APPENDIX B: OPEN SPACE BENEFITS FROM DAIRY FARMLAND

Previous studies of the value of open space in other states indicate strong willingness to pay (WTP) for farmland preservation in urbanizing areas. Table B1 summarizes WTPs for various states.

Table B1. Estimates of Amenity Benefits from Farmland Preservation in Other States						
Author and Issue	Area	Average WTP per acre/household/year (2007\$)	Aggregate WTP (2007\$)			
Cho et al. (2005)	Macon County,	\$0.23-\$0.25				
Rural homeowners' WTP for land conservation easements	North Carolina		-			
Johnston et al. (2001) Preserve farmland from development	Suffolk County, New York	\$.05-\$.20	\$1,631.52/acre/year			
Johnston et al. (2001) Preserve farmland from development	Southold, New York	\$0.17	\$1,443.69/acre/year			
Beasley et al. (1998) Preserve farmland from development	Alaska	\$.15-\$.29	\$999.38/acre/year			
Rosenberger and Walsh, (1997) Preserve western ranchland from development	Colorado	\$.10–\$.17	-			
Ready et al. (1997) Prevent development of horse farm	Lexington, Kentucky	\$0.01	_			
Vieth et al. (1995) Preserve farmland from development	Oahu, Hawaii	\$0.31	_			
Halstead, (1984) Prevent farmland from development	Massachusetts	\$0.02-\$0.06	_			

In this study, we proceed in three steps to estimate the open space benefits from dairy farmland in Connecticut:

Step 1: WTP Data from Surveys. The data used in this study came from WTP surveys carried out by Johnston et al. (2007, 2008) in six Connecticut towns. Table B2 summarizes the data:

Table B2. Farmland Amenity Benefits Estimates for Six Connecticut Towns					
		Average WTP per			
Study & the issue	Town	Household	Town-level WTP		
		Per/acre/year (2007\$)	Per acre/year (2007 \$)		
Johnston et al.(2008)	Brooklyn, CT	\$0.171	\$463		
Willingness to Pay for rural	Pomfret, CT	\$0.281	\$422		
farmland preservation	Thompson, CT	\$0.093	\$345		
	Woodstock, CT	\$0.337	\$506		
Johnston et al.(2007)	Mansfield, CT	\$0.69	\$2,029		
Willingness to Pay for rural	Preston, CT	\$0.15	\$430		
farmland preservation					

Step 2: WTP in 75 Connecticut Towns. Following Lopez et al. (1994), the data from Table B2 were used to estimate town-level WTP in 75 towns where dairy farms were located, using town-level open space, population and per capita income to extrapolate to the state level. The results are:

Table B3. Da	airy Farmland Amer	nity Benefits f	or 75 Connecticut I	Farms, 2007	
		Town-level WTP per household		Average WTP per household	Town-level WTP per household
Town	Average WTP per household/acre/year	acre/year (2007\$)	Town	acre/year (2007\$)	acre/year (2007 \$)
Ashford	0.19	323	New Milford	0.16	1,630
Bethany	0.28	510	Newtown	0.19	1,637
Bethlehem	0.27	349	North Branford	0.23	1,216
Bolton	0.27	551	North Canaan	0.22	314
Bozrah	0.26	241	North Stonington	0.18	341
Bridgewater	0.29	215	Norwich	0.17	2,757
Brooklyn	0.22	594	Old Lyme	0.24	742
Canaan	0.22	101	Oxford	0.27	914
Canterbury	0.20	358	Plainfield	0.17	983
Canton	0.23	844	Pomfret	0.20	304
Colchester	0.18	981	Preston	0.20	392
Columbia	0.25	491	Redding	0.25	740
Cornwall	0.19	120	Salem	0.24	342
Coventry	0.19	847	Salisbury	0.15	278
Durham	0.27	652	Sharon	0.17	217
East Haddam	0.16	557	Simsbury	0.21	1,798
East Windsor	0.21	885	Somers	0.27	845
Eastford	0.24	156	South Windsor	0.24	2,207
Ellington	0.19	1,037	Southbury	0.18	1,360
Enfield	0.19	3,258	Sprague	0.28	323
Farmington	0.22	2,129	Sterling	0.25	296
Franklin	0.27	193	Stonington	0.17	1,341
Goshen	0.21	235	Suffield	0.21	1,010
Granby	0.20	775	Thomaston	0.29	884
Griswold	0.18	801	Thompson	0.16	595
Hampton	0.26	188	Torrington	0.15	2,236
Hebron	0.21	672	Union	0.24	72
Kent	0.18	219	Voluntown	0.20	199
Lebanon	0.18	467	Wallingford	0.19	3,217
Ledyard	0.19	1,030	Warren	0.26	133
Lisbon	0.26	422	Washington	0.20	293
Litchfield	0.16	545	Watertown	0.20	1,708
Lyme	0.22	193	Willington	0.19	471
Mansfield	0.26	1,454	Windham	0.20	1,740
Middletown	0.16	3,163	Woodbridge	0.30	964
Monroe	0.25	1,649	Woodbury	0.19	722
Morris	0.26	251	Woodstock	0.17	488
New Hartford	0.21	499	Simple Average	0.22	849

Step 3: WTP at the State Level. This involved first estimating land in dairy at the county level by allocating total state dairy land to counties based on the number of dairy farms in each county based on a list of addresses of dairy farmers. WTP at the county level was obtained by multiplying the number of acres in dairy by the average county-level WTP per acre, that we compute by aggregating the estimates for each of the 75 towns and weighting them by population. The open space benefits from dairy lands add up to \$55 million for the state in 2007. The estimated state benefit from open space amounts to \$762.38 per acre in dairy (about \$0.15 per pound of milk).

Table B4. Yearly Open Space Benefits (2007\$) Derived from Dairy Farmland					
	Dairy Farms	Dairy Farm	Avg. WTP/acre/	Avg. WTP/acre/	Amenity
County		Acreage 2007	year/household	Year	Benefit/year
		(est.)			
Fairfield	3	1,099	\$0.228	\$1,342	\$1,475,260
Hartford	14	5,129	\$0.214	\$1,613	\$8,273,925
Litchfield	49	17,951	\$0.209	\$ 576	\$10,345,200
Middlesex	4	1,465	\$0.197	\$1,458	\$2,135,759
New Haven	12	4,396	\$0.243	\$1,363	\$5,993,490
New London	49	17,950	\$0.213	\$6,723	\$12,075,030
Tolland	24	8,792	\$0.226	\$ 716	\$6,291,050
Windham	42	15,386	\$0.205	\$ 544	\$8,429,811
Total:	197	72,168			\$55,019,529