

## **What is Historic Integrity Worth to the General Public? Evidence from a Proposed Relocation of a West Virginia Agricultural Mill**

Vishakha Maskey, Cheryl Brown, Alan R. Collins, Hala F. Nassar

Vishakha Maskey is Ph.D. candidate, Cheryl Brown is assistant professor, and Alan R. Collins is associate professor in Agricultural and Resource Economics, West Virginia University. Hala F. Nassar is assistant professor in Planning and Landscape Architecture, Clemson University. The authors would like to thank Randy Rosenberger, Oregon State University for all of his help throughout this project. Any remaining errors are the sole responsibility of the authors.

### **Contact author:**

Vishakha Maskey, PhD Candidate  
Division of Resource Management  
PO Box 6108  
Morgantown, WV 26506-6108  
Phone: (304) 293-4832 ext. 4485  
[Vishakha.Maskey@mail.wvu.edu](mailto:Vishakha.Maskey@mail.wvu.edu)

# **What is Historic Integrity Worth to the General Public? Evidence from a Proposed Relocation of a West Virginia Grist Mill**

## **Abstract**

While historians believe that preserving a historic building in its original location is important to maintain its historic integrity, the general public's opinion is not known. Survey data were gathered from local residents regarding a proposed relocation of a historic mill in rural West Virginia. A minority of the sample population supported keeping the mill open in its original location. Willingness-to-pay to preserve the mill in its original location was estimated at \$8.45 for a one-time donation for the sample; \$2.29 after adjusting for non-respondents using characteristics of the local population. The entire economic value of preservation (\$91,000) was enough to cover some, but not all, of the costs of keeping the mill open at its original location.

**Key Words:** contingent valuation, historic preservation, Tobit model, willingness to pay.

## **Introduction**

Historic resources possess cultural, historic, and educational significance. Historic landscapes are culturally significant because they present the ways in which people lived, worked, organized to meet their needs, and coped as members of society in general and their communities in particular. Culturally significant landscapes are “the expression of human culture and history in the physical environment” (King 2002, p.12). Thus, cultural historic landscapes are a symbol of heritage, which is a factor in the location of economic activity (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000).

Heritage is also part of a location’s identity, which is valued differently by local people compared to outsiders such as tourists. According to Heritage Counts (2003), historic landscapes have a number of values, including existence, option, altruistic, community identity, and recreational. In addition, they represent a potential revenue source through tourism and use of the buildings. Research has shown that historic buildings generate higher property values and economic opportunities within the neighborhoods where they are located (Schaeffer and Millerick 1991; Leichenko, Coulson, and Listokin 2001; Listokin, Listokin, and Lahr 1998). The existing valuation studies of cultural goods suggest that people have positive values regarding the conservation or restoration of cultural resources (Noonan 2003; Navrud and Ready 2002).

Norton and Hannon (1997) consider how location influences environmental and cultural values and what this means for environmental management. Their theory of a hierarchy (from local to global) of place-based values indicates that protection will be strongest at the local level but also extend to the larger community. In the case of relocation of a historic building, the value placed on the original location may depend on how individuals geographically define their community. According to McClelland et al. (1990), one of the seven qualities of historic

integrity is location and setting, thus, a change in location compromises historic integrity.

Historic preservation guidelines indicate that relocation of a historic building should be the last resort when all other attempts to preserve it fail because this will compromise historic integrity.

Historians believe that the relocation of a historic building decreases its historic integrity for the National Register of Historic Places, depending on the degree of loss in historic context.

In order to sustain the value of historic resources, preservation, restoration, reconstruction and relocation have been taking place. Historic sites have been relocated on a number of occasions to protect or to generate economic opportunity through heritage tourism (for examples, see Gonter 2004; Associated Press 2004; Heritage Society of Austin 2003). Decisions to move historic structures involve the belief that it is better to relocate and preserve these structures rather than to lose them forever. Educational and recreational values associated with historic structures often explain their relocation and/or preservation (de la Torre and Mason 1998). However, according to King (2002), a change in historic context influences the way of life of the community, which needs to be addressed in decision-making regarding allocation and use of the historic resource.

While historians agree on the desirability of historic integrity, the extent to which the general public values this aspect of preservation is largely unknown. No research studies have examined what values citizens within a community attach to a change in the integrity of a historic building by relocation of all or part of the structure. Therefore, this study will investigate the attitudes and values held by the general public towards historic integrity in the case of a proposed relocation for a privately owned, historic mill. The economic value of historic integrity that is accessible to the public will be determined using data from a contingent valuation survey of a 20 mile region around the mill. Previous research has examined the value

of heritage or historical sites by considering willingness to pay to preserve, reduce damage, clean, maintain or otherwise care for these resources (Noonan 2002). This study will contribute to this literature by examining the relocation aspect of historic preservation.

### **Case Study Background**

Reckart's Mill is located near Cranesville, West Virginia (Figure 1). The mill is considered a rural, historic industrial landscape because it represents the social history of the nineteenth century agricultural economy and the associated technological changes within the mill industry (Hardesty and Little 2000). It was built in 1865 as a three-story post and beam gristmill, cider press, and wood planer. In 1980, it was listed in the National Register of Historic Places based on its significance for agriculture, social history, industry, architecture and engineering (National Register of Historic Places 2006).

Reckart's Mill has always been privately owned. It is located in a remote area with poor quality roads and no nearby recreational opportunities or tourist destinations (such as stores and restaurants). A lack of visitors, financial difficulties and increasing insurance payments forced the owners to close the mill to the public in 2004 (Hardesty 2004). A non-profit organization, Friends of Reckart's Mill, was created by the owners to restore the historic mill, but the group was not successful in raising enough funds to keep the mill open.

In order to keep the mill located within its native Preston County, a relocation proposal has been put forth by the owner and a local historical society (Hinchliffe 2005). This proposal would involve moving the mill's working parts (the water wheel and grinding millstones) to a former mill site located close to an interstate highway in Bruceton Mills, WV. Relocation of Reckart's Mill has been promoted on the basis of restoring a former mill and providing economic opportunities by increasing the number of visitors at this new location compared to the former

location. Both the Bruceton Mills' town council and Preston County Commissioners have supported relocation of the mill (Plum 2003a, 2003b).

### **Theoretical Framework**

Previous research has assessed the value of heritage places with local, national, or international significance. Navrud and Ready (2002) compiled case studies completed over a 30 year period that assigned values to cultural heritage based on non-market valuation techniques. Empirical research ranges from local goods like a historic hotel in Ft. Collins, Colorado (Kling, Revier, and Sable 2004) to World Heritage Sites such as Fes Medina (Carson, Mitchell, and Conaway 2002) and Stonehenge (Maddison and Mourato 2002). Economic valuation studies using the contingent valuation method (CVM) have been conducted to value art, historical sites, theatres, museums, heritage, archaeological sites, broadcasting, sports, and libraries (Noonan 2002).

CVM is considered a useful technique for policy relevant issues, such as benefit-cost analysis of investment for public programs, and as a policy instrument for privately supplied public goods where efficient supply of the public good requires that the sum of individuals' marginal willingness to pay equals the marginal cost of producing the public good (Santagata and Signorello 2002). Chambers, Chambers, and Whitehead (1998) conclude that the CVM is a valid and reliable method for valuing a local historic building as part of a benefit-cost analysis regarding its preservation.

In CVM, respondents are assumed to react to a described hypothetical market in a way that is comparable to an actual market (Mitchell and Carson 1989). In this study, the CVM was used to measure household level value for maintaining the historical integrity of Reckart's Mill by keeping it open at its original location. This value can be measured either in terms of Willingness to Pay (WTP) or Willingness to Accept (WTA) depending on the property right

assignment. Since the general public was assumed not to have any property rights to the mill, a WTP measure was used. WTP for this qualitative change in the mill can be represented by the compensating surplus (CS) which is measured as the difference between two expenditure functions,  $e(\cdot)$ , where the quality level (historic integrity) of the public good varies but the level of utility is unchanged.

$$(1) \quad WTP = CS = e(p, q_0; U_0, Q, T) - e(p, q_1; U_0, Q, T),$$

where  $p$  is a vector of prices for market goods,  $U_0$  is the initial level of utility,  $q_0$  is the current situation of a closed mill with high likelihood of relocation,  $q_1$  is maintaining the historic integrity of the mill by keeping it open at its original location,  $Q$  is a vector of other public goods that is held constant, and  $T$  is a vector of individual knowledge of and attitudes towards historic preservation. Given the current situation, let the expenditure function represent current income  $Y_0$ . When the level of income required to achieve  $U_0$  at  $q_1$  is expressed as  $Y_1$ , then  $Y_0 - Y_1$  represents WTP for a change from  $q_0$  to  $q_1$ .  $Y_0 - Y_1$  can be either positive or negative depending upon whether an individual desires public access to historic integrity of the mill or supports mill relocation for tourism or convenience.

A WTP function for household  $i$  can be written as:

$$(2) \quad WTP_i = f(\Delta q_j; Y_i, T_i).$$

Equation (2) represents the basis for estimating a valuation function to measure  $\Delta q_j$  as a change from  $q_0$  to  $q_1$ , where  $p$  has been dropped because prices do not change. When household respondents are presented with a contingent market that offers a change from  $q_0$  to  $q_1$ , then a linear functional form for WTP for the  $i^{th}$  household can be estimated as:

$$(3) \quad WTP_i = \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i,$$

where  $\beta$  is a vector of coefficients associated with a matrix of variables that includes income, knowledge and attitude characteristics,  $X_i$ , and  $\varepsilon_i$  refers to the error term (assumed to be normally distributed with zero mean and constant variance) that reflects unobserved preferences (Mourato, Kontoleon, and Danchev 2002).

### **Survey Design and Data Description**

In this study, a self-administered CVM mail questionnaire was used to collect data from households. While being a common data gathering method for CVM, mail surveys generate relatively lower response rates and less reliable information compared to personal interviews (Boyle 2003). However, mail surveys can present better descriptive information compared to telephone surveys while covering a larger geographic area and without the problem of interviewer effects (Boyle 2003). Personal interviews, although advocated by Mitchell and Carson (1989) and NOAA's Blue Ribbon Panel (NOAA 1993) due to their reliability, were not practical for this study due to cost. Internet and telephone surveys also were not considered due to the expense and likely samples not being representative of the general population due to lack of internet access (Dillman 2000).

The survey instrument was constructed based on two focus groups, one pretest and a series of reviews by researchers. One focus group included residents near the mill and the other involved individuals from within 20 miles of the mill. The survey included five sections of questions in the following order: 1) attitudes, beliefs, and behavior regarding historic preservation; 2) attitudes regarding the importance of the original location of a historic resource; 3) questions specific to Reckart's Mill, including respondent support of the plan to move the mill; 4) questions related to the CVM (see Appendix A), along with reasons for not making a donation; and 5) demographic questions.

As shown in Appendix A, a donation mechanism with payment card elicitation technique was used to provide data to estimate WTP. A payment card was chosen to avoid a high proportion of \$0 responses as often occurs with an open-ended question and to avoid anchoring bias that could occur from using a dichotomous choice format (Boyle 2003). Boyle (2003) states that an adequately designed payment card where low and high bids are not excluded appears to provide more efficient statistical information compared to the dichotomous choice format by narrowing the interval where the latent value resides.

Previous research has found that income, education, and household size have impacts on WTP for historic resources (Bille 2002; Chambers, Chambers, and Whitehead 1998; Garrod and Willis 2002; Kling, Revier, and Sable 2004; Mourato, Kontoleon, and Danchev 2002; Riganti and Willis 2002; Morey et al. 2002; Santagata and Signorello 2002). A general conclusion drawn from the studies in Navrud and Ready is that positive values for historic resources are typically those of the wealthier and more educated segments of the population (Pearce et al. 2002). Thus, education and household income were expected to increase WTP for historical integrity of Reckart's Mill. With household income, a positive relationship also supports the theoretical validity of a WTP model (Chambers, Chambers, and Whitehead 1998). Chambers, Chambers, and Whitehead (1998) found that WTP had an inverse relationship with family size, suggesting less disposable income is available for donating for historic preservation.

Respondents' knowledge, attitudes and behavior were expected to influence WTP. Knowledge of historic resources, previous donations made to preservation organizations, interest in cultural heritage, and belief that historic places should be preserved are often important factors in cultural valuation studies (Navrud and Ready 2002). In this study, three variables were included to reflect attitudes, commitment, and knowledge about historic preservation. Attitudes

were based on a respondent's rating of how important it is to preserve local historic buildings. A respondent's commitment to historic preservation was measured by his/her stated affiliation with any historic preservation organization. Knowledge of historic resources was assessed by respondent awareness of 11 types of historic places in his/her county. All of three of these variables were expected to have positive impacts on WTP.

Information about a historic resource is likely to increase WTP for its preservation (Kling, Revier, and Sable 2004). Familiarity with Reckart's Mill was included as a variable to represent this prior information. Since the donation format utilized a non-profit organization, the respondent's opinion regarding whether non-profit organizations should be in charge of preserving historic buildings was included in the model. A respondent who intends to use a historic resource if it is preserved should have a higher WTP than non-users, and a variable representing this intention was included.

Unique to this study is the consideration of moving the historic building from its original location to a place more convenient for tourism. A respondent's attitude towards relocation of historic resources was likely to influence his/her WTP to preserve this building at its current location as opposed to letting it be moved. Two variables were included to account for these attitudes: (1) the respondent's opinion regarding the importance of preserving a historic building at its original location; and (2) the respondent's opinion regarding whether it is acceptable to move a historic building to make it more convenient to visit.

Table 1 describes and presents descriptive statistics for the variables used for the analysis. The dependent variable (Donation) was the stated amount to keep Reckart's Mill open to the public and preserved at its original location. Respondents that stated a positive response to making a donation were assigned a WTP from their circled monetary value on the payment

card<sup>1</sup>. Respondents who declined to make a donation to preserve Reckart's Mill were assigned a zero WTP.

Ready and Navrud (2002) suggest that unless a global cultural heritage good is being considered, study populations should be restricted to a relevant regional level. As Reckart's Mill represents a local historic resource, only those households within a 20 mile radius of the mill were considered relevant. This area includes Preston, Mineral and Monongalia Counties in West Virginia, along with adjacent counties in Maryland and Pennsylvania. Zip codes within 20 miles of Reckart's Mill were determined using ArcGIS software (Figure 1). With a purchased residential household mailing list, a sample of households within this 20-mile radius was obtained based on zip code populations. A total of 1,000 surveys were mailed on April 10, 2006, followed by a postcard reminder two weeks later. To improve the response rate, a small West Virginia University sticker (a locally popular logo) was included in the first mailing as an incentive to return the survey. A second mailing of the questionnaire to non-respondents was sent on May 17, 2006.

### **Model Estimation**

A censored Tobit model was used to explain factors influencing the Donation variable. Donation was considered censored data because respondents were not asked whether they would be willing to pay to have Reckart's Mill relocated rather than remain in its current location. By using a censored Tobit model with a lower limit of zero, respondents who potentially have a WTP of less than zero to preserve the historic integrity of Reckart's Mill (i.e., they prefer that the mill be relocated) were included in the WTP estimation. Thus, respondents included in estimation of the Tobit model were those with a positive value for Donation and those who were assigned a zero value for Donation because they chose not to donate. Use of a censored Tobit

model assumed that the decision to donate and donation level were determined by the same relationships and characteristics (Mourato, Kontoleon, and Danchev 2002). This assumption was evaluated using a Cragg (1971) specification test for the Tobit model.

The Tobit model as represented by Greene (2002) was:

$$(4) \quad WTP_i^* = \beta' X + \varepsilon ; \varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2),$$

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} y_i &= 0 \text{ if } WTP_i^* \leq 0, \\ y_i &= y_i^* \text{ if } WTP_i^* > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where  $WTP_i^*$  is the true, unobserved WTP for the  $i^{th}$  household and  $X$  represents a matrix of explanatory variables from equation (3), and  $\varepsilon$  is the error term. This model was tested for joint significance of all the variables using both Neyman-Pearson and Maximum Likelihood Ratio tests. As suggested by Greene (2002), the following goodness of fit and power of prediction measures were examined: correlation between actual and predicted values for the non-limit observations, Pseudo- $R^2$ , and  $R^2$  Decomposition. The model also was tested for multiplicative heteroskedasticity and normality of the error term with a conditional moment test (Pagan and Vella 1989). The software package LIMDEP was employed for the Tobit estimation (Greene 2002).

From the Tobit model, both the predicted WTP (equation (6)) and uncensored  $WTP^*$  ( $\beta X_i$ ) were used in computation of sample and population mean WTP.

$$(6) \quad E[y_i | X_i] = \Phi\left(\frac{\beta' X_i}{\sigma}\right) (\beta' X_i + \sigma \lambda_i)$$

where  $\lambda_i = \frac{\phi(\beta' X_i / \sigma)}{\Phi(\beta' X_i / \sigma)}$ , and  $\phi(\cdot)$  and  $\Phi(\cdot)$  are the standard normal and cumulative standard

normal density functions, respectively. Since predicted WTP was censored at zero, this value was used to estimate WTP for those respondents with a positive value for Donation. Uncensored

$WTP^*$  was used to estimate WTP for respondents with a zero value for Donation who supported relocation because this value could be positive or negative. Respondents with a zero value for Donation who opposed or were unsure about relocation were assigned a zero as their “true” WTP.

The sample mean WTP was computed as a weighted average over the three groups of respondents (positive donation, zero donation and support relocation, and “true” zero WTP). For the population WTP within 20 miles of Reckart’s Mill, a weighted average between respondents and non-respondents was computed. Differences between respondents and non-respondents were accounted for by the use of demographic data from the U.S. census. Non-respondent predicted WTP and uncensored  $WTP^*$  were computed from the estimated Tobit model using a combination of census and survey data.

## **Results and Discussion**

A 26% response rate for the survey was achieved. Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the respondents compared to statistics for the population within 20 miles of Reckart’s Mill, weighted by zip code from U.S. Census data. While household size and gender for the sample were similar, average age, education level and household income were all higher for the sample compared to the population. It is not unusual for sample respondents to be older, have higher incomes and be more educated than the relevant population (Kling, Revier, and Sable 2004).

The survey questions were designed to reveal the underlying attitudes, knowledge, and motivations towards historic preservation and integrity. Most respondents were aware of historic houses (86%) and mills (60%) within their county; however, less than half (39%) were aware of any historic building being relocated. Almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents were familiar with Reckart’s Mill, and 52% had visited the mill. In terms of attitudes towards historic

preservation, 59% of respondents believed that preserving historic places in their area was very important. Survey responses also suggested that the main reasons for preserving historic places are for the benefit of future generations (82%) and for educational purposes (76%). More than half (57%) of the respondents believed tourism is an important reason for preservation. A majority (70%) believed that it is important or very important to preserve a historic building at its original location and that it is acceptable to relocate a historic building in order to protect it (68%). Less than one-third of respondents (29%) thought it is never acceptable to relocate a historic building. When asked whether they support the move of Reckart's Mill, the vast majority responded either no (41%) or unsure (43%).

There were 247 valid responses<sup>2</sup> to the donation question. More than half of respondents (58%) chose not to make a donation to preserve Reckart's Mill and open it to the public at its current location. The main reason given by those declining to donate was they did not have the money to make a donation. Of the 42% who chose to donate, responses ranged from \$1 to \$200 as specified in the payment card (see Appendix A). The most common responses were \$10 and \$20. A minority of respondents with a positive donation (17%) also supported the move of Reckart's Mill.

The coefficient estimates from the Tobit model are represented in table 3. A test for multiplicative heteroskedasticity rejected the null hypothesis of homoskedastic disturbances. Income and Householdsize variables were used to correct for heteroskedasticity. The heteroskedasticity-corrected model depicts similar results in terms of statistical significance with the exceptions of the coefficient for Householdsize becoming insignificant and familiarity with Reckart's Mill (FamiliarReckart) becoming significant. Both of the Tobit models fail to accept an assumption of error term normality using a conditional moment test. Violations of the

normality assumption may result in inconsistent coefficient estimates (Arabmazar and Schmidt 1982). However, the assumption of a normal distribution was not changed based on a visual inspection of the residual histogram for the heteroskedasticity corrected model which revealed a “normal like” distribution.

For the heteroskedasticity corrected model, the correlation between actual and predicted non-limit observation was computed to be 57%, with Pseudo- $R^2$  of 31%, and  $R^2_{DECOMPOSITION}$  of 51%. Variables with statistically significant, positive coefficients were household income (Income), historic preservation importance (HistPresImport), familiarity with Reckart’s Mill (FamiliarReckart), a belief that non-profit groups should be in charge of preserving historic buildings (NonProfit), and intention to visit Reckart’s Mill in the future (VisitIfPreserv). Among the zero/one variables, the largest marginal effects on the likelihood to donate were found for HistPresImport and VisitIfPresv (table 3). A positive coefficient for Income provides evidence of construct validity for the CVM question (Freeman 2003). The only variable with a statistically significant negative coefficient was belief that it is acceptable to move a historic building for visiting convenience (Convenience). All statistically significant coefficients had their expected signs. Knowledge variables (Affiliation and Aware), attitude about original location (OriginalLocatn), and demographic variables (Education and HouseholdSize) had coefficients that were not statistically different from zero.

From the sample, WTP was estimated using the predicted WTP from the Tobit model for respondents with a positive Donation response (mean = \$23.07 in table 4). Uncensored  $WTP^*$  from the Tobit model (mean = -\$13.52) was used for respondents with a zero value for Donation who supported relocation<sup>3</sup> (table 4). This negative value was interpreted as compensation required by supporters of relocation to keep the mill in its original location. The weighted

average WTP including zero WTP responses for the sample was \$8.45. Thus, the average sample household WTP was \$8.45 as a one time donation to preserve and open Reckart's Mill at its original location.

Predicted WTP and uncensored *WTP*<sup>\*</sup> for non-respondents were computed from the Tobit model using census averages for Income, Education and Householdsize variables along with sample averages for the other variables. Predicted WTP for non-respondents was about one-third of the sample mean, mainly due to lower average income, while uncensored *WTP*<sup>\*</sup> was only about \$1 lower than the sample mean (table 4). Correspondingly, the weighted average WTP among non-respondents was 73% smaller than the sample.

The population WTP was computed by assuming that 26% of the population within 20 miles of Reckart's Mill (23,304 households) were represented by the sample and 74% were represented by non-respondents (based on the response rate to the survey). By multiplying the weighted average WTP from the sample and non-respondents by 26% and 74% of households, respectively, a total WTP of just over \$91,000 was computed.

## **Conclusions**

Survey results revealed attitudes, knowledge, and behavior regarding historic places within a community where relocation of a historic mill was being considered. Although 60% of survey respondents believed that it is very important to preserve historic places, only 35% believed it is very important for that preservation to be at the building's original location. In regards to Reckart's Mill, less than half of the respondents (42%) were willing to donate to preserve and keep the mill open at its original location. The majority of the sample had either a zero WTP for preserving the historic integrity of Reckart's Mill, mainly due to a lack of income, or a negative WTP due to support for relocation. Thus, survey results confirm that a majority of

the community does not disagree with the approval that local elected officials gave to the private owner's proposal to relocate Reckart's Mill.

A Tobit model was estimated based on donations being censored data. Those households with a positive WTP were strongly influenced by a belief that it is very important to preserve historic places and an intention to visit Reckart's Mill if it is preserved at its current location. Despite positive WTP values being in the minority, the population WTP to preserve the historic integrity and keep Reckart's Mill was estimated to be positive (\$91,000). This economic value was reflective of both the historic integrity of and public accessibility to Reckart's Mill. While it would be difficult to separate these two components of value, public accessibility does have a positive economic value as evidenced by the positive WTP responses among supporters of the move.

Since the mill is privately owned, the ultimate decision to open and maintain the mill at its original location rests with the owner and will most likely be based on whether or not it is profitable to do so. Insurance costs (estimated to be \$2,200 for 2004) along with limited income brought in by visitor admission charges (only a few hundred dollars a year) were the primary reasons why the owners decided to close the mill and have considered relocation (Hardesty 2006). The CVM question in this research utilized a donation payment vehicle to establish an endowment fund maintained by a non-profit organization in order to keep the mill open. If the entire economic value of \$91,000 were to be collected and placed in a certificate of deposit earning a 3% rate of interest, the interest generated from the endowment fund (\$2,720 annually) could cover the cost of insurance, possibly keeping the mill open at its original location.

The dilemma would be coming up with a mechanism to collect these funds from the entire population when only a minority of the population within a 20 mile radius of the mill

supports keeping the mill open in its original location. If a mechanism could be found, practically all the economic value from preserving historic integrity would need to be collected to cover the annual insurance costs. This percentage collection rate is much higher than previous CV research that examines actual collection rates using a donation payment vehicle (Ward and Duffield 1992). Even if the mill owners were to incorporate this economic value of historic integrity for a minority of the population into the relocation decision, at best, only the annual insurance costs would be covered with this value.

Given a relatively low survey response rate (26%), the population WTP was adjusted to account for demographic differences between the sample and non-respondents. Excluding households beyond a 20 mile radius surrounding Reckart's Mill may have resulted in an underestimate of the value of historic integrity of the mill as some individuals beyond this distance may have had a positive WTP. However, this value was probably not large given existing evidence that WTP declines with distance (Loomis 1996; Pate and Loomis 1997; Bille 2002; Hanley, Schlaper, and Spurgeon 2003; Rosenberger, Collins, and Svetlik 2005). Potential areas for future research on historic integrity include conducting a benefit-cost analysis of preservation or examining the trade-offs that people are willing to make between a loss of integrity to the community in order to gain economic benefits of tourism and/or preservation with relocation of a historic building.



**Table 1. Description of variables used in the models**

<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Expected sign</b>
<i>Dependent variable</i>		
Donation	Donation amount to preserve Reckart's Mill and keep it open to the public at its original location. (mean=\$25.22, SD=163)	
<i>Demographic variables</i>		
Education	1=college and/or post graduate degree, 0=otherwise (mean=0.30)	(+)
Income (\$1,000)	Household income: Under \$10=\$10; Midpoint of four survey categories: \$17.5; \$37.5; \$75; \$150; Over \$200=\$250 (mean=\$45.52, SD=37.81)	(+)
HouseholdSize	Number of people living in the household (mean=2.42, SD=1.19)	(-)
<i>Attitude and Knowledge Variables</i>		
HistPresImport	1=belief that it is very important to preserve historic places, 0=otherwise (mean=0.59)	(+)
Affiliation	1=affiliated with any historic preservation organization, 0=not affiliated (mean=0.09)	(+)
Aware	Awareness of historic places in county; Count from 0 to 11. (mean=4.49, SD=2.54)	(+)
FamiliarReckart	1=familiar with Reckart's Mill, 0=otherwise (mean=0.63)	(+)
Nonprofit	1=belief that a private non-profit should be in charge of preserving historic buildings, 0=otherwise (mean=0.49)	(+)
VisitIfPreserve	1=will visit Reckart's Mill after being preserved at current location, 0=will not visit (mean=0.40)	(+)
OriginalLocatn	1=belief that it is very important to preserve a historic building at its original location, 0=otherwise (mean=0.36)	(+)
Convenience	1=belief it is acceptable to move a historic building for convenience to visit, 0=otherwise (mean=0.21)	(-)

**Table 2. Comparison of sample to the local population**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Population</b>
Male (%)	48	49
Average Age (years)	54	38
Education (% Bachelors or greater)	30	12.49
Income (\$1,000)	45.57	29.73
Household size (number)	2.34	2.52

**Table 3. Coefficient estimates for the Tobit model**

Variables	Original Model			Model corrected for heteroskedasticity		
	Coefficient	P-value	Marginal Effect	Coefficient	P-value	Marginal Effect
Constant	<b>-50.59</b> (13.11)	0.000	-20.68	<b>-61.72</b> (12.03)	0.000	-25.47
Education	-0.89 (7.84)	0.991	-0.41	-3.34 (9.21)	0.715	-1.54
Income	<b>0.31</b> (0.93)	0.001	0.13	<b>0.25</b> (0.13)	0.059	0.10
HouseholdSize	<b>-9.33</b> (3.08)	0.003	-3.81	-3.40 (3.19)	0.286	-1.40
HistPresImport	<b>28.84</b> (9.02)	0.001	12.97	<b>26.34</b> (10.10)	0.009	12.12
Affiliation	-9.92 (11.81)	0.401	-4.45	-8.09 (13.08)	0.536	-3.72
Aware	1.99 (1.48)	0.180	0.82	1.53 (1.41)	0.277	0.63
FamiliarReckrt	8.90 (8.00)	0.266	4.01	<b>15.39</b> (7.61)	0.043	7.08
Nonprofit	<b>18.50</b> (7.20)	0.010	8.32	<b>18.49</b> (6.55)	0.005	8.51
VisitIfPreserv	<b>31.42</b> (7.74)	0.000	14.14	<b>24.48</b> (7.64)	0.001	11.26
OriginalLocatn	-5.97 (7.65)	0.435	-2.69	3.08 (7.80)	0.693	-1.42
Convenience	<b>-17.20</b> (8.89)	0.053	-7.74	<b>-14.71</b> (7.93)	0.063	-6.77
<b>Log-Likelihood</b>		-429.65			-422.98	
<b>Sigma</b>		36.89			58.62	
<b>N</b>		169			169	

Standard errors are in parentheses. Bold indicates a statistically significant parameter estimate at the 0.10 level or higher.

**Table 4. Sample and non-respondent mean WTP**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Predicted WTP</b>	<b>Uncensored WTP*</b>	<b>Weighted Average<sup>a</sup></b>
Sample	\$23.07	-\$13.52	\$8.45
Non-respondents	\$8.74	-\$14.97	\$2.29

<sup>a</sup> From the sample of 247 valid responses, weighting was based on 104 positive donation responses, 120 “true” zero WTP responses, and 23 responses with a zero donation but who supported relocation.

## References

- Associated Press. 2004. "Cost of Restoring a Historic Building, A Growing Problem." *Eye Witness News*. Available online at <http://www.wfsb.com/Global/story.asp?S=2417731> (accessed October 2004).
- Bille, T. 2002. "A Contingent Valuation Study of the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen". In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp. 200-237). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Boyle, K.J. 2003. "Contingent Valuation in Practice." In Champ, P., K.J. Boyle and T.C. Brown, eds., *A Primer on NonMarket Valuation, The Economics of Non-Market Goods and Resources*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Carson, R.T., R.C. Mitchell, and M. Conaway. 2002. "Economic Benefits to Foreigners visiting Morocco Accruing from Rehabilitation of the Fes Medina." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.118-141). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Chambers, C.M., P.E. Chambers, and J.C. Whitehead. 1998. "Contingent valuation of quasi-public goods: validity, reliability, and application of valuing a historic site." *Public Finance Review*, 26: 137-154.
- de la Torre, M. and R. Mason. 1998. "Economics of Heritage Conservation: Issues and Ideas on Valuing Heritage." A seminar organized by the Getty Conservation Institute, California, Los Angeles. Available online at

[http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf\\_publications/econrpt.pdf](http://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications/pdf_publications/econrpt.pdf) (accessed May 20, 2004).

Dillman, D.A. 2000. *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*, Second Edition: New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Freeman, A.M. 2003. *The Measurement of Environmental and Resource Values*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Garrod, G. and K.G. Willis. 2002. "Northumbria: Castles, Cathedrals and Towns." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.40-52). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Gonter, N.H. 2004. "Historic Hamp House Hits Highway in Relocation." *The Republican Newspaper*, September 27.

Graham, B.A., G.J. Ashworth, and J.E. Tunbridge. 2000. *Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture and Economy*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.

Greene, W.H. 2002. *LIMDEP Version 8.0 Econometric Modeling Guide*, Volume 2. Planview, NY: Econometric Software, Inc.

Hanley, N., F. Schlaper, and J. Spurgeon. 2003. Aggregating the Benefits of Environmental Improvements: Distance-decay Functions for Use and Non-use Values. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 68: 297-304.

Hardesty, D., and B.J. Little. 2000. *Assessing Site Significance, A Guide for Archeologists and Historians*. Heritage Resource Management Series. New York: Altamira Press.

Hardesty, T. 2004. Reckart's Mill owner, Preston County, West Virginia. Personal Communication.

- Hardesty, G. 2006. Reckart's Mill owner, Preston County, West Virginia. Telephone Communication.
- Heritage Counts. 2003. *The Economic Value of the Historic Environment*. The Value of the Built Heritage: A Report prepared by National Economic Research Associates. Available online at <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/heritagecounts/newpdfs/DATA2.pdf> (accessed May 1, 2006).
- Heritage Society of Austin. 2003. *The Castleman Bull House*. Available online at <http://www.heritagesocietyaustin.org/cbhouse.html> (accessed October 21, 2004).
- Hinchliffe, M.H. 2005. "Bruceton Mills Dam, Reckart's Mill Projects on Hold." *Dominion Post*, February 14.
- King, T.F. 2002. *Thinking about Cultural Resource Management: Essays from the Edge*. Heritage Resources Management Series. Oxford: Altamira Press.
- Kling, R.W., C.F. Revier, and K. Sable. 2004. "Estimating the Public Good Value of Preserving a Local Historic Landmark: The Role of Non-Substitutability and Citizen Information." *Urban Studies*, 41(10): 2025-2041.
- Leichenko, R.M., E.N. Coulson, and D. Listokin. 2001. "Historic Preservation and Residential Property Values: An Analysis of Texas Cities." *Urban Studies*, 38(11): 1973-1987.
- Listokin, D., B. Listokin, and M. Lahr. 1998. "The Contribution of Historic Preservation to Housing and Economic Development." *Housing Policy Debate*, 9(3): 431-478.
- Loomis, J.B. 1996. "How Large is the Extent of the Market for Public Goods: Evidence from a Nationwide Contingent Valuation Survey." *Applied Economics*, 28(7): 779-782.
- Maddison, D., and S. Mourato. 2002. "Valuing Different Road Options for Stonehenge." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental*

*Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.159-184).

Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.

McClelland, L.F., T.J. Keller, G.P. Keller and R.Z. Melnick. 1990. *Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Rural Historic Landscapes*. National Register Bulletin, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service and Interagency Resources Division.

Mitchell, R.C., R.T. Carson. 1989. *Using Surveys to Value Public Goods: The contingent Valuation Method*. Washington D.C.: Resources for the Future.

Morey, E.R., K.G. Rossmann, L.G. Chestnut, and S. Ragland. 2002. "Valuing Reduced Acid Deposition Injuries to Cultural Resources: Marble Monuments in Washington, D.C." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.159-184).

Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Mourato, S., A. Kontoleon, and A. Danchev. 2002. "Preserving Cultural Heritage in Transition Economies: A Contingent Valuation Study of Bulgarian Monasteries." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.68-86). Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) 15 FR 4601, Department of Commerce (DOC), 1993. *Natural Resource Damage Assessment Under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990*. In Federal Register Vol 58, No. 10, 15 CFR Chapter IX.

National Register of Historic Places. 2006. *West Virginia, Preston County*. Available online at <http://www.nationalregisterofhistoricplaces.com/WV/Preston/state.html> (accessed July 12, 2006).

- Navrud, S., and R.C. Ready. 2002. *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts*. Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Noonan, D.S. 2002. "Contingent Valuation Studies in the Arts and Culture: An Annotated Bibliography." The Cultural Policy Center, at the University of Chicago, Working Paper, February. Available online at <http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/workingpapers/Noonan11.pdf> (accessed July 10, 2004).
- Noonan, D.S. 2003. "Contingent Valuation and Cultural Resources: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Literature." *Journal of Cultural Economics* 27: 159-176.
- Norton, B.G., and B. Hannon. 1997. "Environmental Values: A Place-Based Theory." *Environmental Ethics*, 19: 227-245.
- Pagan, A., and F. Vella. 1989. "Diagnostic Tests for Models Based on Individual Data: A Survey." *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 4:S29-S59.
- Pate, J., and J. Loomis. 1997. "The Effect of Distance on Willingness to pay Values: A Case Study of Wetlands and Salmon in California." *Ecological Economics*, 20(3): 199-207.
- Pearce, D., S. Mourato, S. Navrud, and R.C. Ready. 2002. "Review of existing studies, their policy use and future research needs." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts*. (pp.257-270) Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Plum, K. 2003a. "Historic wheel may be moved to Bruceton Mills." *The Dominion Post*, November 17.
- Plum, K. 2003b. "Wise gives Preston \$2M: New Kingwood pool, Rowlesburg sewerage among projects." *The Dominion Post*, November 22.

- Plum, K. 2004. "Work under way at Bruceton Mills dam." *The Dominion Post*, June 9.
- Ready, R.C., and S. Navrud. 2002. "Why value cultural heritage?" In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts*. (pp.3-9) Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Riganti, P., and K.G. Willis. 2002. "Component and Temporal Value Reliability in Cultural Goods: The Case of Roman Imperial Remains near Naples." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts*. (pp.142-158) Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rosenberger, R., A. Collins, and J. Svetlik. 2005. "Private Provision of a Public Good: Willingness to Pay for Privately Stocked Trout." *Society and Natural Resources*, 18: 75-87.
- Santagata, W. and G. Signorello. 2002. "Individual Preferences and Allocation Mechanisms for a Cultural Public Good: 'Napoli Musei Aperti'." In Navrud, S. and R.C. Ready, eds., *Valuing Cultural Heritage: Applying Environmental Valuation Techniques to Historic Buildings, Monuments and Artifacts* (pp.238-257) Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Schaeffer, P.V., and C.A. Millerick. 1991. "The Impact of Historic District Designation on Property Values: An Empirical Study, Research and Practice." *Economic Development Quarterly*, 5: 301-312.
- Stomberg, B.E., K.A. Barenklau, and R.C. Bishop. 2001. "Non Point Source Pollution and Present Values: A Contingent Valuation Study of Lake Mendota." *Review of Agricultural Economics*, 23: 120-132.

U.S. Census Bureau. *State and County Quick Facts*. Available online at  
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/> (accessed June 3, 2006).

Ward, K.M. and J.W. Duffield. 1992. *Natural Resource Damages: Law and Economics*. New  
York: John Wiley and Sons.


## Appendix A. Contingent Valuation Questions

In this section, we would like to know how much you would be willing to pay to preserve Reckart's Mill and keep it open at its original location. This information is for research purposes only. The following question asks whether you would consider donating to an endowment fund that would maintain Reckart's Mill at its current location by paying the insurance costs to keep it open to the public. Even with donations, there would still be a small entrance fee to visit the mill.

*This is **not** an actual request for a donation. We would like to know how you would react if asked to make a contribution, so please only say yes if you would really be willing to write a check to such an endowment fund. Your identity will be protected and no one will contact you asking for a donation.*

11. Suppose a non-profit group was organized to preserve Reckart's Mill and keep it open at its original location near Cranesville. Would you be willing to make a one-time donation to an endowment fund that would pay the insurance so that Reckart's Mill could be open to the public?

No SKIP TO QUESTION 13 ON PAGE 7

Yes 

12. What is the highest one-time donation that you would be willing to contribute to insure that Reckart's Mill stays open at its original location?

*(Please circle only one number.)*

\$1	\$5	\$10	\$15	\$20	\$30	\$40
\$50	\$75	\$100	\$150	\$200	\$300	\$500
Other, please specify \$ _____						

IF YOU CIRCLED ONE OF THE ABOVE NUMBERS, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION 14 ON PAGE 8.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup> Positive responses to the donation question could have been analyzed with a grouped Tobit model, but this would have excluded the negative responses from model estimation.

<sup>2</sup> There were seven item non-responses to the CVM question and two donation observations (\$500 and \$2,500) were discarded as outliers due to violation of construct validity. According to Stomberg, Barenklau, and Bishop (2001), willingness to pay validity can be checked by comparing whether the reported willingness to pay is greater than 1% of the respondent's household income. The donation of \$2,500 was approximately 3% of the household income of the respondent while the \$500 response was approximately 1%. Thus, both responses were removed.

<sup>3</sup> Uncensored *WTP*\* values were positive for 15.3% of move supporters who had a zero donation response.