwater-contamination issues. Low-volume landfills, with an effect near 3%, might be a better comparison, because they have an industrial (i.e., non-natural) quality, similar to turbines, but are less likely to have clear health effects. If sound is the primary concern, a 4% effect (corresponding to road noise) could be applied to turbines, which might correspond to a 10-dBA increase for houses within a half mile of a turbine (see e.g., Hubbard and Shepherd, 1991). Finally, as with transmission lines, if houses are in sight but not within sound distance of turbines, there may be no property-value effects unless those homes are immediately adjacent to the turbines. In summary, assuming these potentially analogous disamenity effects can be entirely transferred, turbine impacts might be 0%–14%, but more likely might coalesce closer to 3%–4%.

Of course, wind turbines have certain positive qualities that landfills, transmission lines, and roads do not always have, such as mitigating greenhouse gas emissions. no air or water pollution, no use of water during the generation of energy, and no generation of solid or hazardous waste that requires permanent storage/disposal (IPCC, 2011). Moreover, wind facilities can, and often do, provide economic benefits to local communities (Lantz and Tegen, 2009; Slattery et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2012; Loomis et al., 2012), which might not be the case for all other disamenities. Similarly, wind facilities can have direct positive effects on local government budgets through property tax or other similar payments (Loomis and Aldeman, 2011), which might, for example, improve school quality and thus increase nearby home values (e.g., Haurin and Brasington, 1996; Kane et al., 2006). These potential positive qualities might mitigate potential negative wind effects somewhat or even entirely. Therefore for the purposes of this research we will assume 3-4% is a maximum possible effect.

The potentially small average property-value effect of wind turbines, possibly reduced further by wind's positive traits, might help explain why effects have not been discovered consistently in previous research. To discover effects with small margins of error, large amounts of data are needed. However, previous datasets of homes very near turbines have been small. Hoen et al. (2009, 2011) used 125 PC transactions within a mile of the turbines, while others used far fewer PC transactions within a mile: Heintzelman and Tuttle (2012) (n ~ 35); Hinman (2010) (n ~ 11), Carter (2011) (n ~ 41), and Sunak and Madlener (2012) (n ~ 51). Although these numbers of observations are adequate to examine large impacts (e.g., over 10%), they are less likely to reveal small effects with any reasonable degree of statistical significance. Using results from Hoen et al. (2009) and the confidence intervals for the various fixed-effect variables in that study, estimates for the numbers of transactions needed to find effects of various sizes were obtained.

Approximately 50 cases are needed to find an effect of 10% and larger, 100 cases for 7.5%, 200 cases for 5%, 350 cases for 4%, 700 cases for 3%, and approximately 1,000 cases for a 2.5% effect.[5] Therefore, in order to detect an effect in the range of 3%–4%, a dataset of approximately 350–700 cases within a mile of the turbines will be required to detect it statistically, a number that to-date has not been amassed by any of the previous studies.

As discussed above, in addition to being relatively small on average, impacts are likely to decay with distance. As such, an appropriate empirical approach must be able to reveal spatially diminishing effects. Some researchers have used continuous variables to capture these effects, such as linear distance (Hoen et al., 2009; Sims et al., 2008) and inverse distance (Heintzelman and Tuttle, 2012; Sunak and Madlener, 2012), but doing so forces the model to estimate effects at the mean distance. In some cases, those means can be far from the area of expected impact. For example, Heintzelman and Tuttle (2012) estimated an inverse distance effect using a mean distance of more than 10 miles from the turbines, while Sunak and Madlener (2012) used a mean distance of approximately 1.9 miles. Using this approach weakens the ability of the model to quantify real effects near the turbines, where they are likely to be stronger. More importantly, this method encourages researchers to extrapolate their findings to the ends of the distance curve, near the turbines, despite having few data at those distances to support these extrapolations. This was the case for Heintzelman and Tuttle (2012), who had fewer than 10 cases within a half mile in the two counties where effects were found and only a handful that sold in those counties after the turbines were built, yet they extrapolated their findings to a quarter mile and even a tenth of a mile, where they had very few (if any) cases. Similarly, Sunak and Madlener (2012) had only six PC sales within a half mile and 51 within 1 mile, yet they extrapolated their findings to these distance bands.

One way to avoid using a single continuous function to estimate effects at all distances is to use a spline model, which breaks the distances into continuous groups (Hoen et al., 2011), but this method still imposes structure on the data by forcing the ends of each spline to tie together. A second and more transparent method is to use fixed-effect variables for discrete distances, which imposes little structure on the data (Hoen et al., 2009; Hinman, 2010; Carter, 2011; Hoen et al.,

---

[5] This analysis is available upon request from the authors.

2011). Although this latter method has been used in a number of studies, because of a paucity of data, the resulting models are often ineffective at detecting what might be relatively small effects very close to the turbines. As such, when using this method (or any other, in fact) it is important that the underlying dataset is large enough to estimate the anticipated magnitude of the effect sizes.

Finally, one rarely investigated aspect of potential wind-turbine effects is the possibly idiosyncratic nature of spatially averaged transaction data used in the hedonic analyses. Sunak and Madlener (2012) used a geographically weighted regression (GWR), which estimates different regressions for small clusters of data and then allows the investigation of the distribution of effects across all of the clusters. Although GWR can be effective for understanding the range of impacts across the study area, it is not as effective for determining an average effect or for testing the statistical significance of the range of estimates. Results from studies that use GWR methods are also sometimes counter-intuitive.[6] As is discussed in more detail in the methodology section, a potentially better approach is to estimate a spatial-process model that is flexible enough to simultaneously control for spatial heterogeneity and spatial dependence, while also estimating an average effect across fixed discrete effects.

In summary, building on the existing literature, further research is needed on property-value effects in particularly close proximity to wind turbines. Specifically, research is needed that uses a large set of data near the turbines, accounts for home values before the announcement of the facility (as well as after announcement but before construction), accounts for potential spatial dependence in unobserved factors effecting home values, and uses a fixed-effect distance model that is able to accurately estimate effects near turbines.

3. Methodology

The present study seeks to respond to the identified research needs noted above, with this section describing our methodological framework for estimating the effects of wind turbines on the value of nearby homes in the United States.

[6] For example, Sunak and Madlener (2012) find larger effects related to the turbines in a city that is farther from the turbines than they find in a town which is closer. Additionally, they find stronger effects in the center of a third town than they do on the outskirts of that town, which do not seem related to the location of the turbines.

3.1. Basic Approach and Models

Our methods are designed to help answer the following questions:

1. Did homes that sold prior to the wind facilities' announcement (PA)—and located within a short distance (e.g., within a half mile) from where the turbines were eventually located—sell at lower prices than homes located farther away?
2. Did homes that sold after the wind facilities' announcement but before construction (PAPC)—and located within a short distance (e.g., within a half mile)—sell at lower prices than homes located farther away?
3. Did homes that sold after the wind facilities' construction (PC)—and located within a short distance (e.g., within a half mile)—sell at lower prices than homes located farther away?
4. For question 3 above, if no statistically identifiable effects are found, what is the likely maximum effect possible given the margins of error around the estimates?

To answer these questions, the hedonic pricing model (Rosen, 1974; Freeman, 1979) is used in this paper, as it has been in other disamenity research (Boyle and Kiel, 2001; Jackson, 2001; Simons and Saginor, 2006). The value of this approach is that is allows one to disentangle and control for the potentially competing influences of home, site, neighborhood, and market characteristics on property values, and to uniquely determine how home values near announced or operating facilities are affected.[7] To test for these effects, two pairs of "base" models are estimated, which are then coupled with a set of "robustness" models to test and bound the estimated effects. One pair is estimated using a standard OLS model, and the other is estimated using a spatial-process model. The models in each pair are different in that one focuses on all homes within 1 mile of an existing turbine (*one-mile* models), which allows the maximum number of data for the fixed effect to be used, while the other focuses on homes within a half mile (*half-mile* models), where effects are more likely to appear but fewer data are available. We assume that, if effects exist near turbines, they are larger for the *half-mile* models than the *one-mile* models.

---

[7] See Jackson (2003) for a further discussion of the Hedonic Pricing Model and other analysis methods.

As is common in the literature (Malpezzi, 2003; Sirmans et al., 2005), a semi-log functional form of the hedonic pricing model is used for all models, where the dependent variable is the natural log of sales price. The OLS *half-mile* model form is as follows:

$$\ln(SP_i) = \alpha + \sum_a \beta_1 (T_i \bullet S_i) + \beta_2 (W_i) + \sum_b \beta_3 (X_i \bullet C_i) + \beta_4 (D_i \bullet P_i) + \varepsilon_i \qquad (1)$$

where

SP_i represents the sale price for transaction *i*,

α is the constant (intercept) across the full sample,

T_i is a vector of time-period dummy variables (e.g., sale year and if the sale occurred in winter) in which transaction *i* occurred,

S_i is the state in which transaction *i* occurred,

W_i is the census tract in which transaction *i* occurred,

X_i is a vector of home, site, and neighborhood characteristics for transaction *i* (e.g., square feet, age, acres, bathrooms, condition, percent of block group vacant and owned, median age of block group),[8]

C_i is the county in which transaction *i* occurred,

D_i is a vector of four fixed-effect variables indicating the distance (to the nearest turbine) bin (i.e., group) in which transaction *i* is located (e.g., within a half mile, between a half and 1 mile, between 1 and 3 miles, and between 3 and 10 miles),

P_i is a vector of three fixed-effect variables indicating the wind project development period in which transaction *i* occurred (e.g., PA, PAPC, PC),

$B_{1\text{-}3}$ is a vector of estimates for the controlling variables,

B_4 is a vector of 12 parameter estimates of the distance-development period interacted variables of interest,

ε_i is a random disturbance term for transaction *i*.

This pooled construction uses all property transactions in the entire dataset. In so doing, it takes advantage of the large dataset in order to estimate an average set of turbine-related effects across all study areas, while simultaneously allowing for the estimation of controlling characteristics at

---

[8] A "block group" is a US Census Bureau geographic delineation that contains a population between 600 to 3000 persons.

the local level, where they are likely to vary substantially across the study areas.[9] Specifically, the interaction of county-level fixed effects (C_i) with the vector of home, site, and neighborhood characteristics (X_i) allows different slopes for each of these independent variables to be estimated for each county. Similarly, interacting the state fixed-effect variables (S_i) with the sale year and sale winter fixed effects variables (T_i) (i.e., if the sale occurred in either Q1 or Q4) allows the estimation of the respective inflation/deflation and seasonal adjustments for each state in the dataset.[10] Finally, to control for the potentially unique collection of neighborhood characteristics that exist at the micro-level, census tract fixed effects are estimated.[11] Because a pooled model is used that relies upon the full dataset, smaller effect sizes for wind turbines will be detectable. At the same time, however, this approach does not allow one to distinguish possible wind turbine effects that may be larger in some communities than in others.

As discussed earlier, effects might predate the announcement of the wind facility and thus must be controlled for. Additionally, the area surrounding the wind facility might have changed over time simultaneously with the arrival of the turbines, which could affect home values. For example, if a nearby factory closed at the same time a wind facility was constructed, the influence of that factor on all homes in the general area would ideally be controlled for when estimating wind turbine effect sizes.

To control for both of these issues simultaneously, we use a difference-in-difference (*DD)* specification (see e.g., Hinman, 2010; Zabel and Guignet, 2012) derived from the interaction of

---

[9] The dataset does not include "participating" landowners, those that have turbines situated on their land, but does include "neighboring" landowners, those adjacent to or nearby the turbines. One reviewer notes that the estimated average effects also include any effects from payments "neighboring" landowners might receive that might transfer with the home. Based on previous conversations with developers (see Hoen et al, 2009), we expect that the frequency of these arrangements is low, as is the right to transfer the payments to the new homeowner. Nonetheless, our results should be interpreted as "net" of any influence whatever "neighboring" landowner arrangements might have.

[10] Unlike the vector of home, site, and neighborhood characteristics, sale price inflation/deflation and seasonal changes were not expected tovary substantially across various counties in the same states in our sample and therefore the interaction was made at the state level. This assumption was tested as part of the robustness tests though, where they are interacted at the county level and found to not affect the results.

[11] In part because of the rural nature of many of the study areas included in the research sample, these census tracts are large enough to contain sales that are located close to the turbines as well as those farther away, thereby ensuring that they do not unduly absorb effects that might be related to the turbines. Moreover each tract contains sales from throughout the study periods, both before and after the wind facilities' announcement and construction, further ensuring they are not biasing the variables of interest.

the spatial (*D_i*) and temporal (*P_i*) terms. These terms produce a vector of 11 parameter estimates (*β_4*) as shown in Table 1 for the *half-mile* models and in Table 2 for the *one-mile* models. The omitted (or reference) group in both models is the set of homes that sold prior to the wind facilities' announcement and which were located more than 3 miles away from where the turbines were eventually located (A3). It is assumed that this reference category is likely not affected by the imminent arrival of the turbines, although this assumption is tested in the robustness tests.

Using the *half-mile* models, to test whether the homes located near the turbines that sold in the PA period were uniquely affected (*research question 1*), we examine A0, from which the null hypothesis is A0=0. To test if the homes located near the turbines that sold in the PAPC period were uniquely affected (*research question 2*), we first determine the difference in their values as compared to those farther away (B0-B3), while also accounting for any pre-announcement (i.e., pre-existing) difference (A0-A3) and any change in the local market over the development period (B3-A3). Because all covariates are determined in relation to the omitted category (A3), the null hypothesis collapses B0-A0-B3=0. Finally, in order to determine if homes near the turbines that sold in the PC period were uniquely affected (*research question 3*), we test if C0-A0-C3=0. Each of these *DD* tests are estimated using a linear combination of variables that produces the "net effect" and a measure of the standard error and corresponding confidence intervals of the effect, which enables the estimation of the maximum (and minimum) likely impacts for each research question. We use 90% confidence intervals both to determine significance and to estimate maximum likely effects (*research question 4*).

Following the same logic as above, the corresponding hypothesis tests for the *one-mile* models are as follows: *PA*, A1=0; *PAPC*, B1-A1-B3=0; and, *PC*, C1-A1-C3=0.

Table 1: Interactions between Wind Facility Development Periods and Distances – ½ Mile

		Distances to Nearest Turbine			
Wind Facility Development Periods		Within 1/2 Mile	Between 1/2 and 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Outside of 3 Miles
Prior to Announcement		A0	A1	A2	A3 (Omitted)
After Announcement but Prior to Construction		B0	B1	B2	B3
Post Construction		C0	C1	C2	C3

Table 2: Interactions between Wind Facility Development Periods and Distances - 1 Mile

		Distances to Nearest Turbine		
Wind Facility Development Periods		Within 1 Mile	Between 1 and 3 Miles	Outside of 3 Miles
Prior to Announcement		A1	A2	A3 (Omitted)
After Announcement but Prior to Construction		B1	B2	B3
Post Construction		C1	C2	C3

3.2. Spatial Dependence

As discussed briefly above, a common feature of the data used in hedonic models is the spatially dense nature of the real estate transactions. While this spatial density can provide unique insights into local real estate markets, one concern that is often raised is the impact of potentially omitted variables given that this is impossible to measure all of the local characteristics that affect housing prices. As a result, spatial dependence in a hedonic model is likely because houses located closer to each other typically have similar unobservable attributes. Any correlation between these unobserved factors and the explanatory variables used in the model (e.g., distance to turbines) is a source of omitted-variable bias in the OLS models. A common approach used in the hedonic literature to correct this potential bias is to include local fixed effects (Hoen et al., 2009, 2011; Zabel and Guignet, 2012), which is our approach as described in formula (1).

In addition to including local fixed effects, spatial econometric methods can be used to help further mitigate the potential impact of spatially omitted variables by modeling spatial dependence directly. When spatial dependence is present and appropriately modeled, more accurate (i.e., less biased) estimates of the factors influencing housing values can be obtained. These methods have been used in a number of previous hedonic price studies; examples include the price impacts of wildfire risk (Donovan et al., 2007), residential community associations (Rogers, 2006), air quality (Anselin and Lozano-Gracia, 2009), and spatial fragmentation of land use (Kuethe, 2012). To this point, however, these methods have not been applied to studies of the impact of wind turbines on property values.

Moran's I is the standard statistic used to test for spatial dependence in OLS residuals of the hedonic equation. If the Moran's I is statistically significant (as it is in our models – see Section 5.1.2), the assumption of spatial independence is rejected. To account for this, in spatial-process models, spatial dependence is routinely modeled as an additional covariate in the form of a spatially lagged dependent variable *Wy*, or in the error structure $\mu = \lambda W\mu + \varepsilon$, where ε is an identically and independently distributed disturbance term (Anselin, 1988). Neighboring criterion determines the structure of the spatial weights matrix *W*, which is frequently based on contiguity, distance criterion, or *k*-nearest neighbors (Anselin, 2002). The weights in the spatial-weights matrix are typically row standardized so that the elements of each row sum to one.

The spatial-process model, known as the SARAR model (Kelejian and Prucha, 1998)[12], allows for both forms of spatial dependence, both as an autoregressive process in the lag-dependent and in the error structure, as shown by:

$$\begin{aligned} y &= \rho W y + X\beta + \mu, \\ \mu &= \lambda W\mu + \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

[12] SARAR refers to a "spatial-autoregressive model with spatial autoregressive residuals".

Equation (2) is often estimated by a multi-step procedure using generalized moments and instrumental variables (Arraiz et al., 2009), which is our approach. The model allows for the innovation term ε in the disturbance process to be heteroskedastic of an unknown form (Kelejian and Prucha, 2010). If either λ or ρ are not significant, the model reduces to the respective spatial lag or spatial error model (SEM). In our case, as is discussed later, the spatial process model reduces to the SEM, therefore both *half-mile* and *one-mile* SEMs are estimated, and, as with the OLS models discussed above, a similar set of *DD* "net effects" are estimated for the PA, PAPC, and PC periods. One requirement of the spatial model is that the x/y coordinates be unique across the dataset. However, the full set of data (as described below) contains, in some cases, multiple sales for the same property, which consequently would have non-unique x/y coordinates.[13] Therefore, for the spatial models, only the most recent sale is used. An OLS model using this limited dataset is also estimated as a robustness test.

In total, four "base" models are estimated: an OLS *one-mile* model, a SEM *one-mile* model, an OLS *half-mile* model, and a SEM *half-mile* model. In addition, a series of robustness models are estimated as described next.

3.3. Robustness Tests

To test the stability of and potentially bound the results from the four base models, a series of robustness tests are conducted that explore: the effect that outliers and influential cases have on the results; a micro-inflation/deflation adjustment by interacting the sale-year fixed effects with the county fixed effects rather than state fixed effects; the use of only the most recent sale of homes in the dataset to compare results to the SEM models that use the same dataset; the application of a more conservative reference category by using transactions between 5 and 10 miles (as opposed to between 3 and 10 miles) as the reference; and a more conservative

---

[13] The most recent sale weights the transactions to those occurring after announcement and construction, that are more recent in time. One reviewer wondered if the frequency of sales was affected near the turbines, which is also outside the scope of the study, though this "sales volume" was investigated in Hoen et al. (2009), where no evidence of such an effect was discovered. Another correctly noted that the most recent assessment is less accurate for older sales, because it might overestimate some characteristics of the home (e.g., sfla, baths) that might have changed (i.e., increased) over time. This would tend to bias those characteristics' coefficients downward. Regardless, it is assumed that this occurrence is not correlated with proximity to turbines and therefore would not bias the variables of interest.

reference category by using transactions more than 2 years PA (as opposed to simply PA) as the reference category. Each of these tests is discussed in detail below.

3.3.1. Outliers and Influential Cases

Most datasets contain a subset of observations with particularly high or low values for the dependent variables, which might bias estimates in unpredictable ways. In our robustness test, we assume that observations with sales prices above or below the 99% and 1% percentile are potentially problematic outliers. Similarly, individual sales transactions and the values of the corresponding independent variables might exhibit undue influence on the regression coefficients. In our analysis, we therefore estimate a set of Cook's Distance statistics (Cook, 1977; Cook and Weisberg, 1982) on the base OLS *half-mile* model and assume any cases with an absolute value of this statistic greater than one to be potentially problematic influential cases. To examine the influence of these cases on our results, we estimate a model with both the outlying sales prices and Cook's influential cases removed.

3.3.2. Interacting Sale Year at the County Level

It is conceivable that housing inflation and deflation varied dramatically in different parts of the same state. In the base models, we interact sale year with the state to account for inflation and deflation of sales prices, but a potentially more-accurate adjustment might be warranted. To explore this, a model with the interaction of sale year and county, instead of state, is estimated.

3.3.3. Using Only the Most Recent Sales

The dataset for the base OLS models includes not only the most recent sale of particular homes, but also, if available, the sale prior to that. Some of these earlier sales occurred many years prior to the most recent sale. The home and site characteristics (square feet, acres, condition, etc.) used in the models are populated via assessment data for the home. For some of these data, only the most recent assessment information is available (rather than the assessment from the time of sale), and therefore older sales might be more prone to error as their characteristics might have changed since the sale.[14] Additionally, the SEMs require that all x/y coordinates entered into the model are unique; therefore, for those models only the most recent sale is used. Excluding older sales therefore potentially reduces measurement error, and also enables a more-direct comparison of effects between the base OLS model and SEM results.

3.3.4. Using Homes between 5 and 10 Miles as Reference Category

The base models use the collection of homes between 3 and 10 miles from the wind facility (that sold before the announcement of the facility) as the reference category in which wind facility effects are not expected. However, it is conceivable that wind turbine effects extend farther than 3 miles. If homes outside of 3 miles are affected by the presence of the turbines, then effects estimated for the target group (e.g., those inside of 1 mile) will be biased downward (i.e., smaller) in the base models. To test this possibility and ensure that the results are not biased, the group of homes located between 5 and 10 miles is used as a reference category as a robustness test.

3.3.5. Using Transactions Occurring More than 2 Years before Announcement as Reference Category

The base models use the collection of homes that sold before the wind facilities were announced (and were between 3 and 10 miles from the facilities) as the reference category, but, as discussed in Hoen et al. (2009, 2011), the announcement date of a facility, when news about a facility enters the public domain, might be after that project was known in private. For example, wind facility developers may begin talking to landowners some time before a facility is announced, and these landowners could share that news with neighbors. In addition, the developer might erect an anemometer to collect wind-speed data well before the facility is formally "announced," which might provide concrete evidence that a facility may soon to be announced. In either case, this news might enter the local real estate market and affect home prices before the formal facility announcement date. To explore this possibility, and to ensure that the reference category

---

[14] As discussed in more detail in the Section 4, approximately 60% of all the data obtained for this study (that obtained from CoreLogic) used the most recent assessment to populate the home and site characteristics for all transactions of a given property.

is unbiased, a model is estimated that uses transactions occurring more than 2 years before the wind facilities were announced (and between 3 and 10 miles) as the reference category.

Combined, this diverse set of robustness tests allows many assumptions used for the base models to be tested, potentially allowing greater confidence in the final results.

4. Data

The data used for the analysis are comprised of four types: wind turbine location data, real estate transaction data, home and site characteristic data, and census data. From those, two additional sets of data are calculated: distance to turbine and wind facility development period. Each data type is discussed below. Where appropriate, variable names are shown in *italics*.

4.1. Wind Turbine Locations

Location data (i.e., x/y coordinates) for installed wind turbines were obtained via an iterative process starting with Federal Aviation Administration obstacle data, which were then linked to specific wind facilities by Ventyx[15] and matched with facility-level data maintained by LBNL. Ultimately, data were collected on the location of almost all wind turbines installed in the U.S. through 2011 (*n* ~ 40,000), with information about each facility's announcement, construction, and operation dates as well as turbine nameplate capacity, hub height, rotor diameter, and facility size.

4.2. Real Estate Transactions

Real estate transaction data were collected through two sources, each of which supplied the home's sale price (*sp*), sale date (*sd*), x/y coordinates, and address including zip code. From those, the following variables were calculated: natural log of sale price (*lsp*), sale year (*sy*), if the sale occurred in winter (*swinter*) (i.e., in Q1 or Q4).

The first source of real estate transaction data was CoreLogic's extensive dataset of U.S. residential real estate information.[16] Using the x/y coordinates of wind turbines, CoreLogic

[15] See the EV Energy Map, which is part of the Velocity Suite of products at www.ventyx.com.
[16] See www.corelogic.com.

selected all arms-length single-family residential transactions between 1996 and 2011 within 10 miles of a turbine in any U.S. counties where they maintained data (not including New York – see below) on parcels smaller than 15 acres.[17] The full set of counties for which data were collected were then winnowed to 26 by requiring at least 250 transactions in each county, to ensure a reasonably robust estimation of the controlling characteristics (which, as discussed above, are interacted with county-level fixed effects), and by requiring at least one PC transaction within a half mile of a turbine in each county (because this study's focus is on homes that are located in close proximity to turbines).

The second source of data was the New York Office of Real Property Tax Service (NYORPTS),[18] which supplied a set of arms-length single-family residential transactions between 2001 and 2012 within 10 miles of existing turbines in any New York county in which wind development had occurred prior to 2012. As before, only parcels smaller than 15 acres were included, as were a minimum of 250 transactions and at least one PC transaction within a half mile of a turbine for each New York county. Both CoreLogic and NYORPTS provided the most recent home sale and, if available, the prior sale.

4.3. Home and Site Characteristics

A set of home and site characteristic data was also collected from both data suppliers: 1000s of square feet of living area (*sfla1000*), number of acres of the parcel (*acres*), year the home was built (or last renovated, whichever is more recent) (*yrbuilt*), and the number of full and half bathrooms (*baths*).[19] Additional variables were calculated from the other variables as well: log of 1,000s of square feet (*lsfla1000*),[20] the number of acres less than 1 (*lt1acre)*,[21] age at the time of sale (*age*), and age squared (*agesqr*).[22]

---

[17] The 15 acre screen was used because of a desire to exclude from the sample any transaction of property that might be hosting a wind turbine, and therefore directly benefitting from the turbine's presence (which might then increase property values). To help ensure that the screen was effective, all parcels within a mile of a turbine were also visually inspected using satellite and ortho imagery via a geographic information system.

[18] See www.orps.state.ny.us

[19] *Baths* was calculated in the following manner: full bathrooms + (half bathrooms x 0.5). Some counties did not have *baths* data available, so for them *baths* was not used as an independent variable.

[20] The distribution of *sfla1000* is skewed, which could bias OLS estimates, thus *lsfla1000* is used instead, which is more normally distributed. Regression results, though, were robust when *sfla1000* was used instead.

Regardless of when the sale occurred, CoreLogic supplied the related home and site characteristics as of the most recent assessment, while NYORPTS supplied the assessment data as of the year of sale.[23]

4.4. Census Information

Each of the homes in the data was matched (based on the x/y coordinates) to the underlying census block group and tract via ArcGIS. Using the year 2000 block group census data, each transaction was appended with neighborhood characteristics including the median age of the residents (*medage*), the total number of housing units (*units*), the number vacant (*vacant*) homes, and the number of owned (*owned*) homes. From these, the percentages of the total number of housing units in the block group that were vacant and owned were calculated, i.e., *pctvacant* and *pctowned*.

4.5. Distances to Turbine

Using the x/y coordinates of both the homes and the turbines, a Euclidian distance (in miles) was calculated for each home to the nearest wind turbine (*tdis*), regardless of when the sale occurred (e.g., even if a transaction occurred prior to the wind facility's installation).[24] These were then broken into four mutually exclusive distance bins (i.e., groups) for the base *half-mile* models: inside a half mile, between a half and 1 mile, between 1 and 3 miles, and between 3 and 10 miles. They were broken into three mutually exclusive bins for the base *one-mile* models: inside 1 mile, between 1 and 3 miles, and between 3 and 10 miles.

4.6. Wind Facility Development Periods

After identifying the nearest wind turbine for each home, a match could be made to Ventyx' dataset of facility-development announcement and construction dates. These facility-development dates in combination with the dates of each sale of the homes determined in which

---

[21] This variable allows the separate estimations of the 1st acre and any additional acres over the 1st.

[22] *Age* and *agesqr* together account for the fact that, as homes age, their values usually decrease, but further increases in age might bestow countervailing positive "antique" effects.

[23] See footnote 13.

[24] Before the distances were calculated, each home inside of 1 mile was visually inspected using satellite and ortho imagery, with x/y coordinates corrected, if necessary, so that those coordinates were on the roof of the home.

of the three facility-development periods (*fdp*) the transaction occurred: *pre-announcement* (PA), *post-announcement-pre-construction* (PAPC), or *post-construction* (PC).

4.7. Data Summary

After cleaning to remove missing or erroneous data, a final dataset of 51,276 transactions was prepared for analysis.[25] As shown in the map of the study area (Figure 1), the data are arrayed across nine states and 27 counties (see Table 4), and surround 67 different wind facilities.

Table 3 contains a summary of those data. The average unadjusted sales price for the sample is $122,475. Other average house characteristics include the following: 1,600 square feet of living space; house age of 48 years[26]; land parcel size of 0.90 acres; 1.6 bathrooms; in a block group in which 74% of housing units are owned, 9% are vacant, and the median resident age is 38 years; located 4.96 miles from the nearest turbine; and sold at the tail end of the PA period.

The data are arrayed across the temporal and distance bins as would be expected, with smaller numbers of sales nearer the turbines, as shown in Table 5. Of the full set of sales, 1,198 occurred within 1 mile of a then-current or future turbine location, and 376 of these occurred post construction; 331 sales occurred within a half mile, 104 of which were post construction. Given these totals, the models should be able to discern a post construction effect larger than ~3.5% within a mile and larger than ~7.5% within a half mile (see discussion in Section 2). These effects are at the top end of the expected range of effects based on other disamenities (high-voltage power lines, roads, landfills, etc.).

---

[25] Cleaning involved the removal of all data that did not have certain core characteristics (sale date, sale price, *sfla*, *yrbuilt*, *acres*, *median age*, etc.) fully populated as well as the removal of any sales that had seemingly miscoded data (e.g., having a *sfla* that was greater than *acres*, having a *yrbuilt* more than 1 year after the sale, having less than one *bath*) or that did not conform to the rest of the data (e.g., had *acres* or *sfla* that were either larger or smaller, respectively, than 99% or 1% of the data). OLS models were rerun with those "nonconforming" data included with no substantive change in the results in comparison to the screened data presented in the report.

[26] Age could be as low as -1(for a new home) for homes that were sold before construction was completed.

Figure 1: Map of Transactions, States, and Counties



Table 3: Summary Statistics

Variable	Description	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
sp	sale price in dollars	$ 122,475	$ 80,367	$ 9,750	$ 690,000
lsp	natural log of sale price	11.52	0.65	9.19	13.44
sd	sale date	1/18/2005	1,403 days	1/1/1996	9/30/2011
sy	sale year	2005	3.84	1996	2011
sfla1000	living area in 1000s of square feet	1.60	0.57	0.60	4.50
lsfla1000	natural log of sfla1000	0.41	0.34	-0.50	1.50
acres	number of acres in parcel	0.90	1.79	0.03	14.95
acreslt1*	acres less than 1	-0.58	0.34	-0.97	0.00
age	age of home at time of sale	48	37	-1	297
agesq	age squared	3689	4925	0	88209
baths**	number of bathrooms	1.60	0.64	1.00	5.50
pctowner	fraction of house units in block group that are owned (as of 2000)	0.74	0.17	0.63	0.98
pctvacant	fraction of house units in block group that are vacant (as of 2000)	0.09	0.10	0.00	0.38
med_age	median age of residents in block group (as of 2000)	38	6	20	63
tdis	distance to nearest turbine (as of December 2011) in miles	4.96	2.19	0.09	10.00
fdp***	facility development period of nearest turbine at time of sale	1.94	0.87	1.00	3.00

Note: The number of cases for the full dataset is 51,276

** acreslt1 is calculated as follows: acres (if less than 1) * - 1*

*** Some counties did not have bathrooms populated; for those, these variables are entered into the regression as 0.*

**** fdp periods are: 1, pre-announcement,; 2, post-announcement-pre-construction; and, 3, post-construction.*

Table 4: Summary of Transactions by County

County	State	<1/2 mile	1/2-1 mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles	Total
Carroll	IA	12	56	331	666	1,065
Floyd	IA	3	2	402	119	526
Franklin	IA	8	1	9	322	340
Sac	IA	6	77	78	485	646
DeKalb	IL	4	8	44	605	661
Livingston	IL	16	6	237	1,883	2,142
McLean	IL	18	88	380	4,359	4,845
Cottonwood	MN	3	10	126	1,012	1,151
Freeborn	MN	17	16	117	2,521	2,671
Jackson	MN	19	28	36	149	232
Martin	MN	7	25	332	2,480	2,844
Atlantic	NJ	34	96	1,532	6,211	7,873
Paulding	OH	15	58	115	309	497
Wood	OH	5	31	563	4,844	5,443
Custer	OK	45	24	1,834	349	2,252
Grady	OK	1	6	97	874	978
Fayette	PA	1	2	10	284	297
Somerset	PA	23	100	1,037	2,144	3,304
Wayne	PA	4	29	378	739	1,150
Kittitas	WA	2	6	61	349	418
Clinton	NY	4	6	49	1,419	1,478
Franklin	NY	16	41	75	149	281
Herkimer	NY	3	17	354	1,874	2,248
Lewis	NY	5	6	93	732	836
Madison	NY	5	26	239	3,053	3,323
Steuben	NY	5	52	140	1,932	2,129
Wyoming	NY	50	50	250	1,296	1,646
Total		331	867	8,919	41,159	51,276

Table 5: Frequency Crosstab of Wind Turbine Distance and Development Period Bins

	<1/2 mile	1/2-1 mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles	total
PA	143	383	3,892	16,615	21,033
PAPC	84	212	1,845	9,995	12,136
PC	104	272	3,182	14,549	18,107
total	331	867	8,919	41,159	51,276

As shown in Table 6, the home sales occurred around wind facilities that range from a single-turbine project to projects of 150 turbines, with turbines of 290–476 feet (averaging almost 400 feet) in total height from base to tip of blade and with an average nameplate capacity of 1,637 kW. The average facility was announced in 2004 and constructed in 2007, but some were announced as early as 1998 and others were constructed as late as 2011.

Table 6: Wind Facility Summary

	mean	min	25th percentile	median	75th percentile	max
turbine rotor diameter (feet)	262	154	253	253	269	328
turbine hub height (feet)	256	197	256	262	262	328
turbine total height (feet)	388	290	387	389	397	476
turbine capacity (kW)	1637	660	1500	1500	1800	2500
facility announcement year	2004	1998	2002	2003	2005	2010
facility construction year	2007	2000	2004	2006	2010	2011
number of turbines in facility	48	1	5	35	84	150
nameplate capacity of facility (MW)	79	1.5	7.5	53	137	300

Note: The data correspond to 67 wind facilities located in the study areas. Mean values are rounded to integers

4.8. Comparison of Means

To provide additional context for the analysis discussed in the next section, we further summarize the data here using four key variables across the sets of development period (*fdp*) and distance bins (*tdis*) used in the *one-mile* models.[27] The variables are the dependent variable log of sale price *(lsp)* and three independent variables: *lsfla100*, *acres*, and *age*. These summaries are provided in Table 7; each sub-table gives the mean values of the variables across the three *fdp* bins and three *tdis* bins, and the corresponding figures plot those values.

The top set of results are focused on the log of the sales price, and show that, based purely on price and not controlling for differences in homes, homes located within 1 mile of turbines had lower sale prices than homes farther away; this is true across all of the three development periods. Moreover, the results also show that, over the three periods, the closer homes appreciated to a somewhat lesser degree than homes located farther from the turbines. As a result, focusing only on the post-construction period, these results might suggest that home prices near turbines are

[27] Summaries for the *half-mile* models reveal a similar relationship, so only the *one-mile* model summaries are shown here.

adversely impacted by the turbines. After all, the logarithmic values for the homes within a mile of the turbines (11.39) and those outside of a three miles (11.72) translate into an approximately 40% difference, in comparison to an 21% difference before the wind facilities were announced (11.16 vs. 11.35).[28] Focusing on the change in average values between the pre-announcement and post-construction periods might also suggest an adverse effect due to the turbines, because homes inside of 1 mile appreciated more slowly (11.16 to 11.39, or 25%) than those outside of 3 miles (11.35 to 11.72, or 45%). Both conclusions of adverse turbine effects, however, disregard other important differences between the homes, which vary over the periods and distances. Similarly, comparing the values of the PA inside 1 mile homes (11.16) and the PC outside of 3 miles homes (11.72), which translates into a difference of 75%, and which is the basis for comparison in the regressions discussed below, but also ignores any differences in the underlying characteristics.

The remainder of Table 7, for example, indicates that, although the homes that sold within 1 mile are lower in value, they are also generally (in all but the PA period) smaller, on larger parcels of land, and older. These differences in home size and age across the periods and distances might explain the differences in price, while the differences in the size of the parcel, which add value, further amplifying the differences in price. Without controlling for these possible impacts, one cannot reliably estimate the impact of wind turbines on sales prices.

In summary, focusing solely on trends in home price (or price per square foot) alone, and for only the PC period, as might be done in a simpler analysis, might incorrectly suggest that wind turbines are affecting price when other aspects of the markets, and other home and sites characteristic differences, could be driving the observed price differences. This is precisely why researchers generally prefer the hedonic model approach to control for such effects, and the results from our hedonic OLS and spatial modeling detailed in the next section account for these and many other possible influencing factors.

---

[28] Percentage differences are calculated as follows: exp(11.72-11.39)-1=0.40 and exp(11.35-11.16)-1=0.21.

Table 7: Dependent and Independent Variable Means

Sale Price	<1mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles
PA	$ 84,830	$ 98,676	$100,485
PAPC	$ 95,223	$127,054	$124,532
PC	$109,133	$134,647	$151,559



Log of Sale Price	<1mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles
PA	11.16	11.32	11.35
PAPC	11.30	11.52	11.56
PC	11.39	11.61	11.72



Log of Square Feet (in 1000s)	<1mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles
PA	0.43	0.42	0.38
PAPC	0.38	0.42	0.42
PC	0.38	0.42	0.44



Number of Acres	<1mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles
PA	2.08	0.80	0.83
PAPC	1.98	0.94	0.90
PC	2.09	0.84	0.89



Age at the Time of Sale	<1mile	1-3 miles	3-10 miles
PA	55.32	42.34	47.19
PAPC	58.01	50.34	49.73
PC	58.63	47.39	47.73



5. Results

This section contains analysis results and discussion for the four base models, as well as the results from the robustness models.

5.1. Estimation Results for Base Models

Estimation results for the "base" models are shown in Table 8 and Table 9.[29] In general, given the diverse nature of the data, the models perform adequately, with adjusted R^2 values ranging from 0.63 to 0.67 (bottom of Table 9).

5.1.1. Control Variables

The controlling home, site, and block group variables, which are interacted at the county level, are summarized in Table 8. Table 8 focuses on only one of the base models, the *one-mile* OLS model, but full results from all models are shown in the Appendix. [30] To concisely summarize results for all of the 27 counties, the table contains the percentage of all 27 counties for which each controlling variable has statistically significant (at or below the 10% level) coefficients for the *one-mile* OLS model. For those controlling variables that are found to be statistically significant, the table further contains mean values, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum levels.

Many of the county-interacted controlling variables (e.g., *lsfla1000, lt1acre, age, agesqr, baths,* and *swinter*) are consistently (in more than two thirds of the counties) statistically significant (with a p-value < 0.10) and have appropriately sized mean values. The seemingly spurious minimum and maximum values among some of the county-level controlling variables (e.g., *lt1acre* minimum of -0.069) likely arise when these variables in particular counties are highly correlated with other variables, such as square feet (*lsfla1000*), and also when sample size is limited.[31] The other variables (*acres* and the three block group level census variables: *pctvacant, pctowner,* and *med_age*) are statistically significant in 33-59% of the counties. Only one variable's mean value—the percent of housing units vacant in the block group as of the 2000 census (*pctvacant*)—was counterintuitive. In that instance, a positive coefficient was estimated, when in fact, one would expect that increasing the percent of vacant housing would lower prices;

---

[29] The OLS models are estimated using the areg procedure in Stata with robust (White's corrected) standard errors (White, 1980). The spatial error models are estimated using the *gstslshet* routine in the sphet package in R, which also allows for robust standard errors to be estimated. See: http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sphet/sphet.pdf

[30] The controlling variables' coefficients were similar across the base models, so only the *one-mile* results are summarized here.

[31] The possible adverse effects of these collinearities were fully explored both via the removal of the variables and by examining VIF statistics. The VOI results are robust to controlling variable removal and have relatively low (< 5) VIF statistics.

this counter-intuitive effect may be due to collinearity with one or more of the other variables, or possible measurement errors.[32]

The sale year variables, which are interacted with the state, are also summarized in Table 8, with the percentages indicating the number of states in which the coefficients are statistically significant. The inclusion of these sale year variables in the regressions control for inflation and deflation across the various states over the study period. The coefficients represent a comparison to the omitted year, which is 2011. All sale year state-level coefficients are statistically significant in at least 50% of the states in all years except 2010, and they are significant in two thirds of the states in all except 3 years. The mean values of all years are appropriately signed, showing a monotonically ordered peak in values in 2007, with lower values in the prior and following years. The minimum and maximum values are similarly signed (negative) through 2003 and from 2007 through 2010 (positive), and are both positive and negative in years 2003 through 2006, indicating the differences in inflation/deflation in those years across the various states. This reinforces the appropriateness of interacting the sale years at the state level. Finally, although not shown, the model also contains 250 fixed effects for the census tract delineations, of which approximately 50% were statistically significant.

[32] The removal of this, as well as the other block group census variables, however, did not substantively influence the results of the VOI.

Table 8: Levels and Significance for County- and State-Interacted Controlling Variables[33]

Variable	% of Counties/States Having Significant (*p*-value <0.10) Coefficients	Statistics for Significant Variables: Mean	St Dev	Min	Max
lsfla1000	100%	0.604	0.153	0.332	0.979
acres	48%	0.025	0.035	-0.032	0.091
lt1acre	85%	0.280	0.170	-0.069	0.667
age	81%	-0.006	0.008	-0.021	0.010
agesqr	74%	-0.006	0.063	-0.113	0.108
*baths**	85%	0.156	0.088	0.083	0.366
pctvacant	48%	1.295	3.120	-2.485	9.018
pctowner	33%	0.605	0.811	-0.091	2.676
med_age	59%	-0.016	0.132	-0.508	0.066
swinter	78%	-0.034	0.012	-0.053	-0.020
sy1996	100%	-0.481	0.187	-0.820	-0.267
sy1997	100%	-0.448	0.213	-0.791	-0.242
sy1998	100%	-0.404	0.172	-0.723	-0.156
sy1999	100%	-0.359	0.169	-0.679	-0.156
sy2000	88%	-0.298	0.189	-0.565	-0.088
sy2001	88%	-0.286	0.141	-0.438	-0.080
sy2002	67%	-0.261	0.074	-0.330	-0.128
sy2003	67%	-0.218	0.069	-0.326	-0.119
sy2004	75%	-0.084	0.133	-0.208	0.087
sy2005	67%	0.082	0.148	-0.111	0.278
sy2006	67%	0.128	0.158	-0.066	0.340
sy2007	67%	0.196	0.057	0.143	0.297
sy2008	56%	0.160	0.051	0.084	0.218
sy2009	50%	0.138	0.065	0.071	0.219
sy2010	33%	0.172	0.063	0.105	0.231

** % of counties significant is reported only for counties that had the baths variable populated (17 out of 27 counties)*

5.1.2. Variables of Interest

The variables of interest, the interactions between the *fdp* and *tdis* bins, are shown in Table 9 for the four base models. The reference (i.e., omitted) case for these variables are homes that sold prior to the wind facilities' announcement (PA) and are located between 3 and 10 miles from the

[33] Controlling variable statistics are provided for only the *one-mile* OLS model but did not differ substantially for other models. All variables are interacted with counties, except for sale year (sy), which is interacted with the state.

wind turbines' eventual locations. In relation to that group of transactions, three of the eight interactions in the *one-mile* models and four of the 11 interactions in the *half-mile* models produce coefficients that are statistically significant (at the 10% level).

Across all four base models none of the PA coefficients show statistically significant differences between the reference category (outside of 3 miles) and the group of transactions within a mile for the *one-mile* models (OLS: -1.7%, *p*-value 0.48; SEM: -0.02%, *p*-value 0.94)[34] or within a half- or between one-half and one-mile for the *half-mile* models (OLS inside a half mile: 0.01%, *p*-value 0.97; between a half and 1 mile: -2.3%, *p*-value 0.38; SEM inside a half mile: 5.3%, *p*-value 0.24; between a half and 1 mile: -1.8%, *p*-value 0.60). Further, none of the coefficients are significant, and all are relatively small (which partially explains their non-significance). Given these results, we find an absence of evidence of a PA effect for homes close to the turbines (*research question 1*). These results can be contrasted with the differences in prices between within-1-mile homes and outside-of-3-miles homes as summarized in Section 4.8 when no differences in the homes, the local market, the neighborhood, etc. are accounted for. The approximately 75% difference in price (alone) in the pre-announcement period 1-mile homes, as compared to the PC 3-mile homes, discussed in Section 4.8, is largely explained by differences in the controlling characteristics, which is why the pre-announcement distance coefficients shown here are not statistically significant.

Turning to the PAPC and PC periods, the results also indicate statistically insignificant differences in average home values, all else being equal, between the reference group of transactions (sold in the PA period) and those similarly located more than 3 miles from the turbines but sold in the PAPC or PC periods. Those differences are estimated to be between -0.8% and -0.5%.

The results presented above, and in Table 8, include both OLS and spatial models. Prior to estimating the spatial models, the Moran's I was calculated using the residuals of an OLS model that uses the same explanatory variables as the spatial models and the same dataset (only the most recent transactions). The Moran's I statistic (0.133) was highly significant (*p*-value 0.00),

---

[34] p-values are not shown in the table can but can be derived from the standard errors, which are shown.

which allows us to reject the hypothesis that the residuals are spatially independent. Therefore, there was justification in estimating the spatial models. However, after estimation, we determined that only the spatial error process was significant. As a result, we estimated spatial error models (SEMs) for the final specification. The spatial autoregressive coefficient, lambda (bottom of Table 9), which is an indication of spatial autocorrelation in the residuals, is sizable and statistically significant in both SEMs (0.26, *p*-value 0.00). The SEM models' variable-of-interest coefficients are quite similar to those of the OLS models. In most cases, the coefficients are the same sign, approximately the same level, and often similarly insignificant, indicating that although spatial dependence is present it does not substantively bias the variables of interest. The one material difference is the coefficient size and significance for homes outside of 3 miles in the PAPC and PC periods, 3.3% (*p*-value 0.000) and 3.1% (*p*-value 0.008), indicating there are important changes to home values over the periods that must be accounted for in the later DD models in order to isolate the potential impacts that occur due to the presence of wind turbines.

Table 9: Results of Interacted Variables of Interest: *fdp* and *tdis*

		one-mile	*one-mile*	*half-mile*	*half-mile*
		OLS	SEM	OLS	SEM
fdp	tdis	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)
PA	< 1 mile	-0.017	0.002		
		(0.024)	*(0.031)*		
PA	1-2 miles	-0.015	0.008		
		(0.011)	*(0.016)*		
PA	> 3 miles	Omitted	Omitted		
		n/a	*n/a*		
PAPC	< 1 mile	-0.035	-0.038		
		(0.029)	*(0.033)*		
PAPC	1-2 miles	-0.001	-0.033.		
		(0.014)	*(0.018)*		
PAPC	> 3 miles	-0.006	-0.033***		
		(0.008)	*(0.01)*		
PC	< 1 mile	0.019	-0.022		
		(0.026)	*(0.032)*		
PC	1-2 miles	0.044***	-0.001		
		(0.014)	*(0.019)*		
PC	> 3 miles	-0.005	-0.031**		
		(0.010)	*(0.012)*		
PA	< 1/2 mile			0.001	0.053
				(0.039)	*(0.045)*
PA	1/2 - 1 mile			-0.023	-0.018
				(0.027)	*(0.035)*
PA	1-2 miles			-0.015	0.008
				(0.011)	*(0.016)*
PA	> 3 miles			Omitted	Omitted
				n/a	*n/a*
PAPC	< 1/2 mile			-0.028	-0.065
				(0.049)	*(0.056)*
PAPC	1/2 - 1 mile			-0.038	-0.027
				(0.033)	*(0.036)*
PAPC	1-2 miles			-0.001	-0.034.
				(0.014)	*(0.017)*
PAPC	> 3 miles			-0.006	-0.033***
				(0.008)	*(0.009)*
PC	< 1/2 mile			-0.016	-0.036
				(0.041)	*(0.046)*
PC	1/2 - 1 mile			0.032	-0.016
				(0.031)	*(0.035)*
PC	1-2 miles			0.044***	-0.001
				(0.014)	*(0.018)*
PC	> 3 miles			-0.005	-0.031**
				(0.010)	*(0.012)*
lambda			0.247 ***		0.247 ***
			(0.008)		*(0.008)*
*Note: p-values: < 0.1 *, < 0.05 **, <0.01 ***.*					
n		51,276	38,407	51,276	38,407
adj R-sqr		0.67	0.64	0.67	0.64

5.1.3. Impact of Wind Turbines

As discussed above, there are important differences in property values between development periods for the reference group of homes (those located outside of 3 miles) that must be accounted for. Further, although they are not significant, differences between the reference category and those transactions inside of 1 mile in the PA period still must be accounted for if accurate measurements of PAPC or PC wind turbine effects are to be estimated. The DD specification accounts for both of these critical effects.

Table 10 shows the results of the DD tests across the four models, based on the results for the variables of interest presented in Table 9.[35] For example, to determine the net difference for homes that sold inside of a half mile (drawing from the *half-mile* OLS model) in the PAPC period, we use the following formula: PAPC half-mile coefficient (-0.028) less the PAPC 3-mile coefficient (-0.006) less the PA half-mile coefficient (0.001), which equals -0.024 (without rounding), which equates to 2.3% difference,[36] and is not statistically significant.

None of the DD effects in either the OLS or SEM specifications are statistically significant in the PAPC or PC periods, indicating that we do not observe a statistically significant impact of wind turbines on property values. Some small differences are apparent in the calculated coefficients, with those for PAPC being generally more negative/less positive than their PC counterparts, perhaps suggestive of a small announcement effect that declines once a facility is constructed. Further, the inside-a-half-mile coefficients are more negative/less positive than their between-a-half-and-1-mile counterparts, perhaps suggestive of a small property value impact very close to turbines.[37] However, in all cases, the sizes of these differences are smaller than the margins of error in the model (i.e., 90% confidence interval) and thus are not statistically significant. Therefore, based on these results, we do not find evidence supporting either of our two core hypotheses (*research questions 2 and 3*). In other words, there is no statistical evidence that homes in either the PAPC or PC periods that sold near turbines (i.e., within a mile or even a half

[35] All DD estimates for the OLS models were calculated using the post-estimation “lincom” test in Stata, which uses the stored results’ variance/covariance matrix to test if a linear combination of coefficients is different from 0. For the SEM models, a similar test was performed in R.

[36] All differences in coefficients are converted to percentages in the table as follows: exp(coef)-1.

[37] Although not discussed in the text, this trend continues with homes between 1 and 2 miles being less negative/more positive than homes closer to the turbines (e.g., those within 1 mile).

mile) did so for less than similar homes that sold between 3 and 10 away miles in the same period.

Further, using the standard errors from the DD models we can estimate the maximum size an average effect would have to be in our sample for the model to detect it (*research question 4*). For an average effect in the PC period to be found for homes within 1 mile of the existing turbines (therefore using the *one-mile* model results), an effect greater than 4.9%, either positive or negative, would have to be present to be detected by the model.[38] In other words, it is highly unlikely that the true average effect for homes that sold in our sample area within 1 mile of an existing turbine is larger than +/-4.9%. Similarly, it is highly unlikely that the true average effect for homes that sold in our sample area within a half mile of an existing turbine is larger than +/-9.0%.[39] Regardless of these maximum effects, however, as well as the very weak suggestion of a possible small announcement effect and a possible small effect on homes that are very close to turbines, the core results of these models show effect sizes that are not statistically significant from zero, and are considerably smaller than these maximums.[40]

---

[38] Using the 90% confidence interval (i.e., 10% level of significance) and assuming more than 300 cases, the critical t-value is 1.65. Therefore, using the standard error of 0.030, the 90% confidence intervals for the test will be +/-0.049.

[39] Using the critical t-value of 1.66 for the 100 PC cases within a half mile in our sample and the standard error of 0.054.

[40] It is of note that these maximum effects are slightly larger than those we expected to find, as discussed earlier. This likely indicates that there was more variation in this sample, causing relatively higher standard errors for the same number of cases, than in the sample used for the 2009 study (Hoen et al., 2009, 2011).

Table 10: "Net" Difference-in-Difference Impacts of Turbines

		< 1 Mile	< 1 Mile	< 1/2 Mile	< 1/2 Mile
		OLS	SEM	OLS	SEM
fdp	tdis	b/se	b/se	b/se	b/se
PAPC	< 1 mile	-1.2% NS	-0.7% NS		
		(0.033)	*(0.037)*		
PC	< 1 mile	4.2% NS	0.7% NS		
		(0.030)	*(0.035)*		
PAPC	< 1/2 mile			-2.3% NS	-8.1% NS
				(0.060)	*(0.065)*
PAPC	1/2 - 1 mile			-0.8% NS	2.5% NS
				(0.039)	*(0.043)*
PC	< 1/2 mile			-1.2% NS	-5.6% NS
				(0.054)	*(0.057)*
PC	1/2 - 1 mile			6.3% NS	3.4% NS
				(0.036)	*(0.042)*

*Note: p-values: > 10% NS, < 10% *, < 5% **, <1 % ****

5.2. Robustness Tests

Table 11 summarizes the results from the robustness tests. For simplicity, only the DD coefficients are shown and only for the *half-mile* OLS models.[41] The first two columns show the base OLS and SEM *half-mile* DD results (also presented earlier, in Table 9), and the remaining columns show the results from the robustness models as follows: exclusion of outliers and influential cases from the dataset (*outlier*); using sale year/county interactions instead of sale year/state (*sycounty*); using only the most recent sales instead of the most recent and prior sales (*recent*); using homes between 5 and 10 miles as the reference category, instead of homes between 3 and 10 miles (*outside5*); and using transactions occurring more than 2 years before announcement as the reference category instead of using transactions simply *before* announcement (*prior*).

[41] Results were also estimated for the *one-mile* OLS models for each of the robustness tests and are available upon request: the results do not substantively differ from what is presented here for the *half-mile* models. Because of the similarities in the results between the OLS and SEM "base" models, robustness tests on the SEM models were not prepared as we assumed that differences between the two models for the robustness tests would be minimal as well.

The robustness results have patterns similar to the base model results: none of the coefficients are statistically different from zero; all coefficients (albeit non-significant) are lower in the PAPC period than the PC period; and, all coefficients (albeit non-significant) are lower (i.e., less negative/more positive) within a half mile than outside a half mile.[42] In sum, regardless of dataset or specification, there is no change in the basic conclusions drawn from the base model results: there is no evidence that homes near operating or announced wind turbines are impacted in a statistically significant fashion. Therefore, if effects do exist, either the average impacts are relatively small (within the margin of error in the models) and/or sporadic (impacting only a small subset of homes). Moreover, these results seem to corroborate what might be predicted given the other, potentially analogous disamenity literature that was reviewed earlier, which might be read to suggest that any property value effect of wind turbines might coalesce at a maximum of 3%–4%, on average. Of course, we cannot offer that corroboration directly because, although the size of the coefficients in the models presented here are reasonably consistent with effects of that magnitude, none of our models offer results that are statistically different from zero.

[42] This trend also continues outside of 1 mile, with those coefficients being less negative/more positive than those within 1 mile.

Table 11: Robustness Half-Mile Model Results

				Robustness OLS Models				
		Base OLS	Base SEM	outlier	sycounty	recent	outside5	prior
fdp	tdis	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)	β (se)
PAPC	< 1/2 mile	-2.3% NS	-8.1% NS	-4.7% NS	-4.2% NS	-5.6% NS	-1.7% NS	0.1% NS
		(0.060)	*(0.065)*	*(0.056)*	*(0.060)*	*(0.066)*	*(0.060)*	*(0.062)*
PAPC	1/2 - 1 mile	-0.8% NS	2.5% NS	-1.7% NS	-2.5% NS	2.3% NS	-0.2% NS	0.4% NS
		(0.039)	*(0.043)*	*(0.036)*	*(0.039)*	*(0.043)*	*(0.039)*	*(0.044)*
PC	< 1/2 mile	-1.2% NS	-5.6% NS	-0.5% NS	-1.8% NS	-4.3% NS	-0.3% NS	1.3% NS
		(0.054)	*(0.057)*	*(0.047)*	*(0.054)*	*(0.056)*	*(0.054)*	*(0.056)*
PC	1/2 - 1 mile	6.3% NS	3.4% NS	6.2% NS	3.8% NS	4.1% NS	7.1% NS	7.5% NS
		(0.036)	*(0.041)*	*(0.033)*	*(0.036)*	*(0.042)*	*(0.036)*	*(0.041)*
*Note: p-values: > 0.1 NS, < 0.1 *, <0.5 **, <0.01 ****								
	n	51,276	38,407	50,106	51,276	38,407	51,276	51,276
	adj R-sqr	0.67	0.64	0.66	0.67	0.66	0.67	0.67

6. Conclusion

Wind energy facilities are expected to continue to be developed in the United States. Some of this growth is expected to occur in more-populated regions, raising concerns about the effects of wind development on home values in surrounding communities.

Previous published and academic research on this topic has tended to indicate that wind facilities, after they have been constructed, produce little or no effect on home values. At the same time, some evidence has emerged indicating potential home-value effects occurring after a wind facility has been announced but before construction. These previous studies, however, have been limited by their relatively small sample sizes, particularly in relation to the important population of homes located very close to wind turbines, and have sometimes treated the variable for distance to wind turbines in a problematic fashion. Analogous studies of other disamenities—including high-voltage transmission lines, landfills, and noisy roads—suggest that if reductions in property values near turbines were to occur, they would likely be no more than 3%–4%, on average, but to discover such small effects near turbines, much larger amounts of data are needed than have been used in previous studies. Moreover, previous studies have not accounted adequately for potentially confounding home-value factors, such as those affecting home values before wind facilities were announced, nor have they adequately controlled for spatial dependence in the data, i.e., how the values and characteristics of homes located near one another influence the value of those homes (independent of the presence of wind turbines).

This study helps fill those gaps by collecting a very large data sample and analyzing it with methods that account for confounding factors and spatial dependence. We collected data from more than 50,000 home sales among 27 counties in nine states. These homes were within 10 miles of 67 different then-current or existing wind facilities, with 1,198 sales that were within 1 mile of a turbine (331 of which were within a half mile)—many more than were collected by previous research efforts. The data span the periods well before announcement of the wind facilities to well after their construction. We use OLS and spatial-process difference-in-difference hedonic models to estimate the home-value impacts of the wind facilities; these models control for value factors existing prior to the wind facilities' announcements, the spatial dependence of home values, and value changes over time. We also employ a series of robustness models, which provide greater confidence in our results by testing the effects of data outliers and influential cases, heterogeneous inflation/deflation across regions, older sales data for multi-sale homes, the distance from turbines for homes in our reference case, and the amount of time before wind-facility announcement for homes in our reference case.

Across all model specifications, we find no statistical evidence that home prices near wind turbines were affected in either the post-construction or post-announcement/pre-construction periods. Therefore, if effects do exist, either the average impacts are relatively small (within the margin of error in the models) and/or sporadic (impacting only a small subset of homes). Related, our sample size and analytical methods enabled us to bracket the size of effects that would be detected, if those effects were present at all. Based on our results, we find that it is *highly unlikely* that the actual average effect for homes that sold in our sample area within <u>1 mile</u> of an existing turbine is larger than +/-4.9%. In other words, the average value of these homes could be as much as 4.9% higher than it would have been without the presence of wind turbines, as much as 4.9% lower, the same (i.e., zero effect), or anywhere in between. Similarly, it is highly unlikely that the average actual effect for homes that sold in our sample area within a <u>half mile</u> of an existing turbine is larger than +/-9.0%. In other words, the average value of these homes could be as much as 9% higher than it would have been without the presence of wind turbines, as much as 9% lower, the same (i.e., zero effect), or anywhere in between.

Regardless of these potential maximum effects, the core results of our analysis consistently show no sizable statistically significant impact of wind turbines on nearby property values. The maximum impact suggested by potentially analogous disamenities (high-voltage transmission lines, landfills, roads etc.) of 3%-4% is at the far end of what the models presented in this study would have been able to discern, potentially helping to explain why no statistically significant effect was found. If effects of this size are to be discovered in future research, even larger samples of data may be required. For those interested in estimating such effects on a more micro (or local) scale, such as appraisers, these possible data requirements may be especially daunting, though it is also true that the inclusion of additional market, neighborhood, and individual property characteristics in these more-local assessments may sometimes improve model fidelity.

7. References

Edward and Gail Kenney v. The Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), (2012) Ontario Assessment Review Board (ARB). File No: WR 113994.

Wiggins v. WPD Canada Corporation, (2013) Superior Court of Justice - Ontario, CA. May 22, 2013. File No: CV-11-1152.

American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) (2013) Awea U.S. Wind Industry - Fourth Quarter 2012 Market Report - Executive Summary. American Wind Energy Association, Washington, DC. January 30, 2012. 11 pages.

Anselin, L. (1988) Spatial Econometrics: Methods and Models. Springer. 304 pages. 9024737354.

Anselin, L. (2002) Under the Hood Issues in the Specification and Interpretation of Spatial Regression Models. *Agricultural Economics.* 27(3): 247-267.

Anselin, L. and Lozano-Gracia, N. (2009) Errors in Variables and Spatial Effects in Hedonic House Price Models of Ambient Air Quality. *Spatial Econometrics*: 5-34.

Arraiz, I., Drukker, D. M., Kelejian, H. H. and Prucha, I. R. (2009) A Spatial Cliff-Ord-Type Model with Heteroskedastic Innovations: Small and Large Sample Results. *Journal of Regional Science.* 50(2): 592-614.

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.

Baxter, J., Morzaria, R. and Hirsch, R. (2013) A Case-Control Study of Support/Opposition to Wind Turbines: The Roles of Health Risk Perception, Economic Benefits, and Community Conflict. *Energy Policy.* Forthcoming: 40.

Bloomberg New Energy Finance (Bloomberg) (2013) Q1 2013 North America Wind Market Outlook. Bloomberg New Energy Finance, New York, NY. March 11, 2013. 25 pages.

Bond, S. (2008) Attitudes Towards the Development of Wind Farms in Australia. *Journal of Environmental Health Australia.* 8(3): 19-32.

Bond, S. (2010) Community Perceptions of Wind Farm Development and the Property Value Impacts of Siting Decisions. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal.* 16(1): 52-69.

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.

Braunholtz, S. and MORI Scotland (2003) Public Attitudes to Windfarms: A Survey of Local Residents in Scotland. Prepared for Scottish Executive, Edinburgh. August 25, 2003. 21 pages. 0-7559 35713.

Brown, J., Pender, J., Wiser, R., Lantz, E. and Hoen, B. (2012) Ex Post Analysis of Economic Impacts from Wind Power Development in U.S. Counties. *Energy Economics.* 34(6): 1743-1745.

Carter, J. (2011) The Effect of Wind Farms on Residential Property Values in Lee County, Illinois. Thesis Prepared for Masters Degree. Illinois State University, Normal. Spring 2011. 35 pages.

Cook, R. D. (1977) Detection of Influential Observations in Linear Regression. *Technometrics.* 19(1): 15-18.

Cook, R. D. and Weisberg, S. (1982) <u>Residuals and Influence in Regression</u>. Chapman & Hall. New York.

Currie, J., Davis, L., Greenstone, M. and Walker, R. (2012) Do Housing Prices Reflect Environmental Health Risks? Evidence from More Than 1600 Toxic Plant Openings and Closings. <u>Working Paper Series</u>. Prepared for Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Economics, Cambridge, MA. December 21, 2012. Working Paper 12-30.

Devine-Wright, P. (2005) Beyond Nimbyism: Towards an Integrated Framework for Understanding Public Perceptions of Wind Energy. *Wind Energy.* 8(2): 125-139.

Donovan, G. H., Champ, P. A. and Butry, D. T. (2007) Wildfire Risk and Housing Prices: A Case Study from Colorado Springs. *Land Economics.* 83(2): 217-233.

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.

Gipe, P. (1995) <u>Wind Energy Comes of Age</u>. Wiley Press. New York, NY. 560 pages. ISBN 978-0471109242.

Haurin, D. R. and Brasington, D. (1996) School Quality and Real House Prices: Inter-and Intrametropolitan Effects. *Journal of Housing Economics.* 5(4): 351-368.

Heintzelman, M. D. and Tuttle, C. (2011) Values in the Wind: A Hedonic Analysis of Wind Power Facilities. *Working Paper*: 39.

Heintzelman, M. D. and Tuttle, C. (2012) Values in the Wind: A Hedonic Analysis of Wind Power Facilities. *Land Economics.* August (88): 571-588.

Hinman, J. L. (2010) Wind Farm Proximity and Property Values: A Pooled Hedonic Regression Analysis of Property Values in Central Illinois. Thesis Prepared for Masters Degree in Applied Economics. Illinois State University, Normal. May, 2010. 143 pages.

Hoen, B., Wiser, R., Cappers, P., Thayer, M. and Sethi, G. (2009) The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. December, 2009. 146 pages. LBNL-2829E.

Hoen, B., Wiser, R., Cappers, P., Thayer, M. and Sethi, G. (2011) Wind Energy Facilities and Residential Properties: The Effect of Proximity and View on Sales Prices. *Journal of Real Estate Research.* 33(3): 279-316.

Hubbard, H. H. and Shepherd, K. P. (1991) Aeroacoustics of Large Wind Turbines. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America.* 89(6): 2495-2508.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2011) Special Report on Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA. 1076 pages. ISBN 978-1-107-02340-6.

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.

Kane, T. J., Riegg, S. K. and Staiger, D. O. (2006) School Quality, Neighborhoods, and Housing Prices. *American Law and Economics Review.* 8(2): 183-212.

Kelejian, H. H. and Prucha, I. R. (1998) A Generalized Spatial Two-Stage Least Squares Procedure for Estimating a Spatial Autoregressive Model with Autoregressive Disturbances. *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics.* 17(1): 99-121.

Kelejian, H. H. and Prucha, I. R. (2010) Specification and Estimation of Spatial Autoregressive Models with Autoregressive and Heteroskedastic Disturbances. *Journal of Econometrics.* 157(1): 53-67.

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.

Kuethe, T. H. (2012) Spatial Fragmentation and the Value of Residential Housing. *Land Economics.* 88(1): 16-27.

Lantz, E. and Tegen, S. (2009) Economic Development Impacts of Community Wind Projects: A Review and Empirical Evaluation. Prepared for National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO. Conference Paper, NREL/CP-500-45555.

Laposa, S. P. and Mueller, A. (2010) Wind Farm Announcements and Rural Home Prices: Maxwell Ranch and Rural Northern Colorado. *Journal of Sustainable Real Estate.* 2(1): 383-402.

Loomis, D. and Aldeman, M. (2011) Wind Farm Implications for School District Revenue. Prepared for Illinois State University's Center for Renewable Energy,, Normal, IL. July 2011. 48 pages.

Loomis, D., Hayden, J. and Noll, S. (2012) Economic Impact of Wind Energy Development in Illinois. Prepared for Illinois State University's Center for Renewable Energy,, Normal, IL. June 2012. 36 pages.

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. ISBN 978-0-632-06461-8.

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.

Ready, R. C. (2010) Do Landfills Always Depress Nearby Property Values? *Journal of Real Estate Research.* 32(3): 321-339.

Rogers, W. H. (2006) A Market for Institutions: Assessing the Impact of Restrictive Covenants on Housing. *Land Economics.* 82(4): 500-512.

Rosen, S. (1974) Hedonic Prices and Implicit Markets: Product Differentiation in Pure Competition. *Journal of Political Economy.* 82(1): 34-55.

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., Macpherson, D. A. and Zietz, E. N. (2005) The Composition of Hedonic Pricing Models. *Journal of Real Estate Literature.* 13(1): 3-42.

Slattery, M. C., Lantz, E. and Johnson, B. L. (2011) State and Local Economic Impacts from Wind Energy Projects: A Texas Case Study. *Energy Policy.* 39(12): 7930-7940.

Sunak, Y. and Madlener, R. (2012) The Impact of Wind Farms on Property Values: A Geographically Weighted Hedonic Pricing Model. Prepared for Institute for Future Energy Consumer Needs and Behavior (ACN), RWTH Aachen University. May, 2012 (revised March 2013). 27 pages. FCN Working Paper No. 3/2012.

Tiebout, C. M. (1956) A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures. *The Journal of Political Economy*. 64(5): 416-424.

White, H. (1980) A Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimator and a Direct Test for Heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica.* 48(4): 817-838.

Wolsink, M. (2007) Planning of Renewables Schemes: Deliberative and Fair Decision-Making on Landscape Issues Instead of Reproachful Accusations of Non-Cooperation. *Energy Policy.* 35(5): 2692-2704.

Zabel, J. E. and Guignet, D. (2012) A Hedonic Analysis of the Impact of Lust Sites on House Prices. *Resource and Energy Economics.* 34(4): 549-564.

8. Appendix – Full Results

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
Intercept	11.332***	(0.058)	11.330***	(0.058)	11.292***	(0.090)	11.292***	(0.090)
fdp3tdis3_11	-0.017	(0.024)			0.002	(0.031)		
fdp3tdis3_12	-0.015	(0.011)			0.008	(0.016)		
fdp3tdis3_21	-0.035	(0.029)			-0.038	(0.033)		
fdp3tdis3_22	-0.001	(0.014)			-0.033*	(0.017)		
fdp3tdis3_23	-0.006	(0.008)			-0.033***	(0.009)		
fdp3tdis3_31	0.019	(0.026)			-0.022	(0.031)		
fdp3tdis3_32	0.044***	(0.014)			-0.001	(0.018)		
fdp3tdis3_33	-0.005	(0.010)			-0.031***	(0.012)		
fdp3tdis4_10			0.001	(0.039)			0.053	(0.045)
fdp3tdis4_11			-0.023	(0.027)			-0.018	(0.035)
fdp3tdis4_12			-0.015	(0.011)			0.008	(0.016)
fdp3tdis4_20			-0.028	(0.049)			-0.065	(0.056)
fdp3tdis4_21			-0.038	(0.033)			-0.027	(0.036)
fdp3tdis4_22			-0.001	(0.014)			-0.034*	(0.017)
fdp3tdis4_23			-0.006	(0.008)			-0.033***	(0.009)
fdp3tdis4_30			-0.016	(0.041)			-0.036	(0.046)
fdp3tdis4_31			0.032	(0.031)			-0.016	(0.035)
fdp3tdis4_32			0.044***	(0.014)			-0.001	(0.018)
fdp3tdis4_33			-0.005	(0.010)			-0.031***	(0.012)
lsfla1000_ia_car	0.750***	(0.042)	0.749***	(0.042)	0.723***	(0.045)	0.722***	(0.045)
lsfla1000_ia_flo	0.899***	(0.054)	0.900***	(0.054)	0.879***	(0.060)	0.88***	(0.060)
lsfla1000_ia_fra	0.980***	(0.077)	0.980***	(0.077)	0.932***	(0.083)	0.934***	(0.083)
lsfla1000_ia_sac	0.683***	(0.061)	0.683***	(0.061)	0.633***	(0.065)	0.633***	(0.064)
lsfla1000_il_dek	0.442***	(0.037)	0.441***	(0.037)	0.382***	(0.040)	0.38***	(0.040)
lsfla1000_il_liv	0.641***	(0.030)	0.641***	(0.030)	0.643***	(0.046)	0.643***	(0.046)
lsfla1000_il_mcl	0.512***	(0.019)	0.512***	(0.019)	0.428***	(0.029)	0.428***	(0.029)
lsfla1000_mn_cot	0.800***	(0.052)	0.800***	(0.052)	0.787***	(0.077)	0.787***	(0.077)
lsfla1000_mn_fre	0.594***	(0.028)	0.595***	(0.028)	0.539***	(0.031)	0.539***	(0.031)
lsfla1000_mn_jac	0.587***	(0.101)	0.587***	(0.101)	0.551***	(0.102)	0.55***	(0.102)
lsfla1000_mn_mar	0.643***	(0.025)	0.643***	(0.025)	0.603***	(0.029)	0.603***	(0.029)
lsfla1000_nj_atl	0.421***	(0.012)	0.421***	(0.012)	0.389***	(0.014)	0.389***	(0.014)
lsfla1000_ny_cli	0.635***	(0.044)	0.635***	(0.044)	0.606***	(0.045)	0.606***	(0.045)
lsfla1000_ny_fra	0.373***	(0.092)	0.375***	(0.092)	0.433***	(0.094)	0.436***	(0.094)
lsfla1000_ny_her	0.520***	(0.034)	0.520***	(0.034)	0.559***	(0.035)	0.559***	(0.035)
lsfla1000_ny_lew	0.556***	(0.054)	0.556***	(0.054)	0.518***	(0.057)	0.518***	(0.057)
lsfla1000_ny_mad	0.503***	(0.025)	0.503***	(0.025)	0.502***	(0.025)	0.502***	(0.025)
lsfla1000_ny_ste	0.564***	(0.032)	0.564***	(0.032)	0.534***	(0.034)	0.534***	(0.034)
lsfla1000_ny_wyo	0.589***	(0.034)	0.589***	(0.034)	0.566***	(0.034)	0.566***	(0.034)
lsfla1000_oh_pau	0.625***	(0.080)	0.624***	(0.080)	0.567***	(0.090)	0.565***	(0.090)
lsfla1000_oh_woo	0.529***	(0.030)	0.529***	(0.030)	0.487***	(0.035)	0.487***	(0.035)
lsfla1000_ok_cus	0.838***	(0.037)	0.838***	(0.037)	0.794***	(0.046)	0.793***	(0.046)
lsfla1000_ok_gra	0.750***	(0.063)	0.750***	(0.063)	0.706***	(0.072)	0.706***	(0.072)
lsfla1000_pa_fay	0.332***	(0.111)	0.332***	(0.111)	0.335***	(0.118)	0.334***	(0.118)
lsfla1000_pa_som	0.564***	(0.025)	0.564***	(0.025)	0.548***	(0.031)	0.548***	(0.031)
lsfla1000_pa_way	0.486***	(0.056)	0.486***	(0.056)	0.44***	(0.063)	0.44***	(0.063)
lsfla1000_wa_kit	0.540***	(0.073)	0.540***	(0.073)	0.494***	(0.078)	0.494***	(0.078)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
acres_ia_car	0.033	(0.030)	0.033	(0.030)	0.013	(0.032)	0.013	(0.032)
acres_ia_flo	0.050***	(0.014)	0.050***	(0.014)	0.044***	(0.014)	0.044***	(0.014)
acres_ia_fra	-0.008	(0.022)	-0.008	(0.022)	-0.009	(0.022)	-0.009	(0.022)
acres_ia_sac	0.064***	(0.014)	0.064***	(0.014)	0.054***	(0.015)	0.054***	(0.015)
acres_il_dek	0.068**	(0.027)	0.064**	(0.027)	0.055*	(0.029)	0.048*	(0.029)
acres_il_liv	0.023	(0.014)	0.023	(0.014)	0.014	(0.018)	0.014	(0.018)
acres_il_mcl	0.091***	(0.010)	0.091***	(0.010)	0.092***	(0.011)	0.092***	(0.011)
acres_mn_cot	-0.030***	(0.011)	-0.030***	(0.011)	-0.024*	(0.013)	-0.024*	(0.013)
acres_mn_fre	-0.002	(0.007)	-0.002	(0.007)	0.002	(0.008)	0.002	(0.008)
acres_mn_jac	0.019	(0.016)	0.020	(0.016)	0.03*	(0.016)	0.03*	(0.016)
acres_mn_mar	0.020**	(0.008)	0.020**	(0.008)	0.017*	(0.009)	0.017*	(0.009)
acres_nj_atl	-0.041	(0.031)	-0.041	(0.031)	-0.013	(0.026)	-0.013	(0.026)
acres_ny_cli	0.019***	(0.007)	0.019***	(0.007)	0.022***	(0.007)	0.022***	(0.007)
acres_ny_fra	0.009	(0.010)	0.009	(0.010)	0.014	(0.011)	0.014	(0.011)
acres_ny_her	-0.004	(0.008)	-0.004	(0.008)	0.012	(0.008)	0.012	(0.008)
acres_ny_lew	0.014*	(0.008)	0.014*	(0.008)	0.014	(0.009)	0.014	(0.009)
acres_ny_mad	0.021***	(0.003)	0.021***	(0.003)	0.021***	(0.004)	0.021***	(0.004)
acres_ny_ste	0.009*	(0.005)	0.009*	(0.005)	0.007	(0.005)	0.007	(0.005)
acres_ny_wyo	0.016***	(0.004)	0.016***	(0.004)	0.019***	(0.004)	0.019***	(0.004)
acres_oh_pau	-0.010	(0.020)	-0.010	(0.020)	0.01	(0.024)	0.009	(0.024)
acres_oh_woo	-0.007	(0.010)	-0.007	(0.010)	0.002	(0.010)	0.002	(0.010)
acres_ok_cus	-0.037*	(0.019)	-0.037*	(0.019)	-0.034	(0.022)	-0.034	(0.022)
acres_ok_gra	0.014	(0.010)	0.014	(0.010)	0.019*	(0.011)	0.019*	(0.011)
acres_pa_fay	-0.006	(0.023)	-0.006	(0.023)	0.01	(0.023)	0.01	(0.023)
acres_pa_som	0.003	(0.009)	0.004	(0.009)	0.009	(0.010)	0.009	(0.010)
acres_pa_way	0.017**	(0.007)	0.017**	(0.007)	0.024***	(0.007)	0.024***	(0.007)
acres_wa_kit	0.009	(0.010)	0.009	(0.010)	0.014	(0.011)	0.014	(0.011)
acreslt1_ia_car	0.446***	(0.136)	0.448***	(0.136)	0.559***	(0.144)	0.56***	(0.143)
acreslt1_ia_flo	0.436***	(0.112)	0.435***	(0.112)	0.384***	(0.118)	0.383***	(0.118)
acreslt1_ia_fra	0.670***	(0.124)	0.668***	(0.124)	0.684***	(0.139)	0.68***	(0.139)
acreslt1_ia_sac	0.159	(0.115)	0.160	(0.115)	0.222*	(0.123)	0.221*	(0.123)
acreslt1_il_dek	0.278***	(0.066)	0.285***	(0.066)	0.282***	(0.073)	0.294***	(0.073)
acreslt1_il_liv	0.278***	(0.063)	0.276***	(0.063)	0.383***	(0.088)	0.38***	(0.088)
acreslt1_il_mcl	-0.069***	(0.021)	-0.070***	(0.021)	-0.007	(0.032)	-0.007	(0.032)
acreslt1_mn_cot	0.529***	(0.093)	0.529***	(0.093)	0.466***	(0.120)	0.465***	(0.120)
acreslt1_mn_fre	0.314***	(0.053)	0.314***	(0.053)	0.294***	(0.061)	0.293***	(0.061)
acreslt1_mn_jac	0.250*	(0.144)	0.247*	(0.145)	0.169	(0.146)	0.162	(0.146)
acreslt1_mn_mar	0.452***	(0.062)	0.452***	(0.062)	0.461***	(0.069)	0.462***	(0.069)
acreslt1_nj_atl	0.135***	(0.048)	0.135***	(0.048)	0.044	(0.047)	0.043	(0.047)
acreslt1_ny_cli	0.115***	(0.044)	0.115***	(0.044)	0.108**	(0.047)	0.108**	(0.047)
acreslt1_ny_fra	0.118	(0.100)	0.118	(0.100)	0.113	(0.115)	0.113	(0.115)
acreslt1_ny_her	0.364***	(0.047)	0.364***	(0.047)	0.331***	(0.050)	0.332***	(0.050)
acreslt1_ny_lew	0.119*	(0.061)	0.120**	(0.061)	0.117*	(0.067)	0.117*	(0.067)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
acreslt1_ny_mad	0.017	(0.031)	0.018	(0.031)	0.043	(0.032)	0.043	(0.032)
acreslt1_ny_ste	0.100**	(0.042)	0.100**	(0.042)	0.18***	(0.047)	0.18***	(0.047)
acreslt1_ny_wyo	0.144***	(0.035)	0.144***	(0.035)	0.137***	(0.039)	0.137***	(0.039)
acreslt1_oh_pau	0.426***	(0.087)	0.425***	(0.087)	0.507***	(0.120)	0.507***	(0.120)
acreslt1_oh_woo	0.124***	(0.034)	0.124***	(0.034)	0.114***	(0.041)	0.114***	(0.041)
acreslt1_ok_cus	0.103	(0.070)	0.104	(0.070)	0.091	(0.092)	0.093	(0.092)
acreslt1_ok_gra	-0.038	(0.054)	-0.038	(0.054)	-0.065	(0.066)	-0.065	(0.066)
acreslt1_pa_fay	0.403***	(0.153)	0.403***	(0.153)	0.42**	(0.165)	0.42**	(0.164)
acreslt1_pa_som	0.243***	(0.039)	0.243***	(0.039)	0.223***	(0.047)	0.223***	(0.047)
acreslt1_pa_way	0.138**	(0.062)	0.138**	(0.062)	0.108	(0.077)	0.109	(0.077)
acreslt1_wa_kit	0.335**	(0.134)	0.335**	(0.134)	0.342**	(0.164)	0.342**	(0.164)
age_ia_car	-0.013***	(0.001)	-0.013***	(0.001)	-0.011***	(0.001)	-0.011***	(0.001)
age_ia_flo	-0.013***	(0.002)	-0.013***	(0.002)	-0.013***	(0.002)	-0.013***	(0.002)
age_ia_fra	-0.012***	(0.003)	-0.012***	(0.003)	-0.011***	(0.003)	-0.011***	(0.003)
age_ia_sac	-0.013***	(0.003)	-0.013***	(0.003)	-0.011***	(0.003)	-0.011***	(0.003)
age_il_dek	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.004***	(0.001)
age_il_liv	-0.001	(0.001)	-0.002	(0.001)	-0.003	(0.002)	-0.003	(0.002)
age_il_mcl	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.004***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)
age_mn_cot	-0.021***	(0.003)	-0.021***	(0.003)	-0.013***	(0.005)	-0.013***	(0.005)
age_mn_fre	-0.013***	(0.001)	-0.013***	(0.001)	-0.012***	(0.002)	-0.012***	(0.002)
age_mn_jac	-0.018***	(0.005)	-0.018***	(0.005)	-0.018***	(0.005)	-0.018***	(0.005)
age_mn_mar	-0.010***	(0.001)	-0.010***	(0.001)	-0.009***	(0.002)	-0.009***	(0.002)
age_nj_atl	-0.004***	(0.000)	-0.004***	(0.000)	-0.003***	(0.001)	-0.003***	(0.001)
age_ny_cli	-0.005***	(0.001)	-0.005***	(0.001)	-0.005***	(0.001)	-0.005***	(0.001)
age_ny_fra	-0.004	(0.003)	-0.005	(0.003)	-0.005*	(0.003)	-0.005*	(0.003)
age_ny_her	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)
age_ny_lew	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.009***	(0.001)	-0.009***	(0.001)
age_ny_mad	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)
age_ny_ste	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.007***	(0.001)	-0.007***	(0.001)
age_ny_wyo	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)
age_oh_pau	0.003	(0.003)	0.003	(0.003)	0.003	(0.004)	0.003	(0.004)
age_oh_woo	0.008***	(0.001)	0.008***	(0.001)	0.01***	(0.001)	0.01***	(0.001)
age_ok_cus	-0.000	(0.002)	-0.000	(0.002)	0.002	(0.003)	0.002	(0.003)
age_ok_gra	-0.000	(0.002)	-0.000	(0.002)	0.001	(0.002)	0.001	(0.002)
age_pa_fay	0.010**	(0.004)	0.010**	(0.004)	0.01**	(0.005)	0.01**	(0.005)
age_pa_som	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.006***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)	-0.008***	(0.001)
age_pa_way	0.006***	(0.002)	0.006***	(0.002)	0.007***	(0.002)	0.007***	(0.002)
age_wa_kit	0.010***	(0.003)	0.010***	(0.003)	0.014***	(0.003)	0.014***	(0.003)
agesq_ia_car	0.034***	(0.011)	0.034***	(0.000)	0.022*	(0.012)	0.022*	(0.012)
agesq_ia_flo	0.040***	(0.016)	0.040**	(0.016)	0.044***	(0.016)	0.044***	(0.016)
agesq_ia_fra	0.025	(0.022)	0.025	(0.022)	0.02	(0.023)	0.021	(0.023)
agesq_ia_sac	0.032	(0.022)	0.032	(0.022)	0.025	(0.023)	0.025	(0.023)
agesq_il_dek	0.008	(0.010)	0.008	(0.010)	0.013	(0.012)	0.013	(0.011)
agesq_il_liv	-0.023**	(0.009)	-0.023**	(0.009)	-0.011	(0.014)	-0.011	(0.014)
agesq_il_mcl	0.005	(0.007)	0.005	(0.007)	0.021*	(0.011)	0.021*	(0.011)
agesq_mn_cot	0.109**	(0.043)	0.109**	(0.043)	0.032	(0.069)	0.033	(0.069)
agesq_mn_fre	0.046***	(0.010)	0.045***	(0.010)	0.044***	(0.012)	0.044***	(0.012)
agesq_mn_jac	0.103***	(0.035)	0.104***	(0.035)	0.1***	(0.034)	0.101***	(0.034)
agesq_mn_mar	0.012	(0.012)	0.012	(0.012)	0.006	(0.014)	0.006	(0.014)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
agesq_nj_atl	0.010***	(0.003)	0.010***	(0.003)	0.003	(0.005)	0.003	(0.005)
agesq_ny_cli	0.011*	(0.006)	0.011*	(0.006)	0.011*	(0.006)	0.011*	(0.006)
agesq_ny_fra	-0.011	(0.022)	-0.011	(0.022)	-0.002	(0.020)	-0.002	(0.020)
agesq_ny_her	0.022***	(0.005)	0.022***	(0.005)	0.022***	(0.006)	0.022***	(0.006)
agesq_ny_lew	0.031***	(0.006)	0.031***	(0.006)	0.032***	(0.007)	0.032***	(0.007)
agesq_ny_mad	0.017***	(0.003)	0.017***	(0.003)	0.023***	(0.003)	0.023***	(0.003)
agesq_ny_ste	0.013**	(0.005)	0.013**	(0.005)	0.018***	(0.005)	0.018***	(0.005)
agesq_ny_wyo	0.016***	(0.005)	0.016***	(0.005)	0.017***	(0.005)	0.017***	(0.005)
agesq_oh_pau	-0.044**	(0.022)	-0.045**	(0.022)	-0.043	(0.028)	-0.043	(0.028)
agesq_oh_woo	-0.074***	(0.007)	-0.074***	(0.007)	-0.091***	(0.009)	-0.091***	(0.009)
agesq_ok_cus	-0.091***	(0.019)	-0.091***	(0.019)	-0.113***	(0.026)	-0.113***	(0.026)
agesq_ok_gra	-0.081***	(0.023)	-0.081***	(0.023)	-0.097***	(0.029)	-0.097***	(0.029)
agesq_pa_fay	-0.112***	(0.032)	-0.112***	(0.032)	-0.105***	(0.034)	-0.106***	(0.034)
agesq_pa_som	0.000	(0.008)	0.002	(0.008)	0.016*	(0.009)	0.016*	(0.009)
agesq_pa_way	-0.000***	(0.012)	-0.052***	(0.012)	-0.053***	(0.014)	-0.053***	(0.014)
agesq_wa_kit	-0.000***	(0.027)	-0.097***	(0.027)	-0.132***	(0.031)	-0.132***	(0.031)
bathsim_ia_sac	-0.050	(0.073)	-0.050	(0.073)	-0.082	(0.077)	-0.081	(0.077)
bathsim_il_dek	-0.005	(0.015)	-0.005	(0.015)	0.001	(0.018)	0.001	(0.018)
bathsim_ny_cli	0.090***	(0.025)	0.090***	(0.025)	0.087***	(0.024)	0.087***	(0.024)
bathsim_ny_fra	0.246***	(0.062)	0.245***	(0.062)	0.213***	(0.064)	0.212***	(0.064)
bathsim_ny_her	0.099***	(0.022)	0.099***	(0.022)	0.079***	(0.022)	0.079***	(0.022)
bathsim_ny_lew	0.168***	(0.030)	0.167***	(0.030)	0.142***	(0.031)	0.142***	(0.031)
bathsim_ny_mad	0.180***	(0.014)	0.180***	(0.014)	0.157***	(0.013)	0.157***	(0.013)
bathsim_ny_ste	0.189***	(0.019)	0.189***	(0.019)	0.166***	(0.020)	0.166***	(0.020)
bathsim_ny_wyo	0.107***	(0.021)	0.107***	(0.021)	0.1***	(0.021)	0.1***	(0.021)
bathsim_oh_pau	0.095*	(0.051)	0.095*	(0.051)	0.149***	(0.057)	0.149***	(0.057)
bathsim_oh_woo	0.094***	(0.017)	0.094***	(0.017)	0.092***	(0.019)	0.092***	(0.019)
bathsim_pa_fay	0.367***	(0.077)	0.367***	(0.077)	0.301***	(0.082)	0.302***	(0.082)
bathsim_pa_way	0.082**	(0.036)	0.082**	(0.036)	0.081**	(0.041)	0.081**	(0.041)
pctvacant_ia_car	-2.515*	(1.467)	-2.521*	(1.468)	-2.011	(1.936)	-2.019	(1.937)
pctvacant_ia_flo	0.903	(1.152)	0.921	(1.152)	1.358	(1.409)	1.339	(1.410)
pctvacant_ia_fra	8.887**	(3.521)	8.928**	(3.518)	-2.596	(1.703)	-2.6	(1.703)
pctvacant_ia_sac	0.672	(0.527)	0.673	(0.527)	1.267***	(0.377)	1.266***	(0.377)
pctvacant_il_dek	0.052	(0.639)	0.062	(0.638)	0.037	(0.964)	0.069	(0.961)
pctvacant_il_liv	-0.475	(0.474)	-0.476	(0.474)	-0.699	(0.872)	-0.701	(0.872)
pctvacant_il_mcl	-0.365	(0.397)	-0.366	(0.397)	0.445	(0.670)	0.442	(0.670)
pctvacant_mn_cot	1.072*	(0.592)	1.072*	(0.592)	0.272	(1.039)	0.273	(1.039)
pctvacant_mn_fre	-1.782**	(0.703)	-1.787**	(0.703)	-1.372	(0.965)	-1.384	(0.965)
pctvacant_mn_jac	-1.345	(0.883)	-1.318	(0.884)	-1.285	(1.084)	-1.313	(1.084)
pctvacant_mn_mar	2.178***	(0.502)	2.175***	(0.502)	1.53**	(0.622)	1.528**	(0.622)
pctvacant_nj_atl	-0.054	(0.062)	-0.054	(0.062)	0.096	(0.085)	0.095	(0.085)
pctvacant_ny_cli	0.709***	(0.224)	0.709***	(0.224)	0.842***	(0.251)	0.841***	(0.251)
pctvacant_ny_fra	6.173***	(2.110)	6.104***	(2.113)	0.519	(0.710)	0.499	(0.709)
pctvacant_ny_her	-1.226***	(0.247)	-1.226***	(0.247)	-1.347***	(0.288)	-1.347***	(0.288)
pctvacant_ny_lew	-0.125	(0.127)	-0.125	(0.127)	-0.266*	(0.159)	-0.266*	(0.159)
pctvacant_ny_mad	0.750***	(0.196)	0.752***	(0.196)	0.767***	(0.246)	0.765***	(0.246)
pctvacant_ny_ste	0.280	(0.190)	0.281	(0.190)	0.039	(0.242)	0.04	(0.242)
pctvacant_ny_wyo	0.179*	(0.101)	0.178*	(0.101)	0.225*	(0.119)	0.224*	(0.119)
pctvacant_oh_pau	-1.473	(1.498)	-1.473	(1.499)	-1.341	(1.951)	-1.256	(1.952)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
pctvacant_oh_woo	-0.565	(0.400)	-0.565	(0.400)	-0.304	(0.563)	-0.306	(0.563)
pctvacant_ok_cus	-0.127	(0.358)	-0.140	(0.359)	-0.167	(0.521)	-0.189	(0.521)
pctvacant_ok_gra	1.413*	(0.777)	1.414*	(0.777)	0.537	(1.045)	0.536	(1.045)
pctvacant_pa_fay	0.227	(0.596)	0.229	(0.596)	0.232	(0.807)	0.235	(0.807)
pctvacant_pa_som	0.517***	(0.098)	0.516***	(0.098)	0.562***	(0.138)	0.562***	(0.138)
pctvacant_pa_way	0.445***	(0.156)	0.444***	(0.156)	0.446**	(0.175)	0.446**	(0.175)
pctvacant_wa_kit	-0.076	(0.546)	-0.075	(0.546)	-0.377	(0.282)	-0.377	(0.281)
pctowner_ia_car	-0.225	(0.244)	-0.225	(0.244)	-0.156	(0.324)	-0.156	(0.324)
pctowner_ia_flo	0.579**	(0.238)	0.578**	(0.238)	0.75***	(0.290)	0.75***	(0.290)
pctowner_ia_fra	0.207	(0.310)	0.206	(0.310)	0.172	(0.393)	0.169	(0.393)
pctowner_ia_sac	0.274	(0.585)	0.261	(0.586)	-0.34	(0.545)	-0.345	(0.545)
pctowner_il_dek	0.075	(0.088)	0.073	(0.087)	0.032	(0.123)	0.028	(0.123)
pctowner_il_liv	0.176	(0.140)	0.176	(0.140)	0.265	(0.200)	0.264	(0.200)
pctowner_il_mcl	0.389***	(0.051)	0.388***	(0.051)	0.331***	(0.101)	0.331***	(0.101)
pctowner_mn_cot	0.375***	(0.138)	0.375***	(0.138)	0.609**	(0.254)	0.609**	(0.254)
pctowner_mn_fre	-0.119	(0.090)	-0.120	(0.090)	-0.072	(0.124)	-0.073	(0.124)
pctowner_mn_jac	-0.206	(0.474)	-0.205	(0.474)	-0.175	(0.569)	-0.185	(0.570)
pctowner_mn_mar	0.262***	(0.076)	0.262***	(0.076)	0.151	(0.103)	0.151	(0.103)
pctowner_nj_atl	-0.087**	(0.037)	-0.087**	(0.037)	-0.036	(0.052)	-0.037	(0.052)
pctowner_ny_cli	-0.229	(0.171)	-0.229	(0.171)	-0.305	(0.199)	-0.303	(0.199)
pctowner_ny_fra	2.743*	(1.500)	2.693*	(1.505)	-0.315	(1.447)	-0.398	(1.442)
pctowner_ny_her	0.246***	(0.095)	0.246***	(0.095)	0.213*	(0.109)	0.213*	(0.109)
pctowner_ny_lew	-0.034	(0.185)	-0.034	(0.185)	-0.126	(0.219)	-0.126	(0.219)
pctowner_ny_mad	0.750***	(0.075)	0.750***	(0.075)	0.723***	(0.084)	0.723***	(0.084)
pctowner_ny_ste	0.192	(0.128)	0.191	(0.128)	-0.083	(0.162)	-0.084	(0.162)
pctowner_ny_wyo	-0.089	(0.111)	-0.089	(0.111)	-0.109	(0.138)	-0.108	(0.138)
pctowner_oh_pau	-0.187	(0.347)	-0.185	(0.348)	-1.245***	(0.473)	-1.249***	(0.474)
pctowner_oh_woo	0.263***	(0.092)	0.264***	(0.092)	0.274**	(0.136)	0.274**	(0.136)
pctowner_ok_cus	0.068	(0.104)	0.068	(0.104)	-0.041	(0.146)	-0.043	(0.146)
pctowner_ok_gra	0.271*	(0.159)	0.271*	(0.159)	0.253	(0.217)	0.253	(0.217)
pctowner_pa_fay	-0.413	(1.736)	-0.420	(1.736)	-0.15	(2.037)	-0.165	(2.037)
pctowner_pa_som	0.171	(0.114)	0.170	(0.114)	0.098	(0.173)	0.098	(0.173)
pctowner_pa_way	-0.351	(0.441)	-0.348	(0.441)	-0.251	(0.345)	-0.252	(0.345)
pctowner_wa_kit	0.257	(2.139)	0.259	(2.139)	-0.358	(1.889)	-0.361	(1.890)
med_age_ia_car	0.002	(0.002)	0.002	(0.002)	0.003	(0.003)	0.003	(0.003)
med_age_ia_flo	0.003	(0.002)	0.003	(0.002)	0.004	(0.003)	0.004	(0.003)
med_age_ia_fra	0.066***	(0.015)	0.066***	(0.015)	0.014**	(0.006)	0.014**	(0.006)
med_age_ia_sac	0.028**	(0.014)	0.028**	(0.014)	0.012	(0.010)	0.012	(0.010)
med_age_il_dek	-0.001	(0.002)	-0.001	(0.002)	-0.001	(0.003)	-0.001	(0.003)
med_age_il_liv	-0.004	(0.004)	-0.004	(0.004)	-0.005	(0.005)	-0.005	(0.005)
med_age_il_mcl	-0.006***	(0.002)	-0.006***	(0.002)	-0.006**	(0.003)	-0.006**	(0.003)
med_age_mn_cot	0.017***	(0.005)	0.017***	(0.005)	0.018**	(0.008)	0.018**	(0.008)
med_age_mn_fre	0.012***	(0.002)	0.012***	(0.002)	0.013***	(0.002)	0.013***	(0.002)
med_age_mn_jac	0.013	(0.008)	0.013	(0.008)	0.012	(0.010)	0.012	(0.010)
med_age_mn_mar	0.013***	(0.003)	0.013***	(0.003)	0.012***	(0.003)	0.012***	(0.003)
med_age_nj_atl	0.010***	(0.001)	0.010***	(0.001)	0.016***	(0.002)	0.016***	(0.002)
med_age_ny_cli	0.020***	(0.004)	0.020***	(0.004)	0.02***	(0.004)	0.02***	(0.004)
med_age_ny_fra	-0.517***	(0.198)	-0.511***	(0.198)	0.008	(0.040)	0.01	(0.039)
med_age_ny_her	0.007*	(0.003)	0.007*	(0.003)	0.005	(0.003)	0.005	(0.003)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
med_age_ny_lew	0.013***	(0.005)	0.013***	(0.005)	0.008	(0.005)	0.008	(0.005)
med_age_ny_mad	0.004**	(0.002)	0.004**	(0.002)	0.004*	(0.002)	0.004*	(0.002)
med_age_ny_ste	0.012***	(0.003)	0.012***	(0.003)	0.001	(0.004)	0.001	(0.004)
med_age_ny_wyo	0.008	(0.005)	0.007	(0.005)	0.008	(0.006)	0.008	(0.006)
med_age_oh_pau	0.034***	(0.013)	0.034***	(0.013)	0.019	(0.012)	0.019	(0.012)
med_age_oh_woo	-0.004	(0.003)	-0.004	(0.003)	-0.004	(0.004)	-0.004	(0.004)
med_age_ok_cus	0.004	(0.002)	0.004	(0.002)	0.008**	(0.004)	0.008**	(0.004)
med_age_ok_gra	0.011	(0.009)	0.011	(0.009)	0	(0.006)	0	(0.006)
med_age_pa_fay	0.049	(0.073)	0.049	(0.073)	0.052	(0.095)	0.052	(0.095)
med_age_pa_som	0.008***	(0.002)	0.008***	(0.002)	0.012***	(0.004)	0.012***	(0.004)
med_age_pa_way	-0.005	(0.012)	-0.005	(0.012)	0.002	(0.007)	0.002	(0.007)
med_age_wa_kit	-0.015	(0.095)	-0.015	(0.095)	0.025	(0.034)	0.025	(0.034)
swinter_ia	-0.034**	(0.015)	-0.034**	(0.015)	-0.039***	(0.015)	-0.039***	(0.015)
swinter_il	-0.020**	(0.008)	-0.020**	(0.008)	-0.013	(0.012)	-0.013	(0.012)
swinter_mn	-0.053***	(0.009)	-0.053***	(0.009)	-0.057***	(0.011)	-0.057***	(0.011)
swinter_nj	-0.007	(0.006)	-0.007	(0.006)	-0.008	(0.007)	-0.008	(0.007)
swinter_ny	-0.030***	(0.007)	-0.030***	(0.007)	-0.026***	(0.007)	-0.026***	(0.007)
swinter_oh	-0.048***	(0.012)	-0.048***	(0.012)	-0.055***	(0.014)	-0.055***	(0.014)
swinter_ok	-0.039**	(0.015)	-0.039**	(0.015)	-0.024	(0.018)	-0.024	(0.018)
swinter_pa	-0.025*	(0.015)	-0.025*	(0.015)	-0.02	(0.017)	-0.02	(0.017)
swinter_wa	-0.004	(0.046)	-0.004	(0.046)	0.014	(0.051)	0.013	(0.051)
sy_1996_ia	-0.436***	(0.137)	-0.433***	(0.137)	-0.493***	(0.157)	-0.489***	(0.157)
sy_1996_il	-0.267***	(0.037)	-0.267***	(0.037)	-0.344***	(0.061)	-0.344***	(0.061)
sy_1996_mn	-0.521***	(0.058)	-0.521***	(0.059)	-0.585***	(0.065)	-0.585***	(0.065)
sy_1996_nj	-0.820***	(0.022)	-0.820***	(0.022)	-0.717***	(0.038)	-0.717***	(0.038)
sy_1996_oh	-0.298***	(0.042)	-0.298***	(0.042)	-0.43***	(0.053)	-0.43***	(0.053)
sy_1996_ok	-0.444***	(0.073)	-0.444***	(0.073)	-0.846***	(0.079)	-0.846***	(0.079)
sy_1996_pa	-0.584***	(0.060)	-0.584***	(0.060)	-0.604***	(0.067)	-0.604***	(0.067)
sy_1997_il	-0.242***	(0.036)	-0.242***	(0.036)	-0.234***	(0.052)	-0.232***	(0.052)
sy_1997_mn	-0.445***	(0.055)	-0.445***	(0.055)	-0.535***	(0.060)	-0.535***	(0.060)
sy_1997_nj	-0.791***	(0.021)	-0.791***	(0.021)	-0.686***	(0.038)	-0.686***	(0.038)
sy_1997_oh	-0.302***	(0.043)	-0.302***	(0.043)	-0.39***	(0.053)	-0.39***	(0.053)
sy_1997_pa	-0.458***	(0.057)	-0.458***	(0.057)	-0.51***	(0.066)	-0.51***	(0.066)
sy_1998_ia	-0.442***	(0.078)	-0.441***	(0.078)	-0.633***	(0.099)	-0.634***	(0.099)
sy_1998_il	-0.156***	(0.031)	-0.156***	(0.031)	-0.175***	(0.048)	-0.175***	(0.048)
sy_1998_mn	-0.391***	(0.054)	-0.391***	(0.054)	-0.484***	(0.059)	-0.484***	(0.059)
sy_1998_nj	-0.723***	(0.020)	-0.723***	(0.021)	-0.633***	(0.037)	-0.633***	(0.037)
sy_1998_oh	-0.217***	(0.040)	-0.217***	(0.040)	-0.302***	(0.047)	-0.302***	(0.047)
sy_1998_ok	-0.394***	(0.048)	-0.395***	(0.048)	-0.816***	(0.059)	-0.818***	(0.059)
sy_1998_pa	-0.481***	(0.059)	-0.480***	(0.059)	-0.554***	(0.068)	-0.552***	(0.067)
sy_1998_wa	-0.433***	(0.115)	-0.433***	(0.115)	-0.356**	(0.161)	-0.356**	(0.161)
sy_1999_ia	-0.347***	(0.085)	-0.345***	(0.086)	-0.568***	(0.117)	-0.565***	(0.117)
sy_1999_il	-0.155***	(0.031)	-0.156***	(0.031)	-0.215***	(0.046)	-0.214***	(0.046)
sy_1999_mn	-0.302***	(0.055)	-0.303***	(0.055)	-0.367***	(0.059)	-0.368***	(0.059)
sy_1999_nj	-0.679***	(0.020)	-0.679***	(0.020)	-0.583***	(0.036)	-0.583***	(0.036)
sy_1999_oh	-0.161***	(0.040)	-0.161***	(0.040)	-0.243***	(0.047)	-0.243***	(0.047)
sy_1999_ok	-0.347***	(0.044)	-0.348***	(0.044)	-0.743***	(0.050)	-0.743***	(0.050)
sy_1999_pa	-0.452***	(0.058)	-0.452***	(0.058)	-0.515***	(0.066)	-0.515***	(0.066)
sy_1999_wa	-0.432***	(0.114)	-0.432***	(0.114)	-0.454***	(0.166)	-0.453***	(0.165)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
sy_2000_ia	-0.165	(0.145)	-0.164	(0.146)	-0.246	(0.183)	-0.246	(0.183)
sy_2000_il	-0.088***	(0.031)	-0.088***	(0.031)	-0.172***	(0.045)	-0.171***	(0.045)
sy_2000_mn	-0.148***	(0.051)	-0.149***	(0.051)	-0.224***	(0.053)	-0.224***	(0.053)
sy_2000_nj	-0.565***	(0.020)	-0.565***	(0.020)	-0.461***	(0.036)	-0.462***	(0.036)
sy_2000_oh	-0.098**	(0.041)	-0.098**	(0.041)	-0.161***	(0.047)	-0.16***	(0.047)
sy_2000_ok	-0.330***	(0.050)	-0.331***	(0.050)	-0.748***	(0.059)	-0.749***	(0.059)
sy_2000_pa	-0.394***	(0.057)	-0.395***	(0.057)	-0.478***	(0.067)	-0.478***	(0.067)
sy_2000_wa	-0.463***	(0.115)	-0.463***	(0.115)	-0.403**	(0.160)	-0.402**	(0.160)
sy_2001_ia	-0.334***	(0.065)	-0.332***	(0.065)	-0.435***	(0.066)	-0.433***	(0.066)
sy_2001_il	-0.080**	(0.031)	-0.080***	(0.031)	-0.101**	(0.048)	-0.101**	(0.048)
sy_2001_mn	-0.119**	(0.050)	-0.119**	(0.050)	-0.204***	(0.051)	-0.204***	(0.052)
sy_2001_nj	-0.438***	(0.018)	-0.438***	(0.018)	-0.333***	(0.034)	-0.333***	(0.034)
sy_2001_oh	-0.033	(0.036)	-0.033	(0.036)	-0.078**	(0.040)	-0.078**	(0.040)
sy_2001_ok	-0.250***	(0.041)	-0.251***	(0.041)	-0.648***	(0.044)	-0.648***	(0.044)
sy_2001_pa	-0.402***	(0.055)	-0.402***	(0.055)	-0.446***	(0.063)	-0.447***	(0.063)
sy_2001_wa	-0.378***	(0.122)	-0.378***	(0.122)	-0.275*	(0.163)	-0.275*	(0.163)
sy_2002_ia	-0.130**	(0.059)	-0.128**	(0.059)	-0.264***	(0.064)	-0.261***	(0.064)
sy_2002_il	0.008	(0.030)	0.007	(0.030)	-0.013	(0.043)	-0.013	(0.043)
sy_2002_mn	-0.072	(0.050)	-0.072	(0.050)	-0.138***	(0.051)	-0.139***	(0.051)
sy_2002_nj	-0.330***	(0.019)	-0.330***	(0.019)	-0.195***	(0.035)	-0.195***	(0.035)
sy_2002_ny	-0.307***	(0.020)	-0.307***	(0.020)	-0.342***	(0.020)	-0.342***	(0.020)
sy_2002_oh	-0.022	(0.038)	-0.022	(0.038)	-0.053	(0.042)	-0.053	(0.042)
sy_2002_ok	-0.249***	(0.045)	-0.249***	(0.045)	-0.649***	(0.052)	-0.649***	(0.052)
sy_2002_pa	-0.313***	(0.053)	-0.313***	(0.053)	-0.355***	(0.059)	-0.354***	(0.059)
sy_2002_wa	-0.241**	(0.123)	-0.241**	(0.123)	-0.216	(0.166)	-0.216	(0.166)
sy_2003_ia	-0.195**	(0.081)	-0.194**	(0.081)	-0.311***	(0.085)	-0.314***	(0.084)
sy_2003_il	0.034	(0.030)	0.034	(0.030)	0.021	(0.040)	0.021	(0.040)
sy_2003_mn	0.034	(0.049)	0.034	(0.049)	-0.026	(0.049)	-0.026	(0.049)
sy_2003_nj	-0.119***	(0.017)	-0.119***	(0.017)	0.023	(0.033)	0.023	(0.033)
sy_2003_ny	-0.247***	(0.020)	-0.247***	(0.020)	-0.276***	(0.020)	-0.276***	(0.020)
sy_2003_oh	0.005	(0.036)	0.005	(0.036)	-0.019	(0.039)	-0.019	(0.039)
sy_2003_ok	-0.229***	(0.046)	-0.229***	(0.046)	-0.632***	(0.053)	-0.632***	(0.053)
sy_2003_pa	-0.191***	(0.052)	-0.191***	(0.052)	-0.213***	(0.054)	-0.213***	(0.054)
sy_2003_wa	-0.326***	(0.114)	-0.326***	(0.114)	-0.335**	(0.159)	-0.337**	(0.159)
sy_2004_ia	-0.209***	(0.076)	-0.208***	(0.076)	-0.307***	(0.087)	-0.308***	(0.087)
sy_2004_il	0.087***	(0.029)	0.087***	(0.029)	0.105***	(0.034)	0.105***	(0.034)
sy_2004_mn	0.082*	(0.049)	0.081*	(0.049)	0.036	(0.049)	0.036	(0.049)
sy_2004_ny	-0.179***	(0.019)	-0.179***	(0.019)	-0.2***	(0.020)	-0.2***	(0.020)
sy_2004_oh	0.059	(0.037)	0.059	(0.037)	0.067*	(0.039)	0.067*	(0.039)
sy_2004_ok	-0.143***	(0.041)	-0.143***	(0.041)	-0.511***	(0.044)	-0.511***	(0.044)
sy_2004_pa	-0.146***	(0.052)	-0.146***	(0.052)	-0.145***	(0.053)	-0.145***	(0.053)
sy_2004_wa	-0.144	(0.113)	-0.144	(0.113)	-0.082	(0.152)	-0.081	(0.152)
sy_2005_ia	-0.074**	(0.037)	-0.075**	(0.037)	-0.151***	(0.040)	-0.151***	(0.040)
sy_2005_il	0.125***	(0.027)	0.125***	(0.027)	0.139***	(0.032)	0.138***	(0.032)
sy_2005_mn	0.163***	(0.048)	0.162***	(0.048)	0.12**	(0.048)	0.119**	(0.048)
sy_2005_nj	0.278***	(0.018)	0.278***	(0.018)	0.453***	(0.034)	0.453***	(0.034)
sy_2005_ny	-0.110***	(0.019)	-0.111***	(0.019)	-0.122***	(0.019)	-0.122***	(0.019)
sy_2005_oh	0.112***	(0.036)	0.112***	(0.036)	0.099***	(0.037)	0.098***	(0.037)
sy_2005_ok	-0.018	(0.038)	-0.018	(0.038)	-0.354***	(0.038)	-0.354***	(0.038)

	OneMile OLS		HalfMile OLS		OneMile SEM		HalfMile SEM	
Variables	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**	**coef**	**se**
sy_2005_pa	-0.060	(0.051)	-0.060	(0.051)	-0.058	(0.053)	-0.058	(0.053)
sy_2005_wa	-0.070	(0.111)	-0.070	(0.111)	0.025	(0.153)	0.025	(0.153)
sy_2006_ia	-0.050*	(0.028)	-0.051*	(0.028)	-0.106***	(0.028)	-0.106***	(0.028)
sy_2006_il	0.192***	(0.026)	0.192***	(0.026)	0.215***	(0.030)	0.215***	(0.030)
sy_2006_mn	0.206***	(0.049)	0.206***	(0.049)	0.164***	(0.049)	0.164***	(0.049)
sy_2006_nj	0.340***	(0.017)	0.340***	(0.017)	0.514***	(0.032)	0.514***	(0.032)
sy_2006_ny	-0.066***	(0.019)	-0.066***	(0.019)	-0.073***	(0.019)	-0.073***	(0.019)
sy_2006_oh	0.147***	(0.034)	0.147***	(0.034)	0.144***	(0.035)	0.144***	(0.035)
sy_2006_ok	0.025	(0.039)	0.026	(0.039)	-0.3***	(0.037)	-0.3***	(0.037)
sy_2006_pa	0.008	(0.051)	0.008	(0.051)	-0.001	(0.052)	-0.001	(0.052)
sy_2006_wa	-0.066	(0.131)	-0.066	(0.131)	0.02	(0.160)	0.021	(0.160)
sy_2007_ia	0.013	(0.028)	0.012	(0.028)	-0.019	(0.028)	-0.019	(0.028)
sy_2007_il	0.218***	(0.025)	0.218***	(0.025)	0.251***	(0.028)	0.251***	(0.028)
sy_2007_mn	0.177***	(0.049)	0.177***	(0.049)	0.145***	(0.048)	0.144***	(0.048)
sy_2007_nj	0.297***	(0.017)	0.297***	(0.017)	0.459***	(0.031)	0.459***	(0.031)
sy_2007_ny	-0.020	(0.019)	-0.020	(0.019)	-0.022	(0.019)	-0.022	(0.019)
sy_2007_oh	0.144***	(0.035)	0.143***	(0.035)	0.138***	(0.036)	0.138***	(0.036)
sy_2007_ok	0.149***	(0.037)	0.150***	(0.037)	-0.154***	(0.034)	-0.154***	(0.034)
sy_2007_pa	0.030	(0.051)	0.030	(0.051)	0.067	(0.052)	0.067	(0.052)
sy_2007_wa	0.189*	(0.110)	0.189*	(0.110)	0.209	(0.147)	0.209	(0.147)
sy_2008_ia	0.011	(0.029)	0.010	(0.029)	-0.029	(0.029)	-0.029	(0.029)
sy_2008_il	0.219***	(0.026)	0.218***	(0.026)	0.217***	(0.029)	0.217***	(0.029)
sy_2008_mn	0.149***	(0.050)	0.149***	(0.050)	0.108**	(0.049)	0.108**	(0.049)
sy_2008_nj	0.195***	(0.018)	0.195***	(0.018)	0.35***	(0.032)	0.35***	(0.032)
sy_2008_ny	-0.000	(0.019)	-0.000	(0.019)	-0.008	(0.019)	-0.008	(0.019)
sy_2008_oh	0.084**	(0.036)	0.084**	(0.036)	0.061*	(0.037)	0.061*	(0.037)
sy_2008_ok	0.154***	(0.039)	0.153***	(0.039)	-0.145***	(0.035)	-0.145***	(0.035)
sy_2008_pa	0.044	(0.053)	0.044	(0.053)	0.055	(0.053)	0.056	(0.053)
sy_2008_wa	0.178	(0.117)	0.179	(0.117)	0.326**	(0.148)	0.325**	(0.148)
sy_2009_ia	-0.056	(0.036)	-0.057	(0.036)	-0.102***	(0.036)	-0.102***	(0.036)
sy_2009_il	0.158***	(0.026)	0.158***	(0.026)	0.176***	(0.028)	0.176***	(0.028)
sy_2009_mn	0.104**	(0.051)	0.104**	(0.051)	0.089*	(0.050)	0.089*	(0.050)
sy_2009_nj	0.071***	(0.019)	0.071***	(0.019)	0.238***	(0.032)	0.238***	(0.032)
sy_2009_ny	-0.005	(0.019)	-0.005	(0.019)	-0.013	(0.019)	-0.013	(0.019)
sy_2009_oh	0.036	(0.035)	0.036	(0.035)	0.028	(0.036)	0.028	(0.036)
sy_2009_ok	0.219***	(0.038)	0.219***	(0.038)	-0.102***	(0.034)	-0.101***	(0.034)
sy_2009_pa	0.009	(0.053)	0.010	(0.053)	0.0003	(0.054)	0.0004	(0.054)
sy_2010_ia	0.018	(0.029)	0.017	(0.029)	-0.004	(0.028)	-0.004	(0.028)
sy_2010_il	0.105***	(0.028)	0.105***	(0.028)	0.104***	(0.029)	0.104***	(0.029)
sy_2010_mn	0.181***	(0.050)	0.180***	(0.050)	0.137***	(0.049)	0.137***	(0.049)
sy_2010_nj	0.010	(0.019)	0.010	(0.019)	0.177***	(0.032)	0.178***	(0.032)
sy_2010_ny	0.003	(0.021)	0.003	(0.021)	-0.006	(0.020)	-0.006	(0.020)
sy_2010_oh	-0.017	(0.036)	-0.017	(0.036)	-0.024	(0.036)	-0.024	(0.036)
sy_2010_ok	0.231***	(0.038)	0.231***	(0.038)	-0.074**	(0.033)	-0.074**	(0.033)
sy_2010_pa	0.013	(0.057)	0.013	(0.057)	0.013	(0.057)	0.013	(0.057)
sy_2010_wa	0.207	(0.127)	0.207	(0.127)	0.305*	(0.165)	0.305*	(0.165)
note: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1								
N	51,276		51,276		38,407		38,407	
Adjusted R^2	0.66		0.66		0.64		0.64	

LBNL-2829E

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 Wiser, Peter Cappers, Mark Thayer, and Gautam Sethi

Environmental Energy Technologies Division

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.

Disclaimer

LBNL-2829E

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 Wiser, 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

List of Figures

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 literature[1] 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]

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.

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

[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

	Is there statistical evidence of:			
Statistical Model	**Area Stigma?**	**Scenic Vista Stigma?**	**Nuisance Stigma?**	**Section Reference**
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



The reference category consists of transactions for homes situated more than five miles from the nearest turbine, and that occured after construction began on the wind facility

Figure ES-2: Base Model Results: Scenic Vista



The reference category consists of transactions for homes with an Average Vista, and that occured after construction began on the wind facility

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



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.

model[7] 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 model[8] and a sales volume model[9] 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:

Sales price = *f* (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 lessoned (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 <u>local residents</u>, 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 <u>real estate experts</u> 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

Document Type Author(s)	Year	Number of Transactions or Respondents	Before or After Wind Facility Construction Commenced	Area Stigma	Scenic Vista Stigma	Nuisance Stigma
Homeowner Survey						
Haughton et al.	2004	501	Before	- *	- *	
Goldman	2006	50	After	**none**		
Firestone et al.	2007	504	Before	- *	- *	
Bond	2008	~300	After		- ?	- ?
Expert Survey						
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‡			- ?
Transaction Analysis - Simple Statistics						
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			- ?
Transaction Analysis - Hedonic Model						
Jordal-Jorgensen	1996	?	After			- ?
Hoen	2006	280	After		**none**	
Sims & Dent	2007	919	After			- *
Sims et al.	2008	199	After		-/+ *	

" 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)

"- ?" *indicates a negative effect without statistical significance provided*

"- *" *indicates statistically significant negative effect at 10% significance level*

"-/+ *" *indicates positive and negative statistically significant effects at 10% significance level*

† *Sales were collected after facility announcement but before construction*

‡ *Some respondents had experience with valuations near facilities while others did not*

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
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
NYMCOC	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 counties[26] 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 wallsthatwere 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.

[41]In 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 R^2 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 where 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 rankingthat 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

		All Sales			Post Construction Sales		
Variable Name	**Description**	**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
FinBsmt	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 Freq. *	Mean	Std. Dev.	Post Construction Sales 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 a 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 occured 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:

$$\ln(\mathrm{P}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \mathrm{N} + \sum_{s} \beta_2 \mathrm{S} + \sum_{k} \beta_3 \mathrm{X} + \sum_{v} \beta_4 \mathrm{VIEW} + \sum_{d} \beta_5 \mathrm{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \qquad (1)$$

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 though 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_BAvg	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_AAvg	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_BAvg	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_AAvg	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 criterion[60]), 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 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
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	0.14	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:

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

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:

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

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 R^2 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

		Base Model			Distance Stability			View Stability		
Variables of Interest	***n***	**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:

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

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:

$$\ln(\text{P}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1\text{N} + \sum_{s}\beta_2\text{S} + \sum_{k}\beta_3\text{X} + \sum_{v}\beta_4\text{VIEW} + \beta_5\text{InvDISTANCE} + \varepsilon \qquad (5)$$

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

	Base Model				Continuous Distance			
Variables of Interest	**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	-0.01	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**	**5**
Dependent Variable	**LN_SalePrice96**	**LN_SalePrice96**
Number of Cases	**4937**	**4937**
Number of Predictors (k)	**37**	**34**
F Statistic	**442.8**	**481.3**
Adjusted R Squared	**0.77**	**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:

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

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 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 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

	Base Model				All Sales			
Variables of Interest	**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

	Base Model	All Sales
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
n	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
***t* 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:

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

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 *y* 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 <u>between</u> different DISTANCE and PERIOD categories is be interesting, it is the comparison of coefficients <u>within</u> 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 then 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.

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

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				
		Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
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				
		Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
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

	Base Model				Orientation Model			
Variables of Interest	**Coef**	**SE**	**p Value**	***n***	**Coef**	**SE**	**p Value**	***n***
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

	Base Model	Orientation Model
Model Equation Number	**1**	**8**
Dependent Variable	**LN_SalePrice96**	**LN_SalePrice96**
Number of Cases	**4937**	**4937**
Number of Predictors (k)	**37**	**40**
F Statistic	**442.8**	**410.0**
Adjusted R Squared	**0.77**	**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]

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

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					
		None	Minor	Moderate	Substantial	Extreme	Total
OVERLAP	None	4,207	317	3	0	0	**4,527**
OVERLAP	Barely	0	139	10	1	0	**150**
OVERLAP	Somewhat	0	81	42	7	2	**132**
OVERLAP	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

	Base Model	Overlap Model
Model Equation Number	**1**	**9**
Dependent Variable	**LN_SalePrice96**	**LN_SalePrice96**
Number of Cases	**4937**	**4937**
Number of Predictors (k)	**37**	**40**
F Statistic	**442.8**	**409.7**
Adjusted R Squared	**0.77**	**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:

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

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:

$$\mathrm{AAR} = \beta_0 + \sum_{s} \beta_1 \mathrm{S} + \sum_{k} \beta_2 \mathrm{X} + \sum_{v} \beta_3 \mathrm{VIEW} + \sum_{d} \beta_4 \mathrm{DISTANCE} + \varepsilon \qquad (11)$$

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_1) 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* ~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:

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

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

	Is there statistical evidence of:			
Statistical Model	**Area Stigma?**	**Scenic Vista Stigma?**	**Nuisance Stigma?**	**Section Reference**
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

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 Waye, 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 <u>not</u> 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 improve 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., Clauretie, 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 Mountian 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. Polleti 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
NYMCOC	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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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 Forsan (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 OKAssessor, 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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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 -thatis 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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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 Grevengoed 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 Tennessen 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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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.

<u>Area Description</u>

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

<u>Census Statistics</u>

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
Orinkany Fal	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 lesson 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					
Home Characteristics			**House Photo Number(s)**		
Cul-De-Sac?	No(0) / Yes(1)		Waterfront?		No(0) / Yes(1)
Scenic Vista Characteristics			**Vista Photo Numbers**		
Overall Quality of Scenic Vista: Poor (1), Below Average (2), Average (3), Above Average (4), Premium (5)					
View of Turbines Characteristics			**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)					
Notes:					

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 frrom 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:

$$\ln(\mathrm{P}) = \beta_0 + \sum_{s} \beta_1 (\mathrm{N} \cdot \mathrm{S}) + \sum_{c} \beta_2 (\mathrm{Y}) + \sum_{k} \beta_3 (\mathrm{X} \cdot \mathrm{S}) + \sum_{v} \beta_4 (\mathrm{VIEW} \cdot \mathrm{S}) + \sum_{d} \beta_5 (\mathrm{DISTANCE} \cdot \mathrm{S}) + \varepsilon \qquad \text{(F13)}$$

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:

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

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 Alterative 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, unrestricting 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, unrestricting 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 unrestrict 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 Standard Errors			Unrestricted Models 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 Coefficients			Unrestricted Models 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 <u>predicted</u> 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
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	-0.45	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
FinBsmt	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
FinBsmt	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
NYMCOC	-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
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	0.24	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**

CONSULTATION REPORT:

WIND FARM SURVEY
AND THE
IMPACT ON PROPERTY VALUES

File # 3354

Prepared for

Brady Wind, LLC
Orin Shakerdge, Esq.
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC
700 Universe Blvd., LAW/JB
Juno Beach, FL 33408

Prepared by:

Rose M. Hoefs
RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc.
1129 5th Avenue South, 2nd floor
Fargo, North Dakota 58103

Date of the Report: December 14, 2015

RM HOEFS & ASSOCIATES, INC.

PO Box 3102
1129 5th Avenue South, 2nd floor
PO Box 3102
Fargo, North Dakota 58108
Phone: 701-298-3066
Fax: 701-298-0810

December 14, 2015

Orin Shakerdge, Esq.
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC
700 Universe Blvd., LAW/JB
Juno Beach, FL 33408

Re: Consultation Report
Wind Farm Survey and the Impact on Property Values

Dear Mr. Shakerdge,

Pursuant to your request, we have completed a quantitative survey of individual properties located in areas of wind farms across the State of North Dakota. The intended use of the survey is to provide market reactions regarding wind farms, placing emphasis on externalities created by the construction of such, and the resulting impact on property values. The survey was developed in compliance with USPAP Ethics and Competency Rules.

The Consultation Report represents succinct discussions concerning the data, reasoning, and analyses used. The depth of discussion is specific to the needs of the client and for the survey's intended use. Additional documentation is retained in the work file of the appraiser. No responsibility is assumed for legal matters, nor is any opinion rendered on the property title or on property value.

Neither our employment nor compensation is contingent on the outcome of the survey. The undersigned has no present or contemplated future interest in any of the surveyed properties. All opinions are developed through the course of accepted analytical procedures.

Rose M. Hoefs takes full responsibility for the survey and its content. The assignment is based on an impartial or unbiased perspective; it is not made for favoring a specific cause of any particular party. The Appraiser has no present or contemplated future interest in the data, as presented, and all opinions have been developed through the course of accepted analytical procedures. Careful consideration has been given to provide an accurate analysis of the data, related markets and to any possible benefits and detriments.

It has been a privilege to be of service. If you have any questions or comments after reading the survey, please inquire.

Respectfully submitted,
RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc.

Rose M. Hoefs
Certified General Appraiser

ND Certified General Appraiser's License #1063
MN Certified General Appraiser's License #4002095
SD Certified General Appraiser's License #1333CG

♦ CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that:

I, Rose M. Hoefs, Certified General Appraiser, completed this Consultation Report / Wind Farm Survey and take full responsibility for its contents. Field inspections were made of the data contained in this consultation report. The data are as represented.

The statements of fact contained in the report are true and correct. The reported analyses, opinions and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions, limiting conditions and legal instructions, and are my personal, impartial and unbiased professional analysis, opinions and conclusions.

This consulting assignment is not based on a requested direction of the data. The appraiser has no present or prospective direct or indirect interest in any of the surveyed data, the specific transactions or any personal interest with respect to the parties involved.

The development and reporting of this consultation assignment complies with the Ethics and Competency Rules of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, and the Appraisal Institute's Code of Professional Ethics.

Except as hereinafter provided, the client may distribute entire copies of this survey to selected third parties; however, no portion of this survey can be disseminated to the public by advertising media, public relations media, news media, sales media, or other media for public communication without the prior written consent of the appraiser.

RM Hoefs and Associates, Inc. has not performed any appraisal services regarding the sale data contained in this survey within the three-year period immediately preceding the acceptance of this assignment.

Rose M. Hoefs is a Candidate for Designation with the Appraisal Institute; therefore, the use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute, relating to review by its duly authorized representative(s). As of the date of this report, Ms. Hoefs completed the Standards and Ethics Requirements of the Appraisal Institute for Associate Members.

SIGNED____ DATE December 14, 2015

Rose M. Hoefs, Supervisory Appraiser (Certified General)
RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc.

North Dakota Certified General License	#1063
Minnesota Certified General License	#4002095
SD Certified General Appraiser’s License	#1333CG

♦ TABLE OF CONTENTS

♦ SCOPE OF WORK

I. STATEMENT OF COMPETENCY

This consulting assignment was accepted by R. M. Hoefs & Associates, Inc. from the client, Brady Wind. LLC. Rose M. Hoefs has completed prior assignments on similar projects. Her knowledge and experience is established, being confirmed through the successful completion of numerous appraisals, consulting assignments and also by the completion and passing of educational courses offered by the Appraisal Institute. The appraiser is an advanced candidate of the Appraisal Institute and is a General Appraiser, board-certified through the North Dakota Real Estate Appraiser Qualification and Ethics Board the State of Minnesota Department of Commerce and the South Dakota Department of Labor and Regulation. (See enclosed Qualifications).

In preparation of this assignment, various articles were researched, including those in the text *Towers, Turbines and Transmission Lines, Impacts on Property Values* regarding a diminution in property values due to the construction of wind turbines and wind farms. The preceding steps have been taken to facilitate the completion of this assignment in a competent and professional manner, complying fully with the Competency Provision of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice.

II. CONTINGENT AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

This survey is subject to the following contingent and limiting conditions, which are an integral part of this survey along with all certifications, definitions, facts, statements, assumptions, disclosures hypotheses, analyses, and opinions.

1. By this notice, all persons, companies, corporations or government agencies using or relying on this report in any manner bind themselves to accept these Contingent and Limiting Conditions and all other limiting conditions contained elsewhere in this report. This survey does not address any unforeseeable events that could alter the market conditions reflected in the analysis.

2. Illustrative materials are included only to assist the reader in visualizing the properties included in the survey.

3. As a part of the survey process, information was gathered and analyzed to form opinions that pertain solely to the survey. Information, regarding the sale data, their neighborhoods, or other topics discussed in the report, was obtained from a variety of sources deemed reliable and believed to be true and correct in accordance with the extent of research. Any exhibits in the report are intended to assist the reader in visualizing the subject property and its surroundings. The exhibits are not surveys unless specifically identified as such.

4. This document communicates the result of a consulting assignment. No expertise is claimed in property inspection, engineering, construction, legal or architecture. The appraiser assumes no liability for such as these elements are outside of her control and beyond the scope of work as detailed in the report or outside reasonable "due diligence".

5. All contents of this report are prepared solely for the identified client. The liability of the appraiser is limited solely to the client. There is no accountability, warranty, or liability to any third party. For that portion of work product or services giving rise to liability, the appraiser's maximum liability for services rendered under this engagement is limited to the fee collected and paid to RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc. In no event shall the appraiser be liable for consequential, special incidental or punitive loss, damages or expense, even if advised of their possible existence. The use of this report by third parties is solely at their risk.

6. It is assumed that testimony or attendance in court or at any court hearing is not required by reason of rendering this survey unless such arrangements are made a reasonable time in advance. The appraiser retains the right to expand upon the data contained in the survey and to review and consider any data that becomes available between the date of the survey and the date of court testimony or hearing. The appraiser also retains the right to amend the survey to reflect such data, and to make any required or necessary adjustments to the value opinions.

7. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not carry with it the right of publication. The survey may not be used for any purpose other than its intended use nor may it be used by any person(s) or entity other than the intended users.

III. EXTRAORDINARY ASSUMPTIONS AND DISCLOSURES

This survey employs the following extraordinary assumptions:

- Sale data; i.e. size, topography, legal description, dimensions, etc., are collected from publicly available sources and/or a party to the sale. All information is assumed to be reasonably correct.
- The appraiser did not attempt to study, dig, probe, investigate, detect, remove materials or discover unfavorable physical features.
- No special expertise is implied as related to water conditions, drainage, soil conditions, and other physical components of the sales, other than what is of record or provided by a party to the sale.

The preceding extraordinary assumptions and disclosures are integral to the process upon which the conclusions in this document are based.

IV. SCOPE OF THE CONSULTATION

Assignment Conditions
The development and reporting of this consultation assignment complies with the Ethics and Competency Rules of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, and the Appraisal Institute's Code of Professional Ethics.

Intended Use and Users of the Survey
The contract was secured by Orin Shakerdge, Esquire, NextEra Energy Resources, LLC, the client and intended user of this report.

Purpose of the Consultation
The purpose of this consultation assignment is to develop, without advocacy, a survey of market reactions to wind farms and/or wind turbines. Investigations and inquiries undertaken to arrive at appropriately supported conclusions include the analysis of the market and relevant comparable data through a qualitative survey commonly known as a paired sale analysis. While subjective in nature, this type of survey focuses on descriptive data (comparison of positives and negatives) as opposed to quantitative analysis which focuses on actual numerical outcomes (percentages or actual dollar amounts). The goal of the analysis is to provide definable market patterns.

♦ SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

Wind turbines have been used throughout history as a means of generating energy, draining land, pumping water, milling grain and other industrial purposes. For the last decade, the United States has increased its reliance on wind energy not only to mitigate global warming but also to supplement and eventually supplant oil and gas reserves. A recent report released by Wind Vision forecasts that by 2050, 35% of all the energy used in the United States will be from wind. The following map indicates the Great Plains states have the highest potential for wind farm development, with North Dakota, Montana, Minnesota and South Dakota having the greatest potential.



DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

While surveys indicate that public acceptance of wind energy in the United States is generally high, local concerns can impact the location of a wind farm and impede the development process. Very little was published to address those concerns until 2012, when the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service published *U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service land-Based Wind Energy Guidelines*. To date, this document is the most comprehensive available, establishing requisites for wind farm development. As a result, the American Wind Energy Association has worked diligently to address not only environmental concerns and issues regarding the construction of turbines and wind farms, but also to work hand-in-hand with the National Audubon Society and the National Wildlife Federation to address avian and wildlife issues. As a condition of the permitting process for wind farm development, impact studies are required which address concerns regarding wind speed, development constraints and various environmental issues.

PUBLIC CONCERNS

Concerns voiced by the public are similar to those expressed regarding high voltage transmission lines; namely the aesthetics of the large steel towers and a diminution in property values, more commonly defined as:

- Scenic view stigma: concerns that individual properties may be devalued due to the view of a wind turbine or wind farms.
- Area stigma: concerns that property values within the wind farm area may be devalued.
- Nuisance stigma: concerns that noise and shadow flickers have an adverse influence on property values.

PROXIMITY STUDY / PAIRED SALES ANALYSIS

Given, the preceding, it is the intent of this study to measure the effect wind turbines have on property values via a proximity study of paired sales. The analysis is one of the most useful applications in determining detrimental conditions related to negative externalities, including noise, visual impacts, stigma and/or fear. To determine if legitimate detrimental conditions exist, sales of properties improved with wind turbines are compared to sales of nearby properties without wind turbines. If present, a measurable and consistent difference will be evident in the sale prices of the properties. If not, the differences will not be significant. Ideally, the data (sales) should be similar in all respects; however, in reality, the market place is not ideal, and therefore, the search for data is extremely difficult and at times, nearly impossible. For the study conclusions to be reliable and not misleading, the sale data must be within the same market area, relatively comparable in physical characteristics, and occurring within a reasonable period of one another.

Research included twelve wind farms in Barnes, Burleigh, Cavalier, Dickey – LaMoure, Griggs, Steele, Oliver and Ward Counties. Of the twelve, paired sales were found in five. Data is limited since the majority of wind farms are located in rural areas where farms and ranches are passed down from generation to generation within the family structure. Market participants (buyers and sellers of the preceding sales) were surveyed regarding perceived detrimental conditions. A review of the data indicates that out of the 26 participants,

- 25 did not consider any negative impact;
- one participant would not provide an opinion of impact;
- one property was improved with a mobile home dwelling; the buyer stated no impact;
- two farmsteads adjacent to wind farms were retained by the sellers of the adjacent land.

Although the analysis used in this research has its strengths and weaknesses, the end result is that all of the data are consistent in that no evidence was found as to a diminution in value associated with the location of wind farms or turbines.

BARNES COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA

The surveyed area is located adjacent to and east of Lake Ashtabula, beginning about 9.5 miles northeast of Valley City. The area is primarily rural in nature, with farmsteads interspersed at one to two mile increments. Lake Ashtabula is located one to two miles west. Steele and Griggs Counties lie north-northeast. The topography is one of rolling hills with some steep ravines. The area is generally treeless, with the exception of sporadic mature tree claims or wooded swales. The soils are glacial till, and range from level to undulating with drainage varying from poor to well drained. Agricultural uses include crop and hay production as well as pasture for livestock. As is typical for this area, saline soils are present.

Overall, the wind farms suggest little physical impact to the land other than the area used for turbine placement and access. Typically, the access roads appeared to use a minimal amount of land to access the turbines.

The paired sales are summarized as follows, representing six sales (1, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 12) of properties improved with wind turbines and six without turbines (2, 3, 4, 5, 10 and 11). All of the data are situated adjacent to or near wind farms.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines Present	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	SW	33	142	57	Barnes	4/7/2015	$ 320,000	160.00	54.5	$ 2,000	2.00	yes	no	no
2	NE	35	142	57	Barnes	1/20/2015	$ 520,000	160.00	63.9	$ 3,250	none	yes	no	no
3	NW	33	142	57	Barnes	12/29/2014	$ 357,500	160.00	49.6	$ 2,234	none	yes	no	no
4	NE	2	141	57	Barnes	12/26/2014	$ 540,000	164.02	69.7	$ 3,292	none	yes	no	yes
5	E2SE	34	142	57	Barnes	12/22/2012	$ 320,000	80.00	73.9	$ 4,000	none	yes	no	yes
6	Parts	32 & 29	142	57	Barnes	12/22/2012	$1,920,000	480.00	58.4	$ 4,000	4.00	yes	no	yes
7	NE	6	141	57	Barnes	12/21/2012	$ 275,000	162.80	65.0	$ 1,689	2.00	yes	no	no
	Wind Royalties						$ 375,000	162.80	65.0	$ 2,303	2.00	yes	no	yes
8	NE & E2SW	4	141	57	Barnes	10/31/2012	$ 899,999	239.39	71.6	$ 3,760	2.00	yes	no	no
9	E2SE & SWSW	8	141	57	Barnes	2/23/2012	$ 275,000	105.75	47.4	$ 2,600	1.00	yes	no	yes*
10	SW	25	142	57	Barnes	11/18/2010	$ 215,000	160.00	64.7	$ 1,344	none	yes	no	no
11	SW Parts 9	9 & 10	142	57	Barnes	9/9/2010	$ 250,000	196.27	63.4	$ 1,274	none	yes	no	no
12	NE	33	142	57	Barnes	3/10/2010	$ 170,200	157.49	66.8	$ 1,081	1.00	yes	no	yes
	Wind Royalties						$ 217,500	157.49	66.8	$ 1,381	1.00	yes	no	yes

The sales were then grouped according to date of sale and, with the exception of Sale 7, to their productivity index. Approximately 33.8% of the soils of Sale 7 are saline; therefore, the soils are marginal at best. For that reason, it was placed last in its grouping.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines Present	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid	Market Adjustment Comments
4	NE	2	141	57	Barnes	12/26/2014	$ 540,000	164.02	69.7	$ 3,292	none	yes	no	yes	Premium paid for land due to increasing prices; 9.25 acres are saline; upward adjustment required
2	NE	35	142	57	Barnes	1/20/2015	$ 520,000	160.00	63.9	$ 3,250	none	yes	no	no	35 acres in CRP; 24.19 acres are saline present; positive adjustment
1	SW	33	142	57	Barnes	4/7/2015	$ 320,000	160.00	54.5	$ 2,000	**2.00**	yes	no	no	Turbine present; does not own wind royalties; an upward adjustment is required.
3	NW	33	142	57	Barnes	12/29/2014	$ 357,500	160.00	49.6	$ 2,234	none	yes	no	yes	Wind Farms to east and west
5	E2SE	34	142	57	Barnes	12/22/2012	$ 320,000	80.00	73.9	$ 4,000	none	yes	no	yes	Premium paid for land due to increasing prices
8	NE & E2SW	4	141	57	Barnes	10/31/2012	$ 899,999	239.39	71.6	$ 3,760	**2.00**	yes	no	no	Turbines present; does not own wind royalties
6	Parts	32 & 29	142	57	Barnes	12/22/2012	$ 1,920,000	480.00	58.4	$ 4,000	**4.00**	yes	no	yes	Premium paid for land due to increasing prices. Turbines present; does not own wind royalties; positive adjustment for wind royalties ; 11.9 acres are saline; upward adjustment required
9	E2SE & SWSW	8	141	57	Barnes	2/23/2012	$ 275,000	105.75	47.4	$ 2,600	**1 & met tower**	yes	no	yes*	Turbine present; does not own wind royalties; no negative impact to farmstead; upward adjustment required for turbine and tower
7	NE	6	141	57	Barnes	12/21/2012	$ 375,000	162.80	65.0	$ 2,303	**2.00**	yes	no	yes	Purchased wind royalties @ $50,000/turbine; 55.04 acres are saline (33.8% of total; soils are substantially inferior requiring upward adjustment when compared to Sales 2 and 4.
12	NE	33	142	57	Barnes	3/10/2010	$ 217,500	157.49	66.8	$ 1,381	**1.00**	yes	no	yes	Wind royalties @ $47,300 total or $300 per acre
10	SW	25	142	57	Barnes	11/18/2010	$ 215,000	160.00	64.7	$ 1,344	none	yes	no	no	Wind Farms nearby; positive adjustment required for 19.41 saline acres.
11	SW Parts 9	9 & 10	142	57	Barnes	9/9/2010	$ 250,000	196.27	63.4	$ 1,274	none	yes	no	no	Land under turbines was retained by seller; no impact to farmstead; 13.83 acres are saline

The sale prices of Group 1 are indicative of current values. Group 2 consists of data that closed during a period from 2011 through 2013 when agricultural land prices were increasing rapidly. Price increases were due in part to (1) high commodity prices and (2) an ethanol plant at Casselton, North Dakota, which drove up local corn prices. Group 3 consists of sales prior to the 2011 – 2013 increasing market. Although the representative market value ranges are different, each group depicts a strong correlation of productivity index to sale price whether the sale is improved or unimproved. The variances within each data set are attributable to the conditions of the soils (salinity) and/or wind royalties. None of the groups evidence market resistance. The sellers of Sales 9 and 11 retained their farmsteads which are situated adjacent to wind farms. No aesthetic impact was noted. Sale 11 represents an anomaly to the market as the turbine pad sites (rather than royalty rights) were retained by the seller.

T142N

Barnes County

GRAND PRAIRIE PLAT

CODE: AM

R 57W



NOLTIMIERPLAT

T141N

CODE: AX

R 57W

Land Sale No. 1



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5970
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	24th Street and 122nd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-3330300
Legal Description	SW4 Section 33, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Leigh Ann Hafner
Grantee	Derek E. and Laura M. Bruns
Sale Date	April 07, 2015
Deed Book/Page	WD 280259
Property Rights	Leased Fee; fractional interest; wind royalties reserved by grantor
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage to current farming operation
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were researched for 3 years; no transfers were found.
Verification	Derek Bruns, Grantee; (701) 840-1472, 11/19/2015; County records
Sale Price	$320,000

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to rolling; slopes from 0 to 35%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel
Access	22nd St SE

Land Sale No. 1 (Cont.)

Productivity Index	54.5
Adjusted Productivity Index	62.0 (less slough and waste)
Wind Farm	Wind Farm directly east, west and southeast of tract
Wind Turbines on Tract	Two

Land Size Information

Gross Acres	160.00 Acres
Tillable Acres	120.00 Acres, 75.00%
Slough and Waste	40.00 Acres, 25.00%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$2,000
Sale Price/Tillable Acre	$2,667

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Derek Bruns, Grantee, who stated he was approached by the seller to purchase the land since he was leasing it. The price paid was based on appraisal completed for sale purposes. Of the total, 120 acres are tillable, and the balance is wet or waste. The parcel is improved with 2 wind turbines; the tract to the east (E2 Section 33) is improved with 3 turbines. Mr. Bruns stated the price was not impacted by the wind turbines as he can farm around them. The seller reserved the wind royalty payments to the turbines at the time of sale.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, Barnes-Buse loams, Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams. The slopes range from 0-35%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, VI, VII, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 88, with an overall weighted average of 54.5 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 48.4% is Not Prime Farmland, 34.7% is Prime Farmland, 14.3% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 2.6% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (71.7%), partially hydric (14.3%), predominantly hydric (9.2%), and non-hydric (4.8%).

Aerial Map



29
28
27
23rd St SE
23rd St SE
123rd Ave SE
27
32
33-142N-57W
34
123rd Ave SE
27
160.00
123rd Ave SE
5
4
3
©2015 AgriData, Inc.
map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07
0ft
820ft
1640ft
Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015
www.AgriDataInc.com
33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota
N
W
E
S
11/30/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **33-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **160**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	33.10	20.7%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	25.30	15.8%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G782B	Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	25.08	15.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	3031	81
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	23.80	14.9%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	21.91	13.7%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	15.33	9.6%		0ft.	VIIIw	1217	9
G680F	Buse-Sioux complex, 9 to 35 percent slopes	7.76	4.9%		> 6.5ft.	VIIe	1957	22
G732C	Lanona-Buse complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	4.58	2.9%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2765	56
G506A	Overly-Bearden silty clay loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	3.14	2.0%		4.9ft.	IIc	3548	88
						Weighted Average	**2846.4**	**54.5**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07

0ft 820ft 1640ft

33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

H
W E
S

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 2



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID 5968
Property Type Vacant Land
Address 125th Avenue SE and 23rd Street SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID 13-3510100
Legal Description NE4 Section 35, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor Louis Powers et al
Grantee Andrew K.G. Bruns
Sale Date January 20, 2015
Deed Book/Page WD 279615
Property Rights Leased fee; Surface rights; fractional interest; reservation of minerals
Conditions of Sale Assemblage to current farming operation
Financing Cash to seller
Sale History Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification Andrew Bruns, Grantee; (701) 840-0248, 11/25/15; County records
Sale Price $520,000

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning AG, Agricultural
Topography Level to undulating, slopes 6 – 9%
Utilities Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape Square
Roads Gravel
Access 125th Ave SE
Productivity Index 63.9
Wind Farm Wind Farm located ½ mile SW
Wind Turbines on Tract None

Land Sale No. 2 (Cont.)

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	160.000 Acres; 24.19 acres have saline present (15.12%)
Tillable Acres	125.000 Acres, 78.13%
CRP	35.000 Acres, 21.87%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$3,250

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Andrew Bruns, Grantee, who purchased the land at an estate auction as an assemblage to his farming operation to maintain his farm operation. Mr. Bruns believes he paid a market price. Prior to the purchase, Mr. Bruns leased the land, but would not disclose the amount. Mr. Bruns stated the land has 125 acres tillable and the balance of 35 acres is CRP. Mr. Bruns again does not know the CRP value but stated there is 2 years left. Mr. Bruns farms with his brother and father and his father handles the business aspects. It is noted that the land in CRP is tillable, but not as productive as the balance of the acreage.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse loams and Hamerly-Tonka complex. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 22 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 63.937.8 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 51.7% is Prime Farmland, 17.1% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 15.9% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 15.3% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (60.3%), partially hydric (15.9%), predominantly hydric (15.3%), and non-hydric (8.5%). 24.19 acres have saline present. Saline negatively impacts plant growth and as a result, sale prices.

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 4' 23.88, 97° 51' 51.65

0ft 820ft 1640ft

35-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **35-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **160**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	55.73	34.8%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	25.05	15.7%		2.5ft.	IIe	4114	64
G167B	Balaton-Wyard loams, 0 to 6 percent slopes	17.79	11.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	3245	73
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	16.07	10.0%		0.7ft.	IVw	3892	42
G123A	Svea-Cavour loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	13.75	8.6%		4ft.	IIc	2703	73
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	8.12	5.1%		0.7ft.	IVw	4453	31
G680C	Barnes-Sioux complex, 3 to 9 percent slopes	8.04	5.0%		4.9ft.	IIe	2302	55
G101A	Hamerly-Wyard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	6.67	4.2%		2.5ft.	IIe	4014	77
G680B	Barnes-Sioux complex, 1 to 6 percent slopes	5.37	3.4%		4.9ft.	IIe	2416	63
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	2.67	1.7%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
G523A	Lowe-Fluvaquents, channeled complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	0.67	0.4%		2.5ft.	VIw	2276	22
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	0.07	0.0%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
						Weighted Average	**3326.5**	**63.9**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 4' 23.88, 97° 51' 51.65

0ft 820ft 1640ft

35-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

11/30/2015

Land Sale No. 3



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID 5969
Property Type Vacant Land
Address 23rd Street and 122nd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID 13-3320200
Legal Description NW4 Section 33, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor Leigh Ann Hafner
Grantee Andrew Bruns
Sale Date December 29, 2014
Deed Book/Page WD 279497
Property Rights Leased Fee
Conditions of Sale Assemblage to current farming operation
Financing Cash to seller
Sale History Records were searched for 3 years; no transfer was found.
Verification Andrew Bruns, Grantee; (701) 845-3346, 11/19/2015;: County records
Sale Price $357,500

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning AG, Agricultural
Topography Level to rolling hills, slopes 0 to 9%
Utilities Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape Square
Roads Gravel
Access 23rd St SE

Land Sale No. 3 (Cont.)

Productivity Index	49.6
Adjusted Productivity Index	58.9 (Less sloughs and waste)
Wind Farm	Wind Farms directly east west and south of tract
Wind Turbines on Tract	None

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	160.00 Acres
Tillable Acres	118.00 Acres, 73.75%
Sloughs and Waste	41.00 Acres, 26.25%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$2,234
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$3,030

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Andrew Bruns, who stated he has been leasing the land and approached the Grantor wanting to maintain his farm operation. Mr. Bruns had the land appraised prior to the purchase and believes he paid market price. Of the total, 118 acres are tillable; 41 acres are slough and waste. This tract is not improved with wind turbines, but lies between Wind Farms on the east, west and south. Mr. Bruns indicated that the wind farms had no impact on the price.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse loams, Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, and Southam silty clay loam. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, III, IV, V, VI, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, stones, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 88, with an overall weighted average of 49.6 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 61.1% is Not Prime Farmland, 33.4% is Prime Farmland, 4.1% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, with the remaining 1.4% being Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (76.7%), predominantly hydric (19.0%), non-hydric (2.9%), and partially hydric (1.4%).

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07

0ft 820ft 1640ft

33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By surety
© Agridata, Inc 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **33-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **160**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	46.72	29.2%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	33.32	20.8%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	27.67	17.3%		0ft.	VIIIw	1217	9
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	27.23	17.0%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G506A	Overly-Bearden silty clay loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	6.84	4.3%		4.9ft.	IIc	3548	88
G276B	Renshaw-Sioux complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	6.28	3.9%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	2002	40
G486C	Eckman-Zell loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	4.61	2.9%		4.9ft.	IIIe	2850	64
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	3.13	2.0%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	2.24	1.4%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G732C	Lanona-Buse complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	1.96	1.2%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2765	56
						Weighted Average	**2617.6**	**49.6**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07

0ft 820ft 1640ft

33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

11/30/2015

Land Sale No. 4



Property Identification

Record ID	5967
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	125th Avenue SE and 24th Street SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Noltimier Township
Tax ID	24-0210100
Legal Description	NE4 Section 2, T141N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota

Sale Data

Grantor	Ronald K. and Clarise E. Powers
Grantee	Jason and Hilary Sjostrom
Sale Date	December 26, 2014
Deed Book/Page	CFD 279646
Property Rights	Fee simple to pass at the time W/D is issued
Conditions of Sale	Investment
Financing	Financing: Contract for Deed: $540,000, inclusive of 1.72% interest per year. The first payment of $90,000 due on completion of the title opinion, 5 further payments of $90,000 to be paid yearly on or before January 5th of each year from 2015 to and including 2019.
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Jason Sjostrom; (701) 367-4548, November 25, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price	$540,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating, 0 to 9% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel

Land Sale No. 4 (Cont.)

Access	125th Ave SE
Productivity Index	69.7
Wind Farm	Wind Farms directly south, southeast
Wind Turbines on Tract	None

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	164.02 Acres; 9.25 acres have saline present
Tillable Acres	161.00 Acres, 98.16%
Slough / Waste / Trees	3.02 Acres 1.84%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$3,292
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$3,354

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Jason Sjostrom, Grantee, purchased the land from the Grantor as an investment, and rents it to the Grantor's son. Mr. Sjostrom believes he paid a small premium for the vacant land due to increasing market conditions; however, there was no impact from the wind farms located to the south, southeast. The tract is nearly 100% tillable. A row of evergreens is in CRP, for which the buyer receives $180 per year for the remaining 5 or 6 year period.

The primary soils include Balaton-Wyard loams, Barnes-Svea loams, Barnes-Buse loams, and Hamerly-Wyard loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and V, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 22 to 81, with an overall weighted average of 69.7 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 81.3% is Prime Farmland, 8.8% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 6.2% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 3.7% being Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly hydric (85.2%), predominantly non-hydric (9.9%), and non-hydric (4.9%). 9.25 acres are saline soils which affects plant growth and pricing. 9.25 acres have saline present. Saline impacts plant growth and sale prices.

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 3' 31.61, 97° 51' 51.48

0ft 823ft 1647ft

2-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

11/25/2015

Maps Provided By surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **2-141N-57W**
Township: **Noltimier**
Acres: **164.02**
Date: **11/25/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Non-Irr Class *c	Productivity Index
G167B	Balaton-Wyard loams, 0 to 6 percent slopes	46.94	28.6%		IIe	73
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	28.20	17.2%		IIe	75
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	27.64	16.9%		IIe	69
G101A	Hamerly-Wyard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	27.42	16.7%		IIe	77
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	9.25	5.6%		IVw	42
G123A	Svea-Cavour loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	6.34	3.9%		IIc	73
G2A	Tonka silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	6.18	3.8%		IVw	42
G680B	Barnes-Sioux complex, 1 to 6 percent slopes	5.26	3.2%		IIe	63
G782B	Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	3.24	2.0%		IIe	81
G680C	Barnes-Sioux complex, 3 to 9 percent slopes	2.63	1.6%		IIe	55
G523A	Lowe-Fluvaquents, channeled complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	0.74	0.5%		VIw	22
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	0.18	0.1%		Vw	25
					Weighted Average	**69.7**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 3' 31.61, 97° 51' 51.48

0ft 823ft 1647ft

2-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/25/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 5



Property Identification

Record ID	5974
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	23rd Street SE and 123rd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-3440400
Legal Description	E2SE4 Section 34, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Joyce S. Larson Revocable Living Trust U/T/A
Grantee	Mark C. Winter et al
Sale Date	December 22, 2012
Deed Book/Page	TD 274326
Property Rights	Leased fee (share crop basis)
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage / atypical with premium
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Mark Winter, Grantee; (701) 845-3082, 11/18/2015; County records
Sale Price	$320,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; slopes 0 – 9%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Rectangular
Roads	Gravel
Access	23rd St SE
Productivity Index	73.9

Land Sale No. 5 (Cont.)

Wind Farm	Wind Farms directly west
Wind Turbines on Tract	None

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	80.00 Acres
Tillable Acres	67.00 Acres, 83.75%
Wetlands Land Size	13.00 Acres, 16.25%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$4,000
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$4,776

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Mark Winter, Grantee, who stated he purchased the land as an assemblage to the existing farming operation. He had been leasing it, when approached by the Grantor. Since market prices were premium, Mr. Winter was not looking to buy as prices, but purchased the tract as the Grantor had health issues and needed to sell. The lease was on a share crop basis with wheat/beans on a 70% share for the Grantee and 30% share for the Grantor; corn was at a share of 75% - 25%. The sale price was determined by the sale of other tracts in the area. The fact that those tracts may have had wind towers on them was not a part of the consideration for the price paid. He also stated that no consideration was given to the abutting wind farm.

The primary soils include Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, Hamerly-Tonka complex, and Barnes-Buse loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and V, with various susceptibility to erosion and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 81, with an overall weighted average of 73.9 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 77.8% is Prime Farmland, 18.6% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 3.6% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly hydric (77.9%), partially hydric (18.6%), and predominantly non-hydric (3.5%).

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 4' 24.18, 97° 53' 8.52

0ft 817ft 1634ft

34-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/1/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **34-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **80**
Date: **12/1/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G782B	Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	48.91	61.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	3031	81
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	14.38	18.0%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	13.77	17.2%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2.86	3.6%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	0.08	0.1%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
						Weighted Average	**3300.4**	**73.9**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 4' 24.18, 97° 53' 8.52

0ft 817ft 1634ft

34-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

12/1/2015

Land Sale No. 6



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5975
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	23rd Street SE and 122nd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-2930300; 13-3210100; 13-3220200
Legal Description	N2 Section 32; SE Section 29, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Joyce S. Larson Revocable Living Trust U/T/A
Grantee	Casey J. and Debra L. Burchill
Sale Date	December 22, 2012
Deed Book/Page	TD 274327
Property Rights	Leased fee; fractional interest; seller retained wind royalties
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage to existing farming operation
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Deb Burchill, Grantee; (701) 845-0726, 11/19/2015; County records
Sale Price	$1,920,000

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to rolling hills; slopes 0 – 15%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Gravel
Access	23rd Street SE
Productivity Index	58.4 (no adjustment required)
Wind Farm	Wind Farms on tract and to east; southeast
Wind Turbines on Tract	Four

Land Sale No. 6 (Cont.)

Land Size Information

Gross Acres	480.00 Acres
Tillable Acres	384.00 Acres, 80.00%
Sloughs and Waste	96.00 Acres, 20.00%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$4,000
Sale Price/ Acre	$5,000

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Deb Burchill, Grantee, who stated they were approached by the Grantor to purchase the land due to the fact they were leasing it at the time for $75.00/acre. Mrs. Burchill purchased the land to continue their farm operation. The land is 80% tillable and 20% water / wasteland. Four wind turbines were located on the N2 of Section 32 at the time of the sale. Mrs. Burchill would have liked to have purchased the wind royalty rights for the turbines, but the Grantor retained them. Mrs. Burchill believes the price was premium and stated that the turbines did not impact the sale price.

The primary soils include Hamerly-Tonka complex, Barnes-Svea loams, and Barnes-Buse loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, VI, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, stones, and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 58.4 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 36.0% is Prime Farmland, 35.7% is Not Prime Farmland, 25% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 3.3% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (60.6%), partially hydric (25%), predominantly hydric (11.1%), and non-hydric (3.3%). 11.90 acres are saline, which impacts plant growth and sale price.

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 4' 49.76, 97° 55' 40.3

0ft 843ft 1686ft

32-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N S W E

12/1/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **32-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **480**
Date: **12/1/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	120.06	25.0%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	93.51	19.5%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	73.88	15.4%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	65.97	13.7%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G276B	Renshaw-Sioux complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	34.56	7.2%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	2002	40
G4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	20.96	4.4%		0ft.	VIIIw	1217	9
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	17.51	3.6%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	15.88	3.3%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G680C	Barnes-Sioux complex, 3 to 9 percent slopes	15.33	3.2%		4.9ft.	IIe	2302	55
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	11.90	2.5%		0.7ft.	IVw	3892	42
G250A	Divide loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	5.32	1.1%		2.5ft.	IIs	3729	58
G447A	Colvin-Borup complex, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	5.12	1.1%		0.7ft.	IVw	3801	37
						Weighted Average	**3182.1**	**58.4**

Topography Map

map center: 47° 4' 49.76, 97° 55' 40.3

0ft 843ft 1686ft

32-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/1/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Land Sale No. 7



Property Identification

Record ID	5972
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	24th Street SE and 120th Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Noltimier Township
Tax ID	24-0610100
Legal Description	NE4 Section 6, T141N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Sandra J. Burchill
Grantee	John T. Bruns
Sale Date	December 21, 2012
Deed Book/Page	WD 274276
Property Rights	Leased Fee
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Verification	John Bruns, Grantee; (701) 845-3346, 11/20/2015; County records
Sale Price / Land	$275,000 or $1,689 per gross acre
Sale Price/Turbines	$100,000 representing wind right to turbines ($50,000 per turbine)
Cumulative Sale Price	$375,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Nearly level, slopes 0-6%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel
Access	24th St SE
Productivity Index	65.0
Adjusted Productivity Index	68.4

Land Sale No. 7 (Cont.)

Wind Farm	Wind Farms on tract; to the east and ½ mile north and 1 mile northeast
Wind Turbines on Tract	Two

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	162.800 Acres; 55.04 acres have saline present (33.8%)
Tillable Acres	140.000 Acres, 86.00%
Sloughs and Waste	22.800 Acres, 14.00%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,689 excluding wind royalties; $2,303 including wind royalties
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$1,964 excluding wind royalties; $2,679 including wind royalties

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by John Bruns, Grantee, who stated that the seller approached him to buy the land since he was leasing it. The land is very flat and has about 80 good tillable acres, 60 marginal acres and 22.8 in waste and sloughs. He stated that the Grantor, Sandra Burchill is a substantial land owner in the area and he and his sons would like to acquire more land from her, so bought this land to keep her happy. The transaction was comprised of two transactions, rolled into one. The land was purchased at $1,689 per acre or $275,000 total. The wind royalties for the two turbines on the land were purchased at $100,000 or $50,000 per turbine. Mr. Bruns used Ag County to assist in establishing the price paid for the air rights. He viewed the deal as a "public relations" transaction to keep the doors open for future transactions with Ms. Burchill.

The primary soils include Overly-Bearden silty clay loams, Bearden silty clay loam, Vallers loam, and Colvin-Borup complex. The slopes range from 0-6%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and V, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, stones, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 88, with an overall weighted average of 65 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage, 55.8% is Prime Farmland, with the remaining 44.2% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (55.8%), predominantly hydric (36.9%), and non-hydric (7.3%). This tract has 55.04 acres of saline soils, which negatively affect plant growth and price paid.


Aerial Map
30
31
32
162.80
6-141N-57W
5
1
120th Ave SE
120th Ave SE
25th St SE
12
7
8
©2015 AgriData, Inc.
map center: 47° 3' 32.1, 97° 56' 56.93
0ft
817ft
1634ft
6-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota
N
W
E
S
11/30/2015
Maps Provided By
surety
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015
www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **6-141N-57W**
Township: **Noltimier**
Acres: **162.8**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G506A	Overly-Bearden silty clay loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	49.07	30.1%		4.9ft.	IIc	3548	88
G430A	Bearden silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	30.63	18.8%		2.5ft.	IIe	3933	84
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	27.50	16.9%		0.7ft.	IVw	3892	42
G447A	Colvin-Borup complex, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	25.18	15.5%		0.7ft.	IVw	3801	37
G275A	Renshaw loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	11.90	7.3%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	1969	44
G491A	Gardena-Glyndon loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	7.18	4.4%		4.9ft.	IIc	3371	87
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	5.21	3.2%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	3.77	2.3%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2.36	1.4%		0.7ft.	IVw	4453	31
						Weighted Average	**3651.8**	**65**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 3' 32.1, 97° 56' 56.93

0ft 817ft 1634ft

6-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 8



Property Identification

Record ID 5971
Property Type Vacant Land
Address 123rd Avenue SE and 24th Street SE , Barnes County, North Dakota
Location Noltimier Township
Tax ID 24-0410100; 24-0440400
Legal Description NE4; E2SW4 Section 4, T141N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor Bruce L. Schmidt et al
Grantee Casey J. and Debra L. Burchill
Sale Date October 31, 2012
Deed Book/Page WD 273843, 273844, 273845
Property Rights Surface rights / fractional interest; reservation of mineral rights and life estate in existing wind project (wind royalties)
Conditions of Sale Assemblage
Financing Cash to seller
Sale History Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification Casey Burchill, Grantee; (701) 845-0726, November 24, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price $889,999

Land Data

Zoning AG, Agricultural
Topography Level to undulating; slopes 0 to 9%
Utilities Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape Square
Roads Gravel
Access 123rd Ave SE
Productivity Index 71.6

Land Sale No. 8 (Cont.)

Wind Farm	Wind Farms adjacent to the NW
Wind Turbines on Tract	Two

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	239.390 Acres
Tillable Acres	239.39 Acres

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$3,718

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Casey Burchill, Grantee, who stated they purchased the land via an auction that was advertised in the newspaper. Mr. Burchill believes he paid market price for the vacant land and stated that the seller kept the wind royalties to the two turbines on the tract, it did not impact the sale price. Mr. Burchill purchased the land to expand his farm operation and described the land as mostly tillable with a tree clump on the north border and a row of trees near the south border.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse loams, Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II and IV, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 42 to 92, with an overall weighted average of 71.6 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 78.6% is Prime Farmland, 16.4 is Not Prime Farmland, 4.8% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 0.2% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (94.6%), partially hydric (4.8%), and predominantly hydric (0.6%).

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 3' 31.8, 97° 54' 24.33

0ft 830ft 1660ft

4-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N
W E
S

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **4-141N-57W**
Township: **Noltimier**
Acres: **239.39**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	80.51	33.6%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G782B	Kranzburg-Lismore silty clay loams, 2 to 6 percent slopes	49.50	20.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	3031	81
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	37.31	15.6%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	23.34	9.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G167B	Balaton-Wyard loams, 0 to 6 percent slopes	18.19	7.6%		4.9ft.	IIe	3245	73
G782A	Lismore-Kranzburg silty clay loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	16.88	7.1%		4.9ft.	IIc	3835	92
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	11.57	4.8%		2.5ft.	IIe	4114	64
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	1.63	0.7%		0.7ft.	IVw	3892	42
G466A	Overly-Nahon silt loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.46	0.2%		4.9ft.	IIc	2757	79
						Weighted Average	**3105.7**	**71.6**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 3' 31.8, 97° 54' 24.33

0ft 830ft 1660ft

4-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N W E S

11/30/2015

Land Sale No. 9

Property Identification

Record ID	5973
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	26th Street SE and 123rd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Noltimier Township
Tax ID	24-0840400
Legal Description	E2SE4; SW4SW4 Section 8, T141N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota, less and excepting a tract in the SE4 containing 4.25 acres and Auditor's Lot No. 1 of the SE4 containing 10 acres.

Sale Data

Grantor	Prairie Industries, LLC
Grantee	Steve Winter and Mark C. Winter
Sale Date	February 23, 2012
Deed Book/Page	WD 272189
Property Rights	Leased fee; fractional interest; excludes wind royalties – existing projects
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	CFD 258568 dated 12/7/2006 from James L. and Lori K. Larson to Prairie Industries, LLC for $170,000, satisfied by WD 272188 dated 3/6/2012. This transfer did not include Auditor's Lot No. 1 which was the residential site (see FSA map).
Verification	Paul Reese, Grantor; (936) 346-2491, Other sources: County records
Sale Price	$275,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; slopes 0 – 15%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Gravel

Land Sale No. 9 (Cont.)

Access	26th St SE
Productivity Index	47.4
Adjusted Productivity Index	51.5, less sloughs and waste
Wind Farm	Wind Farms adjacent to the NE
Wind Turbines on Tract	One turbine and one met tower

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	105.75 Acres
Tillable Acres	89.00 Acres ; 84.16%
Slough and Waste	16.75 Acres; 5.84%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$2,600
Sale Price/Tillable Acre	$3,090

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Paul Reese, Grantor, who stated the Grantee rented and farmed the land prior to purchase. Mr. Reese said the sale price was not discounted due to the lease or the turbine – since he kept the wind royalties, but that both he and the grantee were satisfied with the price which reflected the rapidly increasing prices of ag land in 2012. The tract has about 16.75 acres in slough and waste as measured by FSA maps. The seller indicated no negative impact on the residence (his homestead) which was excluded from this sale. (12/12/15)

The primary soils include Barnes-Sioux complex and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, VI, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, stones, and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 47.4 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 57.2% is Not Prime Farmland, 31.4% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, with the remaining 11.4% being Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (53.9%), non-hydric (35.7%), and predominantly hydric (10.4%).

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 2' 39.73, 97° 55' 40.65

0ft 820ft 1640ft

8-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/30/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **8-141N-57W**
Township: **Noltimier**
Acres: **105.75**
Date: **11/30/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G680C	Barnes-Sioux complex, 3 to 9 percent slopes	32.89	31.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	2302	55
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	29.72	28.1%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	12.46	11.8%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	10.72	10.1%		0ft.	VIIIw	1217	9
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	7.65	7.2%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G275A	Renshaw loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	4.19	4.0%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	1969	44
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	3.92	3.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G276B	Renshaw-Sioux complex, 2 to 6 percent slopes	3.57	3.4%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	2002	40
G680B	Barnes-Sioux complex, 1 to 6 percent slopes	0.63	0.6%		4.9ft.	IIe	2416	63
						Weighted Average	**2398.2**	**47.4**

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

*c: Using Capabilities Class Dominant Condition Aggregation Method

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Topography Map



map center: 47° 2' 39.73, 97° 55' 40.65

0ft 820ft 1640ft

8-141N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

11/30/2015

Land Sale No. 10



Property Identification

Record ID	5966
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	125th Avenue SE and 23rd Street SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-2530300
Legal Description	SW4 Section 25, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Nora B. Sannes
Grantee	Jack T. Bruns and John T. Bruns
Sale Date	November 18, 2010
Deed Book/Page	CFD 269323; (W/D 269450 January 6, 2011 satisfied C/D)
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Contract for Deed: $5,000 down payment and the remaining $210,000 to be paid in 2 installments of $110,000 on or before November 18, 2010 and $100,000 to be paid on or before January 5, 2011.
Sale History	Records were searched for 3 years prior to this sale; no transfer was found.
Verification	John Bruns, Grantee; (701) 840-2330, November 23, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price	$215,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Nearly level; slopes 0 – 6%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel
Access	23rd St SE

Land Sale No. 10 (Cont.)

Productivity Index	64.7
Adjusted Productivity Index	66.0, less sloughs and waste
Wind Farm	1 mile southwest
Wind Turbines on Tract	None

Land Size Information

Gross Acres	160.000 Acres; 19.41 acres have saline present
Tillable Acres	136.96 Acres; 85.6%
Sloughs, Waste	23.04 Acres; 14.4%

Indicators

Sale Price/ Acre	$1,344
Sale Price / Tillable Acre	$1,570

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by John Bruns, Grantee, who stated this was a private sale with his former father-in-law connecting him with the Grantor. The purchase was contract for deed for tax reasons and was satisfied via WD 269450 dated January 6, 2011. There are no wind turbines on the land, however, there are wind farms nearby. Mr. Bruns does not believe this had an impact on the purchase price. The land is 100% tillable. Mr. Bruns purchased the land to expand his farm business which is on the west side of 125th Avenue SE. Mr. Bruns has since deeded the land to his son via WD 277107 dated February 11, 2014, this transaction was exempt. The tract has many small potholes and sloughs.

The primary soils include Hamerly-Tonka complex, Hamerly-Wyard loams, and Balaton-Wyard loams. The slopes range from 0-6%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and V, with various susceptibility to erosion and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 77, with an overall weighted average of 64.7 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 53.3% is Prime Farmland, 32.2% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 14.5% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (53.3%), partially hydric (32.2%), and predominantly hydric (14.5%).

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 5' 15.93, 97° 50' 35.9

0ft 817ft 1634ft

25-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N W E S

11/25/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **25-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **160**
Date: **11/25/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Non-Irr Class *c	Productivity Index
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	51.15	32.0%		IIe	64
G101A	Hamerly-Wyard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	25.93	16.2%		IIe	77
G167B	Balaton-Wyard loams, 0 to 6 percent slopes	25.23	15.8%		IIe	73
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	21.92	13.7%		IIe	69
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	12.73	8.0%		IIe	75
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	11.57	7.2%		IVw	31
G118A	Vallers loam, saline, 0 to 1 percent slopes	7.84	4.9%		IVw	42
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	3.63	2.3%		Vw	25
					Weighted Average	**64.7**

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

*c: Using Capabilities Class Dominant Condition Aggregation Method

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Topography Map



map center: 47° 5' 15.93, 97° 50' 35.9

0ft 817ft 1634ft

25-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

11/25/2015

Land Sale No. 11



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5976
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	20th Street SE and 123rd Avenue SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-1030300; 13-0930320; 13-0940430
Legal Description	SW4 Section 10, less tracts; and Auditor's Lot 3 of the W2 and a tract 100 rods x 60 rods in the SE4, Section 9, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota. Metes and bound on file in the office of the appraiser.

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Mark C. Askerooth et al
Grantee	Casey J. and Debra L. Burchill
Sale Date	September 09, 2010
Deed Book/Page	WD 268586; Amended October 27, 2010; W/D 269226
Property Rights	Lease fee; Surface rights / fractional interest; mineral rights reserved
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	TD 259801 dated 22 May 2007, Ethel A. Askerooth Living Trust to Mark C. Askerooth et al for the SW4, this transaction was exempt.
Verification	Deb Burchill, Grantee; (701) 845-0726, November 19, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price	$250,000

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to rolling hills; slopes 0 – 15%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available

Land Sale No. 11 (Cont.)

Shape	Irregular
Roads	Gravel
Access	20th St SE
Productivity Index	63.4
Wind Farm	Adjacent
Wind Turbines on Tract	None; pad sites are owned by Grantor

Land Size Information	
Gross Acres	196.270 Acres; 13.83 acres have saline present
Tillable Acres	176.640 Acres, 90.00%
Wetlands Land Size	19.620 Acres, 10.00%

Indicators	
Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,274
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$1,415

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Deb Burchill, Grantee, who stated they leased the land for $65.00/acre from the Grantor prior to purchase. She believes they paid market price and purchased the land to maintain their farm operation. The land is 90% tillable and 10% waste / wetland. There were 3 wind turbines on the land at the time of the sale which the Grantor kept, making the sale quite confusing as it was one of the first in the State. Since attorneys were not familiar with wind royalties, the land under the turbines was omitted from the sale, resulting in very complicated legal descriptions for the sold tracts. (See W/D Doc. #'s 268462, 268463, 268461, 268464). Mrs. Burchill believes the wind farm had no impact on the value of the land. A large substation is located in the SW corner of the SW4 Section 10. A farmstead that belongs to the grantor, is located just south-southwest of the turbines on the S2 of Section 9. The seller retained the farmstead.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse loams and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, III, IV, V, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 63.4 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage, approximately 71.5% is Prime Farmland, 17.3% is Not Prime Farmland, 10.7% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 0.5% is Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (84.0%), predominantly hydric (7.8%), non-hydric (7.6%), and partially hydric (0.6%). 13.83 acres have saline present. Saline affects plant growth and prices.

Aerial Map


4-142N-57W
3-142N-57W
123rd Ave SE
27
9-142N-57W
10-142N-57W
24.83
30.05
141.39
20th St SE
16-142N-57W
15-142N-57W
©2015 AgriData, Inc.
map center: 47° 7' 52.46, 97° 54' 3.42
0ft
1099ft
2198ft
9-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota
N
W
E
S
12/1/2015
Maps Provided By
surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015
www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **9-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **196.27**
Date: **12/1/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	86.90	44.3%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	23.46	12.0%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	19.52	9.9%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G732B	Swenoda-Barnes complex, 3 to 6 percent slopes	16.24	8.3%		4.9ft.	IIIe	3334	74
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	13.83	7.0%		0.7ft.	IVw	4453	31
G680B	Barnes-Sioux complex, 1 to 6 percent slopes	11.94	6.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	2416	63
G123A	Svea-Cavour loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	7.82	4.0%		4ft.	IIc	2703	73
G680C	Barnes-Sioux complex, 3 to 9 percent slopes	7.19	3.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	2302	55
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	6.38	3.3%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	1.65	0.8%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	1.34	0.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
						Weighted Average	**3107.4**	**63.4**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 7' 52.46, 97° 54' 3.42

0ft 1099ft 2198ft

9-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/1/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 12



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5964
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	123rd Avenue SE and 23rd Street SE, Barnes County, North Dakota
Location	Grand Prairie Township
Tax ID	13-3310100
Legal Description	NE4 Section 33, T142N R57W, Barnes County, North Dakota.

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Sandra Burchill
Grantee	Jason Sjostrom
Sale Date	March 30, 2010
Deed Book/Page	WD 267592
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Normal
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for 3 years prior to the sale; no transfer was found.
Verification	Jason Sjostrom, Grantee; (701) 367-4548, November 23, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price /Land Only	$170,200 land only
Premium for Air Rights	<u>$ 47,300</u> air rights at $300 per acre
Sale Price inc Air Rights	$217,500

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; slopes 1 – 9%
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel
Access	123rd Ave SE
Productivity Index	66.8

Land Sale No. 12 (Cont.)

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	157.490 Acres
Tillable Acres	149.490 Acres, 94.92%
Sloughs Land Size	8.000 Acres, 5.08%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,381
Sale Price/ Acre	$1,455

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Jason Sjostrom, Grantee. He purchased the land from the Grantor as an investment, and now rents it back to her nephew. Of the total, 149.49 acres are tillable; 8 acres are waste or slough. There was 1 wind turbine on the land at the time of the sale. Mr. Sjostrom said he paid $300.00+ more per acre for the land to secure the royalty rights, or $47,300 for the royalty rights of the single turbine. This is comparable to Sale 16 in which the buyer paid $50,000 per turbine for the royalty rights. That sale took place in December 2012 or roughly 2.5 years later, which would explain the increase.

The primary soils include Barnes-Buse loams, Hamerly-Tonka complex, and Barnes-Svea loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and V, with various susceptibility to erosion and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 66.8 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 75.3% is Prime Farmland, 18.1% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 6.6% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (77.9%), partially hydric (18.1%), and predominantly hydric (4.0%).

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07

0ft 820ft 1640ft

Maps Provided By surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/25/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Barnes**
Location: **33-142N-57W**
Township: **Grand Prairie**
Acres: **157.49**
Date: **11/25/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND003, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Non-Irr Class *c	Productivity Index
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	97.67	62.0%		IIe	69
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	28.79	18.3%		IIe	64
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	20.97	13.3%		IIe	75
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	6.30	4.0%		Vw	25
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	3.76	2.4%		IVe	56
					Weighted Average	**66.8**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 4' 24.4, 97° 54' 25.07

0ft 820ft 1640ft

33-142N-57W
Barnes County
North Dakota

N W E S

11/25/2015

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

STEELE COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA

The surveyed area is located north of Luverne, North Dakota, adjacent to and east of Lake Ashtabula or the upper reserve of the Baldhill Dam. The area is primarily rural in nature, with farmsteads located at one to two mile increments, and Lake Ashtabula lying about ½ to three miles west. Barnes County lies to the south. The topography is comprised of rolling hills with some steep ravines. The area is generally treeless, with the exception of sporadic mature tree claims or wooded swales. The soils are glacial till, and range from level to undulating with drainage varying from poor to well drained. Agricultural uses include crop and hay production as well as pasture for livestock.

Overall, the wind farms suggest little physical impact to the land other than the area used for turbine placement and access. Typically, the access roads appeared to use a minimal amount of land to access the turbines.

Sales were not as plentiful as Barnes County. Only two sales (1 and 3), which represent a sale and partial resale of the same tract, were improved with wind turbines. Sales 2 and 4 were not. All of the data are situated adjacent to or near wind farms.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	NE4; Lots 1&2	20	144	57	Steele	2/26/2013	$ 668,043	262.27	66.8	$ 2,547	two	yes	no	no
2	A,B,C SW4	1	144	58	Griggs	12/31/2012	$ 205,000	108.21	66.7	$ 1,894	none	yes	no	no
3	Parts NE, S2 N2	20 29	144	57	Steele	12/23/2012	$1,737,563	662.23	69.0	$ 2,624	three	yes	no	yes
4	W2, NE4, less tracts	3	144	57	Steele	12/12/2012	$1,239,000	413.00	68.7	$ 3,000	none	yes	no	yes

The sales were then grouped according to their productivity index as follows.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid	Comments
3	Parts NE, S2 N2	20 29	144	57	Steele	12/23/2012	$1,737,563	662.23	69.0	$ 2,624	three	yes	no	yes	Wind royalties were retained by previous grantor; 27.97% waste
4	W2, NE4, less tracts	3	144	57	Steele	12/12/2012	$1,239,000	413.00	68.7	$ 3,000	none	yes	no	yes	Premium paid for land due to increasing prices
1	NE4; Lots 1&2	20	144	57	Steele	2/26/2013	$ 668,043	262.27	66.8	$ 2,547	two	yes	no	no	Wind royalties were retained by previous grantor. Partial resale of part of Sale 4; 33.8% waste
2	A,B,C SW4	1	144	58	Griggs	12/31/2012	$ 205,000	108.21	66.7	$ 1,894	none	yes	no	no	Parcel consists of three individual tracts; diminution in functional utility noted

Again, these sales occurred during the rapidly increasing market of 2012. The data notes the rapidly increasing agricultural prices from 2011 to 2013 due to high commodity prices and to the construction of an ethanol plant at Casselton, North Dakota, which was driving up the price of corn. Sale 1 is a part of Sale 3. The buyer of Sale 3 indicated that neither the turbines nor the lack of wind royalties made a difference in the price he paid. The land was purchased for agricultural and recreational uses. The difference in sale prices between the two tracts (1 and 3) is due to the amount of waste, which becomes readily apparent when the Sales are compared to Sale 4 which is entirely tillable. The buyer of Sale 4 stated he paid a premium for the tract because he wanted it to expand his farming operation. Finally, Sale 2 suffers from functional inutility as it is comprised of three tracts of irregularly shaped land located in the same section. The variances within each data set are attributable to differences in physical condition. None of the Sales evidence market resistance.

BROADVIEW PLAT

WILLOW LAKE PLAT



Griggs County

Steele County

Land Sale No. 1



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5999
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	9th Street SE; east of County Hwy 25, Steele County, North Dakota
Location	Willow Lake Township
Tax ID	20-0000-04280-000; 20-0000-04282-000
Legal Description	NE4; Lots 1–4, Section 20, T144N R57W, Steele County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Trevor L. Jacobson et al
Grantee	Darwin L. and Denora M. Haugaard
Sale Date	February 26, 2013
Deed Book/Page	WD 102716
Property Rights	Surface rights / fractional interest, less wind royalties
Conditions of Sale	Normal
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	WD 102715 dated 2/21/2013, from Gregg W. Christensen et al to Trevor L. Jacobson et al, for this land and other land see DC 5998.
Verification	Trevor Jacobson, Grantor; (701) 371-9233, 12/1/2015; Judy Brosz, Office of the State Tax Commissioner, (701) 328-3142, County records
Sale Price	$668,043

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; 0 to 15% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	9th St SE and part landlocked

Land Sale No. 1 (Cont.)

Productivity Index	66.8
Adjusted Productivity Index	71.7 less sloughs and waste
Wind Farm	Adjacent to the northwest and northeast
Wind Turbines on Tract	Two

Land Size Information

Gross Acres	262.27 Acres
Tillable Acres	173.71 Acres, 66.23%
Sloughs and Waste	88.56 Acres. 33.77%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$2,547
Sale Price/Tillable Acre	$3,846

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Trevor Jacobson, Grantor, who stated he sold the land privately and believes he got a market rate. Mr. Jacobson did not think the wind turbines impacted the price but he does not own the royalty rights to the turbines and therefore could not sell the rights with the land. The land is vacant with a large tree grove; the sale does not include Willow Lake. The NE4 is mostly tillable whereas there is little land in the SE4 as it is mostly lake.

The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams, Barnes-Buse loams, and Hamerly-Tonka complex. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 2 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 66.8 for the entire tract. Of the total average acreage 62.2% is Prime Farmland, 21.4% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 16.4% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (76.7%), partially hydric (20.1%), and predominantly hydric (3.2%).

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 16' 37.2, 97° 55' 45.97

0ft 846ft 1693ft

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

20-144N-57W
Steele County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/4/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Steele**
Location: **20-144N-57W**
Township: **Willow Lake**
Acres: **262.27**
Date: **12/4/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND091, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	107.83	41.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	64.31	24.5%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	50.55	19.3%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	12.77	4.9%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	7.75	3.0%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	7.48	2.9%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	6.91	2.6%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G997	Water, intermittent	4.67	1.8%		0ft.		415	2
						Weighted Average	3235	66.8

Topography Map



map center: 47° 16' 37.2, 97° 55' 45.97

0ft 846ft 1693ft

20-144N-57W
Steele County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/4/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Land Sale No. 2



Property Identification

Record ID	6000
Property Type	Agricultural
Address	7th Street SE, Prairie Road, Griggs County, North Dakota
Location	Broadview Township
Legal Description	Tracts A, B and C in SW4 Section 1, T144N R58W, Griggs County, North Dakota

Sale Data

Grantor	James and JoAnne Wold Trust
Grantee	George Berger
Sale Date	December 31, 2012
Deed Book/Page	CFD 102864; amended 2/15/2013 Doc #102958
Property Rights	Fee Simple to pass when warranty deed is issued
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to Seller
Verification	George Berger, Grantee; (701) 490-1222, December 04, 2015
Sale Price	$205,000

Land Data

Topography	Undulating, 3 to 15% slopes
Utilities	Assumed water and electricity
Shape	Irregular
Access	7th Street SE
Productivity Index	66.7
Wind Farm	To the S-SE, N-NE and ½ mile east
Turbines on Tract	None

<u>Land Size Information</u>
Gross Land Size 108.21 Acres

<u>Indicators</u>
Sale Price/Gross Acre $1,894

<u>Remarks</u>

The grantee and the grantor were neighbors. The grantee believes he paid a market price for the vacant subject. The property was an assemblage to the grantee's land. The tract includes 8 acres of native prairie grass. The grantee believes there was no impact on the price due to wind towers being located adjacent to the tract.

The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams, and Barnes-Buse loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion. The PI for this subject ranges from 46 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 66.7 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 16.6% is Not Prime Farmland, 6.8% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 76.6% is Prime Farmland. The soils are 100% predominantly non-hydric.

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 19' 0.55, 97° 58' 34.31

0ft 449ft 899ft

1-144N-58W
Griggs County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N W E S

12/4/2015

Soil Map





Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

State:	**North Dakota**
County:	**Griggs**
Location:	**1-144N-58W**
Township:	**Broadview**
Acres:	**108.21**
Date:	**12/4/2015**

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND039, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Non-Irr Class *c	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	42.70	39.5%		IIe	75
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	38.11	35.2%		IIe	69
G147D	Buse-Barnes-Darnen loams, 6 to 15 percent slopes	18.45	17.1%		VIe	46
G147C	Buse-Barnes-Darnen loams, 3 to 9 percent slopes	8.95	8.3%		IVe	60
					Weighted Average	**66.7**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 19' 0.55, 97° 58' 34.31

0ft 449ft 899ft

1-144N-58W
Griggs County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

12/4/2015

Land Sale No. 3



Property Identification

Record ID	5998
Property Type	Vacant Land
Property Name	3 wind turbines
Address	County Hwy 25 and 9th Street SE, North Dakota
Location	Willow Lake Township
Tax ID	Various parcel numbers
Legal Description	Lots 1 – 8; NE4 Section 20; N2 Section 29; T144N R57W, Less 4.03 acres for homestead. See WD for metes and bounds.

Sale Data

Grantor	Gregg W. Christensen et al
Grantee	Trevor L. Jacobson et al
Sale Date	December 23, 2012
Deed Book/Page	C/D 102571; satisfied W/D Doc #102715 / 2/21/2013
Property Rights	Leased fee; fractional interest, less mineral rights and wind royalties
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Trevor Jacobson, Grantee; (701) 371-9233, December 01, 2015; Other sources: County records
Sale Price	$1,737,563

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to rolling hills, 0 to 15% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular

Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	County Hwy 25 and 9th St SE
Productivity Index	69
Tree Farm	Adjacent, NE and NW
Turbines on Tract	Three

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	662.230 Acres
Tillable Land Size	477.000 Acres, 72.03%
Unusable Land Size	185.330 Acres, 27.99%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$2,624
Sale Price/ Acre	$3,643

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Trevor Jacobson, Grantee, who stated he was approached by the Grantor to purchase the land. The price was negotiated and Mr. Jacobson felt the price was market. Although the Grantor retained the royalty rights to the three turbines located on the tract, Mr. Jacobsen stated that neither the turbines nor the lack of royalty rights influenced the price paid. Mr. Jacobson He had been leasing it for $57.00 per acres prior to sale, and purchased it to maintain his farm operation as well as to have some private hunting ground. Willow Lake acts as a safe haven for water and ground fowl. The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams and Barnes-Buse loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The County does not include the lake area as taxable area as the State of North Dakota maintains control over lakes.

The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 2 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 69 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 72.4% is Prime Farmland, 14.5% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 13.1% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (82.9%), partially hydric (13.1%), and predominantly hydric (4.0%).

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 16' 36.24, 97° 55' 45.6

0ft 1913ft 3825ft

20-144N-57W
Steele County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/4/2015

Maps Provided By:
surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Steele**
Location: **20-144N-57W**
Township: **Willow Lake**
Acres: **662.33**
Date: **12/4/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND091, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	276.46	41.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	3004	75
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	117.16	17.7%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	84.50	12.8%		4.9ft.	IIe	4114	64
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	78.36	11.8%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	61.69	9.3%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	25.49	3.8%		0ft.	Vw	5306	25
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	15.95	2.4%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	2.48	0.4%		0.7ft.	IVw	4453	31
G997	Water, intermittent	0.24	0.0%		0ft.		415	2
						Weighted Average	**3266**	**69**

Topography Map



map center: 47° 16' 36.24, 97° 55' 45.6

0ft 1913ft 3825ft

20-144N-57W
Steele County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/4/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Land Sale No. 4



<u>Property Identification</u>	
Record ID	6003
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	County Hwy 5 and 124th Avenue SE
Location	Willow Lake
Tax ID	020-0000-04212-010 & 20-0000-04210-000
Legal Description	W2 less tract, and the NE4 Section 3, T144N R57W, Steele County, North Dakota. See WD for full legal description.
<u>Sale Data</u>	
Grantor	Randy C. and Mary Jensen
Grantee	David A. and Valerie Johnson
Sale Date	December 12, 2012
Deed Book/Page	WD 102505
Property Rights	Fee Simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to Seller
Sale History	Numerous Warranty Deeds in the 1990s transferring ownership to Randy and Mary Jensen.
Verification	Dave Johnson, Grantee; (701) 945-2881, 12/4/2015; Judy Brosz, Office of the State Tax Commissioner, (701) 328-3142, County records
Sale Price	$1,239,000
<u>Land Data</u>	
Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; slopes 0 – 9%

Land Sale No. 4 (Cont.)

Shape	Irregular
Utilities	Electricity and Phone
Roads	Gravel
Access	County Hwy 5
Productivity Index	68.7
Wind Farm	Adjacent
Turbines on Tract	None

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	413.000 Acres

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$3,000

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Dave Johnson, Grantee, who stated he was the Grantor's neighbor for the last 50 years, and that the grantor knew he wanted to buy the land. Mr. Johnson believes the price was high, but he purchased the tract to expand his farm operation. The land was 100% tillable. Mr. Johnson stated he had no comment regarding the impact of the wind turbine.

The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams and Hamerly-Wyard loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II and IV, with various susceptibility to erosion and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 31 to 77, with an overall weighted average of 68.7 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 71.1% is Prime Farmland, 19% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 9.9% being Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (84.7%), partially hydric (9.9%), and predominantly hydric (5.4%).

Aerial Map


35
36
5
6th St SE
124th Ave SE
413.00
3-144N-57W
4
2
7th St SE
9
10
11
©2015 AgriData, Inc.
map center: 47° 19' 11.15, 97° 53' 13.41
0ft
869ft
1739ft
3-144N-57W
Steele County
North Dakota
N
W
E
S
12/9/2015
Maps Provided By:
surety
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© AgriData, Inc. 2015
www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Steele**
Location: **3-144N-57W**
Township: **Willow Lake**
Acres: **413**
Date: **12/9/2015**

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Maps Provided By: surety — Customized Online Mapping
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND091, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	168.79	40.9%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G101A	Hamerly-Wyard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	77.52	18.8%		2.5ft.	IIe	4014	77
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	56.97	13.8%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	40.39	9.8%		2.5ft.	IIe	4114	64
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	29.84	7.2%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	22.87	5.5%		0.7ft.	IVw	4453	31
G167B	Balaton-Wyard loams, 0 to 6 percent slopes	16.62	4.0%		4.9ft.	IIe	3245	73
						Weighted Average	**3369.9**	**68.7**

Topography Map



CAVALIER COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA

The surveyed area is located in Cavalier County, about 6 miles south of Langdon. Langdon is situated approximately 68 miles northwest of I-29 at Drayton and 15 miles south of the Canadian border. The area is primarily rural in nature, with farmsteads interspersed at one to two mile increments. The topography is gently rolling to undulating, being a part of the drift plain deposited by glaciers. Drainage is typically poor and is the major concern of most farming operations. The Pembina River flows through the County, east of the Pembina Gorge, which marks the end of the drift plain. Tributaries of the Pembina River flow through the study area. The majority of the County sits on the Pierre Aquifer, which is slightly saline; the water is generally not suitable for irrigation purposes. The soils are used for crop and hay production as well as pasture for livestock.

Overall, the wind farms suggest little physical impact to the land other than the area used for turbine placement and access. Typically, the access roads appeared to use a minimal amount of land to access the turbines.

Again, sales were not plentiful as most farming operations are retained within families for generations. Only two sales were found. Sale 1, consisting of two separate tracts located one mile apart, was improved with a single turbine. Sale 2 located ¼ mile north of Sale 1 of Sections 25 and 26 T160N R60W is not improved.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	Parts 25, 26	34	160	60	Cavalier	7/28/2010	$356,000	320.00	68.2	$ 1,113	one	yes	no	no
2	NE	26	160	60	Cavalier	7/28/2010	$144,000	160.00	67.5	$ 900	none	yes	no	no

When arranged by the productivity index, the results are as follows:

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	Parts 25, 26	34	160	60	Cavalier	7/28/2010	$356,000	320.00	68.2	$ 1,113	one	yes	no	no
2	NE	26	160	60	Cavalier	7/28/2010	$144,000	160.00	67.5	$ 900	none	yes	no	no

The sales closed in 2010, prior to the increasing markets of 2011 – 2013. Both sales were from relative to relative; however, Sale 1 was purchased at auction against five other bidders. Sale 2 was purchased privately. Once Sale 2 is adjusted for the acreage in CRP, which is marginal land at best, the sale prices are comparable. The variances within the data set are attributable to differences in physical condition. Neither sale evidenced market resistance.

Cavalier County

PERRY PLAT
CODE: BQ

T-160-N

R-60-W



Land Sale No. 1



Property Identification

Record ID	5993
Property Type	Vacant Land
Property Name	1 wind turbine
Address	County Highways 1 and 66, Cavalier County, North Dakota
Location	Perry Township
Tax ID	33176000; 33142000; 33135000
Legal Description	S2SW4 Section 25; S2SE4 Section 26; NW4 Section 34; T160N R60W Cavalier County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	William Gellner et al
Grantee	Kenneth and Dianne Stremick
Sale Date	July 28, 2010
Deed Book/Page	SWD 232584
Property Rights	Leased fee; Fractional interest; reservation of wind royalties
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for 3 years prior; no transfer was found.
Verification	Bill Gellner, Grantor; (701) 281-2180, 11/23/2015; Judy Brosz, Office of the State Tax Commissioner , (701) 328-3142, County records
Sale Price	$356,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; 0 to 65 slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square and rectangular
Roads	Paved and gravel

Land Sale No. 1 (Cont.)

Access	107th Ave NE and prairie trail
Productivity Index	68.2
Wind Farm	Adjacent
Wind Turbine on Tract	One

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Acres	320.000 Acres
Tillable Acres	272.000 Acres, 85.00%
Wetlands Acres	48.000 Acres, 15.00%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,113
Sale Price / Tillable Acre	$1,309

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Bill Gellner, Grantor. The tract was sold through a local attorney office with a number of interested parties interested placing bids. Mr. Gellner is an uncle to the Grantee but this did not impact the price and Mr. Gellner believes he got market rate. The land is vacant with 85% tillable and 15% waste and sloughs. The Grantee leased 160 acres of the land prior to the sale at $42/acre. A wind turbine is located on the tract in Section 25. Per the deed, Mr. Gellner kept the royalty rights. He also stated that the adjacent turbines did not impact the sale price as wind farms are individual operations.

The primary soils include Hamerly-Tonka complex, Svea-Buse loams, and Barnes-Svea loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, III, IV, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, stones, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 68.2 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage approximately 46.7% is Prime Farmland, 46% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 37.1% is Prime Farmland if Drained, with the remaining 11.6% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (51%), partially hydric (40.8), non-hydric (4.3%), and predominantly hydric (3.9%).

Aerial Map

35-160N-60W
Cavalier County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

12/4/2015

Soil Map



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Cavalier**
Location: **35-160N-60W**
Township: **Perry**
Acres: **320**
Date: **12/4/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND019, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
F100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	121.73	38.0%		0.5ft.	IIe	4023	64
F154B	Svea-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	71.79	22.4%		4.9ft.	IIe	3045	77
F143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	43.33	13.5%		4.9ft.	IIe	3025	75
F143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	25.82	8.1%		4.9ft.	IIc	3381	85
F119A	Vallers-Hamerly loams, saline, 0 to 3 percent slopes	15.41	4.8%		2.5ft.	IVw	3665	45
F101A	Hamerly-Wyard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	11.58	3.6%		3.7ft.	IIe	3919	77
F122A	Svea-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	7.98	2.5%		4.9ft.	IIc	2608	79
F286C	Fordville-Sioux complex, 2 to 9 percent slopes	7.03	2.2%		4.9ft.	IIIe	2199	49
F128A	Ferney-Cavour loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	5.03	1.6%		4ft.	IVs	2059	30
F12A	Vallers, saline-Parnell complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	4.71	1.5%		0ft.	IVw	4394	31
F125A	Cavour-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	4.02	1.3%		4.9ft.	IVs	2311	50
F4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	1.57	0.5%		0ft.	VIIIw	1205	9
						Weighted Average	**3459.6**	**68.2**

Topography Map



map center: 48° 37' 58.46, 98° 21' 26.36

0ft 1991ft 3983ft

35-160N-60W
Cavalier County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

12/4/2015

Land Sale No. 2



Property Identification

Record ID	5994
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	86th Street NE and 107th Avenue NE , Cavalier County, North Dakota
Location	Perry Township
Tax ID	33138000
Legal Description	NE4 Section 26, T160N R60, Cavalier County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	William Gellner et al
Grantee	Corey Stremick
Sale Date	July 28, 2010
Deed Book/Page	WD 232583
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Corey Stremick, Grantee; (701) 256-5271, 11/30/2015; Judy Brosz, Office of the State Tax Commissioner, (701) 328-3142, County records
Sale Price	$144,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Nearly level
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	86th St NE
Productivity Index	67.5

Land Sale No. 2 (Cont.)

Wind Farm Adjacent
Wind Turbine on Tract None

Land Size Information
Gross Acres 160.000 Acres
Tillable Acres 110.88 Acres, 81.80%
Waste / Slough 29.12 Acres, 18.20%
CRP Acres 14.15 Acres

Indicators
Sale Price/Gross Acre $900
Sale Price / Tillable Acre $1,205
Sale Price CRP Acre $736

Remarks
The sale was confirmed by Corey Stremick, Grantee, who stated he was approached by the Grantor to purchase the land. Mr. Stremick had been leasing the land for $50/acre and purchased it to maintain his farm operation. The Grantee and Grantor are distant relatives and wanted the land to stay in the family. The vacant land has 110 tillable acres, and 14.5 acres in CRP with 10 years left on the contract. The CRP payment is $40/acre/year; at 90% net operating income and a 5% capitalization rate, the indicated value of the 14.15 acres is approximately $736 per acre, which capitalized. Mr. Stremick stated the nearby wind farm did not impact the sale price.

The primary soils include Svea-Cresbard loams, Barnes-Svea loams, and Hamerly-Tonka complex. The slopes range from 0-6%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 67.5 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 33.9% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 33.3% is Prime Farmland, 18.1% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 14.7% being Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (67.2%), partially hydric (25.8%), and predominantly hydric (7.0%).

Aerial Map



Osnabrock Rd
88th St NE
Osnabrock Rd
106th Ave NE
107th Ave NE
1
160.00
26-160N-60W
22
23
24
25
27
34
35
36
©2015 AgriData, Inc.
map center: 48° 39' 8.72, 98° 21' 3.25
0ft
814ft
1627ft
26-160N-60W
Cavalier County
North Dakota
N
W
E
S
12/4/2015
Maps Provided By:
surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015
www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Cavalier**
Location: **26-160N-60W**
Township: **Perry**
Acres: **160**
Date: **12/4/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND019, Soil Area Version: 20

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
F122A	Svea-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	45.87	28.7%		4.9ft.	IIc	2608	79
F143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	29.21	18.3%		4.9ft.	IIe	3025	75
F100A	Hamerly-Tonka complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	23.78	14.9%		0.5ft.	IIe	4023	64
F119A	Vallers-Hamerly loams, saline, 0 to 3 percent slopes	17.72	11.1%		2.5ft.	IVw	3665	45
F143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	14.42	9.0%		4.9ft.	IIc	3381	85
F4A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	11.31	7.1%		0ft.	VIIIw	1205	9
F154B	Svea-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	9.20	5.8%		4.9ft.	IIe	3045	77
F135A	Hamerly-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	8.49	5.3%		3.7ft.	IIe	3078	75
						Weighted Average	**3032.1**	**67.5**

Topography Map



map center: 48° 39' 8.72, 98° 21' 3.25

0ft 814ft 1627ft

26-160N-60W
Cavalier County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/4/2015

DICKEY AND LAMOURE COUNTIES, NORTH DAKOTA

The surveyed area is located along the southwest border of LaMoure County and northwest corner of Dickey County, about 2.5 miles east of Kulm, 10 miles southwest of Edgeley, and 20 miles north of the South Dakota border. These counties are part of the Drift Plain (glaciated) with the surveyed area lying in the Coteau du Missouri. The area is rural with community size typically less 1,000 people. Farmsteads are located two to three miles apart. The topography is gently rolling to undulating then sharply increasing to rolling hills made up of glacial moraine. Gravel and sand deposits are present. The James, Elm and Maple Rivers cut through the area. Drainage is typically poor and is the major concern of most farming operations. Sloughs and potholes are present. The three major aquifers are the Spiritwood, which lies concurrent to the James River, Nortonville and Ellendale. They range in depth from about 10 to 300 feet below the surface. The water is sufficient for domestic use and is also used for irrigation. The soils are suitable for crop and hay production as well as pasture and rangeland. Livestock are raised primarily in the western portions of the counties.

Overall, the wind farms suggest little physical impact to the land other than the area used for turbine placement and access. Typically, the access roads appeared to use a minimal amount of land to access the turbines.

Five sales were found with one improved with turbines. The lack of data is attributable to the retention of land within families for generations. The four unimproved sales are located adjacent to one another about 1.0 to 1.5 miles east of the improved sale. As noted, the royalty rights went with the improved sale. The unimproved sales are located in Dickey County; the improved sale is located in LaMoure County.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	part SE4	3	132	65	Dickey	6/27/2013	$ 105,000	150.00	35.2	$ 700	none	yes	no	no
2	Lots 1-6 S2	6 32	132 133	65 65	Dickey LaMoure	5/31/2012	$1,000,000	537.21	72.1	$ 1,861	three & met tower	yes	no	no
3	SW4	10	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 240,000	160.00	70.7	$ 1,500	none	yes	no	no
4	NW less tract	10	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 220,500	146.60	71.1	$ 1,504	none	yes	no	yes
5	SE, less ROW	9	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 140,000	146.76	68.4	$ 954	none	yes	no	yes

The sales were then grouped according to their productivity index as follows.

No	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid	Comments
2	Lots 1-6 S2	6 32	132 133	65	Dickey LaMoure	5/31/2012	$1,000,000	537.21	72.1	$ 1,861	three & met tower	yes	no	no	Royalty Rights went with sale Note 16 month time difference in sales
4	NW less tract	10	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 220,500	146.60	71.1	$ 1,504	none	yes	no	yes	Road Frontage; tillable and pasture
3	SW4	10	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 240,000	160.00	70.7	$ 1,500	none	yes	no	no	Land locked ; tillable and waste
5	SE, less ROW	9	132	65	Dickey	10/24/2011	$ 140,000	146.76	68.4	$ 954	none	yes	no	yes	Land locked; tillable and pasture
1	part SE4	3	132	65	Dickey	6/27/2013	$ 105,000	150.00	35.2	$ 700	none	yes	no	no	Road frontage; all pasture

Sales 1, 3, and 5 were purchased by members of the same family of large land owners in the area. These multiple sales establish what buyers are willing to pay for assemblage of land with and without access. Mrs. Giesler stated that she can see the wind farm from her house, but that view does not create a negative impact. Both Sales 3 and 4 are assemblages to current farm/ranch operations. Although Sale 3 was tilled prior to purchase, it is now used to pasture buffalo.

With the exception of Sale 1, which had a PI of 35.2, the remaining sales demonstrated a very consistent range from 68.4 to 72.1. Once the sales are adjusted for use and landlocked status, the sales demonstrate no diminution in value.



Land Sale No. 1



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5986
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	79th Street SE and 76th Avenue, Dickey County, North Dakota
Location	Young Township
Tax ID	07450000
Legal Description	SE Section 3, less SESESE; T132N R65W, Dickey County, North Dakota

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Judith E. Morgan
Grantee	Eric and Carol Giesler
Sale Date	June 27, 2012
Deed Book/Page	WD 180971
Property Rights	Leased Fee
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Judy Morgan, Grantor; (701) 452-2395, 12/2/2015; County records
Sale Price	$105,000

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to steep hills; 0 to 25% steep slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Gravel
Access	79th St SE
Productivity Index	35.2
Wind Farm	2.5 miles west, northwest
Turbines on Tract	None

Land Sale No. 1 (Cont.)

Land Size Information
Gross Land Size 150.00 Acres

Indicators
Sale Price/Gross Acre $700

Remarks
The sale was confirmed by Judy Morgan who is a neighbor to the Grantee and was approached to purchase the land. The Grantee farms and ranches with his father who owns substantial adjacent land. They had been trying to purchase this tract for some time. Other parties had been interested but since Giesler's had been renting it, she decided to sell to them as they are her neighbors. The wind farms located near the subject had no impact on the price which Ms. Morgan believes was market. The sale is fenced pasture as is the majority of surrounding land. Ms. Morgan stated she had partially removed some of the gravel prior to sale.

The primary soils are Renshaw-Sioux complex. The slopes range from 0-25%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, VI, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, stones, and water. The PI for this subject ranges from 9 to 75, with an overall weighted average of 35.2 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 89.2% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 10.8% being Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (48.6, non-hydric (41.5%), predominantly hydric (5.3%), and partially hydric (4.6%).

Aerial Map



map center: 46° 16' 39.59, 98° 48' 24.42

0ft 801ft 1601ft

3-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N
W E
S

12/3/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Dickey**
Location: **3-132N-65W**
Township: **Young**
Acres: **150**
Date: **12/3/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index	Barley	Oats	Sunflowers	Spring wheat	Winter wheat
G276A	Renshaw-Sioux complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	71.82	47.9%		> 6.5ft.	IVs	2042	42					
G650	Pits, gravel and sand	21.63	14.4%		> 6.5ft.	VIIIs	212	9					
G651E	Udarents loamy, abandoned gravel pits, 0 to 25 percent slopes	18.05	12.0%		> 6.5ft.	VIIIs	332	14	1	1	11	1	1
G282A	Spottswood loam, dry, 0 to 2 percent slopes	15.60	10.4%		4.9ft.	IIs	2718	66					
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	7.93	5.3%		0ft.	Vw	5336	25					
G562A	La Prairie-Fluvaquents, channeled complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes, frequently flooded	7.10	4.7%		4.9ft.	VIw	2460	42					
G272C	Sioux-Arvilla-Renshaw complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	4.16	2.8%		> 6.5ft.	VIs	1767	26					
G273A	Sioux-Arvilla complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	1.87	1.2%		> 6.5ft.	VIs	1755	32					
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	1.13	0.8%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75					
G147D	Buse-Barnes-Darnen loams, 6 to 15 percent slopes	0.71	0.5%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2534	46					
					Weighted Average		**1835.2**	**35.2**	**0.1**	**0.1**	**1.3**	**0.1**	**0.1**

Topography Map



map center: 46° 16' 39.59, 98° 48' 24.42

0ft 801ft 1601ft

3-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 2





Property Identification

Record ID	5991
Property Type	Vacant Land
Property Name	3 wind turbines
Address	74th Avenue SE and 78th Street SE , Dickey County, North Dakota
Location	Young Township and Pomona View Township
Tax ID	25-3203000; 25-3204000; 07459000; 07460000; 07461000
Legal Description	Lots 1 - 6 Section 6, T132N R65W, Dickey County; S2 Section 32, T133N R65W, LaMoure County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Ronald Brost
Grantee	Frederick and Linda Gackle
Sale Date	May 31, 2012
Deed Book/Page	CFD 168599; satisfied W/D 172303; 3/31/2015
Property Rights	Leased Fee;
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage.
Financing	A down payment of $60,000; balance at 4% interest per annum; three equal installments of $60,171.25; beginning June 1, 2013 and ending June 1, 2015. Balloon payment due June 1, 2016 of $904,323.25.
Sale History	WD; 7/21/1982 from Mathilda Brost to Ronald Brost, 1/3 interest, exempt
Verification	Jordan Gackle (701) 321-1041, Fred Gackle, (701) 647-2429, 11/20/2015; County records
Sale Price	$1,000,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating, 0 to 35% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Paved and gravel

Land Sale No. 2 (Cont.)

Access	74th Ave SE and 78th St SE
Productivity Index	72.1
Wind Farm	Adjacent to the north
Wind Turbines on Tract	Three plus one meteorological tower

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	537.21 Acres
Tillable Land Size	430.00 Acres, 80.04%
Pasture	107.21 Acres, 19.96%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,861
Sale Price / Tillable Acre	$2,151
Sale Price/ Pasture Acre	$700

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Fred Gackle, Grantee, who leased the land on a 1/3 – 2/3 split for 30 years prior to purchase, and was approached by the grantor. The land was vacant except for an old farmstead with no contributory value. It was purchased to maintain the farm operation but also as a start-up for his 2 sons. At the time of the sale, Section 32 was improved with 3 wind turbines and 1 meteorological tower, which were built in 2003 and leased for 25 years. The Grantor retained the royalty rights until the contract for deed was paid in full, at which time the rights passed to the buyer. Mr. Gackle feels the lease has a positive effect on the value of the land. Jordan Gackle, confirmed that he and his brother then purchased the land from their father. He feels the monetary benefit of the turbines outweighs the cost of the land.

The primary soils include Williams-Bowbells loams and Barnes-Svea loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, VII, and VIII, with susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 5 to 86, with an overall weighted average of 72.1 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 51.6% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, 31.5% is Prime Farmland, with the remaining 16.9% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (87.5%), predominantly hydric (6.4%), hydric (5.8%), and partially hydric (0.3%).

Aerial Map



map center: 46° 17' 11.73, 98° 52' 40.41

0ft 1903ft 3806ft

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

32-133N-65W
La Moure County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: North Dakota
County: La Moure
Location: 32-133N-65W
Township: Pomona View
Acres: 537.21
Date: 12/3/2015

Maps Provided By: surety® © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18
Area Symbol: ND045, Soil Area Version: 16

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
C210B	Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	171.71	32.0%		4.2ft.	IIe	2876	83
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	66.86	12.4%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	56.79	10.6%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
C210B	Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	52.89	9.8%		4.2ft.	IIe	2876	83
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	41.98	7.8%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
C210A	Williams-Bowbells loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	27.43	5.1%		4.2ft.	IIc	2711	86
C3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	26.94	5.0%		0ft.	Vw	5939	20
C210A	Williams-Bowbells loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	23.90	4.4%		4.2ft.	IIc	2711	86
C5A	Southam silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	20.91	3.9%		0.5ft.	VIIIw	919	5
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	13.59	2.5%		0.7ft.	Vw	5336	25
C156F	Zahl-Max-Bowbells loams, 6 to 35 percent slopes	8.06	1.5%		4.2ft.	VIIe	2422	36
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	7.25	1.3%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
C132C	Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	5.90	1.1%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2334	56
C135C	Zahl-Williams-Zahill complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	4.53	0.8%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2294	56
C3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	3.78	0.7%		0ft.	Vw	5939	20
C132C	Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	1.98	0.4%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2334	56
C276A	Hamerly-Tonka-Parnell complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	1.20	0.2%		2.5ft.	IIw	4209	58
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	0.97	0.2%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
C276A	Hamerly-Tonka-Parnell complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	0.54	0.1%		2.3ft.	IIw	4209	58
						Weighted Average	3090.7	72.1

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18
Area Symbol: ND045, Soil Area Version: 16

*c: Using Capabilities Class Dominant Condition Aggregation Method

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Topography Map



map center: 46° 17' 11.73, 98° 52' 40.41

0ft 1903ft 3806ft

32-133N-65W
La Moure County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

Land Sale No. 3



Property Identification

Record ID	5990
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	79th Street SE and 76th Avenue SE , Dickey County, North Dakota
Location	Young Township
Tax ID	07477000
Legal Description	SW4 of Section 10, T132N R65W, Dickey County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Melvin and Darlene Y. Herrmann
Grantee	Gary and Carrie Giesler
Sale Date	October 24, 2011
Deed Book/Page	WD 180164
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	WD 173401; 11/14/2006 and WD 173745; 3/5/2007 from Betty Zimmerman to Melvin and Darlene Herrmann, exempt transactions.
Verification	Carrie Giesler, Grantee; (701) 647-2254, 12/1/2015; County records
Sale Price	$240,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating; 0 to 9% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel
Access	Land locked
Productivity Index	70.7

Land Sale No. 3 (Cont.)

Wind Farm	2 miles west, northwest
Turbines on Tract	None

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	160.00 Acres
Tillable Land Size	120.00 Acres, 75.00%
Waste	40.00 Acres; 25%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,500
Sale Price/Tillable Acre	$2,000

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Carrie Giesler, Grantee, who stated they purchased the land by private auction, limited to 6 parties. She states they paid market for the tract. The purchase is an assemblage to their existing farming operation. Mrs. Giesler added that she can see the wind farm from her house but that it does not create a negative impact.

The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II and IV, with various susceptibility to erosion and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 56 to 85, with an overall weighted average of 70.7 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 57.8% is Prime Farmland, 22.8% Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 19.4% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are 100% predominantly non-hydric.

The land was not accessible; the photograph is looking south toward the sale and adjacent sale.

Aerial Map

map center: 46° 15' 54.79, 98° 48' 24.98

0ft 810ft 1621ft

10-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By:
surety®
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

N
W E
S

12/3/2015

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Dickey**
Location: **10-132N-65W**
Township: **Young**
Acres: **160**
Date: **12/3/2015**

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	91.35	57.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	35.14	22.0%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G122A	Svea-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	17.95	11.2%		4.9ft.	IIc	2788	79
G138A	Forman-Cavour loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	13.50	8.4%		4.9ft.	IIc	2671	67
G143A	Barnes-Svea loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	2.06	1.3%		4.9ft.	IIc	3405	85
						Weighted Average	**2921**	**70.7**

Topography Map



Land Sale No. 4



<u>Property Identification</u>

Record ID	5988
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	79th Street SE and 76th Avenue SE , Dickey County, North Dakota
Location	Young Township
Tax ID	07476000
Legal Description	NW4 Section 10, T132N R65W, Dickey County North Dakota, Less 630 x 930 parcel containing 13.4 acres more or less.

<u>Sale Data</u>

Grantor	Melvin and Darlene Y. Herrmann
Grantee	Dennis J. Schimke
Sale Date	October 24, 2011
Deed Book/Page	WD 180123
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	WD 173401; 11/14/2006 from Betty Lou D. Zimmerman to Darlene Y. Herrmann and including N2SW4 Section 10. Exempt transaction
Verification	Dennis Schimke; (701) 298-3625, 12/1/2015: County records
Sale Price	$220,500

<u>Land Data</u>

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to rolling hills; 0 to 15% slopes
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Irregular
Roads	Gravel

Land Sale No. 4 (Cont.)

Access	79th St SE
Productivity Index	71.1
Wind Farm	2 miles northwest
Turbines on Tract	None

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	146.600 Acres

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,504

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Dennis Schimke, Grantee, who stated he was invited by the Grantor's attorney to attend an auction with 5 other parties. Mr. Schimke believes he paid a market price and stated the wind farms 2+ miles away had no impact on the price. He purchased the land as assemblage to his ranch operation in Section 3, as he raises buffalo. This tract will be used for pasture.

The primary soils include Svea Cresbard loams, Barnes-Svea loams, and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-15%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, V, and VI, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 25 to 93, with an overall weighted average of 71.1 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 39.4% is Prime Farmland, 31.3% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 29.3% being Farmland of Statewide Importance. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (97.9%) and predominantly hydric (2.1%).

Aerial Map

map center: 46° 15' 54.79, 98° 48' 24.98

0ft 810ft 1621ft

10-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By **surety**® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING

© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State: **North Dakota**
County: **Dickey**
Location: **10-132N-65W**
Township: **Young**
Acres: **146.6**
Date: **12/3/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G122A	Svea-Cresbard loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	43.17	29.4%		4.9ft.	IIc	2788	79
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	41.13	28.1%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	35.80	24.4%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G142A	Svea loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	17.13	11.7%		4ft.	IIc	2988	93
G143D	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	6.36	4.3%		> 6.5ft.	VIe	2650	41
G3A	Parnell silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	3.01	2.1%		0.7ft.	Vw	5336	25
						Weighted Average	**2920.6**	**71.1**

Topography Map



map center: 46° 15' 54.79, 98° 48' 24.98

0ft 810ft 1621ft

10-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By: surety CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Land Sale No. 5



<u>Property Identification</u>	
Record ID	5987
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	79th Street SE and 76th Avenue SW, Dickey County, North Dakota
Location	Young Township
Tax ID	07474000
Legal Description	SE4 Section 9 less ROW, T132N R65W, Dickey County, North Dakota
<u>Sale Data</u>	
Grantor	Betty L. Zimmerman Revocable Living Trust
Grantee	Gary and Carrie Giesler
Sale Date	October 24, 2011
Deed Book/Page	WD 180165
Property Rights	Fee simple
Conditions of Sale	Assemblage
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	WD 173400; 11/14/2006 from Darlene Y. Herrmann to Betty Lou D. Zimmerman, includes SW4 Section 10. Exempt transaction.
Verification	Carrie Giesler, Grantee; (701) 647-2254, 12/1/2015; County records
Sale Price	$140,000
<u>Land Data</u>	
Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Gravel roads
Access	Land locked

Land Sale No. 5 (Cont.)

Productivity Index	68.4
Wind Farm	2.5 miles northwest
Turbines on Tract	None

Land Size Information

Gross Acres	146.760 Acres
Tillable Acres	88.056 Acres, 60.00%
Pasture Acres	58.704 Acres, 40.00%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$954
Sale Price/ Tillable Acre	$1,123
Sale Price / Pasture Acre	$700

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Carrie Giesler, Grantee. The tract was purchased by private auction with five other parties attending. Giesler believes they paid less than market as the tract is land locked. Additionally, the tract is severed by railroad tracks. The land was purchased to expand the current farming operation. It is 60% tillable (the acreage lying to the east of the railroad) and 40% pasture which lies west of the railroad tracks. Mrs. Giesler added that she can see the wind farm from her house but that it does not create a negative impact.

The primary soils include Barnes-Svea loams and Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams. The slopes range from 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II and IV, with various susceptibility to erosion, water, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 42 to 93, with an overall weighted average of 68.4 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 64.8% is Prime Farmland, 34.7% is Not Prime Farmland, with the remaining 0.5% being Prime Farmland if Drained. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (99.5%) and predominantly hydric (0.5%).

The land was not accessible; the photograph is looking south toward the sale and adjacent sale.

Aerial Map

map center: 46° 15' 55.21, 98° 49' 39.93

0ft 810ft 1621ft

9-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By
surety
CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2016 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map





State: **North Dakota**
County: **Dickey**
Location: **9-132N-65W**
Township: **Young**
Acres: **146.76**
Date: **12/3/2015**

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Area Symbol: ND021, Soil Area Version: 18

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
G143B	Barnes-Svea loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	75.53	51.5%		4.9ft.	IIe	3034	75
G143C	Barnes-Buse-Langhei loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes	49.44	33.7%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2763	56
G144B	Barnes-Buse loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	15.58	10.6%		4.9ft.	IIe	2988	69
G142A	Svea loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	5.28	3.6%		4ft.	IIc	2988	93
G2A	Tonka silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	0.93	0.6%		0.5ft.	IVw	4606	42
						Weighted Average	**2946.1**	**68.4**

Topography Map



map center: 46° 15' 55.21, 98° 49' 39.93

0ft 810ft 1621ft

9-132N-65W
Dickey County
North Dakota

12/3/2015

Maps Provided By: surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

BURLEIGH COUNTY, NORTH DAKOTA

The surveyed area is located approximately 19 miles north of Bismarck, the State Capital and roughly 7 miles east of U. S. Highway 83. The area is rural, with farmsteads placed at ½ mile to one mile intervals. The topography is gently rolling to undulating then sharply increasing to rolling hills made up of glacial land formations with rocky soils and alluvial bottom lands. The county lies in the Missouri River Trench, Coteau Slope and Missouri Coteau. The county is drained by the Missouri River, Apple Creek and Burnt Creek. Drainage is typically collected in pot holes or sloughs. Erosion is the major concern of most farming operations. The soils are suitable for crop and hay production as well as pasture and rangeland. Livestock are raised throughout the county.

Overall, the wind farms suggest little physical impact to the land other than the area used for turbine placement and access. Typically, the access roads appeared to use a minimal amount of land to access the turbines.

Three sales were found; one improved with a turbine, noted as Sale 1; one without a turbine noted as Sale 2; and one of a farmstead, noted as Sale A. Again, the lack of data is attributable to the retention of land within families for generations. As noted, the royalty rights went with the improved sale.

No.	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid
1	SW4	11	142	79	Burleigh	10/27/2013	$ 170,000	160.00	60.6	$ 1,063	yes	no	no	no
2	SW4SW4	8	142	78	Burleigh	8/30/2013	$ 40,000.00	40.00	71.20	$ 1,000	none	yes	no	no
A	NW4NE4	11	142	79	Burleigh	5/27/2014	$ 289,900	37.62		$ 7,706	none	yes	no	yes

The sales were then grouped according to their productivity index as follows.

No.	Legal Description					Date	Sale Price	Deeded Acres	PI	Sale Price/ Deeded Acre	Turbines on Sale Tract	Adjacent Wind Farm	Negative Influence	Premium Paid	Comments
2	SW4SW4	8	142	78	Burleigh	8/30/2013	$ 40,000.00	40.00	71.20	$ 1,000	none	yes	no	no	100% tillable land
1	SW4	11	142	79	Burleigh	10/27/2013	$ 170,000	160.00	60.60	$ 1,063	yes	no	no	no	Grantor retained the royalty rights
A	NW4NE4	11	142	79	Burleigh	5/27/2014	$ 289,900	37.62		$ 7,706	none	yes	no	yes	Improved at time of sale; no market resistance to adjacent wind farm

Sales 1 and 2 closed in 2013 two months apart. Both were purchased as assemblages to existing farming operations. The differences are nominal. Neither sale evidenced market resistance. Sale A was improved with a mobile home, a barn and other out buildings at the time of sale. The buyer indicated he purchased the property as the site of his new home, which he intends to construct. The mobile home was sold off after purchase. He stated that the proximity of the wind turbines located nearby did not impact the price paid.



Burleigh County

Land Sale No. A



Property Identification

Record ID	6015
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	County Road 36 and 93rd Street NE , Burleigh County, North Dakota
Location	Ecklund Township
Tax ID	10-142-79-00-11-220
Legal Description	NW4NE4 Section 11, T142N R79W, Burleigh County, North Dakota, less the N100' of said NW4NE4 as conveyed in Document No. 213880.

Sale Data

Grantor	Dale Vollan
Grantee	Rudolph D. Anderson
Sale Date	May 27, 2014
Deed Book/Page	WD 806592
Property Rights	Surface rights / fractional interest
Conditions of Sale	Normal
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Rudy Anderson, Grantee; (701) 220-4584, 12/15/2015 County records
Sale Price	$289,900

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	County Road 36

<u>Land Size Information</u>

Gross Land Size	37.620 Acres
Tillable Land Size	25.000 Acres, 66.45%
Unusable Land Size	12.620 Acres, 33.55%

<u>Indicators</u>

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$7,706

<u>Remarks</u>

The sale was confirmed by Rudy Anderson, Grantee, who stated that he bought this tract the day it went up for sale, offering the full list price of $289,900, which was accepted. He believes this may have been a premium price. The subject had been on the market a few years earlier for $300,000 but did not sell. The land consists of 25 tillable acres, a small slough and the farmstead which was improved with a double wide mobile home, barn and miscellaneous out buildings. Mr. Anderson stated the wind turbines located nearby did not impact the price he paid, and did not diminish the view. He sold off the mobile home for $40,000 and will be constructing a new stick built house on the property. He valued the barn, which was in good condition at $70,000 and gave no value to the outbuildings. Burleigh County purchased the adjacent NE4NE4 to build a shop. The Grantor retained ownership of the balance of the NE4.

Land Sale No. 1



Property Identification

Record ID	6013
Property Type	Vacant Land
Property Name	1 wind turbine
Address	County Road 36 and 80th Street NE , Burleigh County, North Dakota
Location	Ecklund Township
Tax ID	10-142-79-00-11-600
Legal Description	SW4 Section 11, T142N R79W, Burleigh County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Phyllis Vollan et al
Grantee	Donald D. and Doreen Sorch
Sale Date	October 27, 2013
Deed Book/Page	WD 798067
Property Rights	Surface rights / fractional interest
Conditions of Sale	Leased fee
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	WD 666587 dated 29 December 2006 from James and Phillis Vollan to James Vollan et al, this transfer was exempt.
Verification	Renee Kunz, Grantor; (206) 948-8155, 12/14/2015; Judy Brosz, Office of the State Tax Commissioner, (701) 328-3142, County records
Sale Price	$170,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to steep hills

Land Sale No. 1 (Cont.)

Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square
Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	80th St NE
Productivity Index	60.6

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	160.000 Acres
Tillable Land Size	106.000 Acres, 66.25%
Pasture Land Size	54.000 Acres, 33.75%

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,063

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Renee Kunz, Grantor. She stated that her family approached the grantee who had been leasing the land. He purchased it as an assemblage to the current farming operation. The land was approximately 2/3 cropland and 1/3 hay land / pasture. Ms. Kunz believed the sale price was market and that the wind turbine did not negatively impact the sale price. The royalty rights were retained.

The primary soils include Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex and Sen silt loam. The topography ranges from level to steep hills at 0-60%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II, IV, VI, and VIII, with various susceptibility to erosion, stones, and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 10 to 98, with an overall weighted average of 60.6 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 55.9% is Not Prime Farmland, 31.5% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, with the remaining 12.6% being Prime Farmland. The soils are a range of predominantly non-hydric (58.3%) and non-hydric (41.7%).

.

Aerial Map



map center: 47° 8' 6.8, 100° 39' 14.68

0ft 823ft 1647ft

11-142N-79W
Burleigh County
North Dakota

N W E S

12/14/2015

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.



State:	**North Dakota**
County:	**Burleigh**
Location:	**11-142N-79W**
Township:	**Ecklund**
Acres:	**160**
Date:	**12/14/2015**

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING © Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND015, Soil Area Version: 16

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Non-Irr Class *c	Productivity Index
C132C	Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	40.59	25.4%		IVe	56
C972B	Sen silt loam, 3 to 6 percent slopes	29.11	18.2%		IIe	74
C964D	Sen-Werner complex, 9 to 15 percent slopes	21.87	13.7%		VIe	37
C471A	Grail silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	19.42	12.1%		IIc	95
C135D	Zahl-Williams loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes	18.43	11.5%		VIe	43
C210B	Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	13.39	8.4%		IIe	83
C981F	Ustarents loamy, mineland, 0 to 60 percent slopes	8.20	5.1%		VIIIs	10
C523A	Belfield-Rhoades-Grail silty clay loams, 0 to 2 percent slopes	7.47	4.7%		IIs	66
C451A	Arnegard loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	1.04	0.6%		IIc	98
C210A	Williams-Bowbells loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	0.48	0.3%		IIc	86
					Weighted Average	**60.6**

Area Symbol: ND015, Soil Area Version: 16

*c: Using Capabilities Class Dominant Condition Aggregation Method

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Topography Map



map center: 47° 8' 6.8, 100° 39' 14.68

0ft 823ft 1647ft

11-142N-79W
Burleigh County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

12/14/2015

Land Sale No. 2



Property Identification

Record ID	6011
Property Type	Vacant Land
Address	119th Street NE and 292nd Avenue NE, Burleigh County, North Dakota
Location	Ghylin Township
Tax ID	11-142-78-00-08-600
Legal Description	SW4SW4 Section 8, T142N R78W, Burleigh County, North Dakota.

Sale Data

Grantor	Maynard and Sharon Tosseth
Grantee	Steven and Kelly Bauer
Sale Date	August 30, 2013
Deed Book/Page	WD 794269
Property Rights	Surface rights / fractional interest
Conditions of Sale	Leased fee
Financing	Cash to seller
Sale History	Records were searched for a 3 year period; no transfer was found.
Verification	Maynard Tosseth, Grantor (701)734-6420, 12/14/2015; County records
Sale Price	$40,000

Land Data

Zoning	AG, Agricultural
Topography	Level to undulating
Utilities	Assumed telephone and electricity available
Shape	Square

Land Sale No. 2 (Cont.)

Roads	Paved and gravel
Access	119th St NE
Productivity Index	71.2

Land Size Information

Gross Land Size	40.000 Acres; 100% tillable

Indicators

Sale Price/Gross Acre	$1,000

Remarks

The sale was confirmed by Maynard Tosseth, Grantor, who stated he was approached by the Grantee. The Grantee had been leasing the land for $40/acre prior to purchase. Mr. Tosseth believes he got a market rate and the price was not impacted by the nearby wind farms. The land was improved with an old building of no value.

The primary soils include Williams-Bowbells loams and Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex. The topography range is undulating at 0-9%. The non-irrigated soil classifications are II and IV, with various susceptibility to erosion and climate. The PI for this subject ranges from 56 to 86, with an overall weighted average of 71.2 for the entire tract. Of the total acreage 55.9% is Farmland of Statewide Importance, with the remaining 44.1% being Not Prime Farmland. The soils are 100% predominantly non-hydric.

Aerial Map

map center: 47° 8' 6.07, 100° 35' 27.52

0ft 820ft 1640ft

8-142N-78W
Burleigh County
North Dakota

Maps Provided By: surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

12/14/2015

Soil Map



Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

State: **North Dakota**
County: **Burleigh**
Location: **8-142N-78W**
Township: **Ghylin**
Acres: **40**
Date: **12/14/2015**

Maps Provided By surety® CUSTOMIZED ONLINE MAPPING
© Agridata, Inc. 2015 www.AgriDataInc.com

Area Symbol: ND015, Soil Area Version: 16

Code	Soil Description	Acres	Percent of field	PI Legend	Water Table	Non-Irr Class *c	Range Production (lbs/acre/yr)	Productivity Index
C210B	Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes	20.83	52.1%		4.2ft.	IIe	2876	83
C132C	Williams-Zahl-Zahill complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes	17.71	44.3%		> 6.5ft.	IVe	2334	56
C210A	Williams-Bowbells loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	1.46	3.6%		4.2ft.	IIc	2711	86
						Weighted Average	**2630**	**71.2**

Area Symbol: ND015, Soil Area Version: 16

*c: Using Capabilities Class Dominant Condition Aggregation Method

Soils data provided by USDA and NRCS.

Topography Map



ADDENDA

CONSULTING SERVICES AGREEMENT

This Consulting Services Agreement ("**Agreement**") dated October 8, 2015, is by and between RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc., a North Dakota corporation ("**Consultant**"), and Brady Wind, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company ("**Wind Operator**").

1. Retention of Consultant. Subject to the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement, Wind Operator hereby retains Consultant to perform the services set forth in this Agreement and Consultant accepts this retention on the terms and conditions set forth in this Agreement.

2. Term. The term of this Agreement shall commence as of the date set forth above and shall terminate on January 31, 2017, subject to the earlier termination provisions contained herein ("**Term**"). The Term may be extended as mutually agreed upon in writing by the parties.

3. Consulting Services. The services to be performed by Consultant under this Agreement ("**Consulting Services**") shall be as set forth and described in **Exhibit A**.

4. Compensation and Payment. Consultant's compensation, payment and rates for Consulting Services ("**Fee**") shall be as set forth in **Exhibit B** to this Agreement.

5. Insurance. Consultant shall procure and maintain at its expense, the following minimum insurance coverage, unless otherwise specified in the Agreement, covering all operations required to complete the Consulting Services. Consultant shall provide evidence of the following minimum insurance coverage by providing an ACORD or other Certificate of Insurance in forms and with insurance companies acceptable to the Risk Management Department of Wind Operator (rated "A-, VII" or higher by A.M. Best's Key Rating Guide are deemed acceptable, before any Consulting Services under the Agreement begins: (i) all insurance requirements required by law, including but not limited to, workers' compensation insurance for statutory obligations imposed by workers' compensation or occupational disease laws; (ii) Employers' Liability Insurance, including Occupational Disease, shall be provided with a limit of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence; (iii) General Liability Insurance, written on Insurances Services Office form CG 00 01 1204 (or equivalent) covering liability arising out of premises, operations, bodily injury, property damage, products and completed operations and liability insured under and insured contract (contractual liability), with minimum limits of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence, which shall insure the performance of the contractual obligations assumed by the Consultant under the Agreement. The coverage shall insure the performance of the contractual obligations assumed by Consultant under the Agreement; and (iv) Professional Liability, Errors and Omissions Coverage, with the minimum limits of liability, per claim, of One Million Dollars ($1,000,000). Except for the Workers' Compensation and Professional Liability, Errors and Omissions Coverage, Wind Operator, its parent, subsidiaries and affiliated companies, along with their respective officers, directors, agents and employees (collectively, "**Wind Operator Entities**") shall be designated as an additional insured on Consultant's insurance policy required to be maintained under the Agreement, and such policy shall be endorsed to be primary to any insurance that may be maintained by or on behalf of the Wind Operator Entities. All policies of insurance required to be maintained by the Consultant hereunder shall: (i) provide a severability of interests or cross liability clause; (ii) provide that Wind Operator Entities be provided thirty (30) business days prior written notice of any non-renewals or cancellations; and (iii) waive any right of subrogation against Wind Operator Entities and waive any other right of the insurers to any off-set or counterclaim or any other deduction, whether by attachment or otherwise, in respect of any liability of Wind Operator Entities. Neither the Consultant's failure to provide evidence of minimum coverage of insurance following Wind

Operator's request, nor Wind Operator's decision to not make such request, shall release Consultant from its obligation to maintain the minimum coverage provided for in this Section 5.

6. Independent Contractor. Consultant agrees to perform Consulting Services as an independent contractor and not as a subcontractor, agent or employee of Wind Operator, its parent, subsidiaries or affiliates. Wind Operator retains no control or direction over Consultant, its employees or over the detail, manner or methods of performance of Consulting Services. Consultant is not granted any right or authority or responsibility expressed, implied or apparent on behalf of or in the name of Wind Operator to bind or act on behalf of Wind Operator.

7. Taxes. Consultant, and not Wind Operator, shall be solely responsible for all taxes incurred by Consultant in connection with its performance of Consulting Services, including, but not limited to, (i) all withholding, social security and other taxes of Consultant's employees and (ii) all taxes with respect to Consultant's compensation.

8. Business Records. Consultant shall maintain books and records supporting all costs for Consulting Services performed under this Agreement. During Consultant's normal business hours for the duration of this Agreement, and for a period of two years thereafter, Wind Operator shall have access to such books and to all other records of Consultant as required to verify reimbursable costs and to otherwise ensure compliance with the terms of this Agreement.

9. Confidentiality.

(a) Consultant agrees to hold Confidential Information in strict confidence and agrees that it shall not disclose Confidential Information without prior written consent of Wind Operator. For purposes of this Agreement, **"Confidential Information"** shall mean all information, regardless of the form in which it is communicated or maintained (whether oral, written, or visual) and whether prepared by Wind Operator or otherwise which is disclosed to Consultant in connection with the this Agreement and including all reports, analyses, notes or other information that are based on, contain or reflect any such Confidential Information. Confidential Information may only be disclosed to employees with a need to know the Confidential Information for the sole purpose of performing Consulting Services under this Agreement and Consultant is responsible for any breach of this provision by its employees.

(b) This provision does not apply to information that is presently a matter of public knowledge, which is or becomes available on a nonconfidential basis from a source which is not known to be prohibited from disclosing such information or which was legally in Consultant's possession without obligation of confidentiality prior to disclosure by Wind Operator.

(c) In the event that Consultant is requested or required by legal or regulatory authority to disclose any Confidential Information, Consultant shall promptly notify Wind Operator of such request or requirement prior to disclosure so that Wind Operator may seek an appropriate protective order and/or waive compliance with the terms of this Agreement.

(d) Wind Operator and Consultant acknowledge that Wind Operator would not have an adequate remedy at law for money damages if the covenants contained in this provision were breached. Accordingly, Wind Operator shall be entitled to an injunction restraining Consultant from violating this provision.

(e) Upon the termination of this Agreement or at any time upon written request of Wind Operator, Consultant shall promptly deliver to Wind Operator all drawings, manuals, letters, notes, notebooks, reports, and copies thereof and all other materials, including those of a secret or confidential nature, relating to Wind Operator's business that are in Consultant's and its contractors' or consultants' possession or control. The obligations of confidentiality contained in this provision 9 shall survive the termination of this Agreement and shall remain in effect for a period of two years following such termination.

(f) Wind Operator makes no representation or warranty as to the accuracy or completeness of the Confidential Information. Neither Wind Operator nor any of the other Wind Operator Entities shall be subject to liability resulting from any use of the Confidential Information by Consultant.

10. Publicity. The Consultant shall not make any public disclosures regarding Wind Operator or the project for which it is performing the Consulting Services without the prior approval of Wind Operator.

11. Work Product. Subject to the next sentence, the Consultant and Wind Operator agree that Wind Operator, not the Consultant, shall own all rights (including all intellectual property rights), title and interest to any and all work products resulting from Consulting Services performed under this Agreement. The Consultant shall retain all right, title and interest in and to Consultant Preexisting IP, provided that to the extent that any of Consultant Preexisting IP is embedded in the work product provided to Wind Operator under this Agreement, the Consultant hereby grants to Wind Operator and each Wind Operator Entity a non-exclusive, irrevocable, perpetual, and royalty-free license to use such Consultant Preexisting IP as Wind Operator may deem necessary to utilize the work product for Wind Operator's business purposes. **"Consultant Preexisting IP"** means individually and collectively, all inventions, improvements and/or discoveries, patentable or unpatentable, copyrightable or uncopyrightable, including but not limited to, computer software databases, methodologies and works of authorship, which were in existence, prior to the Consultant's performance of the Consulting Services under this Agreement. The Consultant hereby assigns all rights (including all intellectual property rights), title and interest in work products resulting from this Agreement. At the request of Wind Operator, the Consultant shall, without further consideration, execute all papers and documents and perform all other acts necessary or appropriate to evidence or further document Wind Operator's ownership of the work product.

12. Standard of Performance. The Consultant shall perform the Consulting Services in accordance with (i) the standards of care, diligence, skill and judgement normally exercised by professional firms and individuals with respect to services of a similar nature; (ii) recognized and sound consulting practices, procedures and techniques; (iii) all applicable laws and regulations; and (iv) the terms of **Exhibit A**.

13. Termination. Wind Operator or Consultant shall have the right to terminate this Agreement for its convenience in whole or in part at any time, upon thirty (30) days' written notice to the other party. In the event of such termination, Consultant shall be paid for services provided to the termination date.

14. Modifications. No amendment or modification to this Agreement shall be effective unless made in writing.

15. Assignment. This Agreement and all of the Consultant's rights, duties and obligations under this Agreement are personal in nature and shall not be subcontracted, assigned, delegated or otherwise disposed of by the Consultant without the prior written consent of Wind Operator. Wind Operator may assign this Agreement upon prior written notice to the Consultant.

16. Liability Limitation. In no event shall either party be liable to the other party whether in contract, tort or otherwise for payment of any special, indirect, incidental, consequential or similar damages.

17. Indemnification. The Consultant shall protect, defend, indemnify and hold Wind Operator, its affiliates, officers, employees, partners, members, successors and assigns free and unharmed from and against any and all claims, liabilities, loss, costs, or damages, including court costs and attorneys' fees which shall arise in connection with (i) anything done or omitted to be done by the Consultant with respect to the Consulting Services if caused by the negligence or willful misconduct of the Consultant, (ii) any breach by the Consultant of a covenant, warranty or representation contained herein, or (iii) any claim by Consultant's employees.

18. Notice. All notices required under this Agreement shall be deemed given when sent by overnight courier or registered or certified mail, or when sent by telecopy, telegraph or other graphic, electronic means and confirmed by overnight courier or registered or certified mail addressed as follows:

Hoefs & Associates, Inc.,
PO Box 3102
Fargo, ND 58103
(701) 298-3066 Office
(701) 799-3347 Cell

Brady Wind, LLC
700 Universe Blvd., FEW/JB
Juno Beach, FL 33408
Attn: Project Manager
(561) 694-4638

Either party shall have the right to change the address or name of the person to whom such notices are to be delivered by notice in accordance with this paragraph to the other party.

19. Law and Venue. This Agreement shall be governed in all respects by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of Florida without regard to conflicts of law provisions. Any litigation between the parties shall be conducted in the state or federal courts of the State of Florida.

20. Headings. The headings in this Agreement are provided for convenience of reference only and shall not affect the construction of the text of this Agreement.

21. Non-Waiver. No waiver of any provision of this agreement shall be deemed to be nor shall constitute a waiver of any other provision whether or not similar, nor shall any waiver constitute a continuing waiver. No waiver shall be binding unless executed in writing by the party making the waiver.

22. Cumulative Remedies. All rights and remedies of the parties under this Agreement shall be cumulative and the exercise of any one right or remedy shall not bar the exercise of any other right or remedy.

23. Severability. If any provision of this Agreement shall be held or deemed to be invalid, inoperative or unenforceable, such circumstances shall not affect the validity of any other provision of this Agreement.

24. Survival. The obligations of the parties hereunder which by their nature survive the termination of this Agreement and / or the completion of the Consulting Services hereunder shall survive and inure to the benefit of the parties. Those provisions of this Agreement which provide for the limitation of or protection against liability shall apply to the full extent permitted by law and shall survive termination of this Agreement and / or completion of the Consulting Services.

25. Complete Agreement. This Agreement is composed of this document and all exhibits hereto. This Agreement constitutes the entire and final agreement and supersedes all prior and contemporaneous agreements, representations, warranties and understandings of the parties, whether oral, written or implied.

26. Counterparts. This Agreement may be signed in counterparts, each of which may be deemed an original and all of which together constitute one and the same agreement.

27. Waiver of Trial by Jury. Wind Operator and Consultant hereby knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally waive the right to a trial by jury with respect to any litigation based hereon or arising out of, under or in connection with this Agreement. This provision is a material inducement for the parties entering into this Agreement.

28. Authorization and Binding Obligations. Each party hereto represents to the other party that the execution, delivery and performance of this Agreement have been duly authorized, and this Agreement has been duly executed and delivered by the signatory so authorized, and the obligations contained herein constitute the valid and binding obligations of such party.

(The remainder of this page is intentionally blank. The next page is the signature page.)

The parties have executed this Consulting Agreement effective as of the day and year first above written.

Consultant

RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc.,
a North Dakota corporation

By: ______________________
Rose M. Hoefs, President

Wind Operator:

Brady Wind, LLC
a Delaware limited liability company

By: ______________________
John DiDonato, Vice President

6

EXHIBIT A

Consulting Services

Provide labor, material, equipment, transportation and office calculations to perform a study on the impact of NextEra Energy Resources, LLC's wind farms (if any) on property improved with wind turbines and related structures, as well as surrounding properties. Consultant shall use paired sales by using the sale of the Wind Operator's encumbered tracts and tracts adjacent to the encumbered tracts as a basis.

EXHIBIT B

Compensation

Upon completion of the analysis set forth in **Exhibit A**, the Consultant shall submit an invoice summarizing the Consulting Services performed, the number of hours worked and the expenses incurred with accompanying receipts. Consultant's rate shall be $175.00 per hour and expenses include a straight per diem of $40.00 per day plus $0.567 per mile, plus lodging costs. The only receipts submitted will be for lodging. This is done in accordance with invoices submitted to the ND DOT and similar institutions. If it appears the cost of the analysis set forth in **Exhibit A** will exceed $25,000.00 then Consultant shall immediately contact Wind Operator so that Wind Operator can restrict the scope of the analysis, if necessary. Payments for undisputed amounts shall be made within forty-five (45) days from the receipt of an invoice.

Any modifications to the Scope of Work, respective modifications to compensation, if any, shall be agreed upon by both parties in a mutual writing.

♦ QUALIFICATIONS OF ROSE M. HOEFS

AFFILIATION

The Appraisal Institute, Chicago, Illinois, 1986; Associate Member
The International Right of Way Association
DUNS available on request

MEMBER OF

Greater Minnesota Chapter of the Appraisal Institute
Greater North Dakota Chapter of the Appraisal Institute
Fargo-Moorhead Board of Realtors

LICENSES AND DESIGNATIONS

North Dakota Certified General Appraiser, 1992; #1063
Minnesota Certified General Appraiser, 1992; #4002095
South Dakota Certified General Appraiser, 2014; #1333CG
North Dakota Real Estate Broker, 1976; lapsed 2005
GRI (Graduate Realtors Institute) 1976; CRS (Certified Residential Specialist) 1977

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Dickinson Branch NDSU, Dickinson, North Dakota
Moorhead State University, Moorhead, Minnesota
North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis, Minnesota

EDUCATION – APPRAISAL INSTITUTE COURSES

Advanced Applications
2000 University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Advanced Sales Comparison and Cost Approaches
2000 University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Basic Valuation Procedures
1989 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Business Practices and Ethics
2013 Appraisal Institute
2009 Appraisal Institute

Capitalization Theory and Technique, Parts A and B
1989 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Case Studies
1992 University of St. Thomas, Minneapolis, Minnesota
1991 Appraisal Institute, Houston, TX

Commercial Cost Approach Training
2009 Appraisal Institute

Condemnation Appraising / Advanced Topics and Applications
1999 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Condemnation Appraising / Basic Principles and Applications
1999 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Demonstration Report Writing
1999 Appraisal Institute, Chicago, Illinois

Eminent Domain and Condemnation
2006 Appraisal Institute

FHA and the Appraisal Process
1999 Appraisal Institute, Bismarck, ND

Introduction to Green Buildings: Principles & Concepts
2013 Appraisal Institute

Real Estate Principles
1988 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Report Writing and Valuation
1991 Houston Chapter, Appraisal Institute; Houston, Texas

Residential Cost Approach Training
2009 Appraisal Institute

Residential Market Analysis and Highest & Best Use
2011 Appraisal Institute

Small Hotel/Motel Valuation
2006 Appraisal Institute

Subdivision Valuation
2013 Appraisal Institute

Supervising Appraisal Trainees
2013 Appraisal Institute

Valuation of Detrimental Conditions in Real Estate
2006 Appraisal Institute

Uniform Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions
2014 Chamberlain, SD
2007 St. Paul, Minnesota
2002 Sheridan, Wyoming

Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, Parts A, B & C
2013 North Dakota Chapter, Appraisal Institute; update
2012 State of Minnesota, Department of Commerce; update
2010 North Dakota Chapter, Appraisal Institute; update
2008 North Dakota Chapter, Appraisal Institute; update
2006 North Dakota Chapter, Appraisal Institute; update
2005 North Dakota Chapter, Appraisal Institute; update
1999 Houston Chapter, Appraisal Institute; Houston, Texas
1994 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota
1988 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

EDUCATION – OTHER

Enbridge Safety Course 2014; Grand Forks, North Dakota

REAL ESTATE AND APPRAISAL EXPERIENCE

1996-present	RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc.; Fargo, North Dakota; Fee Appraiser
1995-1998	Parsons Brinkerhoff; Herndon, Virginia; FEMA Inspector
1990-1996	TW Sapa & Associates; Fargo, North Dakota; Fee Appraiser
1989-1990	Fargo Planning Commission; Fargo, North Dakota; Board Member
1984-1990	H.R. Arneson & Associates; Fargo, North Dakota; Fee Appraiser
1983-1984	Bagan Real Estate; Jamestown, North Dakota; Broker – Owner
1975-1981	Bagan Real Estate; Jamestown, North Dakota; Real Estate Sales
1974-1975	Rueben Liechty & Company; Jamestown, North Dakota; Real Estate Sales

Appraisal Experience includes over 5,600 self-contained, summary, or restricted appraisals of vacant land, mixed residential, commercial, industrial, and special purpose properties. Primary focus is litigation and eminent domain issues.

Purpose of the Appraisals includes purchase, sale, refinance, government acquisition, easements, contamination, insurance, litigation, and damaged properties. Appraisal area includes all of North Dakota, Western Minnesota, and northeastern South Dakota.

Court Experience: Qualified expert witness; appraisal and reviewer; decision North Dakota Supreme Court/review/ {*City of Grand Forks v. Hendon, No. 20050197*}.

PARTIAL LIST OF CLIENTS

Government

Bismarck Airport Authority, Bismarck, North Dakota
Cass County, North Dakota
City of Breckenridge, Minnesota
City of Detroit Lakes, Becker County, Minnesota
City of Dickinson, North Dakota
City of East Grand Forks, Minnesota
City of Fargo, North Dakota
City of Grand Forks, North Dakota
City of Moorhead, Minnesota
City of West Fargo, North Dakota
Clay County, Minnesota
Fargo Airport Authority, Fargo, North Dakota
Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
Federal Housing Administration (FHA)
General Services Administration (GSA)
Grand Forks Airport Authority, Grand Forks, North Dakota
Homeland Security, North Dakota / Army Corps Engineers – Rock Island, Illinois
Mayville Airport Authority, Mayville, North Dakota
Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT)
Mountrail County, North Dakota
North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT)
North Dakota State Water Commission
U.S. Department of the Army / Corps of Engineers – St. Paul, Minnesota
Wahpeton Airport Authority, Wahpeton, North Dakota

Engineering Firms

Apex Engineering Group, Inc
Bartlett and West - AECOM Engineers, Inc
DOWL HKM, Inc.
HDR Engineering, Inc.
Houston Engineering, Inc
Interstate Engineering, Inc
Kadrmas, Lee, and Jackson
Moore Engineering, Inc
SRF Consulting, Inc
Tait & Associates, Inc.
Ultieg Engineers, Inc

Corporations and Other Entities

American Society for Environmental Education
AT&T
Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad
Cargill, Inc
Cass County Electric
Coca Cola
Concordia College
Consolidated Beef
Enbridge Oil Corporation
General Motors
Great Plains Supply
John Deere
Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing
Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc.
Northwestern Bell
Pamida, Inc.
Pepsi Cola
Ramada Inns
Regency Inns
Roadway Express
Steiger Tractor
SuperValu Stores
Surplus Tractor, Inc.

REFERENCES

Garylle Stewart, Attorney at Law; Solberg, Stewart, & Miller; Fargo, North Dakota 701-237-3166
Howard Swanson, City Attorney and Special Assistant to the Attorney General of North Dakota; Grand Forks, North Dakota 701-772-3407
Richard Stoppelmoor, Vice President, PE; HDR Inc.; 4503 Coleman Street, Suite 105, Bismarck, North Dakota 58503-2007; 701-557-9602

MAJOR PROJECTS (1996 – Present)

AIRPORT NEW CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION

Fargo, ND
Grand Forks, ND
Gwinner, ND
Jamestown, ND
Kindred, ND
Lisbon, ND
Stanley, ND
Wahpeton, ND

AIRPORT REVIEW

Bismarck, ND
Gen Ulen, ND
Grand Forks, ND
Kindred, ND
Lakota, ND
Linton, ND
Oaks, ND
Washburn, ND

STREETS, HIGHWAYS, AND UTILITIES

- ***North Dakota Department of Transportation***

Construction / Reconstruction of I-29 & Main Avenue Railroad Shoofly, Fargo, ND
Construction of Dickinson Bypass, Dickinson, ND (2 of 3 phases completed)
Construction of Highway 85/2 North, Williams County, North Dakota
Construction of I-94 sound wall; Fargo, ND
Construction of U.S. Highway 281 Bypass, (approximately 12 miles) Jamestown, ND
Construction of Williston Bypass, Williston, ND (3 phases completed)
Construction of Williston Temporary Bypass, Williston, ND
Construction of Williston Underpass, Williston, ND
Reconstruction of 12th Avenue North and University Drive, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of County Road 3A, Mountrail County, ND
Reconstruction of County Road 7, Mountrail County, ND
Reconstruction of Dakota Avenue, City limits to Red /Ottertail/Bois de Sioux River; Wahpeton, ND
Reconstruction of Highway 1804 interchange, Williams County, ND
Reconstruction of Highway 20, Devils Lake, ND
Reconstruction of Highway 23, Mountrail County, ND
Reconstruction of Highway 281 South, Mill Hill to City limits, Jamestown ND
Reconstruction of Highway 83; Max, ND
Reconstruction of Highway19, Devils Lake, ND
Reconstruction of I-29 and 52nd Avenue Overpass; Fargo, North Dakota
Reconstruction of Intersection of Highways 1804 and 58, Buford, ND
Reconstruction of Main Ave & 25th Street Underpass/Shoofly, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of Main Ave & University Drive Underpass/Shoofly, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of Main Street, 1st Ave to 6th Ave, Williston, ND
Reconstruction of North Broadway, Minot, North Dakota, total takings
Reconstruction of Palermo Road, Mountrail County, ND
Reconstruction of roads and bridges; Ward County and FEMA; Ward County, ND

Reconstruction of Shell Creek Bridge, Mountrail County, ND
Reconstruction of South University Drive, north of 52nd Avenue; Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of State Highway 200, Killdeer, North Dakota
Reconstruction of State Highway 46, Gackle, North Dakota
Reconstruction of West Main Avenue, West Fargo, ND

- ***City of Fargo, North Dakota***

Construction / Reconstruction of 32nd Avenue S - 45th Street to 38th Street, Fargo, ND
Construction / Reconstruction of 45th Street - I-94 to 52nd Avenue, Fargo, ND
Construction of 17th Avenue Underpass / I-29, Fargo, ND
Construction of 42nd Avenue South Underpass / I-29, Fargo, ND
Construction of 64th Avenue South and 25th Street, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of 13th Avenue South - 25th Street to I-29, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of 25th Street - 17th Avenue S to 23rd Avenue S, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of 42nd Street - 9th Avenue S to 32nd Avenue S, Fargo, ND
Reconstruction of 45th Street - 9th Avenue South to I-94
Reconstruction of Main Avenue - 45th Street to 25th Street, Fargo, ND
Utility Project, Major Thoroughfares, Fargo, ND

- ***Cass County, North Dakota***

Cass County Highway 32, Alice, North Dakota
Cass County Highway 4, Argusville ND to CC Highway 18
Construction of County Road 14, Horace, ND to I-29
Reconstruction of Cass County 17 from County Road 6 to Horace, ND
Reconstruction of County Highway 15, Mapleton, ND
Reconstruction of County Road 32 / Rush River, Amenia, ND

- ***Transmission Lines / Oil Pipelines***

Construction of Big Stone Transmission Line – Dickey County, ND
Construction of Minnkota Power transmission line, various counties, ND
Construction of Sandpiper Pipeline, Enbridge Corporation - Tioga, ND to Grand Forks, ND

- ***US Border Control – Homeland Security / Army Corps of Engineers***

Construction of Maida Border Control Station, Maida, ND
Construction of Pembina Border Control Station, Pembina, ND
Construction of Portal Border Control Station, Portal, ND

WATER PROJECTS

- ***Total and Partial Takings / Government Participation (2000 – present)***

Baldhill Dam / Lake Ashtabula, 5' Pool Raise – Corps of Engineers
Becker County, MN; Becker County Dam / South Branch of Wild Rice River
Breckenridge, MN, floodwall and levee construction; Corps of Engineers
Devils Lake East End Outlet – North Dakota Water Commission
Devils Lake West End Outlet; Property Owners versus State of North Dakota Water Commission
East Grand Forks, MN; floodwall and levee construction; Corps of Engineers
Fargo and Cass County, ND; south/north side flood project
Fargo, ND; levee construction; City of Fargo (on going)
Fargo-Moorhead Red River Diversion (on going)
Grand Forks, ND; floodwall and levee construction; Corps of Engineers
Hendrum, Minnesota, ring dike; Wild Rice Water District
Little Missouri pipeline break, Medora, ND; North Dakota State Water Commission
Neva, Minnesota, ring dike; Wild Rice Water District
Norman County Minnesota; Wild Rice Water District; levee construction
Oxbow, North Dakota Emergency Buyouts – Corps of Engineers & FM Metro Area Diversion

Perley, Minnesota ring dike; Wild Rice Water District
Shelly, Minnesota, ring dike; Wild Rice Water District

- ***Voluntary Buyouts / Government Participation (2000 – present)***

Breckenridge, MN
Cass County, ND
City of Fargo, ND
Clay County, MN
Norman County, MN
Wild Rice Water District, MN

- ***Flood Damaged Properties (1997 – present)***

Cass County, ND
Clay County, MN
East Grand Forks, MN
Fargo, ND
Grand Forks, ND
Lisbon, ND
Moorhead, MN
Norman County, MN

COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

The descriptions, analyses, and conclusions stated herein are intended for the exclusive use of our client, and any other explicitly identified intended users, solely for the intended use stated in this document.

RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc. retains all rights, title, and interests in all trademarks, trade names, trade secrets, data, conclusions, opinions, valuations, and other information included in, arising out of, or in any way related to this survey.

No person or entity shall be entitled to break down, strip out, mine, or disseminate any component or portion of this report, including, but not limited to any valuations, opinions, data compilations, or conclusions.

This report and all its contents is a culmination of intellectual and professional experiences, education, personal investigations, and know-how, which shall at all times remain the property of RM Hoefs & Associates, Inc., its sole owner.

END OF REPORT

Fact Sheet

What impact will a wind farm have on my property value?

Multiple studies have found wind farms have **no significant long-term impacts** on property values.

- Wind energy projects drive **economic development**, job growth and tax revenue to their host communities, which benefits landowners and land values in the area.
- Landowners who host a wind turbine on their property earn regular lease payments that transfer with the sale of the property, **adding to its value**.
- While some potential property purchasers may be hesitant to purchase land near wind turbines, academic studies show that the **positive impacts** of a wind energy project either balance or **outweigh any negative impacts**.
- A study of more than 50,000 home sales among 27 counties in nine states found no statistical evidence that home prices near wind farms were affected by the wind farm.[1]
- A 2010 study conducted in Chatham-Kent, Ontario, found there was no statistically relevant relationship between the presence of a wind project and negative effects on property values.[2]

CASE STUDY

"There is a lot of real estate sales activity and many properties in the area of the NextEra Windfarm project are selling for substantially higher prices than what is reflected on the current assessment rolls. For the 2015 calendar year Assessor's Office data shows 712 single family residential properties sold in the areas around the Windfarm and transmission line corridor. The total value of those sales was just under $181.1 million dollars. This represents an increase of $42.9 million over the current Assessor's Market Value on those same properties. An even greater increase in value is indicated by the sales of 30 parcels of grazing land for $5.4 million representing a $3.7 million dollar increase over Assessor's Market Value on those properties."

– **Steve Schlieker,** El Paso County Assessor, *El Paso County, CO*[3]

Sources:

[1] Wind Farm Proximity and Property Values: A Pooled Hedonistic Regression Analysis of Property Values in Central Illinois. Jennifer L. Hinman, (May 2010).

[2] A Spatial Hedonic Analysis of the Effects of Wind Energy Facilities on Surrounding Property Values in the United States. Hoen, B., Brown, J., Jackson, T., Wiser, R., Thayer, M. and Cappers, P. (2013). Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. 151 pages.

[3] County Assessor Reports Spike in Home and Property Values Near Calhan Wind Farm, 02/18/2016, The Gazette [Colorado], Ryan Maye Handy.

Additional research:

The Impact of Wind Power Projects on Residential Property Values in the United States: A Multi-Site Hedonic Analysis. Hoen, B., Wiser, R., Cappers, P., Thayer, M. and Sethi, G. (2009). Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA. December, 2009. 146 pages. LBNL-2829E.