NÚMERO 596

LOPAMUDRA CHAKRABORTI, DAVID R. HERES AND DANAE HERNÁNDEZ CORTÉS

Are Land Values Related to Ambient Air Pollution Levels? Hedonic Evidence from Mexico City

Abstract

The average resident of Mexico City suffers unhealthy levels of air quality for the most part of the year. Nevertheless, the uneven distribution of firms and road traffic across the city, together with wind patterns and differences in microclimates generates localized pollution concentrations. The objective of this study is to investigate whether residents of Mexico City value cleaner air taking advantage of the variation in pollution levels and land values observed across neighborhoods within the city. Contrary to most studies of this type, commonly focused in developed countries, ours is based on land values reported by external appraisals. The panel nature of our data and inclusion of time varying controls for neighborhood characteristics and local economic conditions allows for correction of potential endogeneity bias arising due to unobserved factors that influence both current pollution levels and property values. Our results suggest that air quality improvements lead to an increase in land values by approximately 3% in Mexico City which is equivalent to a marginal willingness to pay of up to $178 (2010) pesos per m^2. Thus, we provide an estimate of the possible benefits of public policy dedicated to air quality improvements, measured as the value that Mexico City's residents have for cleaner air.

Keywords: Air Quality, Hedonic Valuation, Willingness to Pay, Environmental amenities, Mexico City.

JEL Classification Numbers: Q51, Q53, R14, R21

Resumen

Los habitantes de la Ciudad de México sufren, en promedio, calidad de aire precaria durante gran parte del año. Sin embargo, existen grandes diferencias en la distribución de empresas y tráfico vehicular dentro de la ciudad que junto con patrones de aire y microclimas generan concentraciones de contaminación localizadas. El objetivo de este estudio es analizar cuál es el valor del aire limpio para los habitantes de la Ciudad de México aprovechando la variación de niveles de contaminación y los valores de inmuebles dentro de la ciudad. La mayoría de los estudios de este tipo son desarrollados en países de ingreso alto, para lo cual este trabajo provee evidencia de la valoración de la calidad ambiental en ciudades de países emergentes. Mediante el uso de datos en panel e incluyendo controles de variables que cambian en el tiempo para las características de los vecindarios y las condiciones económicas locales, se puede corregir por posible endogeneidad en los parámetros que surge de los factores no observados que influyen tanto los niveles de contaminación y los valores de las propiedades. Nuestros resultados sugieren que el aumento de la calidad del aire pueden llevar a un aumento en los valores de propiedades de aproximadamente 3% en la Ciudad de México. Este valor es equivalente a una disposición a pagar de $178 pesos (en valores del 2010) por m^2. De esta forma, brindamos estimadores de los posibles beneficios de la existencia de políticas públicas dedicadas a aumentos de la calidad del aire, medidas como el valor que los habitantes de la Ciudad de México tienen por el aire limpio.

Palabras clave: Calidad del Aire, Métodos Hedónicos, Disposición a pagar, Amenidades ambientales, Ciudad de México.

Números de clasificación JEL: Q51, Q53, R14, R21

Are Land Values Related to Ambient Air Pollution Levels? Hedonic Evidence from Mexico City Working Paper*

Lopamudra Chakraborti[†]   David R. Heres [†]   Danae Hernández Cortés

February 2016

Abstract

The average resident of Mexico City suffers unhealthy levels of air quality for the most part of the year. Nevertheless, the uneven distribution of firms and road traffic across the city, together with wind patterns and differences in microclimates generates localized pollution concentrations. The objective of this study is to investigate whether residents of Mexico City value cleaner air taking advantage of the variation in pollution levels and land values observed across neighborhoods within the city. Contrary to most studies of this type, commonly focused in developed countries, ours is based on land values reported by external appraisals. The panel nature of our data and inclusion of time varying controls for neighborhood characteristics and local economic conditions allows for correction of potential endogeneity bias arising due to unobserved factors that influence both current pollution levels and property values. Our results suggest that air quality improvements lead to an increase in land values by approximately 3% in Mexico City which is equivalent to a marginal willingness to pay of up to \$178 (2010) pesos per m^2. Thus, we provide an estimate of the possible benefits of public policy dedicated to air quality improvements, measured as the value that Mexico City's residents have for cleaner air.

Introduction

Air pollution is a relevant problem in most densely populated cities. According to the OECD, air pollution causes more than 3 million related deaths in the world.[1] Similarly, poor air quality is related to the prevalence of different respiratory diseases and exposure to criteria pollutants such as ozone (O_3), particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NOx) and sulfur dioxide (SO_2) is shown to cause long run health effects. Various types of sources contribute to air pollution, such as mobile (transport) and fixed (industry and construction) sources and both are characteristic features of urban growth. In this study we focus on air pollution in Mexico City. Ranked as the most polluted city by the UN in 1992, Mexico City has witnessed significant improvements in controlling its dire state of air pollution. However, rapidly expanding urban growth means that it is still one of the most polluted cities in the world.

The objective of this paper is to derive estimates for possible benefits of improvement in air quality, in Mexico City. We accomplish this by calculating the willingness to pay for cleaner air amongst Mexico City residents. Air pollution is known to have substantial economic impacts in terms of health of the affected population. However, in developing countries, in particular, quantitative estimates of these damages of pollution are practically non-existent. Hence, we look at the housing market to analyze if the residents of highly polluted cities such as Mexico City value air quality by revealing their preferences for choosing houses located in less polluted areas within the City. Such estimates on willingness to pay can inform policy makers directly on the benefits of improving air quality.

There is a large amount of literature that analyze the economic impact of air pollution translated to social costs–see Greenstone and Jack (2015) for a survey of the studies that estimate the impacts of air pollution on health. Beatty and Shimshack (2014) find that an increase in CO and O_3 is associated with increases in children's respiratory treatments and the impact of CO is also related to long run health. Among the most relevant, for developing countries and Mexico in particular, Arceo-Gómez, Hanna, and Oliva (2012) analyze the effect of air pollution on infant mortality in Mexico. They conclude that air quality (measured by the concentration of criteria pollutants) has an effect on infant mortality in Mexico City. Tanaka (2015) analyzes the effect of a change in pollution regulation scheme in 1998 for China on infant mortality with a difference in difference approach and found that infant mortality decreased by 20% since the implementation. Pollution seems to exert economic damages not only through health but also through its negative impact on labor supply. R. Hanna and Oliva (2015) studied the effect of pollution on labor supply using the exogenous variation in pollution due to the closing of a refinery in 1991 in Mexico City. They find that the decline in SO_2 pollution resulted in an increase of 1.3 hours of work per week for the residents of

---

[1]OECD (2014). *The Cost of Air Pollution: Health Impacts of Road Transport*, OECD Publishing.

neighborhoods located closer to where the refinery was, compared to others.

This study fills an important gap in the literature on valuation of environmental benefits, particularly for developing countries. This research question is of significant importance as comparatively few studies have focused on developing countries where some of the most polluted cities are. According to the World Health Organization, developing countries have the highest records of pollution levels for Nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and suspended particles.[2] Specifically, we try to quantify the impact of pollution on independent assessments of land value, in Mexico City. We consider a previously unused data base of land value appraisals at zip code level in Mexico City obtained from the Sociedad Hipotecaria Federal (SHF). To our knowledge, Gonzalez, Leipnik, and Mazumder (2013) is the only other study that uses information on individual housing sales from SHF.

We construct a unique dataset linking pollution to land values which has the following characteristics. 1) Our measure of land value based on assessments commissioned by credit institutions avoids the need to control for individual household characteristics for households that purchase these properties or parcels of land. 2) The aggregated nature of our measure of land values (the mean value at the zip code level) allows us to conduct our analysis at the appropriate scale, as we consider zip code level variability to more accurately reflect exposure to ambient air pollution in contrast to individual housing value. 3) We control for type of land parcel: individual houses, condominiums, multiple housing and condos, and location features as captured by center, intermediate, periphery (i.e. semi-urban) and rural zones. 4) We consider four different pollutants, namely, Particulate Matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$),Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2) and ozone, since they are some of the most prevalent in Mexico City and together constitute part of the air pollution. 5) The availability of panel data means that we can control for the potential endogeneity bias of unobserved time varying factors that influence both pollution and land values. 6) We explore two such time varying mechanisms—neighborhood's socioeconomic characteristics and local economic conditions. Our regressions control for neighborhood characteristics, by collecting information on socioeconomic status of the nearby population. In particular, we match AGEB (Area Geostadística Básica Urbana) level data on number of houses with drainage and electricity, number of houses with three or more rooms, average schooling, health care access, population density and number of households in the area. Second, we control for local economic conditions by including total number of firms or business establishments obtained at the AGEB level from the economic census. Number of industries might also be capturing other (dis) amenities or location specific factors such as closeness to pollutant sources. 7) Finally, we control for spatial correlation by clustering standard errors at the municipality level.

We find that higher pollution leads to lower land value assessments. Our fixed effects

---

[2]World Health Organization (2006) *Air Quality Guidelines: Update 2005,* WHO publications.

results show that a decline in SO_2 pollution by 1 part per billion leads to an increase in zipcode average land values by 3 percent. Similarly, a decline in $PM_{2.5}$ pollution by 1 microgram per cubic meter leads to an increase in land values by 2.4 percent, while a decline in PM_{10} pollution by 1 microgram per cubic meter leads to an increase in land values by about 1 percent. This latter result is expected as $PM_{2.5}$ is known to cause more severe negative health impacts than the larger particulate matter, PM_{10}. As for SO_2, it is known to be primarily emitted from point sources of pollution i.e. factories and hence might be capturing some of the negative emitter effects of proximity to industries. We conclude that an average resident of Mexico City has a positive marginal willingness to pay for cleaner air. Our estimates suggest a magnitude of almost \$178 pesos for a reduction in SO_2, 142.3 pesos for a reduction in $PM_{2.5}$ and 53.3 pesos for a reduction in PM_{10} pollution; all monetary values expressed in constant 2010 pesos.

1 Air quality in Mexico City

Mexico City comprises 16 municipalities with a total of 8'851,000 inhabitants; taking into account suburbs and neighboring municipalities of different states nearby, the Mexico City Metropolitan Area is the most populated region in Mexico with 20'116,842 inhabitants.[3] In economic terms, Mexico City represents 17.03% of Mexico's gross domestic product. The population and economic activity are factors that partially determine pollution concentrations in Mexico City. In this sense, annually almost 10.455 million m^3 are consumed in the transportation sector (gas and diesel), which contribute to 46% of pollutants emissions.[4] Other sources of pollution are industry (21%), residential services (20%) and other services (13%).[5] Besides population and economic factors, geographically Mexico City is located in a zone conducive to the prevalence of pollution. According to Molina and Molina (2004), height, solar intensity and topography contribute to the formation of ozone and trap pollutants that reduce air quality in Mexico City.

In this study we refer only to the criteria pollutants which are the ones more insidious to health and are reported every hour by the Automatic Air Quality Monitoring Network (RAMA by its name in Spanish): sulfur dioxide (SO_2), particulate matter (PM), and ozone (O_3). Each pollutant is related to different health issues. For instance, SO_2 enhances morbidity and mortality of heart and lung patients, NO_2 increases respiratory issues, and PM can lead to lung cancer. Each of these pollutants has different origin and its distribution varies according to local climate, and atmospheric conditions.[6] According to our data, in Mexico City the pollutants whose levels are more frequently exceeded are Ozone and Particulate Matter and Sulfuric Dioxide.

Given the effects of air pollution on health and the associated costs of policies aimed at improving them, it is important to estimate the value that Mexico City inhabitants place on air quality. This would allow assessing the potential benefits of public policy directed towards diminishing pollution. Figure 1 shows that pollution is not homogeneous in Mexico City due to different atmospheric conditions that each zone presents and the distance to pollution sources (factories or transportation). In general, the north of the city has higher levels of pollution in comparison to the south. Therefore, this study assesses the willingness to pay for a marginal improvement in air quality in Mexico City, as reflected in housing prices. In particular, we find evidence on whether Mexico City residents have preferences over air quality (related to better health or aesthetics) and they consider these preferences

---

[3]INEGI, General Direction of Sociodemographic Characteristics: *Censo de Población y Vivienda 2010.*

[4]Atmospheric Monitoring System of Mexico City Metropolitan Area (SIMAT).

[5]Direction of Atmospheric Monitoring of Mexico City (Dirección de Monitoreo Atmosférico de la Ciudad de México.

[6]National Institute for Ecology and Climate Change (2013). Criteria Pollutants. http://www.inecc.gob.mx/calaire-indicadores/523-calaire-cont-criterio

when choosing where to live.

2   Hedonic Prices Model

There are several goods that share the same market but are not homogeneous, i.e., they have different prices and characteristics associated. When looking at the transactions in a market with differentiated goods, the value of the underlying characteristics of the good can be obtained. The hedonic prices model is an indirect valuation method that allows one to assess the value of a good that does not have an explicit market, like air quality. Rosen (1974) is one of the first authors that describe the hedonic price model.

In this section we present a brief discussion of Freeman (2003) hedonics model, applied to the housing market. An individual's utility is a function of consumption of a composite commodity $\mathbf{X}$, a vector of location-specific environmental amenities $\mathbf{Q}$, a vector of structural characteristics of the house (size, number of rooms, age of house etc) $\mathbf{S}$, and a vector of characteristics of the neighborhood in which the house is located (e.g. quality of schools, accessibility to parks, crime rate) denoted by N. Hence, an individual's utility who occupies house i is given by

$$U = U(X, Q_i, S_i, N_i)$$

Assuming that preferences are weakly separable in housing and its characteristics, the demand for the housing characteristics are independent of the prices of other goods. The individual maximizes $u(\dot{)}$ subject to the budget constraint:

$$M - P_{h_i} - X = 0$$

The hedonic price function $P_h(\dot{)}$ can be estimated for an urban area under the assumption that it can be treated as a single market for housing services. In other words, buyers (and sellers) have full information on all alternative choices and are free to choose a house anywhere inside the urban area. To empirically estimate the hedonic price function it needs an additional assumption that the housing market is in equilibrium i.e. all individuals have made their utility-maximizing choices given the prices and that these prices just clear the existing stock of housing alternatives.

$$P_{h_i} = P_h(S_i, N_i, Q_i)$$

Hence, the price of the ith residential location can be expressed as a function of the structural, neighborhood and environmental characteristics of that location. As Freeman (2003) Freeman (2003) points out, the most preferred source of data is that on actual sales

Figure 1: Air quality distribution among monitoring stations in Mexico City

htbp

Maximum values recorded by monitoring stations in IMECA values for 2005-2014

prices of individual houses, along with relevant characteristics. However, this requires the heroic assumption that buyers and sellers have full information on willingness-to-pay and willingness-to-accept offers of other potential buyers and sellers. An alternative source of property value data would be professional appraisals of individual properties for taxation or other purposes (mortgage statement). As we will discuss later, third party neutral assessments provided by experts are used for our present purposes.

The other assumption of a single market in equilibrium is relaxed later in the section on empirical robustness. By and large, Mexico City can be considered as a single housing market as the buyers do not suffer from any barriers to access to housing markets, across the city. However, when considering the causality of pollution levels on housing prices, one must consider the problem of reverse sorting (by households) based on average housing prices, as pointed out in section 4.6 of Kuminoff, Smith, and Timmins (2013). In particular, we allow for sorting based on average zipcode pollution levels and zipcode by year pollution levels (following Currie and Neidell (2005) and Beatty and Shimshack (2014)) in our empirical model where zipcode level land values are regressed on average pollution levels and neighborhood characteristics.

2.1 Hedonic prices and air quality

There is a broad literature that assesses the effect of air quality on housing prices in United States using hedonic prices approaches. Traditional hedonic models that focus at the individual, house or property level, have often found confounding results of higher pollution driving up housing prices or no impact of pollution in the vicinity on house prices Smith and Huang (1995); Zabel and Kiel (2000)). Neighborhood characteristics such as per capita income affect both pollution and housing values. Higher per capita income drives up the demand for environmental quality and hence exerts a downward pressure on pollution and consequently drives up housing prices. Such omitted/unobserved variables can lead to biased estimates of the effect of local pollution on house prices. These biases might be 'fixed' or unchanging over time which can be differenced out by looking at the effect of change in pollution on change in housing prices (B. G. Hanna (2007)). Bajari, Fruehwirth, Kim, and Timmins (2012) argue that fixed effects may mitigate omitted variable bias in the presence of time invariant observables when panel data are available. However, this approach does not address time varying factors that affect both pollution and house prices.

Chay and Greenstone (2005) use a panel of counties in United States to estimate if changes in exposure to total suspended particulate matter (TSP) pollution has an impact on housing values. In order to solve the omitted variables problem, they use an instrumental variable approach in which they consider the Clean Air Act's (1970) nonattainment status designation for each county as the source of exogenous variability of pollution. According

to their estimates, a variation of 1 μ g/m^3 of particulate matter causes an increase of 0.2-0.4 percentage points in the average value of houses, which is a higher value than the ones estimated before.

Leggett and Bockstael (2000) paper is one of the few studies that estimate a separate regression for the value of land defined as a 'residual' of the total price of the house minus the value of the structure. Leggett and Bockstael (2000) is one of the earliest studies that address this potential omitted variable bias by incorporating 'emitter effects' in their house values regressions. They are concerned with unaccounted for variables that might actually negatively bias the coefficient on pollution i.e. inflate the negative impact of pollution on house prices. In particular, their study finds that exclusion of aesthetic disamenities i.e. undesirable features of the landscape such as odor, noise and unsightliness, negatively biases the effect of environmental pollution on housing prices.

However, the housing market in United States might be different from other countries, especially developing countries. For example, the importance of environmental amenities for some consumers might be very different in developed countries compared to developing ones. Yusuf and Resosudarmo (2009) use hedonic prices to estimate the importance of air quality for the residents of Yakarta, Indonesia. They consider the presence of spatial effects that influence the houses values such as the distance to the district center. The authors conclude that a marginal improvement of SO$_2$ is associated with \$28 per variation of μg/m3, which is a relatively small amount compared to other (developed) countries. Won Kim, Phipps, and Anselin (2003) perform a hedonic model for Seoul and they conclude that SO$_2$ levels have a significant effect on house prices. An important contribution of the study is that they consider spatial econometric models(spatial lags and spatial correlation in error term) to control for the possible existence of omitted variables. Marginal WTP for a small change in air quality (a permanent 4% improvement in mean SO$_2$ concentrations) is about \$2333 or 1.4% of mean housing price.

For Latin America, Carriazo, Ready, and Shortle (2013) develop a hedonic price approach to estimate the value for an improvement in air quality in Bogota, Colombia, on rental property values. Their principal contribution is that they estimate a heteroskedastic frontier regression model to account for the bias that unmeasured quality attributes of residential properties tend to be correlated with the environmental quality attribute of interest and asymmetrically distributed across properties. They find that the price elasticity for air quality was 25% higher in the OLS specification than in a frontier model with asymmetric random errors. This implies that possible omitted variable bias in conventional hedonic models leads to the marginal value of air quality to be overestimated.

2.2 Hedonic prices and Mexico

As Gonzalez et al. (2013) point out hedonic methodology applied to developing countries is rare, in particular, Latin American countries. We hope to fill a gap in this literature, in particular, for one of the most polluted (in Mexico) and one of the largest metropolitan areas worldwide. In a developing country context, willingness to pay for improved environmental quality might be biased towards zero so any significant finding on the influence of local pollution on housing values would directly inform environmental decision making not only at the metropolitan level but nationwide.

Gonzalez et al. (2013) exploit the seasonality of particulate matter (PM_{10}) pollution to use seasons as an instrument for the potentially endogenous PM_{10} concentrations. PM_{10} measurements being higher in the dry season such as winter due to higher resuspension of PM_{10}, in other words, rainfall is an efficient way to remove suspended particles from the atmosphere. Hence, home owners that made property visits in the winter experienced a higher level of pollution in contrast to those that decided during the rainy season. The authors use a cross section of housing sales between January 2003 and May 2004 in the three largest metropolitan areas of Mexico: Mexico City, Monterrey and Guadalajara. The authors use household socioeconomic characteristics such as income, age of head of household, number of dependents, education and type of employment to proxy for neighborhood characteristics such as quality of school and crime rates etc. They find a house price-pollution elasticity of -0.07 for Mexico City and Monterrey and -0.05 for Guadalajara implying that one unit reduction in PM10 levels is valued at $43.47 USD in Monterrey, $41.73 USD in Mexico City and $36.34 USD in Guadalajara. Their findings are consistent with marginal benefits of reducing pollution being higher in more polluted areas.

Rodríguez-Sánchez (2014) estimates that a household head in Mexico would pay a lower bound of 46.90 dollars (constant 2000 dollars) for a one-unit reduction in Particulate Matter emissions per year. They incorporate migration or mobility costs into the hedonic approach by using a residential sorting model. A two stage model is estimated. In the first stage, a discrete choice model to obtain the probability that a person chooses to live in any location (state) depends on migration costs, income that individual could have earned in any location and the quality of life in every location. In the second stage, these location fixed effects (or quality of life) are regressed on air pollution concentrations to recover the WTP for air quality across states in Mexico. Crime per capita, employment rate, government expenditure per capita, population, life expectancy, rankings of art and number of firms in state are among the other variables considered in this modified hedonic regression.

3   Data

3.1   Land values

The dependent variable of interest is the mean value of land (per square meter) by zip code and quarter for the years 2006-2013. Data were obtained from external appraisals in Mexico City gathered and published by the Federal Mortgage Association (Sociedad Hipotecaria Federal, SHF) where each appraiser must be registered. The appraiser estimates what is the value of each house considering its characteristics and location. The information is obtained by type of property (houses, apartments, condos, and empty lots) and location (central, intermediate, peripheral, extension zone or rural) that is described as the proximity reference of the property. The values are deflated with Mexico City's consumer price index of December, 2010. The resulting final dataset is an unbalanced panel of 539 out of 1445 zip codes of Mexico City from the first quarter of 2005 to the third quarter of 2014.

Table 1 indicates that the average land value for the observed quarters in Mexico City is \$5,927 Also, most of the properties are apartments (55.07%) although there are many houses (27.28%). Regarding the location category, most of the observations are considered as having an intermediate location. Since both the type of property and the location matters for assessing the land value, the panel variable considers the average value at zip code level for the same type of property and location.

Table 1: Housing characteristics in Mexico City

Variables	Average
	(Standard Deviation)
Land value (per m^2)	$5,927
	(35,241.89)
TYPE	
Apartments	55.07%
Houses	27.28%
Condos	13.02%
Multiple houses	3.05%
Other	0.93%
Empty Lots	0.65%
LOCATION	
Intermediate	47.21%
Central	31.56%
Peripheral	19.98%
Rural	0.75%
Extension zone	0.50%
Observations	31,262

3.2   Pollutants

The information on pollution levels in Mexico City come from the Automatic Air Quality Monitoring Network (Red Automática de Monitoreo Atmosférico, RAMA) that consists of several monitoring stations that report pollution concentrations every hour. Each zip code in the sample is matched with the monitoring stations that are located within 3 miles (from the centroid of each zip code) for estimating the pollution level that the population might be exposed to. The quarterly average and maximum values were calculated for the different pollutants reported from the hourly measurements (?). In order to assign a level of pollution for each zip code, measurements from each nearby monitoring station was weighted by its inverse distance to give higher weights to the nearest stations.[7] Figure 2 shows the maximum values recorded for each pollutant in Mexico City. We consider four pollutants: O_3, SO_2, PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ which are the most prevalent during the period. Table 2 shows the average level of pollution, as well as the maximum recorded value for each pollutant in the period 2006-2013. Column 3 in table 2 shows the average number of hours that the lower bound of "bad air quality" is reached. "Bad air quality" refers to the third level of the air quality

---

[7]Not all monitoring stations have data for pollution concentrations for each quarter of the studied period but this is not much of a problem since we consider the average of all relevant weighted values.

index according to local regulations. Whenever this threshold level is reached, the government recommends children and elder people not to perform outdoor activities.

Figure 2: Recorded values for pollutants

Maximum recorded values. Bad air quality indicates the minimum pollution level to be considered bad air quality according to official regulations.

Table 2: Pollutants' prevalecence in Mexico City

Pollutants	Maximum value	Average value	Average number of hours with bad air quality
(units)	(standard deviation)	(standard deviation)	air quality is reached
PM10 [$\mu g/$ m^3]	260.2	44.4	16
	-131.4	-13.35	
PM2.5 [$\mu g/$ m^3]	128	25.47	17.57
	-66.74	-5.607	
O3 [ppb]	150.2	28.34	15.72
	-17.96	-5.972	
SO2 [ppb]	106.1	5.92	16.9
	-44.7	-2.573	

3.3 Socioeconomic and neighborhood's economic activity data

As mentioned before omitted variable bias is a big problem in hedonic specifications. In order to reduce this bias in our estimations we include time varying neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics as they are likely to influence both housing values and pollution levels. In addition, we include proxies for local economic conditions that might also influence both housing values and pollution concentrations. To capture socioeconomic characteristics we include Census data from the 2005 and 2010 years that is available at the AGEB level. AGEBs are fairly small urban areas (more than 2,500 inhabitants) with relatively homogeneous socioeconomic characteristics. We associated each AGEB to a zip code according to the centroids of both polygons using GIS (Geographic Information Systems). We construct a zipcode level measure for socioeconomic characteristics by considering all AGEBs that are within 1 mile of each zipcode centroid.

Mexico's Census do not ask questions on income (and or poverty) directly. Hence, we include proxies for income or economic status like percentage of houses with drainage and electricity, percentage of houses with 3 or more rooms, education levels like number of years of study and access to formal social security (Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, IMSS). Number of inhabited houses and population density are also likely to be related with socioeconomic status of the local population. Higher proportion of unoccupied housing and lower population density might be related to poorer economic conditions. Table 3 shows the socioeconomic variables for 2005 and 2010. Most of the variables show significant changes between the two years considered. Finally to capture local economic conditions we consider the total number of economic units or establishments in each zip code. We use the number of firms by major economic activity category (manufacture, services and business) at the AGEB level, obtained from the economic censuses of 2004 and 2009. Figure 3 shows how the distribution of economic activities varies geographically within Mexico City obtained from the 2009 economic census.

Figure 3: Distribution of economic units

Table 3: Socioeconomic and economic units* variables

Variable	2005	2010	Difference	p-value	
Drainage and electricity (% of total houses)	93.08%	84.17%	0.089	0	***
3 rooms or more (% of total houses)	82.67%	74.22%	0.0844	0	***
AGEB population density (pop/m2)	0.01704	0.0166	0.0003	0	***
Total number of inhabited houses	1,013.14	1,221.25	-208.11	0	***
Average years of study	11.08	10.81	0.2719	0	***
Population with IMSS (% of total)	37.63%	37.97%	-0.0029	0.6015	
Manufacture economic units	424.86	457.24	-32.37	0	***
Business economic units	2,466.11	2,528.76	-62.65	0.0306	**
Services economic units	2,025.65	2,232.62	-206.96	0	***
Total economic units	4,916.63	5,218.63	-302.0014	0	***

* Economic units' information is obtained from 2004 and 2009 economic census.

4   Empirical Approach

In our model we use quarterly average land values by zipcode for Mexico City, differentiated by type of property (e.g. individual houses versus condos, apartments or empty lots) and by zonal category (i.e. central, peripheral or suburban). As mentioned before, these are characteristics that are likely to be important in terms of controlling for differences in land values within the same zipcode. However, as part of empirical robustness checks we estimate the model presented below for zipcode average land values, i.e. average taken across all types of properties and zonal locations. Particularly, because our primary explanatory variable, i.e. our pollution measure is constructed at the zipcode level.

The empirical approach is given by:

$$LV_{t,z} = \alpha_z + \beta_1 Poll_{C,z} + \beta_2 S_{SC,z} + \beta_3 EU_{EC,z} + \delta_Q + \rho_Y + u_{t,z} \tag{1}$$

Where LV represents the quarterly average land value at zip code level for the period 2006-2013, by type of property and zonal category. Based on findings of Cropper, Deck, and McConnell (1988), the dependent variable is log transformed. α_z is the zipcode by type of property and zonal category fixed effects. $Poll$ is the average level of pollution weighted by the inverse distance of the nearest monitoring stations to the zip code and for the current year i.e. the annual average is constructed as the average from the current quarter to 3 quarters ago. We estimate separate regressions for the four pollutants considered as each one of the individual pollutants are likely to be (highly) correlated with the other pollutants considered. S is the vector of socioeconomic controls obtained from the 2005 and 2010 population censuses. For the time period 2006 to 2010 we associate variables corresponding to the 2005 census and for the time period 2011 to 2013 we associate the 2010 census variables. $EU_{EC,z}$ is the vector of controls for local economic conditions: the total number of firms by manufacturing, services and business establishments, for zipcode z and based on the two economic census years 2004 and 2009. For the time period 2006 to 2010 we associate variables corresponding to the 2004 economic census and for the time period 2011 to 2013 we associate the 2009 economic census variables. δ is the quarterly or seasonal fixed effects and ρ_Y is the yearly fixed effects. The annual dummy variables are included to control for differences from one year to the next that are unexplained or not controlled for in the model. The quarterly or seasonal dummy variables control for seasonal variations, particularly, pollution concentrations are different depending on the season—higher particulate matter concentrations during the dry seasons as opposed to rainy seasons. Lastly, the zipcode by type of property and zonal category fixed effects controls for all time invariant factors that could explain variations in the land values assessments.

The error term is likely to exhibit serial correlation as land values assessments within the same zipcode are likely to be correlated from one quarter to the next. However, following

Cameron and Miller (2015), we present our results with standard errors clustered at the municipality level which is a more aggregate i.e. higher level than the zipcode, to control for arbitrary spatial correlation. In other words, land values within the same municipality are likely to be correlated because of similar location features, for example. Results are overall similar to clustering standard errors at the zipcode level (to control for arbitrary serial correlation) except for ozone, that becomes statistically significant at the 10 % level. This implies that spatial correlation is likely an issue with our data.

5 Results

Table 4 presents the results with fixed effects for within zipcode assessments by type of property and zonal category. The fixed effects controls for all unobserved time invariant factors at the level of zipcode but differentiated by type of property and zonal category. The log of quarterly zipcode average land value assessments are regressed on annual average pollution observed in the same zipcode during a year, and controls for socioeconomic characteristics, local economic conditions and seasonal and yearly dummies. Standard errors are clustered within the municipality level. The negative coefficient on the pollution variable shows that higher pollution has a downward impact on zipcode average land assessments. The coefficient in column (1) of Table 4 can be interpreted as, a 1 microgram per cubic meter increase in PM_{10} leads to a decline in land values by 0.7 percent. Evaluating this estimate at the average land value of 5,927 (2010) pesos in Mexico City, one can express the Marginal WTP for lower PM_{10} pollution as 41.5 (2010) pesos. This result is consistent with Gonzalez et al. (2013) and Rodriguez's (2014) findings for willingness to pay for lower particulate matter pollution in Mexico. For $PM_{2.5}$, the coefficient is much larger in magnitude as one might expect because of its severe health implications; however, the coefficient is significant only at the 10 percent level. The coefficient in column (2) of Table 4 can be interpreted as, 1 microgram per cubic meter increase in $PM_{2.5}$ leads to a decline in zipcode average land values by 2.2 percent. In pesos, the MWTP for lower $PM_{2.5}$ pollution is 130.4 (2010) pesos. For SO_2, the coefficient is statistically significant at the 1 percent level. The coefficient in column (3) of Table 4 can be interpreted as, a 1 parts per billion increase in SO_2 pollution leads to a decline in zipcode average land values by 2.6 percent. In pesos, the MWTP for lower SO_2 pollution is as much as 154 (2010) pesos. The coefficient on O_3 is positive however not statistically significant. The mechanism of ozone accumulation is clearly different from vehicular and industrial pollution of SO_2 and particulate matter, which might explain why local land values assessments are not related to ozone pollution.

Controls for local economic conditions as captured by total number of industries (manufacturing) seem to be highly significant; although it is of the opposite sign from what is expected. Higher industrial concentration might be capturing improved local economic conditions leading to higher land values assessments as opposed to Leggett and Bockstael (2000) negative emitter effects of higher industrial pollution.

Table 4

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Land value	Land value	Land value	Land value
Businesses	0.000***	0.000	0.000***	0.000***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Manufactures	0.001***	0.002***	0.001***	0.001***
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Services	0.000	-0.001	-0.001*	-0.001*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
AGEB population density	-2.214	-15.828	-16.244	48.789
	-34.513	-33.122	-25.293	-33.967
3 rooms or more	1.218	-0.242	0.235	-5.071*
	(2.236)	(2.69)	(1.868)	(2.437)
Drainage and electricity	-2.054	-0.156	-0.762	3.226
	(1.761)	(2.707)	(1.632)	(2.399)
Population with IMSS	-2.395	-2.048	-2.885**	-0.36
	(1.741)	(2.722)	(1.255)	(0.909)
Total number of inhabited houses	0.000	-0.001***	0.000	-0.001**
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Average years of study	-0.001	-0.406**	-0.02	0.129**
	(0.05)	(0.136)	(0.038)	(0.045)
PM_{10}	-0.007**			
	(0.003)			
$PM_{2.5}$		-0.022*		
		(0.01)		
SO_2			-0.026***	
			(0.008)	
O_3				0.014
				(0.009)
cons	9.862***	14.798***	9.881***	6.951***
	(1.381)	(2.93)	(1.374)	(1.189)
R^2	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02
N	13,146	7,676	15,015	15,331

***$p<0.01$, ** $p< 0.05$, * $p<0.1$ Log of land value for each zipcode by type of property and zonal category. Controls for socioeconomic characteristics, local economic conditions, and seasonal and yearly dummies. Standard errors are clustered within municipality level.

6 Robustness Checks

In this section we check whether the impact of pollution on land values is robust to controlling for all possible time varying factors that might be changing within the zipcode and differentiated by type of property and zonal category. In effect, this is a more general specification than the two specific mechanisms of time varying neighborhood socioeconomic characteristics and local economic conditions that are explored in our main results. We control for all time varying factors, by including zipcode by type of property and zonal category by year fixed effects. So, log of zipcode average land values differentiated by property type and zonal category is regressed on zipcode by property type and zonal category by year fixed effects, annual average pollution in the current year and seasonal dummy variables. Standard errors are again clustered within the same municipality to control for arbitrary spatial correlation. The model is presented in equation 2 below:

$$LV_{t,z} = \alpha_{ZY} + \beta_1 Poll_{C,z} + \delta_Q + u_{t,z} \tag{2}$$

Our results, presented in Table 5 shows that the effect of pollution is robust to controlling for all time varying factors that might change within the zipcode and by property type and zonal category. The magnitudes of the coefficients are somewhat larger than Table 4, where we control for only two types of time varying features. The coefficient in column (1) of Table 5 can be interpreted as, a 1 microgram per cubic meter increase in PM_{10} leads to lower land values within the same zipcode and property type and zone, by 0.9 percent. In pesos, this translates to a MWTP of 53.3 (2010) pesos. For $PM_{2.5}$, the coefficient is now significant at the 5 percent level and the MWTP for lower $PM_{2.5}$ pollution is 142.3 (2010) pesos. For SO_2, we get a large coefficient of MWTP for lower SO_2 pollution of almost 178 (2010) pesos. The marginal impact of ozone is again positive but not statistically significant.

Our second robustness check is to estimate the models in equations 1 and 2 but with our dependent variable averaged over property type and zonal category i.e. we generate a single observation which is the zipcode average land value for each quarter that there is data for. We are particularly interested in this because our primary explanatory variable that of pollution is constructed at the zipcode level. Not to mention that the socioeconomic controls as well as proxies for local economic conditions are constructed at the zipcode level. Effectively, we estimate the models in equations 1 and 2 but only considering a different dependent variable, keeping all the right hand side variables as they are constructed at the zipcode level.

Table 6 presents the results of regressing this zipcode average land value (irrespective of property type and zone) on zipcode fixed effects, annual average zipcode level pollution, seasonal and annual controls and controls for socioeconomic characteristics and number of establishments. Overall, the coefficients are very similar in magnitude to the land values

regressions but differentiated by property type and zone within the same zipcode (Table 4). The MWTP estimates that we get range from 154 (2010) pesos for $PM_{2.5}$, 130.3 (2010) pesos for SO_2 and 35.6 (2010) pesos for PM_{10}.

Table 7 presents the results of the log of land values for each zipcode and quarter (averaged over property type and zone), regressed on zipcode by year fixed effects (to control for all time varying factors) and seasonal controls. Again, we see that pollution has a consistent impact on zipcode average land values assessments that is robust to controlling for all possible time varying zipcode level factors. The MWTP is 189.7 pesos for $PM_{2.5}$, 124.5 for SO_2 and 59.3 for PM_{10}. All estimates are in 2010 pesos. Overall, the marginal impact of $PM_{2.5}$ is larger in magnitude and with higher level of statistical significance in the land values averaged over property type and zone models compared to the estimates where the land values are differentiated based on property type and zones. The marginal effect of SO_2 on the other hand declines in magnitude when compared to the results differentiated by property type and zones (Tables 4 and 5).

Table 5

	(1) Land value	(2) Land value	(3) Land value	(4) Land value
PM_{10}	-0.009**			
	(0.004)			
$PM_{2.5}$		-0.024**		
		(0.009)		
SO_2			-0.030***	
			(0.008)	
O_3				0.02
				(0.011)
cons	8.555***	8.601***	8.319***	7.534***
	(0.172)	(0.234)	(0.038)	(0.341)
R^2	0	0	0	0
N	13,934	8,203	15,868	16,236

***$p<0.01$, ** $p< 0.05$, * $p<0.1$ Log of land value for each zipcode by type of property and zonal category including year fixed effects and seasonal dummy variables. Standard errors clustered within municipality.

Table 6

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Land value	Land value	Land value	Land value
Businesses	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000*
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Manufactures	0.001	0.002***	0.001*	0.001**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Services	0.000	-0.001**	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
AGEB population density	-27.483	-48.636	-14.889	24.704
	(25.432)	(40.6)	(23.431)	(30.493)
3 rooms or more	0.73	-4.058	-0.949	-3.884*
	(1.945)	(2.267)	(2.009)	(1.877)
Drainage and electricity	-1.533	3.496	-0.097	1.94
	(1.503)	(2.76)	(1.632)	(1.978)
Population with IMSS	-2.217	1.177	-1.652	-0.262
	(2.275)	(3.637)	(1.999)	(1.534)
Total number of inhabited houses	0.000	-0.001**	0.000	-0.000**
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Average years of study	0.027	-0.375***	0.025	0.104***
	(0.041)	(0.105)	(0.053)	(0.034)
PM_{10}	-0.006**			
	(0.003)			
$PM_{2.5}$		-0.026**		
		(0.009)		
SO_2			-0.022***	
			(0.006)	
O_3				0.006
				(0.007)
cons	9.972***	14.381***	9.599***	8.132***
	(0.877)	(1.912)	(0.761)	(0.779)
R^2	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03
N	5,142	3,058	5,825	5,913

***$p<0.01$, ** $p< 0.05$, * $p<0.1$ Log of land values for each zipcode and quarter (averaged over property and zone) including zipcode fixed effects, annual average zipcode level pollution, seasonal and yearly dummies and socioeconomic characteristics and number of establishments variables. Standard errors clustered within municipality.

Table 7

	(1) Land value	(2) Land value	(3) Land value	(4) Land value
PM_{10}	-0.010**			
	(0.004)			
$PM_{2.5}$		-0.032***		
		(0.003)		
SO_2			-0.021***	
			(0.005)	
O_3				-0.003
				(0.008)
cons	8.852***	9.072***	8.500***	8.428***
	(0.176)	(0.088)	(0.028)	(0.224)
R^2	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
N	5,462	3,269	6,168	6,268

***$p<0.01$, ** $p< 0.05$, * $p<0.1$ Log of land values for each zipcode and quarter (averaged over property and zone). Controls for all time varying factors, including zipcode by year fixed effects and seasonal controls. Standard errors clustered within municipality.

7 Conclusion

On average a resident of Mexico City is exposed to high levels of air pollution on a daily basis which is a relevant problem since there are many harmful consequences of air quality on health. Furthermore, pollutants are not evenly distributed among neighborhoods in Mexico City. We take advantage of this variation in air pollution within Mexico City, to show whether its residents have a preference for cleaner air. This study provides an estimate of the possible benefits of public policy dedicated to air quality improvements measured as the value that Mexico City's residents have for cleaner air. The main objective of this study is to analyze the effect of air quality on land value in Mexico City, the most populated city in Mexico. Our study provides estimates of the Marginal Willingness to Pay for the reduction of four different pollutants: SO_2, PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$ and O_3.

To our knowledge, there are only a few studies that perform a hedonic approach to estimate the effect of ambient pollution on land value in Mexico. Our study uses a panel data estimation that allows us to control for all time varying, unobserved factors that affect both pollution levels and property values. Furthermore, we explore two such mechanisms of neighborhood characteristics and controls for local economic conditions. We find that improvements in SO_2 lead to 3% higher land values i.e. a MWTP of almost $178 (2010) pesos per m^2. Our control for number of industries ensures that our estimates are unbiased (from the negative emitter effects as mentioned in Leggett and Bockstael (2000) Leggett and Bockstael (2000). Improvements in $PM_{2.5}$ and PM_{10} lead to 2.4% and 1% higher land values, translated into 2010 pesos: $142.3 pesos and $53.3 per m^2, respectively. Additionally, we show that pollution has a robust impact on land values, irrespective of the type of property or zonal category assessed within the same zipcode.

References

Arceo-Gómez, E. O., Hanna, R., & Oliva, P. (2012). *Does the effect of pollution on infant mortality differ between developing and developed countries? Evidence from Mexico City* (Tech. Rep.). National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bajari, P., Fruehwirth, J. C., Kim, K. i., & Timmins, C. (2012). A rational expectations approach to hedonic price regressions with time-varying unobserved product attributes: The price of pollution. *The American Economic Review*, *102*(5), pp. 1898-1926.

Beatty, T. K., & Shimshack, J. P. (2014). Air pollution and children's respiratory health: A cohort analysis. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *67*(1), 39–57.

Cameron, A. C., & Miller, D. L. (2015). A practitioner's guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, *50*(2), 317–372.

Carriazo, F., Ready, R., & Shortle, J. (2013). Using stochastic frontier models to mitigate omitted variable bias in hedonic pricing models: A case study for air quality in bogotá, colombia. *Ecological Economics*, *91*, 80–88.

Chay, K. Y., & Greenstone, M. (2005). Does air quality matter? evidence from the housing market. *Journal of Political Economy*, *113*, 376–424.

Cropper, M. L., Deck, L. B., & McConnell, K. E. (1988). On the choice of funtional form for hedonic price functions. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 668–675.

Currie, J., & Neidell, M. (2005). Air pollution and infant health: What can we learn from california's recent experience? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *120*(3), 1003-1030. Retrieved from `http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/120/3/1003.abstract` doi: 10.1093/qje/120.3.1003

Freeman, A. (2003). *The measurement of environmental and resource values: Theory and methods.* Resources for the Future. Retrieved from `https://books.google.com.mx/books?id=Ur3tBatIV4IC`

Gonzalez, F., Leipnik, M., & Mazumder, D. (2013). How much are urban residents in Mexico willing to pay for cleaner air? *Environment and Development Economics*, *18*(03), 354–379.

Greenstone, M., & Jack, B. K. (2015). Envirodevonomics: A research agenda for an emerging field. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *53*(1), 5–42.

Hanna, B. G. (2007). House values, incomes, and industrial pollution. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *54*(1), 100–112.

Hanna, R., & Oliva, P. (2015). The effect of pollution on labor supply: Evidence from a natural experiment in Mexico City. *Journal of Public Economics*, *122*(0), 68 - 79.

Kuminoff, N. V., Smith, V. K., & Timmins, C. (2013). The new economics of equilibrium sorting and policy evaluation using housing markets. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *51*(4), 1007–1062.

Leggett, C. G., & Bockstael, N. E. (2000). Evidence of the effects of water quality on

residential land prices. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *39*(2), 121–144.

Molina, L. T., & Molina, M. J. (2004). Improving air quality in megacities: Mexico city case study. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1023*(1), 142–158.

Rodríguez-Sánchez, J. I. (2014). Do mexicans care about air pollution? *Latin American Economic Review*, *23*(1), 1–24.

Rosen, S. (1974). Hedonic prices and implicit markets: product differentiation in pure competition. *The journal of political economy*, 34–55.

Smith, V. K., & Huang, J.-C. (1995). Can markets value air quality? a meta-analysis of hedonic property value models. *Journal of Political Economy*, 209–227.

Tanaka, S. (2015). Environmental regulations on air pollution in China and their impact on infant mortality. *Journal of Health Economics*, *42*(0), 90 - 103.

Won Kim, C., Phipps, T. T., & Anselin, L. (2003). Measuring the benefits of air quality improvement: a spatial hedonic approach. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, *45*(1), 24–39.

Yusuf, A. A., & Resosudarmo, B. P. (2009). Does clean air matter in developing countries' megacities? a hedonic price analysis of the Jakarta housing market, Indonesia. *Ecological Economics*, *68*(5), 1398–1407.

Zabel, J. E., & Kiel, K. A. (2000). Estimating the demand for air quality in four us cities. *Land Economics*, 174–194.