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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Historic preservation is typically judged to be a sound investment. By most accounts, it is more efficient and profitable to preserve a historic building than to construct a new one. Designating a landmark or district as historical typically maintains if not boosts the value of the property, and as an economic development tool, historic preservation has proved its worth. Nearly any way the effects are measured, be they direct or indirect, historic preservation tends to yield significant benefits to the economy.

However, the methods of determining the value of historic preservation vary widely, and several challenges persist in applying economic methods to the field. This discussion paper, which is followed with an extensive and annotated bibliography, reviews the current findings on the value of historic preservation and the methods used to assess that value, making the case for needed improvement if the economics of preservation is to more objectively and rigorously quantify the effects of historic preservation.

The dilemmas faced in assessing the value of historic buildings include the fact that historic preservation is both public and private, and has both monetary and nonmonetary purposes. Historic preservation, for example, can be a private good in that it offers a range of goods and services consumed by individuals and traded in markets (such as real estate). On the other hand, it can be intrinsically a public good, with benefits deriving collectively and provided not by markets, but by government or nonprofit groups. These differences lead to very different methods, and degrees of complexity, in assessing its value, both of which are reviewed here.

The methods reviewed in this paper are:

- Basic cost studies: These include financial calculations, development pro formas, audits of existing preservation, and cost-benefit analyses.

- Economic impact studies: Perhaps the most widely used, these studies gauge the effect, in dollar terms, of a particular historic preservation investment on a regional economy.

- Regression analysis: hedonic, travel-cost, and property value studies. This statistical technique examines the relation between multiple variables and the market price of historic preservation. A regression analysis, for example, might predict the effect of landmark regulation on real estate property values. Hedonic methods measure the effect of a popular historic site on land values at various distances from the site. The travel-cost method assesses the various costs people are willing to incur to travel to a historic site.

- Contingent valuation and choice modeling: These methods measure “nonuse” values of public goods. They are based on surveyed consumer preferences rather than actual market data. These methods create hypothetical market situations to essentially assess how much the public values historic preservation.
Case studies: Given the conceptual difficulties in quantifying preservation value, case studies—involving narratives, descriptive statistics, and clear analytical frameworks—offer a sound option for assessing value.

The economics of preservation is an embryonic field compared with research in other economics disciplines, and the research is currently weighted heavily toward advocacy. The paper concludes with a call for more development in the field to be able to more objectively answer the question: Does preservation pay? Toward that end, the paper calls for a hybrid of the most promising methods and more collaboration across research fields. By combining methods, the particular shortcomings or blind spots of different methods can perhaps offset one another. Without further refinement, the ability to make conclusive, generalized statements about the economics of preservation will remain elusive.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This report reviews the substantial academic and professional literature concerning the economics of historic preservation. It is intended as a guide to recent work being pursued in many different professional fields and disciplines, though not as a comprehensive summary of the parts of the literature. This review is not intended to pass judgment on the validity of particular research results, nor otherwise suggest quantitative answers to the popular question, “Does preservation pay?” Rather, the review will empower professionals and decision-makers to choose, use, and better analyze the kinds of research and theoretical works existing on the subject. Finally, this report also aims to inspire and focus future research efforts on economic aspects of historic preservation.

The economic costs and benefits of historic preservation are the subject of persistent and urgent questioning in public debates. Whenever historic preservation comes up in public discourse, it seems, economic arguments figure prominently. Sometimes the discussion is about whether historic preservation has some economic value, and the answer generally is “yes.” And sometimes the tougher questions are ventured: does historic preservation of a certain site have more economic value than an alternative investment might have? What are the costs and benefits of regulation? Is preservation an effective way to stimulate economic development?

These are fundamentally difficult and tricky questions to study. Historic preservation is organized primarily to sustain and create cultural values, like historical associations, senses of place, cultural symbolism, the aesthetic and artistic qualities of architecture, and the like. Studying the economics of this (or any other part of the cultural sector) amounts to calculating the incalculable, or pricing the priceless. Economic analyses can easily determine partial or proxy values for the full value of historic preservation, but what do these tell us? Are they sufficient or even useful?

A growing number of studies and research projects take on issues in this realm of understanding the economic values of historic preservation. The specific kinds of questions and themes addressed include: Justification of public policies and other investments (especially rehabilitation tax credits); rationales for advocating preservation over new construction; rationales for promoting generally conservative approaches to managing the built environment (falling under the rubrics of “sustainability” or “smart growth”); justifying material support for preservation as an expression of culture (in which a lot of the questioning is identical to that plaguing the arts and culture sectors in general, whether the topic is funding for museums, art, music, or other forms); and how to use economic analysis to inform management decisions for historic preservation sites and programs.

Despite the growing number, range, and sophistication of studies, however, this review concludes that the field is not thoroughly studied, nor is there much agreement on answers to basic pragmatic and policy questions.

The historic preservation field suffers, in general, from an absence of an intellectual and research infrastructure to support the full range of activities and debates that define the
contemporary preservation field. There is an excellent research infrastructure supporting the work of physical science and material conservation aspects of the field; there is less in the area of historic and cultural aspects of the field; there is almost none in the realm of social sciences, including economics.

Of the research that has been done on the economics of preservation, much of it is done by economists or other analysts who work outside of the preservation field, but are sympathetic to it. Such work tends to be less focused on the core ideas behind historic preservation—such as cultural significance, or the historical and aesthetic values of the built environment—and more interested in the measurable, often subsidiary benefits which are expressible as market values. This body of research is varied and seemingly incommensurable, and too little synthesis has been attempted to interpret the greater meaning of this work. There is a growing, multi-faceted effort to undertake more research and advocacy in the area of economics and historic preservation, and this paper intends to urge this work onwards and inform future directions.
II. Methodology

This report is not concerned with answering specific preservation questions such as “how to finance historic preservation,” “how to make a profit from preservation,” “why is investing public funds in historic preservation always a good idea,” or “how much does preservation pay?” Rather, the core concerns of this collection and analysis of literature is documenting how the economics of historic preservation are currently understood, measured, presented, and included in arguments for and against historic preservation activities and analyses of preservation activities of all types. The review focuses on understanding the range of methods and approaches to understanding and expressing the economic values of preservation, rather than documenting the specific economic costs and benefits of preservation. The search for precise calculations of the economic benefits of historic preservation, though compelling, is highly situational and thus intentionally different from a review. Most generalizations about the measured economic values of preservation – based as they are on very particularistic, highly conditional studies – are overreaching or misleading.

The review aims for establishing the general patterns in the research on preservation economics rather than proposing empirical answers to the questions noted above.

Some underlying assumptions about economic understandings of preservation have informed this review:

1. Historic preservation is a legitimate public good. Historic preservation has, by consensus, tradition and law, been considered by the majority of American voters and public officials as a legitimate function of government. The levels and kinds of public support and spending on historic preservation are up for questioning, however, and constantly debated. Thus arises an “advocacy” literature, supporting ideological beliefs in the cultural need for historic preservation with economic analyses and rationales.

2. Reconciling economic and cultural notions of value is a source of confusion. Different conceptions of the value of things—some priceable, some priceless—have traditionally separated those working in the culture and economics fields. Since historic preservation trades on, and generates, both kinds of value, it requires seeing value through these very different lens.

3. The value of historic preservation need not be expressed and analyzed only in quantitative terms. Qualitative expressions of the value of preservation often are dismissed by economists simply because they are not susceptible to standard economic (mathematically driven) methods of analysis. But these cultural values—resisting easy quantification and mathematical treatment—are essential to the nature of historic preservation and there must somehow remain part of the discourse on decision-making and other economic discourses on preservation. In other words, applying standard quantitative, market-derived measures of historic preservation will not suffice—a priori—to express the full value of preservation as cultural expression and public good.

4. The methodologies of a few different disciplines need to be considered in this review. These disciplines range from economics and historic preservation fields per se to planners, policy
analysts, architects, social scientists, and community activists. This stems from the realization that historic preservation, by seeking to preserve a wide range of values attached to older built environments, draws on the skills, knowledge, and methodologies belonging to these different spheres.

5. The purpose of this study is advancing the debate about the economic values of historic preservation to strengthen our understanding of the roles preservation can play in managing the built environment and creating a healthy and democratic public realm. A belief that more, better designed, somewhat disinterested academic research is needed to support advocacy and improve the practice of preservation.

Practically, this review has proceeded in a number of different, simultaneous directions to collect relevant literature. The historic preservation and urban planning fields, as well as the economics discipline (and specifically the sub-discipline of cultural economics), were canvassed first. This was done by collecting bibliographic work already published and available, by consulting informally with experts in the field, and by keyword database searches. The works included here are intended to be characteristic of the kinds of published work available; it is not a comprehensive review. Only more recent works are included here (generally focused on the last ten years); earlier literature is surveyed in previous bibliographies (for example Listokin, Lahr, McLendon and Klein, 2002).¹

¹ The author wishes to continue building and updating this bibliography; additional references should be sent directly to the author’s email, and updates will be periodically posted to http://www.design.upenn.edu/new/hist/research.htm
III. ECONOMIC AND PRESERVATION: REVIEW AND RESULTS FROM THE LITERATURE

There is broad agreement that the benefits of historic preservation outweigh the costs. More specifically, the economic costs of preservation are outweighed by the benefits—both economic and cultural—of a robust historic preservation sector. The literature is conclusive about the overall positive benefits of historic preservation—sometimes explicitly, often tacitly. Much of the literature is therefore concerned either with articulating these benefits, often in quantitative, monetized terms, or finding those points on the cost-benefit curve at which the best marginal improvements to benefit can be made.

A number of studies in the literature on the economics and preservation have yielded empirical results documenting, in many instances, the positive economic benefits of historic preservation. This section of the report summarizes some of the most prominent of these results. There is no clearly dominant model for how preservation benefits and costs should be expressed. No study creates a total picture of economic benefits, or finds a magical formula for profitability. But significant evidence of positive economic benefits of historic preservation activity is offered in a number of studies surveyed briefly below.

The adequacy of the literature depends upon the question one is asking, and there are a wide variety of questions asked of historic preservation. They range across issues at the level of government policy decisions to those of individual consumers; questions regarding the proper pricing of historic preservation benefits to the evaluation of alternative decision choices. This review concludes that adequate tools and studies exist to analyze the private values of historic preservation, but studying these alone is inadequate to the task of making informed decisions about historic preservation. To enable better decisions, the public values of preservation need to be better analyzed. In particular, replicable model studies of the empirical relationships between historic preservation activity and economic factors are needed. And these studies should be designed to answer directly the kinds of questions practitioners and policy makers have about the relationship between preservation and economics. There is a growing literature on this front—in particular, the research falling under the headings of contingent valuation and other stated-preference methods—that is yet inadequate to everyday application by historic preservation practitioners, other professionals, and decision-makers.

A. The Economics of Individual Historic Preservation Projects

It has been demonstrated time and again that individual historic preservation projects are, under certain conditions, comparable economically to projects involving new construction—in other words, preservation can pay. Donovan Rypkema (1991) makes the clearest case for this, debunking “myths” about relative costs of building rehabilitation versus new construction. New construction is not necessarily less expensive or more profitable than rehabilitation, his work shows. “If no demolition is required, a major commercial rehabilitation will probably cost from 12 percent less to 9 percent more than the cost of comparable new construction with the typical building cost saving being about 4 percent...On the other hand, if new construction requires incurring the costs of razing...”
an existing building, the cost savings from rehabilitation should range from 3 percent to 16 percent.” (p.7) In other words, Rypkema identifies the commonplace conditions under which preservation makes more economic sense than new construction.

Rypkema goes on to show detailed calculations for new-construction and rehabilitation options of a hypothetical rehabilitation project. These pro forma calculations, and the accompanying explanations, demonstrates that, “Historic preservation is a rational and effective economic response” to a number of development situations. (1991, p.21) There is no law dictating that preservation will always be profitable, or always more profitable than new construction, but Rypkema’s line-by-line pro formas compare the costs and benefits in a manner that empirically helps preservationists make a determination about the prospects of a particular project. And they are adaptable to many particular kinds of projects and circumstances.

Important variables in the equations determining the economics of individual projects are existing and proposed public subsidies, such as tax deductions, credits, or abatements. A report sponsored by the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia presents examples of historic preservation pro formas using a proposed (at the time) Federal Historic Homeownership Tax Credits, showing the changed project costs once these and other subsidies were applied (Preservation Action 1999).

A study by Wolf, Horn, and Ramirez (1999) analyzes the same question specifically for the federal stock of historic buildings managed by the General Services Administration and reach the same conclusion: in many cases, it is more efficient and profitable to preserve historic buildings than to construct a new building. This general line of analysis is advanced by closer consideration of the issue of energy-efficiency of preserving historic buildings vs. new construction, as evidenced by Webster and Cohen’s (2002) account of energy efficiency arguments for reuse of Army buildings. Still more sophisticated efforts attempt to account for historic and cultural qualities (i.e., non-use values) of buildings as part of life-cycle cost analysis. The methodology outlined in Whole Building Design Guide [2003] employs a multi-attribute decision analysis method that consider non-monetary as well as monetary attributes.

It is fairly rare to find published the economics of individual projects from the private sector, however a number of case studies exist and provide some financial documentation of successful historic-preservation-led development projects (see, for example, the case studies of commercial rehabilitation in Lipman Frizzell & Mitchell LLC (2002), the wide range of projects described in National Trust for Historic Preservation (2002), the valuable Development Case Studies available by subscription from the Urban Land Institute, and in any number of the publications on affordable housing cited below).

B. The Effects of Historic Preservation on Property Values

Perhaps the most-often asked economic question regarding historic preservation is whether the designation and public regulation of historic districts and landmarks increases or decreases the
economic value of the properties designated. The economics literature clearly comes down in favor of a positive effect of historic districting on property values.

“Virtually every analysis that has been done on the economic impact of [historic district] protection has indicated that values have maintained at worst, and usually are enhanced, because of historic district status,” writes real estate and historic preservation expert Donovan Rypkema (1994b). He goes on to cite evidence from Canada as well: a 1993 study found that, “In every heritage district designated in Canada in the last 20 years, property values have risen despite the fact that development potential has been reduced.”

New York City’s Independent Budget Office recently conducted a study of the effect of local historic district designation and regulation on real-estate prices and “[found evidence of a statistically significant price premium associated with inclusion [of a property] in an historic district. The extent of the premium varied from year to year, ranging from 22.6%... to 71.8%.” (New York City Independent Budget Office 2003, p.2).

An exhaustive academic study by Robin Leichenko, Edward Coulson and David Listokin (2001) found that local historic district designation had a positive effect on property values in seven of the nine Texas cities they studied (in the other two cities, results were inconclusive). Historic designation, they found, increased property values in the range of 5-20 percent.

In a study of National Register districts in Philadelphia, economists Paul Asabere and Forrest Huffman wrote: “Residential parcels located within historic districts appear to attract a substantial price premium of 131 percent. The price premium associated with nonresidential parcels within historic districts are, however, insignificant.” (Asabere and Huffman 1991, p.6) Other studies have been inconclusive, or have documented some negative effects, but the weight of evidence is toward positive effects.

In New Jersey, it was found that, “Properties listed on the national, state or local historic registers [throughout the state of New Jersey] have a market value of $6 billion, of which about $300 million can be attributed to the value-enhancing effect of historic designation.” (New Jersey Historic Trust 1998, p.6)

C. The Economics of Preservation in Local or Regional Economies

Another important set of questions relates to the effects of historic preservation as an economic development tool. Does public policy stimulating or investing in historic preservation yield positive fiscal benefits for the public sector. Such questions are often approached by performing economic impact studies. The question posed by economic impact studies is what effect investment in historic preservation activity has on the economy of a particular region. In other words, these studies ask the question, “Does preservation pay?” on more than a project-by-project basis. A significant number of these studies have been undertaken across the U.S., and the answer to this question is a resounding “yes”—historic preservation yields significant benefits to the economy.
An appraisal of the economics of historic preservation by academics in the urban planning field (Listokin, Listokin and Lahr, 1998) notes the basic relationship at the heart of economic impact studies: “... the direct benefits associated with historic preservation, such as enhanced rehabilitation and heritage tourism spending, have advantageous multiplier effects.” The dollars spent on preservation rebound through the economy, magnifying the “direct” effects of investment with positive “indirect” effects. Table 8 from this article in Housing Policy Debate (p.459) compares the measurable economic impacts of $1 million investment in historic preservation (residential rehabilitation) versus equal investments in book publishing, pharmaceutical production and electrical component production. Nearly any way the impacts are measured—generation of jobs, income, state and local tax revenues—historic preservation exceeds the other sectors. (Questions are often raised about the partiality of economic impact study methods—they always yield positive benefits of preservation investment, and usually fail to consider its opportunity costs. Critique of economic impact methods can be found in Seaman, 2003, and Mason, ed., 1999.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Effect (National)</th>
<th>Residential Historic Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Book Publishing</th>
<th>Pharmaceutical Production</th>
<th>Electronic Component Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (jobs)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income ($000)</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State taxes ($000)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxes ($000)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Listokin, Listokin and Lahr 1998

Economic impact is often expressed in statistics relating to several different aspects of historic preservation, such as rehabilitation work on buildings, heritage tourism, production of housing. And the measures offered come in different forms: total expenditures on historic preservation activities, number of jobs and businesses created through those expenditures, or relative measures of the impact of investment in preservation versus another sector. The following excerpts from the most up-to-date economic impact studies give an indication of the overwhelmingly positive economic impacts that have been reported for historic preservation.

A Colorado Historical Society report (based on an economic study conducted by Clarion Associates, et al, 2002) began, “Studies across the country have shown that historic preservation acts as a powerful economic engine, creating tens of thousands of jobs and generating significant household income. Our research shows that this is especially true in Colorado....” Between 1981 and 2002, the study reports $1.5 billion in total expenditures on historic rehabilitation projects in the state, which generated $522.7 million in total household earnings, 21,327 jobs, $4 million in business income taxes, $10.8 million in personal income taxes and $27.4 million in state sales taxes. (Colorado Historical Society 2002)

A state-wide study of economic impacts for Florida—Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation in Florida: Executive Summary (Center for Governmental Responsibility, University of
Florida Levin College of Law and the Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University 2002, based on an exhaustive study by Listokin, Lahr, McLendon and Klein 2002)—begins: “The Economic Impacts of Historic Preservation in Florida … reveals the startling statistic that for every dollar generated in Florida’s historic preservation grants, two dollars return to the state in direct revenues. A dollar directed to the Florida Main Street program… shows a tenfold return.” (p.2, emphasis in original) Annual economic activities in the state attributable to preservation equaled $4.2 billion, which translated to 123,242 jobs and $2.766 billion in income. This includes economic activity related to historic building rehabilitation, heritage tourism, Main Street programs, and historical museums operation.

Reporting the results of a similar study undertaken for the state of New Jersey, New Jersey Historic Trust 1998 (summarizing results from an extensive study conducted by David Listokin and Michael Lahr of Rutgers’ Center for Urban Policy Research) maintains that: “Each $1 million spent on non-residential historic rehabilitation creates two jobs more than the same money spent on new construction. It also generates $79,000 more in income, $13,000 more in taxes, and $111,000 more in wealth.” (p.2) In the sector of heritage tourism—an important part of the economic contributions of historic preservation—the researchers found that heritage tourists stay 4.7 nights longer than the average tourist, and spend 78% more in restaurants than other travelers. (p.6) The study also reports that “[p]reservation in New Jersey creates 21,575 jobs each year, 10,140 of them in the state” (p.2), and concludes that historic preservation investments create more wealth and more jobs than an equal investment in either new construction or highway construction.

An economic impact study conducted for Maryland (Lipman, Frizzell and Mitchell 2002) reached similarly positive conclusions specifically with respect to the impacts of the state of Maryland’s rehabilitation tax credit, a major stimulus for preservation investment. In the two years covered by the study (2001-2), the following economic impacts were calculated as positive impacts of the historic rehabilitation tax credits in the Maryland state economy and in local jurisdictions:

- “The tax credit program spurred total rehabilitation investment by private developers and homeowners of $155.5 million during the two-year period.”
- “An estimated 2,454 jobs were created throughout the state and in many sectors of its economy: only half were construction sector jobs on-site. Total output in the Maryland economy was increased by $260.5 million and wages increased by $81.6 million.”
- “Public revenues increased by an estimated $20.0 million due to the increased rehabilitation spending.”
- “The rehabilitation qualified for $38.9 million in State historic preservation tax credits. Each $1.00 in State investment has leveraged $4.00 in construction spending and $.80 in federal tax credits.”

In addition to these state-wide measures, the study looked closely at three financially successful, private, case-study projects that had used the rehabilitation tax credits. The study found, “Total public revenues (including counties and municipalities) have been increased as a result of the
State’s investment, yielding a present value of $1.30 to $5.02 in revenues for every $1.00 of State tax credit investment.”

A study specifically focused on heritage tourism in a nine-county area of western Pennsylvania found direct annual economic impacts of $12.2 million and indirect impacts of $5.6 million. This economic activity was found to support 337 jobs annually. (Strauss, Lord and Powell 2002)

Under the auspices of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Main Street Program has spread to hundreds of communities across the country. One of Main Street’s main goals is economic revitalization, and Program data consistently report positive economic impacts in their communities. Main Street programs have been undertaken in more than 1,700 communities since the early 1980s, accumulating these impressive economic impact statistics:

- Total public and private reinvestment: $17 billion
- Average reinvestment per community: $9.5 million
- Net gain in businesses: 57,470
- Net gain in jobs: 231,682
- Number of buildings rehabilitated: 93,734

All in all, the “reinvestment ratio” (average number of dollars generated in a community per dollar used to operate the local Main Street program) is documented as $40.35 for every $1 spent.  

The types of studies cited in this section demonstrate the positive economic benefits of investment in historic preservation activities of several types: building rehabilitation, tax credits, heritage tourism, Main Street revitalization programs, and so on. This is not to say the benefits are guaranteed, or that they always outweigh the costs of preservation. But these studies do present convincing evidence that “preservation pays” (or can pay) when viewed simply in economic terms—both from the perspective of individual investors, and from a public, fiscal policy perspective. These conclusions, coupled with the anecdotal but logical arguments about preservation’s catalytic effect on other economic development activities (forcefully argued in Listokin, Listokin and Lahr, in Rypkema’s many works, and others) leads to the conclusion that historic preservation can (and often does) have net positive effects on a regional or local economy.

As Listokin and his colleagues conclude in their New Jersey study, “Our research showed that preservation was often a superior economic catalyst compared with other investments. For example, in New Jersey, $1 million in non-residential historic rehabilitation was found to generate 38.3 jobs nationally and 19.3 jobs in-state. In comparison, $1 million in new nonresidential construction was found to generate fewer jobs: 36.1 jobs nationally and 16.7 jobs in-state.” (Listokin and Lahr, 2000)

\[2\] Data according to the most recent statistics available, posted on the National Main Street Center’s web site, [http://www.mainstreet.org/About/numbers.htm](http://www.mainstreet.org/About/numbers.htm), accessed September 5, 2004.
IV. METHODS USED TO UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF PRESERVATION

While there is consensus that historic preservation often makes good economic sense, simple quantitative statements to this effect remain elusive. There are a number of challenges in applying economic methods to historic preservation, given the mix of cultural and economic values embodied in any preservation activity. A number of methodologies are currently being used to try to accurately understand all aspects of the value of historic preservation activities. This section describes the basic challenges of studying historic preservation, and then summarizes the types of methodologies currently being used.

Dilemmas facing researchers of historic preservation phenomena are quite similar to those encountered by researchers looking at the arts and other cultural fields. Indeed, many of the approaches and methods used for studying preservation are borrowed from economics of arts and culture (see section on “Economics of the Arts and Culture” below). One of the basic dilemmas in the economics of preservation is that historic preservation is both public and private. Historic preservation is in some aspects a private good—a range of goods and services consumed by individuals and traded on markets (real estate, the services of a restoration carpenter). In other important respects, historic preservation is a public good, of value collectively and provided not by markets but by government or nonprofit institutions. Like national defense, street lights, elementary education, and sewage systems, historic preservation meets in some respects the definition of the “public good”\(^3\) (Hutter and Rizzo 1997; Throsby 2001; or any other “overview” works). The distinction between private and public is generally congruent with the categories of use and nonuse values used in economics.

Most germane to this review, the distinction between private goods/use values and public goods/non-use values leads directly to different kinds of economic methodologies. The specific methods are discussed below.

Some of the methods draw on market data to measure the value of historic preservation as a private good; other methods, seeking to express public-good aspects of historic preservation quantitatively, rely on various ways of making estimates of prices in hypothetical markets. Market-based valuation methodologies include: economic impact studies, regression analyses (comparing, for instance, the effect of historic district designation on property markets), and straightforward development cost calculations (like real estate pro formas). Non-market valuation methodologies applied to preservation include revealed-preference studies (hedonic pricing or travel cost methods) as well as stated-preference studies, particularly contingent valuation or willingness to pay studies. In addition, the economic values of preservation are often communicated through case studies or other analyses that depend on narrative arguments.

\(^{3}\) Technical definition of public goods—non-rival and non-exclusive in consumption.
A. Basic Cost Studies

Basic cost studies include financial calculations, development pro formas, audits of existing preservation programs, and cost-benefit analyses (CBA). What they hold in common is that they rely primarily on straightforward math and descriptive statistics. Some studies present collected market data, other project market costs based on practical assumptions of future costs.

The most straightforward way of studying the economics of preservation is simply calculating the market costs of a particular project. What is important in evaluating these studies is which factors and data are included in the analysis—not so much the methods for manipulating them, which are straightforward arithmetic. For instance, are demolition and disposal costs factored in to the cost calculations for a project?

These include the type of the economic analysis associated with most any project—the pro forma financial analysis (Miles, Berens and Weiss 2000 gives a detailed overview of real estate practices; Rypkema 1991a is specific to historic preservation), carried out more for project development, budgeting and fund-raising than for making any comparative study of alternative (i.e., non-preservation) investments. The well-known work of preservationist and real-estate consultant Donovan Rypkema stands out in this area. His work details and compares costs of developing historic preservation projects to traditional, new-construction development.

Fundamentally, cost-benefit analyses are measurements made to assist in decision-making, particularly to decide between alternatives.\(^4\) At a simple level, they involve balance-sheet mathematics, measuring use values (incomes and outlays) attached to a particular action, accruing to a consumers, firm, government agency, or other entity. They are generally not concerned with nonuse values.

Cost-benefit analysis, though it sounds commonplace and simple, highlights some difficult issues in analyzing the economics of preservation. Many of the types of studies carried out and reviewed here relate to parts of the full cost-benefit equation, but don’t entertain the full spectrum of issues and alternatives invoked by true CBA—which would require that the economic alternatives to preservation measures should be calculated and compared.

In the preservation literature, cost-benefit analyses are common and often quite simple—comparing the estimated market costs of alternative actions—for example, stabilization of a structure vs. rehabilitation vs. full restoration. These are found in many typical preservation studies and plans, often portrayed as options for justifying different levels of investment. Since CBA is such a wide, generic umbrella methodologically, they sometimes go by other names—for instance, “fiscal impact

\(^4\) "Cost-benefit analysis shows how choices should be made so as to pursue some given objective as efficiently as possible." "It has two essential characteristics, consistency and explicitness. Consistency is the principle that decisions between alternatives should be consistent with objectives...Cost-benefit analysis is explicit in that it seeks to show that particular decisions are the logical implications of particular, stated, objectives." Sugden, Robert and Alan Williams. 1978. The Principles of Cost-benefit Analysis. Oxford University Press.
analyses” are often carried out to estimate the market costs and revenues expected from a particular, projected investments and are standard fare from economic and real-estate advisory firms.

Because they weigh the known and measurable costs and benefits using what data is available, CBAs are often not comprehensive. Decisions about which costs and benefits are included in the frame of a particular study should be examined carefully.

B. Economic Impact Studies

“For too many years, preservation has been defended solely on aesthetic grounds. [Economic impact]-type studies show that preservation also provides significant economic benefits” (Listokin and Lahr, 2000). Because they quantify preservation activity in dollar terms, economic impact studies are perhaps the most widely used and frequently cited type of economic analysis of historic preservation. They have proven popular and useful as rhetorical aids to preservation advocacy, the perception being that officials and other decision-makers are susceptible mostly to quantitative arguments about how much preservation pays.

Economic impacts studies measure the use values of historic preservation activities—the aspects of historic preservation that are expressed as market activity—within the context of a particular regional economy. Economic impact studies are premised on the idea that the flow of economic activity multiplies the benefits of the initial investment, producing positive externalities. Economic impact studies are designed to gauge the effect of particular investment and spending activities on a regional economy. They are commonly used to analyze and justify policy programs and decisions. They effectively present the argument that historic preservation is a legitimate category of economic activity and investment, and a contributor to regional/urban economies. Implicitly, they presume that generation of use values leads to generation of nonuse values; that increasing private values reflects greater public values. Often, public and private values cannot both be maximized.

Market data on direct spending in the various preservation activities (for example, building rehabilitation costs, admission prices to heritage sites, related wages, etc.—studies differ according to data availability) is collected from existing data sources or through surveys undertaken specifically for the study. These “direct spending” amounts for each sub-sector are plugged in to an input-output model of the regional economy5, which yields a total amount of revenue attributable to the direct spending. The ratio of total spending calculated to direct spending observed is termed the “multiplier.” Once the total dollars of effect are calculated (total investment times the multiplier) this is commonly converted to number of jobs represented by that increase in net revenue. The kind of result often cited from EIS’s is “one dollar of preservation spending yields X dollars of economic activity.”

5 One recurrent theme in the economic impact study literature is the choice of which input-output is used. Refinement and expansion of i/o models is one of the clear trajectories being followed in this area of research.
One of the first economic impact studies performed on historic preservation focused on Rhode Island (reported in Sanderson 1994; based on University of Rhode Island 1993). The research yielded strongly positive effects of historic preservation investment in Rhode Island over a 20-year period, looking specifically at the economic impact on other expenditures. “Over the last twenty years, for each dollar appropriated by the Rhode Island General Assembly for historic preservation, the state has received $1.69 in new state tax revenue. The overall benefit to the state’s economy was $29 for each state dollar appropriated. In other words, state spending for historic preservation actually makes money.” (Sanderson, 1994)

David Listokin and his colleagues associated with Rutgers University’s Center for Urban Policy Research done the most sophisticated economic impact studies of historic preservation activity. Through their large-scale studies of several states, they have refined the input-output models to get more accurate calculations of effects and multipliers of preservation investment in different economic sectors: tax, property values, job creation, and tourism. The economic impact studies for New Jersey and Texas are the most advanced (Listokin and Lahr, 1997; Listokin et al, 2002). These studies examined several kinds of economic activity representing the preservation sector: historic rehabilitation, heritage tourism, Main Street investment, operation of historic sites and organizations, and property value and property tax contributions of historic properties. The results of the study enable the authors to draw clear conclusions in favor of the fiscal sense of preservation public policies: “the results of the New Jersey investigation… show that the public cost of capital grants for historic rehabilitation that were distributed by the New Jersey Historic Trust was easily offset by state tax revenues resulting from those investments.” (Listokin and Lahr, 2000)

Though popular, economic impact methods have weaknesses and blind spots. Economic impact studies account for some of aspects of historic preservation well, but cannot account for the whole range of preservation values. Aspects of preservation that cannot be represented by market prices are excluded from the studies. Because they account for only the easiest-to-measure economic aspects of preservation activity, the conclusions based on them are not necessarily complete. While they do gauge the magnitude of spending in the sector being studied, they don’t account for the opportunity costs of preservation investments—in other words, the potential impact those dollars would have had if spent on something other than historic preservation (see Blustone in Mason, ed., 1999; Seaman, 2003).

Economic Impact studies are based on gross assumptions. They tend to be used to present economic impacts as absolute amounts, instead of scrutinizing the relative impact of preservation and other activities (a question that is pertinent to many public policy debates about preservation). For instance, Sanderson (1994) concluded, “For each dollar received in state appropriations, RIHPC generated $129 in preservation work.” But how many of those $129 would have accrued anyway to investment in something else—such as golf-course construction, or casino gambling, or school spending? (Listokin, Listokin and Lahr, 1998 is a notable exception to this, as the study specifically includes an analysis of economic impact projected for preservation scenarios vis-à-vis other kinds of development options.)
Because of this, economic impact studies are more effective and meaningful when measuring the effect of investment being imported (not re-circulated) into a particular, bounded regional economy—for instance, a tourism project drawing most of its visitors from outside the region.

Finally, there are logistical impediments to improving the implementation and reach of EI's: they are time consuming, resource intensive (in terms of money and people), and the data required to fuel them often is not readily available.

C. Regression Analyses: Hedonic, Travel-cost, Property Value Studies

Regression analysis is a statistical technique for studying multiple variables and examining their relation to one another. Regression is commonly used in the social sciences to explore causal relationships between phenomena thought to be related (expressed as “variables”). These studied relationships are, in turn, used to make predictions. To take a non-preservation example, regression analysis might try to determine the whether individuals' educational attainment or race has a greater power to predict income level. Various statistical measures are used to express the strength or weakness of the relation theorized between the variables (or rather, the level of confidence that the relationships expressed in the statistical tests actually represent “the real world”).

For studying preservation issues, regression analysis does not aim to measure or predict the price of heritage goods directly, but rather tries to determine the effect of (mostly) non-economic factors on market prices of other goods—the most common and important examples of this are studies that look at the effect of landmark regulations on real-estate property values. Hypothetically, though, a type of regression study called the “hedonic method” could be used to measure the effect of a popular historic site on land values at various distances from the site; or, what place the presence of an historic site plays in the value of adjoining land by comparing it statistically to similar land not in proximity to an historic site.

Another version of regression called the “travel-cost method” has been used to understand economic behavior related to historic sites by measuring the varied costs people are willing to incur to travel to visit them. This method is often used to study the economics of recreational and natural-resource sites.

D. Stated-Preference Studies: Contingent Valuation and Choice Modeling

Contingent valuation (CV) studies are designed to measure nonuse values of public goods. They are a type of “stated-preference study”—based on data collected by asking potential consumers’ preferences rather than on data representing actual market transactions (which are known as “revealed-preference studies”).
As discussed above, economic investment in historic preservation produces both private benefits (for individuals, owners, investors, and others involved in direct economic activity) and public benefits (for social groups). The private benefits can be measured straightforwardly, using market data (as in economic impact studies or simple cost-benefit analyses). The public benefits are of at least two kinds: economic (use) values quite susceptible to economic methods, and non-economic, nonuse values for which economic methods are ill-suited (values of beauty, memorial power, attachment, and other “priceless” qualities). The public benefits are foundations of modern historic preservation practice—the collective, cultural benefits⁶ that are the reason we do historic preservation at all—often are the crux of determining the fate of public support for a preservation project or policy. Therefore, devising ways of measuring these values is a major challenge—“pricing the priceless”—and an opportunity for research in the economics of preservation.

Facing the difficulty in quantitatively measuring the public benefits of historic preservation, economists have cleverly devised methods to estimate their dollar value. Stated preference methods create hypothetical market situations to derive price estimates for the public, non-market benefits of historic preservation activity. These methods often rely on some kind of survey instrument or other means of asking respondents to speculate about what would be a reasonable price if a market for the public good would exist. Hypothetically, for instance, if an area of older homes in your town were to be rehabilitated and maintained how much more would you be willing to pay in taxes? Survey results are converted into “willingness to pay” for the historic preservation good, expressed as a price (thus joining qualitative and quantitative methods). The studies are sometimes termed “willingness to pay” (WTP) or “willingness to accept loss” (WTA) studies. Contingent valuation methods (abbreviated as CV, or sometimes CVM) were developed in the environmental economics field, where they have been used extensively. They gained wide notoriety, and validation, when CV methods were used to support public policy decisions in the legal cases stemming from the Exxon Valdez disaster and compensation for the public, ecological benefits lost.

In recent years, CV methods have increasingly been applied to historic preservation situations. CV studies are perhaps the biggest recent innovation in the economics of historic preservation, and major alternative to impact studies, and other economic analyses derived directly from market data. There now exists a strong and burgeoning literature on the application of CV to historic preservation. Among the most notable recent works are studies of Bulgarian monasteries (in Navrud and Ready, 2002); different road development options for the World Heritage Site of Stonehenge (Maddison and Mourato, 2001); tourism to Fes, Morocco, (Carson, et al, in Navrud and Ready, 2002). Carson, Wilks and Imber (1994) employs contingent valuation as one input to a cost-benefit analysis evaluating different development options for Australia’s Kakadu National Park (a natural and cultural World Heritage Site).

⁶ These benefits are described in a variety of ways: cultural values, historic and aesthetic values, intrinsic values, and more. For a review, see Avrami and Mason, 2000; de la Torre 2002.
Chambers, Chambers and Whitehead (1996) conducted a study confirming the validity of the contingent valuation methods as a way of studying the perception of economic benefits from historic preservation projects. Their study focused on the potential preservation of a school in Missouri, asking people, through a detailed survey, what they would be “willing to pay” to see the school project completed. While the most frequent willingness-to-pay response was $0 (about 60% of respondents to their survey), about 40% of respondents indicated a positive WTP for the benefits of this potential project.

Contingent valuation studies generate insight on how the public values historic preservation. But they are problematic for several reasons, too. Like other economic methods, they reduce the values of preservation to the singular proxy of price, but CV is (theoretically, at least) more sensitive to the multiple values of heritage because the surveys can be designed to elicit responses in a number of ways: narrative, visual, and scenario-based, as well as posing individual economic decisions themselves. Some criticize CV methods at the conceptual level because they are not based on actual markets and data from actual transactions. This is based on the idea that only actual market transactions are credible enough to draw valid results. Along these same lines, the hypothetical nature of the “transaction” used to elicit responses is seen as a potentially enormous source of error and confusion—since people don’t actually have to pay what they report to be “willing” to pay, the price data derived from surveys/interviews may be quite inaccurate. Indeed, some economists have studied the difference between actual and reported willingness-to-pay, and report that the different is often substantial (Leggett, et al., 2003; Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago, 2002).

Related to these uncertainties, there is great variability in the design of how the information in a CV study is presented to survey respondents. The quality of the information design and presentation has a large effect on results. Because there are no effective ways of controlling what kinds of formats are used, and study parameters vary widely, different studies are incommensurable. Finally, like many other economic methods, wide, practical use of CVM is hampered by its expense. No economists have undertaken the development of shorthand, less-resource-intensive versions of CV methods, but the potential exists (de la Torre 2002).

E. Choice Modeling

Choice modeling is, like CV, a survey-based method of gauging people’s preferences for nonmarket goods. It presents more sophisticated means of eliciting preferences among complex choices, asking respondents to rank rather than just choose among alternatives. Choice modeling was developed to extend the insights of CV methods. A choice modeling (CM) study would work like this: The good or scenario in question is described in detail, its many different attributes articulated (not just price, but look, feel, etc.). The respondents rank these different attributes, giving a more fine-grained account of how the different attributes are valued. In other words, it tries to expose and analyze the detail of what goes on inside the “black box” of consumer decisions in markets. CM studies would attempt to answer, for instance, the reasons why a person would be willing to visit a
certain historic site, instead of just asking them how much they would pay and having this price be the proxy for all the different attributes they are considering in their decision.


F. Case Studies

Qualitative assessments of historic preservation value remain prominent in the literature on economic aspects of preservation, and should remain so, given the conceptual difficulties involved in quantifying important preservation values. The best case studies have clear analytical frameworks, and not merely anecdotal documentation. The persuasive power of straightforward, narrative case studies should therefore not be dismissed as a significant part of the literature on economics and preservation.

Most case studies engage issues of preservation policy and practice, not the efforts to value preservation goods per se. Though many case studies employ findings from qualitative, analytically rigorous kinds of studies—or at least make some use of relating quantitative data (usually through descriptive statistics)—the case studies noted here do not, for the most part, represent new research. However, they are an effective means of disseminating information about new policy developments or results of research.
V. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

There is a relative lack of academic research on the economics of preservation (as compared with other economic sectors, or as compared to the literature on preservation’s cultural aspects generated from within the field itself). This is due to two factors, respectively: on the first point, cultural topics in general are seen as relatively unimportant, less serious, and less desirable subjects of economic research (there are many incentives for economists to work on traditional, market-centered topics); on the second point, preservation being a field, not a discipline, there is no established academic infrastructure and base of research institutions to support sustained research on the topic (or many other preservation topics) over time.

Not surprisingly, the literature is weighted toward advocacy studies. Academic approaches are often enlisted for advocacy causes, however, so there are not always clear advocacy-or-academic distinctions to be made. There are relatively few analyses with enough critical distance and honest questioning of the value of alternatives to historic preservation be looked at more seriously. Perhaps the most important factor to mind in this regard is the motive behind the research, and whether it is clearly in service of preservation advocacy or adopting a more objective stance.

A number of future research directions stand out as excellent opportunities to generate relevant knowledge for the preservation field and make it more effective. The suggestions below both extend existing lines of inquiry and develop new ones to fill research gaps.

One clear research direction identified in the literature revolves around creating hybrid methodologies able to gauge both economic and cultural benefits and values of preservation in more sophisticated ways. By combining methods, the particular short-comings or blind-spots of different methods can perhaps offset one another. CVM was created to address this challenge, but it has remained in the realm of technical economic studies, for the most part, and can be pushed into further innovation by combining it with the work of other disciplines and professionals.

More attention needs to be focused on the relative value of preservation versus other kinds of investment. How does one rationalize an investment in preservation as a better trade-off than an investment, say, in a mall, or big-box retail, or a new sports stadium? Such questions are important to justifying public and public-sector support for historic preservation, but are rarely studied. Well-designed studies accounting for the wide range of costs and benefits—across the whole range of use and non-use (economic and cultural) values of heritage—would be very illuminating (even though they would probably not be totally conclusive.) And rigorous study of the political frameworks in which these decisions are made would be of great value.

Research in historic preservation suffers because of the field’s lack of understanding of the whole system of culture, memory, built environment relations of which historic preservation is part (when seen, for instance, from an ecological or anthropological perspective). Research premised on understanding the whole system of built-environment relations of which historic preservation is a
part—which is to say not portraying historic preservation as a stand-alone activity—would represent a step ahead conceptually. Further, with a systemic model to work against, particular studies could explore public-health arguments in favor of historic preservation (such as those being done for smart growth/sprawl), broader quality-of-life or social-capital arguments in favor of preservation, or studies that explore the costs of not investing in historic preservation (and, to be fair, the potential benefits of not doing so).
VI. CONCLUSION

The literature on economic aspects of historic preservation is growing in both variety and depth, and there is much to build upon. The literature includes straightforward applications of standard econometric analyses, as well as creative approaches addressing the key conceptual disconnects in this area of research—the multivalent nature of historic preservation benefits, and the fairly incommensurable ways that the economics and cultural fields have for measuring and describing the benefits of preservation. This paper echoes a number of thoughtful scholars and practitioners from both the economics and historic preservation fields in calling for new, hybrid, collaborative research to bridge some of the gaps.

While conclusive, scientifically verifiable answers to preservation economics questions are elusive at best, a number of reasonable conclusions can be drawn about the economic benefits of historic preservation on the basis of the literature reviewed here. Historic preservation has important economic values and produces certain economic benefits for both private actors and the public at large. Preservation projects can be profitable; and preservation policies do make sound fiscal sense. However, the economic impacts and measures of historic preservation activities are too situational to be able to extrapolate widely. Making conclusive, generalized statements about the economics of preservation on the basis of a great variety of empirical studies is a future goal, perhaps, but not a current reality.
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. “First Ten Readings”

This list identifies ten works drawn from the review that would best initiate and inform a reader new to economics-preservation issues.

1. David Throsby’s *Economics and Culture* (2001), an academic though readable treatment of the concepts and philosophies shaping the way the economics field looks at historic preservation (and other spheres of culture as well).
5. Mourato and Mazzanti (in de la Torre ed., 2002), a comprehensive account of economists’ successes, failures, and prospects for studying the economic values of heritage (from the perspective of economists, but written for preservation professionals); also in this vein is Hutter and Rizzo (1997), an edited collection that is an excellent survey of cultural economists’ work as applied to specific issues of historic preservation.
7. Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago (2002), the proceedings of a conference at which leading economists parse arguments for and against the two main methodologies for studying the economics of preservation: economic impact studies and contingent valuation methods.
9. Ashworth (2002), which looks carefully at the “economic context of decision making” and the presumption that historic designation has a positive effect on property values.
10. The RAND Corporation report *The Gifts of the Muse* (McCarthy, et al., 2004) summarizes policy debates surrounding public investment in the arts, with many parallels to historic preservation, and also includes useful theoretical reviews of economic and non-economic rationales for cultural policy.
B. Overarching Works on Economics and Historic Preservation

Studying the economics of preservation remains outside the mainstream of the economics field. The conventional, well-established British economist Sir Alan Peacock, in a published lecture, felt the need to justify his interest in the subject: “Having established that the economics of heritage is worthy of attention and presents some fascinating intellectual problems….” (Peacock, 1995, chapter 1).

In light of the variety and complexity of possible approaches to the economic of historic preservation, works designed to explain the range of approaches to analyzing the economics of historic preservation are particularly valuable. They provide a map of the whole literature—describing known features as well as the terra incognita of unexplored issues—and establish a framework for relating single works to the whole literature.

There are a range of approaches to the economics of preservation is best described by the extent to which the authors problematize the whole prospect of measuring the economic values of historic preservation. In some works, the economic measures are seen as unproblematic—a simple application of proven economic analyses to a different sort of good/service, and following from this a simple input to existing decision-making apparatuses (Pagiola, 1996; some chapters in Hutter and Rizzo, 1997). Elsewhere, the difficulty in pricing nonuse values and the built-in uncertainties and politics of cultural policy are identified as a central problematic (Throsby, 2001). There is a general trend toward more sophisticated analysis of nonuse values, extending economists’ analytical reach farther into the nonuse realm with new methods tools, without determining how far these methods can actually take our understanding (Mourato and Mazzanti, 2002).

The following works offer invaluable overviews of the concepts, frameworks, and methodologies connecting economics and historic preservation:

- Throsby 2001; a thorough overview, written mostly for economists though not exclusively, adapting the tools of environmental economics and economics of art to culture in general and specifically to the field of historic preservation;
- Hutter and Rizzo 1997; collecting the work of the leading cultural economists working on historic preservation-related topics, along with a clear overview of research issues, problems, and concepts;
- Mourato and Mazzanti 2002: an excellent, recent overview of the range of methodological approaches, as well as some new and novel suggestions (choice modeling—see below);
- Klamer and Zuidhof 1999: interpreting the range of economic approaches to heritage, specifically in light of the distinction between cultural and economic values of heritage;
- Pagiola 1996: writing from the applied economist perspective, applying the tested methods of environmental economics directly to cultural heritage situations in support of analyzing World Bank financing and lending decisions.
- Ashworth 2002 gives an overview of the problematic issues joining economics and preservation, as seen through the lens of a widely debated pragmatic and policy issue—the
effect of historic district designation, one of the most common preservation policy tools, on property values.

- These synthetic works connect economic concepts and analyses to matters of cultural policy: Peacock 1995; Peacock and Rizzo 1994; Schuster and de Monchaux 1997.


C. Economics of the Arts and Culture

Beginning in earnest in the 1960s, a subfield of economics concerned with the arts has emerged as a recognized area of research. The thrust of this work is applying the concepts and tools of neoclassical economics to the spheres of art and culture—looking at artworks and cultural performances as another kind of commodity/sphere of economic activity, though with some novel aspects. Because of the obvious nonuse values of art and culture—the raison d’etre of art and culture being by definition beyond economic and pragmatic concerns—this area of economics has itself been a creative center. Methodologies have been built to address the inclusion of art and culture in the normal, normative discourse of economics; in many cases, environmental economics have been the source of methodologies for cultural economics. The leading works cited below convey an overview of issues and methods used in the studying the arts and cultural spheres as kinds of economic activity.

Academic writing about the arts as an economic activity goes back at least to John Kenneth Galbraith in the 1960s7, but was more fully developed by Baumol (Baumol and Bowen 1966). A number of excellent collections and overviews have been published, including Peacock and Rizzo 1994; Throsby 2001; Towe and Khakee 1992; and Towe 1997. These and a number of other economists regularly publish research in the Journal of Cultural Economics and in the proceedings of biannual conferences of the Association of Cultural Economics International.

7 Throsby, 2001, p.12.
D. **Environmental Economics**

The issues and methods involved in studying environmental or natural-resource conservation mirror very closely the issues regarding cultural resources in general and historic preservation specifically. A number of economic concepts and methodologies developed in the field of environmental economics (also known as ecological economics) over the last several decades provide important jumping-off points for studying the economics of historic preservation. Given that the literature on environmental economics is considerable and well-developed, it constitutes an important foundation for developing the economics of preservation.

Both cultural and natural resources are treated by economists as having both private-good and public-good qualities. Consequently, extra-market measures of natural-resource values have been a focus of economists working in this area. Contingent valuation methods, for instance, were pioneered in environmental economics and only more recently have been applied to historic preservation and other cultural resources. A number of cultural economists began working on natural-resource issues and explicitly discuss the borrowing of methods and concepts from environmental economics (for instance, Pagiola, 1996; Throsby, 2001).

There are many useful overview works represented the considerable accomplishments of the environmental economics subfield. These works often have a very strong orientation toward the applied, given that many environmental economic tools have developed out of the practical needs of institutions such as the World Bank. Of particular note are the work of Robert Costanza (Costanza
As with much literature from the economics field, much of the material in environmental economics is quite technical, with mathematical equations forming an important part of the discourse; Edward-Jones et al. (2000) provides an excellent introduction for non-economists. Rietbergen-McCracken and Abaza (2000) present a number of creative applications of environmental economics methodologies, many of them relevant to cultural heritage issues.

A number of interesting, more specialized works on particular aspects of environmental economics are available. Some examples include Attfield (1998) on typologizing the values of ecology and building methodological approaches following from this, and Howarth and Farber (2002), who attempt to account for externalities such as “the quiet of the woods” in accounting for economic valuation of the natural environment.

Complementing these academically focused studies, there is a substantial stock of advocacy-focused studies on environmental issues such as open space protection, smart growth/growth management, or other policies. In this vein, see Lerner and Poole (1999), an extensive and persuasive report for the Trust for Public Land enumerating the benefits (economic and otherwise) or open-space preservation. Like many other advocacy reports, their study relays the results of extensive research in fairly attenuated form—i.e., selecting and presenting a few of the most striking and memorable results.

In addition, articles appearing in such academic journals as Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, Environmental Values, and Journal of Environmental Planning and Management, should be watched as sources of innovation and comparison to cultural-resource issues. The web site ecosystemvaluation.org gives a useful and non-technical introduction to environmental economics issues and tools.

The work of economist Mark Sagoff warrants special note as a critical voice in the use of environmental economics and the shaping of resource protection policy. Many of his articles take issue with common assumptions and received wisdom in the field, looking more closely at some of the assumptions behind environmental economics, and casting some doubt of them (Sagoff, 1994, 1997).

The academic literature on growth management (a.k.a. Smart Growth) is expansive, and potentially quite relevant to historic preservation policy issues and methodological challenges. The intangible aesthetic and “quality of life” factors that play a role in the analysis and advocacy of growth management are parallel to the nonuse values of historic preservation. Therefore, while state-of-the-art measures of sprawl continue to exclude cultural factors for the most part (Song and Knapp 2004), efforts such as the Costs of Sprawl study by the Transportation Research Board (1998), and Jackson and Kochtitsky (2002) are potentially of great relevance for preservation.

E. Works on the Notion of Value

The conceptual issues regarding the economics of preservation are extremely important to understanding the existing literature, the absences in it, and the fundamental methodological challenges. The concept of value is foremost. As it is used here, “values” refers to the different qualities of a certain building, place or preservation activity. Every preserved building or preservation project has, by its nature, several different types of value—it may be valued for its historical associations, its beauty, its use as a social gathering spot, as part of an ecosystem, or financially. Efforts to classify all the different values of historic preservation have yielded many different types (Avrami and Mason, 2000); for the purposes of this review, the broad distinction between cultural values and economic values is most relevant.

The conceptual distinction between economic and cultural values of historic preservation is important because they represent incommensurable ways of looking at the same phenomena and thus to different methodological choices (Mason, ed., 1999; Avrami and Mason, 2000; de la Torre, 2002). Consider, for instance, how an historian would describe the value of an old building, as opposed to how an economist would describe it.

In the parlance of economics, the value of historic buildings falls into two clear categories: use and non-use values. Use values are consumable and tradable through markets and therefore are fairly simple to price and analyze with standard economic methods that calculate prices in straightforward manner. Non-use values are not consumable by individuals or tradable through markets, and are consonant with the notion of public goods. These two broad categories relate to respective kinds of methodologies that have been created to study them. Use values are measured with data from markets; non-use values have to be have prices estimated for them. In any historic preservation project, both these value types are present, creating some confusion about which methodologies are most appropriate.

Because some of the most important benefits (or, impacts) of historic preservation are cultural, the fundamental difficulty in measuring culture looms large in any effort to quantify the values of preservation (Klamer 1996; Selwood 2002). Despite the range of economic tools available for quantifying intangible, “priceless” phenomena, there remains a fundamental blind spot in economic analyses of the value of historic preservation: costs and benefits that resist quantification are often simply excluded from economic studies of preservation, because of the admitted difficulties in quantifying them.

Avrami, Erica and Randall Mason eds. "Values and Heritage Conservation." Los Angeles, California:

---

8 There is some justifiable impatience among practitioners when it comes to discussing conceptual issues—it seems to delay discussion of specific, “real” results—but some discussion of concepts is indispensable. But the specific results of this review, and the individual studies, would be meaningless without an understanding of the concepts underlying them and the context within which they are set.
F. Basic Cost Studies / Descriptive Works

This group of studies documents and describes the economic factors of preservation projects or policies in fairly straightforward ways that skirt the methodological difficulties cited above. Common types of studies include cost-benefit studies undertaken by state agencies to evaluate the fiscal basis for particular policies—especially rehabilitation tax credits (Missouri Economic Research & Information Center, 2002; Thompson, 2004).

There are a few regular reports on specific, nation-wide programs: Statistical report on annual activity with the federal rehabilitation tax credit (National Park Service, 2002a); National Main Street Trends Survey (2003) gathering statistics and survey data gleaned from 1500 community organizations running Main Street programs. For some state-level Main Street programs, one can find simple reporting of statistics (jobs created, number of projects completed, dollars of reinvestment) from the areas with Main Street policies in place. These reports combine simple descriptive statistics and reporting of measured costs with some other figures derived from economic impact studies (especially job creation). See, for instance:

- New Jersey- http://www.state.nj.us/dca/dhcr/msstats.htm
- Maine: http://www.mdf.org/downtown/economic_impact.html
- Wisconsin: http://www.commerce.state.wi.us/CD/CD-bdd-impact.html

United States Defense Department, n.d. offers cost-benefit arguments to commanders of military installations, along with guidance on other aspects of heritage management.

National Park Service Director’s Order 90 (2002b) outlines a system for value engineering NPS projects, including the tool termed “Choosing by Advantages,” essentially a synonym for cost-
benefit analysis. The Order defines cost-benefit analysis as: "A system of concepts and methods to structure decision-making. CBA quantifies the relative importance of non-monetary advantages or benefits for a set of alternatives and allows subsequent benefit and cost consideration during decision-making." (National Park Service, 2002b). The methodology itself is not outlined.


G. Economic Impact Studies

The basic features and methods of economic impact studies are described above (in sections III.C and IV.B). In addition to the works noted there, a few others deserve special mention:

- Vivian, Gilberg and Listokin (2000) takes stock of recent economic impact studies of preservation, as well as future prospects, noting the increasing precision and accuracy of economic impact studies (based on the increasing sophistication of the underlying input-output models, and the increasingly broad range of the direct and indirect effects of preservation spending that are included in the studies). They report on the discussions at a one-day seminar of experts, including difficulties of data availability; the impulse to quantify quality of life factors (understood as significant benefits of historic preservation activities); and the difficulty of doing so.
- Lipman Frizzell & Mitchell studies offered detailed analyses in advocating for the continued success of Maryland’s state rehabilitation tax credits
- The National Trust for Historic Preservation’s Dollars and Sense series includes 19 place-specific studies, mostly using economic impact methods to establish the positive economic effects of preservation on local economies, property values, etc.

Four studies are offered as empirical examples of specific, preservation-project-related economic impact studies:

- MASS MoCA [Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art, which involved reuse of a number of historic industrial buildings] Economic Impact Report: reports the actual economic impacts several years after initial feasibility studies and implementation of the museum and associated commercial developments. [http://www.downsideupthemovie.org/interact/MASSMoCA_EIR.pdf]
- City of Sacramento Sports and Entertainment District Concept Plan: used economic impact studies to evaluate three different development scenarios according to the magnitude of economic impact of each [http://www.cityofsacramento.org/SED/Economic_Impact_Analysis.pdf]
- Weston State Hospital (West Virginia) reuse planning: economic impact studies were included as part of the criteria for scoring proposals solicited for the reuse of this site [http://www.westonlandmark.com/adaptive_reuse_proposal_criteria.pdf]
Transportation Economics & Management Systems, Inc. (2001) uses economic impact methods to analyze the catalytic role of renovating historic train stations as part of downtown revitalization programs.


———. "Virginia's Economy and Historic Preservation: The Impact of Preservation on Jobs,
H. Regression Analyses

The ideas behind regression analyses are introduced above, in section IV.C. In practice, a number of regression-analysis-based studies relating landmarking to property values have been carried out. Does historic-preservation designation and protection decrease or increase property values? If so, how much? There are conflicting theories about how this relationship works, and regression analyses have been used to test these theories. Because of differences in the particular assumptions, data availability, and specific questions pursued by these varied studies, there is no single conclusive answer to which theory is "right." However, most studies report that historic preservation (most often in the form of local historic district designation) has a positive effect on property values—that is, property values rise somewhat higher, or somewhat faster, inside historic districts than outside them.
Studies reporting positive economic effects of landmarking include:

- NYC Independent Budget Office 2003
- Coulson and Leichenko 2001
- Asabere and Huffman 2001
- Clark and Herrin 1997

Studies reporting a negative effect of landmarking on property values include:

- Ashworth 2002
- Asabere, Huffman and Mehdian 1994

Other examples of regression analyses are referenced in Hutter and Rizzo 1997 and Navrud and Ready 2002.

Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions. 1999. The Economic and Fiscal Impact of Local Historic Districts in Maryland, a Summary of Six Case Studies. Frederick, MD:
Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions.

I. Stated-Preference Studies: Contingent Valuation and Choice Modeling

Stated-preference studies are introduced above in section IV.D. Two published works are excellent guides to the concepts, application scenarios, and pragmatic issues of designing and implementing contingent valuation (CV) studies. They are also clear about both the benefits, problems, and limitations involved in doing and interpreting CV: Mourato and Mazzanti (2002) and Navrud and Ready (2002). Mourato and Mazzanti, as noted above in the section on “overview” works, locate CV studies in the broader spectrum of economic concepts and methods applicable to studying the economics of preservation. Navrud and Ready present in their collection a number of chapters reporting on empirical applications of CV studies of historic preservation projects/policies (many undertaken by scholars coming from the very applied world of environmental economics), as well as good explanations of the concepts and uses of CV.

The University of Chicago’s Cultural Policy Center hosted a conference (in February 2002), bringing together the leading scholars and latest thinking on contingent valuation methods related to culture. Of particular note in the conference proceedings (unpublished, but papers are available on the web site http://culturalpolicy.uchicago.edu/cvmconf.html) is the exhaustive bibliography on the CV literature by Doug Noonan (Noonan 2002). Bruce Seaman’s essay relaying criticisms of both CV and EI methods, and prospects for joining them, is another useful overview.

The literature on property appraisal techniques responsive to the subtleties of the values of historic properties is on the increase. This is confirmed by a recent presentation by Richard Roddewig, who noted, “that professional appraisers’ experience with historic properties has increased dramatically in recent years, and useful information about key issues such as easements and landmarks ordinances is now readily available. Historic property appraisals are consequently becoming increasingly accurate. Thus, while economists still need to examine appraised values with a measure of caution, these concerns should become less of a factor as appraisers experience with historic properties continues to improve in the coming years” (Vivian, Gilberg and Listokin, 2000).

A scan of the literature for professional property appraisers yields a number of works relevant to the challenges of determining more accurately the market value of historic properties. The best overview is Reynolds 2002, published by the National Trust. Most of the works cited are
fairly technical, though see Reynolds 1977, Listokin 1985, and Land Trust Alliance 1999 for more general treatments. Also of note are several works concerning easements and other valuation issues related to scenic and natural (environmental) qualities of properties. As with other methodologies and applications, the issues raised by environmental goods are quite similar to those raised by preservation and other cultural goods.


K. Policy and Decision-Making Support

This eclectic group of works share an orientation of directly shedding light on evaluating historic preservation policies or otherwise understanding decision-making for historic preservation policies. They range from documentation and description to examples of specific types of analysis.


L. Case Studies

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a clearing house for many case studies relating successful efforts in specific American cities. These are found in the Trust’s publication Forum Journal (for example, see Slaughter, 1997; Lyon, 1993; and Hunter, 1995), as well as through the Forum website, which regularly features new, short accounts on recent developments in the preservation field (often related to economic development issues) (https://forum.nationaltrust.org/; paid membership is required for access). The Trust also creates publications around specific issues—of particular note is the 19-volume Dollars and Sense series (from 1996-2000) and a recent booklet summarizing the wide range of economic redevelopment strategies employing historic preservation (NTHP, 2002). (The literature on the history of the historic preservation field presents some historical cases of the engagement of historic preservation and economic development. See Page and Mason, 2004.)

Other valuable case studies on the combination of historic preservation and economic development can be found in the urban planning literature. Particularly useful examples focusing on downtown revitalization are: Bunnell (2002); Collins, Waters and Dotson (1995); and Gratz 1994.
The Urban Land Institute’s series of Development Case Studies contains a number of detailed financial and development case studies, particularly for adaptive reuse projects (they are part of a subscription series available at www.uli.org).

At the international level, the World Bank and other multi-laterals have produced a number of interesting case-study documents regarding the economic values of historic preservation. World Bank (1999) and Serageldin, Shluger, and Martin-Brown (2001) offer broad surveys of the few points of engagement between historic preservation and the international development. Hankey (1999) and Harvard University Unit for Housing and Urbanization (1999) report on two of the Bank’s lending projects, and the economic analyses underlying them, in Lahore, Pakistan and Fes, Morocco. The Inter-American Development Bank has been very progressive in undertaking urban development projects with significant historic preservation components. Rojas (1999) is a good compendium and introduction to IADB’s work. At a more conceptual and advocacy level, a few UNESCO publications (1995; 2000) have attempted to place economic questions alongside other cultural, political, and education issues vis-a-via globalization threats. Finally, a series of four case studies on the management of heritage sites, sponsored by the Getty Conservation Institute, places economic values in the context of the larger spectrum of policy and management issues affecting how particular sites are managed (de la Torre 2004).


M. Economic Development And Historic Preservation

Listokin, Listokin and Lahr (1998) is a good mainstream overview of various historic-preservation-as-economic-development arguments. The authors come down squarely on the side that preservation is a strong economic development choice, simply by virtue of its economic benefits. The economic impact of historic preservation remains elusive, even to the most practiced scholars of economic analysis of the field. The catalyst effect of preservation on downtown development “is observed more anecdotally than statistically” (p.443). The journal Housing Policy Debate published the article along with some criticisms (Werwath, 1998; Smith, 1998). The critics do not focus on the economic impact/multiplier methodology, but on the suggestion that historic preservation is well-suited as a community revitalization tool.

Stough (1994) portrays preservation as a “secondary goal” in many economic development projects; indeed, “few preservation projects today could be accomplished without providing an economic development rationale.” The author outlines three main types of economic development theory—economic base, growth pole, and infrastructure investment—and the different opportunities they present for “preservation-led development.” Overall, he presents a useful summary of different types of economic development policy practiced in recent decades, filtered through the question of how preservation has, and could, fit with them. Some recent works aimed at broader economic
development and business audiences attempt to put preservation and other cultural activities at the center of future growth strategies (Florida, 2004; Cunningham, 2002).

The Main Street Program, an outreach project of the National Trust for Historic Preservation since the 1970s, is perhaps the most successful program in recent memory to join historic preservation and local economic development goals. While detailed statistics are kept to track the activity of Main Street related investments, the reporting is based on descriptive statistics and economic impact results only; there is a dearth of serious study of this widely renown and successful program.


N. **Gentrification**

Gentrification is an important critical theme tying economics and economic development to historic preservation. Relatively few works directly analyze the connections between preservation and gentrification, though the common wisdom holds that the connections are strong and clear. Created since Smith and Williams’ 1986 collection; recent works by Freeman and Braconi 2002 and Hackworth 2002 warrant attention more recently.


O. **Affordable Housing and Historic Preservation**

In the past few decades there have been a number of efforts to link historic preservation policies to the provision of affordable housing. Many of the sources cites here address means of strategically and pragmatically linking these goals. At the same time, the issue of mass abandonment of inner-city housing has been an acute problem in large cities like Baltimore and Philadelphia, raising both preservation and housing issues. Cohen 2001 (and responses Page 2001 and Culhane and Hillier 2001) replay the challenges abandonment presents to both economic development and historic preservation policies.


A few political scientists and other social scientists have studied the urban political process and institutional behavior surrounding the role of historic preservation in urban growth/management debates in American cities. These studies include: Reichl (1997) examining the fate of preservation in the face of progrowth politics in New York, Atlanta and New Orleans; Newman (2001) studying the failure of preservation to garner political support in Atlanta; and Strom’s (2002) focus on museums and other cultural organizations, which are analogous and often related to historic preservation institutions and efforts.


Q. Tax Issues And Historic Preservation

Some of the most popular, and most contentious, public policy issues stemming from historic preservation investment relates to the use tax incentives to stimulate private preservation activities. The long-standing federal tax credits, as well as robust state-level programs, have generated a number of how-to publications as well as some evaluation studies.


Escherich, Susan M. Stephen J. Farneth and Bruce D. Judd. Affordable Housing Through Historic...
Tourism And Historic Preservation

Tourism is an economic sector with strong connections to historic. The connections between tourism and preservation actually relate to two distinct bodies of literature: First, and more central to this paper, the tourism development field generates a substantial “how-to” literature about effectively hitching historic preservation to the economic development juggernaut of tourism-development strategies. Tourism undeniably is an important economic sector in many American cities and regions. To the extent that it imports dollars to a particular region, it is even more coveted. There is evidence that a substantial amount of tourism activity is specifically motivated by visiting heritage sites—43% of American adults traveling in 2001 included a visit to an historic site in their itineraries. (Pennsylvania Tourism and Lodging Association, 2003, p.9, citing Travel Industry Association data).
Several of the economic impact studies cited earlier (see the various studies and articles by David Listokin and colleagues, in particular) specifically analyze tourism as a sector of economic activity central to historic preservation (along with building rehabilitation). Academic and professional journals on tourism management abound, many of them focusing on how-to, best-practices research for developing and managing tourism sites and programs. In addition, many tourism industry groups and government agencies charged with tourism development or management have also produced some useful guidance.

- Australian Heritage Commission (2000) on best practices and case studies of successful partnerships
- Pennsylvania Tourism & Lodging Association (2003) on a comprehensive set of policies and actions to implement a state-wide heritage tourism system
- Webb and Dane (2001a and 2001b) present successful case studies of heritage tourism
- US Travel Data Center is a good source of updated statistics, along with the Travel Industry Association of America (2001, and see web site—www.tia.org).

Second is the literature on tourism as a factor in cultural change and an object of public policy in the broad sense. There are myriad disciplinary and political takes on the cultural effects of preservation, many of them inflected with political economic critiques, which makes them relevant to this paper. This substantial scholarly literature is generally quite critical of the social and cultural effects of tourism, whatever its economic successes. See, for instance: Bendixen, 1997; Boyer, 1992; Graham, Ashworth and Tunbridge, 2000; Herbert, 1995; Kirschenblatt-Gimblett, 1998; MacCannell, 1999; and Urry, 1995.

S. Preservation Advocacy

Preservation organizations—mostly the NGO’s, but sometimes government agencies as well—often issue publications stating and rationalizing the case for economic and political support of historic preservation activities. The best of these are quite persuasive, though there is a good deal of repetition or arguments and rationales among the various reports. In large part, however, the advocacy literature is less oriented toward “research”—in the sense of shedding light on a question of interest with some objectivity—and rather more oriented to convincing others that preservation is a good investment. The methods and evidence are therefore quite partial.

Advocacy studies remain important for researchers because they most clearly state the case for the positive economic benefits of preservation. Particularly comprehensive and impressive examples include reports prepared by state-wide preservation advocacy organizations—Maryland (Rypkema, 1999), Colorado (Colorado Historical Society, 2003; based on Clarion Associates, 2002), and New Jersey (New Jersey Historic Trust, 1998, based on New Jersey Historic Trust and Center for Urban Policy Research, 1997). The web sites of many of these state-wide organizations are excellent starting points for advocacy publications, economic impact studies, tax policy information related to preservation, and other information.

English Heritage (England’s leading quasi-governmental historic preservation organization) has published a report directly advocating the view that historic preservation is a wise investment and excellent economic development policy. The Heritage Dividend documents several case studies, as well as general policy successes, for a variety of building types, reuse projects, and revitalization settings (English Heritage, 1999/2002). Also of interest is English Heritage’s Power of Place, marshaling a broad argument for why and how the public values the country’s heritage, based on an extensive public opinion survey.


———. 1997. Preservation and Property Values in Indiana. Indianapolis: Historic Landmarks...
Foundation of Indiana.

(www.state.nj.us/dep/hpo/4sustain/spkrseries1.pdf)
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Every day historic preservation strengthens our economy, but leaders in the field don’t always know how to articulate that connection. Knowing the facts to support our case can help us spell out the many ways in which preservation supports neighborhoods and communities. The Economics of Historic Preservation Classic. Donovan Rypkema’s The Economics Of Historic Preservation: A Community Leader’s Guide, an indispensable tool for historic preservation professionals, is available on Amazon. More. Creates Jobs. It found, for example, that in boroughs outside Manhattan, historic districts with historically high minority populations maintained their racial makeup. The NYLC report also found that historic districts are the densest neighborhoods. likely that historic preservation on a significant scale will be supported from public budgets. Without participation of the private sector in rehabilitating the deteriorating historic building stock, the city is in danger of losing a vital part of its cultural heritage. Policymakers believe that rehabilitation of the city’s rich architectural heritage could be the cornerstone of a city revitalization project which will attract foreign and domestic investment.  

26 Butler, Nayyar-Stone and O’Leary, The Low and Economics of Preservation in St Petersburg. 2. Profile of St. Petersburg. Contemporary St. Petersburg, with a population of 4.8 million, is divided into 18 administrative districts. Historic preservation concerns need to be considered when planning for the future of coastal and riverfront communities, many of which have extensive historic and prehistoric resources and valued traditional cultural patterns. Having an accurate, up-to-date inventory of historic resources and archeological sites (identified and predicted) in vulnerable areas is key to an informed and quick response when disasters strike, as well as a basis for long term resilience planning. Working with FEMA after Hurricane Sandy, the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) quickly surveyed affect