

Pinto, Edward J.; Oliner, Stephen D.; Davis, Morris A.; Bokka, Sankar

Working Paper

Residential land values in the Washington, DC metro area: New insights from big data

AEI Economics Working Paper, No. 2016-02

Provided in Cooperation with:

American Enterprise Institute (AEI), Washington, DC

Suggested Citation: Pinto, Edward J.; Oliner, Stephen D.; Davis, Morris A.; Bokka, Sankar (2017) : Residential land values in the Washington, DC metro area: New insights from big data, AEI Economics Working Paper, No. 2016-02, American Enterprise Institute (AEI), Washington, DC

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/280538>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



Residential Land Values in the Washington, DC Metro Area: New Insights from Big Data

Morris A. Davis

Rutgers University

Stephen Oliner

American Enterprise Institute, UCLA

Edward J. Pinto

American Enterprise Institute

Sankar Bokka

FNC, Inc.

AEI Economics Working Paper 2016-02

Updated June 2017

© 2017 by Morris Davis, Stephen Oliner, Edward Pinto and Sankar Bokka. All rights reserved.

The American Enterprise Institute (AEI) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit, 501(c)(3) educational organization and does not take institutional positions on any issues. The views expressed here are those of the author(s).

Residential Land Values in the Washington, DC Metro Area: New Insights from Big Data*

Morris A. Davis
Rutgers University

Stephen D. Oliner
American Enterprise Institute and UCLA

Edward J. Pinto
American Enterprise Institute

Sankar Bokka
FNC, Inc.

June 9, 2017

Abstract

We use a new property-level data set and an innovative methodology to estimate the price of land from 2000 to 2013 for nearly the universe of detached single-family homes in the Washington, DC metro area and to characterize the boom-bust cycle in land and house prices at a fine geography. The results show that land prices were more volatile than house prices everywhere, but especially so in the areas where land was inexpensive in 2000. We demonstrate that the change in the land share of house value during the boom was a significant predictor of the decline in house prices during the bust, highlighting the value of focusing on land in assessing house-price risk.

JEL Classification Numbers: C55, E32, R14, R23, R31, R32

Keywords: Land, Housing, House Prices, Housing Boom and Bust, Financial Crisis

*The views expressed are ours alone and do not represent those of the institutions with which we are affiliated. We received expert research assistance from Rahee Jung, Jessica Li, Lilla Lukacs, Urbashee Paul, Eleanor Qian, Benji Smith and Shuyi Yu. In addition, we received helpful comments from Norrine Brydon, John Clapp, Jeffrey Cohen, Robert Dorsey, Gabriel Ehrlich, Stuart Gabriel, David Geltner, Richard Green, William Larson, Stuart Rosenthal, Joe Tracy, Stijn Van Nieuwerburgh, Mike Viehweg, Susan Wachter, and participants at the International Conference on Collateral Risk (March 2014), the AREUEA National Conference (May 2014) and the Third and Fourth Annual International Conferences on Housing Risk (September 2014 and October 2015). We thank the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift for providing the data for the paper. We also thank the UCLA Rosalinde and Arthur Gilbert Program in Real Estate, Finance and Urban Economics for generous funding. Corresponding author: Morris A. Davis, mdavis@business.rutgers.edu.

1 Introduction

One of the key lessons from the housing boom and bust, the foreclosure surge, and the financial crisis is that participants in housing and mortgage markets, along with policymakers, need better information to evaluate the risks in these markets. With the right data and tools in place, we believe that future volatility in housing and mortgage markets can be tempered through sound lending practices and appropriate regulation. The research here contributes to this objective by quantifying collateral risk at a fine level of geography. Many studies ([Davis and Heathcote \(2007\)](#), [Davis and Palumbo \(2008\)](#), [Haughwout, Orr, and Bedoll \(2008\)](#), [Kok, Monkkonen, and Quigley \(2014\)](#) and [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#), among others) have shown that most of the risk in the price of a house reflects risk to the value of the underlying land. In this paper, we estimate the price of residential land from 2000 to 2013 for more than 700,000 detached single-family homes in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. These properties represent nearly the universe of all such homes in the area under study. To our knowledge, no previous study has estimated land values for individual parcels on such a large scale as the data requirements are enormous and the micro-level data have simply not been available.¹

As emphasized by [Davis and Heathcote \(2007\)](#), [Davis and Palumbo \(2008\)](#), and [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#), housing can be viewed as a bundle consisting of a structure that provides shelter and land that provides utility because of its particular location. Housing structures are relatively easy to reproduce using a known technology whereas the supply of land ready for development is inelastically supplied.² If the supply curve for structures is flat, and the supply curve for land is steep, then shocks to the demand for housing should result primarily in an increase in the quantity of structures built and an increase in the price of land.

Although housing can be affected by both supply shocks and demand shocks, the available evidence suggests that demand shocks account for most of the time-series variation in house prices and housing market activity. Well-calibrated models with only supply shocks ([Davis and Heathcote \(2005\)](#), [Favilukis, Ludvigson, and Van Nieuwerburgh \(2015\)](#) and [Gar-](#)

¹Studies on land values in Chicago provide the closest analogue to the rich data used in this paper. [McMillen \(1996\)](#) maps the land-price gradient for Chicago using data on the value of land for square-mile tracts from [Hoyt \(1933\)](#) and for individual blocks for later years from *Olcott's Land Value Blue Book of Chicago*. [McMillen \(1996\)](#) contains citations to earlier studies that used the Hoyt and Olcott data. See [Ahlfeldt and McMillen \(2014\)](#) for estimates of Chicago land values through 2010 using the Olcott data supplemented by information on vacant land sales.

²[Gyourko and Saiz \(2006\)](#) estimate that the elasticity of supply for housing structures is in the neighborhood of 50, while [Saiz \(2010\)](#) shows that land-use regulations and geographic constraints limit the supply of available land, which implies a much lower supply elasticity for land than for structures. See [Gyourko \(2009\)](#) for further discussion.

riga, Manuelli, and Peralta-Alva (2012), for example) have trouble replicating the observed volatility of house prices. In addition, a casual look at aggregate data strongly supports the notion that demand shocks drive housing markets. Figure 1 graphs the four-quarter percent change in real house prices against single-family housing starts, both for the U.S. as a whole. The two series are very highly correlated. Figure 1 is consistent with the idea that housing markets are best characterized as subject to large and persistent demand shocks that simultaneously boost prices and quantities. Given its low elasticity of supply, land will account for the bulk of the price variation in the housing bundle.

We estimate land prices at the zip-code level using a new method that we developed to take advantage of the rich information in the large dataset that we assembled. Briefly summarizing this method, we start by measuring the implied value of land for new homes built in the early years of our sample period as the difference between the observed sale price and the estimated construction cost for the new structure. Since we focus on new homes, this method does not require an estimate of the depreciation of existing housing structures. This represents a significant departure from key papers of the previous literature, such as Davis and Palumbo (2008), and in our view provides a more accurate measure of land values given the strong assumptions required to estimate depreciation rates. The resulting land prices for newly-built homes provide a market-based “stake in the ground” early in the sample period that we apply to all existing homes in the same zip code after adjusting land values for differences in lot size. Finally, we create time series for home value, land value, and structure value that incorporate the stake in the ground and that reflect the changes over time in construction costs and zip-level indices of house prices.

Our results for the cross-sectional pattern of land prices and land use conform in broad terms to the predictions of a standard urban model, i.e. Muth (1969) and Mills (1972). In the Washington, DC metro area, the price of land tends to be less expensive and lot sizes tend to increase the farther parcels are located from the city center. At the same time, we find that the Washington, DC area cannot be characterized by a uniform downward land-price gradient from the city center, as the price of land is relatively low in close-in areas populated by less affluent residents.

When we focus on time-series variation in land prices, our results are quite striking. In the places where land was cheap in 2000, largely the outer suburbs and closer-in areas with limited locational amenities, the price of land jumped more than 700 percent during the boom from 2000 to 2006. In contrast, in the affluent inner suburbs where land was expensive in 2000, its price increased less than 200 percent over the same period. We see the same pattern in reverse during the bust. The price of land declined only about 10 percent from its peak in expensive areas but plunged 75 percent in initially cheap areas. Although land

prices were everywhere more volatile than house prices, the price of land was most volatile in areas where land was inexpensive and represented a small fraction of home value in 2000.

Unlike land prices, house prices in the Washington area rose by roughly the same percentage in most places from 2000 to 2006. Importantly, this implies a simple analysis of house prices would have provided few clues to mortgage underwriters or other housing-market participants as to which areas were most vulnerable to a possible downturn. After the peak, house prices and land prices moved down in tandem, with steep price drops where land was initially cheap and much milder declines in places where land was expensive. Our analysis provides a key insight for future assessments of house-price risk. An explosive rise in land prices, even when not accompanied by a relatively large increase in house prices, may signal an increased risk of a severe house-price decline.

Our final result relates to the land-leverage hypothesis of [Bostic, Longhofer, and Redfearn \(2007\)](#). This hypothesis predicts that house prices will be most volatile in areas where the value of land accounts for much of the value of housing, i.e. areas with the highest land share of property value. The prediction will hold if land prices are everywhere more volatile than house prices and if the ups and downs in land prices are similar in the various areas under study. Our results are consistent with the first condition but not the second, as we find that the land-price cycle was much sharper in the areas with low land shares. Consequently, in the Washington, DC area, the drop in house prices after 2006 was the most severe in areas with low land shares – the opposite of the prediction of the land leverage hypothesis. We believe our paper, which permits the measurement of land prices and land shares with fine geographic detail, is the first study to provide evidence that is inconsistent with the hypothesis.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The next section discusses the unique, property-level dataset for the Washington, DC area that we create for the analysis. Section [3](#) describes in detail how we estimate land prices for the individual properties in the dataset. Section [4](#) presents a snapshot of the cross-sectional variation in the Washington metropolitan area, while section [5](#) lays out the time-series results for the recent boom-bust cycle. Section [6](#) concludes.

2 Data

2.1 Geographic Coverage

Our dataset covers the city of Washington, DC and the other primary jurisdictions in the Washington, DC metropolitan area: Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties in Mary-

land, along with Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William and Loudoun Counties and the City of Alexandria in Virginia. Table 1 presents basic information about the eight jurisdictions in the dataset. Fairfax County and Montgomery County are the most populous areas, with each having slightly more than a million residents as of 2014. The eight jurisdictions have a total population of about five million people. Compared with the United States as a whole, the eight jurisdictions on average are quite affluent, have a well-educated population, and are ethnically diverse.

However, there are some significant differences across the jurisdictions. Arlington, Fairfax and Loudoun counties have a combination of high median income, high educational attainment, and a relatively small share of the population that is Black or Hispanic. In contrast, Prince George’s County has considerably lower median income, a much smaller of adults with a college education, and a population that is almost 80 percent Black or Hispanic. The City of Alexandria, Montgomery and Prince William Counties and Washington, DC have a blend of the characteristics at these extremes.

2.2 Source Data

The core of our dataset consists of property-level information for detached single-family homes in the eight jurisdictions. The primary data source is the National Collateral Database (NCD) produced by the mortgage technology firm FNC Inc., a CoreLogic company. As described in [Dorsey, Hu, Mayer, and Wang \(2010\)](#), the NCD covers virtually all residential properties throughout the United States, blending data from public records and home appraisals. The property-level information includes physical characteristics, location, the history of sale prices, appraised value, and the latest tax assessment. Importantly, the NCD file shows the year in which the home was built, its sale price when new, and its lot size. This information enables us to estimate land value with the methodology described in section 3.

We merge the NCD file with two other pieces of information for each home. The first is FNC’s proprietary estimate of the home’s market value as of either 2013:Q3 or 2014:Q3.³ FNC maintains a set of automated valuation models (AVMs) and selects the model that performs best for a given location.⁴ For example, in Montgomery County, the preferred

³The earlier date applies to properties in Fairfax, Montgomery, Prince George’s, and Prince William Counties, as well as Washington, DC, while the latter date applies to properties in the other jurisdictions. The dates differ because we obtained the FNC data in two tranches. The differing valuation dates do not pose a problem because we use zip-level house price indices, as described below, to adjust estimated market values across the sample period.

⁴For further information, see “FNC Automated Valuation Models” (April 2014), which is available from FNC on request. To assess the accuracy of the AVM methodology, we calculated the real-time AVM estimate for a random sample of about 80,000 sales of single-family homes in the Washington, DC metro area for the period January 1985 to February 2017. We then compared the AVM to the subsequent sale price. The results

AVM keys off the home’s tax assessment.

The other piece of information merged with the NCD record is the estimate of the home’s reconstruction cost as of 2013:Q3 or 2014:Q2 from Marshall & Swift, a CoreLogic company.⁵ Marshall & Swift’s construction cost estimates are used extensively by property insurance companies, building contractors, appraisers, and government agencies. Their estimate of reconstruction cost represents the full cost of rebuilding the home from the ground up as a new structure. This includes the cost of materials and labor, equipment rentals, builder and subcontractor profit margins, permits and fees, and all applicable taxes associated with residential construction in the local area. The estimated reconstruction cost differs across homes based on a number of factors, but the main drivers are location, total square footage of living space, number of stories, and whether the home is attached or detached from other housing units.

As noted above, each home’s estimated market value and reconstruction cost pertain to a single quarter around the end of our sample period. We create property-level time series for both variables with local house price indices and construction cost indices. The house-price indices are those produced by FNC using a spatial hedonic model estimated with the NCD data (see [Dorsey, Hu, Mayer, and Wang \(2010\)](#) for details). FNC constructs the indices monthly back to January 2000 at various levels of geography, including the five-digit zip-code level. For each home, we use the index for the five-digit zip code in which it is located.⁶ The construction cost indices come from Marshall & Swift. These indices measure the cost of constructing several different models of homes in a given area, incorporating the various costs described above. Marshall & Swift produces the indices monthly for three-digit zip codes throughout the country. The level of aggregation is higher than for the house price indices because construction costs do not vary within narrowly defined areas. We use the construction cost index for the three-digit zip code in which each home is located.

2.3 Property-Level Dataset

To create the dataset for our empirical work, we merged the three sources of property-level data and then removed properties in the NCD file that could not be address-matched to the Marshall & Swift file or that did not have an AVM. Among the remaining properties, we applied a series of data-quality screens.

The first of these screens removed properties in the NCD file that likely are either con-

showed that the AVMs were essentially unbiased estimates of the sale price in each of the eight jurisdictions in our dataset, with mean errors that ranged from 0 to 1.5 percent across the jurisdictions.

⁵As with the AVMs, we received the Marshall & Swift reconstruction cost estimates in two tranches.

⁶The zip-level indexes are available from FNC on request.

miniums or townhouses. In an initial pass through the data, we eliminated properties that Marshall & Swift classified as condos or end-unit townhouses.⁷ Then, to screen out other attached units, we dropped the properties with very small lots.⁸

Three additional screens removed properties with evident data errors or properties that were outliers. Specifically, we dropped properties that were listed as having the same address as another property, properties with extremely large lots (in the top 1/2 percent for their jurisdiction), and properties for which the difference between the AVM and the estimated construction cost was in the bottom 1 percent or top 1 percent for their zip code. We did the latter trim at the zip level to allow for systematic differences in land values.⁹

Table 2 shows the size of the resulting dataset, together with the 2013 Census estimate of the number of detached single-family homes in each jurisdiction. Our dataset contains more than 700,000 properties, implying a coverage rate of 94.5 percent relative to the Census estimate. Hence, our dataset contains nearly the universe of detached single-family homes in the Washington, DC area. For the eight jurisdictions individually, the coverage rates range from about 75 percent in Alexandria to slightly more than 100 percent in Prince William County.¹⁰

2.4 Zip Codes and Zip Groups

The number of properties in each five-digit zip code varies widely. Of the 192 five-digit zips in the dataset, several have more than 10,000 properties, while others have just a handful. These differences reflect the underlying variation in the total number of residential properties by zip code and the split of these properties between detached single-family homes and other types of housing.

To deal with this variation, we attached the zip codes with sparse data to an adjacent zip code (or in some cases, more than one adjacent zip) to create geographic units with at least

⁷The Marshall & Swift file only identifies townhouses that are end units. It does not distinguish other townhouses from detached homes.

⁸Specifically, we removed properties with lots in the bottom 1/2 percent of the jurisdiction’s lot size distribution. We then manually checked a random sample of properties that remained after this trim to look for the presence of townhouses. Based on this manual check, we set a minimum lot size for each jurisdiction so that the properties with lot sizes slightly above the threshold were predominantly detached single-family homes. The resulting minimum lot size ranged from 3,500 square feet in Washington, DC to 6,000 square feet in Loudoun County, with a median across the eight jurisdictions of 4,000 square feet.

⁹For zip codes with relatively few properties, we trimmed at the “zip group” level. We discuss the distinction between zip codes and zip groups below.

¹⁰A coverage rate above 100 percent can arise for two reasons. First, the Census Bureau estimates come from the 2013 American Community Survey and are subject to sampling error. The Census Bureau estimates that the 90 percent confidence band for Prince William County is ± 3.1 percent around the reported count. Second, our dataset includes some townhouses, which causes our totals to slightly overstate the number of detached single-family homes.

1000 properties. This aggregation condensed the original 192 zip codes into 141 geographic units that we refer to as “zip groups.” About three-quarters of the zip groups consist of a single zip code, and most of the others combine two zips. Appendix table [A.1](#) lists all the individual zip codes in the dataset and the created zip groups, showing the number of properties in each zip group, the jurisdiction in which it is located and information related to the estimation of land value.

3 Estimating Land Value

We estimate land value for individual homes in the Washington, DC area with an approach has its roots in traditional land valuation practices – see [Babcock \(1932\)](#) for an early reference – and that blends the methods used in two strands of the modern literature. One strand has relied on observed land sales; recent examples include [Albouy and Ehrlich \(2013a\)](#), [Albouy and Ehrlich \(2013b\)](#), [Kok, Monkkonen, and Quigley \(2014\)](#) and [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#). This approach has the virtue of incorporating observed market prices. However, the volume of land transactions in the older, established parts of a metropolitan area is generally too sparse to estimate changes in land values over time for specific localities. Reflecting this limitation, [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#) estimated an aggregate land price index for each of 23 metropolitan areas, but did not attempt to calculate indexes for different parts of each metro area. An alternative approach (see, for example, [Davis and Palumbo, 2008](#)) measures land value indirectly as the difference between the value of a representative house and an estimate of the depreciated reconstruction cost of the structure on the lot. This method can be implemented with less data than the transaction-based approach. But calculating land value as a residual means that the estimates inherit the measurement errors elsewhere in the accounting framework.

Our method takes advantage of the strengths of each approach, while circumventing their weaknesses. Specifically, we use market prices to estimate land value for individual homes at a given time and then compute internally consistent measures of home value and structure value. This provides a market-based stake in the ground for a specific time period. We then create property-level time series for home value, land value, and structure value that incorporate the stake in the ground and that reflect the changes over time in indices of house prices and construction costs for the property’s zip group.

Importantly, this method does not require any estimate of depreciation for housing structures – a significant benefit given that the depreciation rate of housing structures is never directly observed, it must be either assumed or inferred. [Davis and Heathcote \(2005\)](#), for example, use estimates of depreciation published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis, which

are based on the assumption of a fixed life-span of a housing structure; [Davis and Palumbo \(2008\)](#) simply assume a depreciation rate of 1.5% per year. [Diewert, de Haan, and Hendriks \(2015\)](#) and others use hedonic methods to estimate depreciation rates, and in doing so assume differences in the value of houses of different vintages built near each other reflect depreciation, after controlling for other attributes. As [Clapp and Salavei \(2010\)](#) and [Munneke and Womack \(2017\)](#) discuss, standard hedonic methods can confuse depreciation with the option value attached to the underlying land. That is, by failing to account for option value, hedonic regressions can overstate the depreciated value of structures as a result of omitted variable bias. Option value arises, in large part, from the obsolescence of an existing structure, which becomes ever more costly to remediate as the structure ages. In the extreme case of an imminent teardown, the value of the house would consist solely of the option value of the land; the economic value of the structure would be zero.¹¹ We avoid the need to separate option value from depreciated structure value by using only newly-built homes to estimate land prices.

3.1 Land, Home and Structure Value in a Single Reference Period

3.1.1 Land Value for Newly Built Homes

We take advantage of two key pieces of property-level information: The sales price for a house when it was first built and the estimated cost of rebuilding the structure as new. Let $h_{i,z,r}^n$ denote the sale price of new home i located in zip group z and built in period r , and let $s_{i,z,T}^n$ denote the reconstruction cost for the structure if built new in period T . We distinguish between the date of the estimate of the replacement cost of the structure, T , and the date the new home was built and sold, r , because the estimated reconstruction cost provided to us from Marshall & Swift is as of 2013:Q3 or 2014:Q2 for all properties, whereas the sale prices are almost entirely from periods before 2013.

We first move the estimated reconstruction cost of specific home i in zip group z back to the period of the initial home sale using the Marshall & Swift index of construction costs. Denote this index value for any arbitrary period t as $p_{z,t}^c$. We compute the reconstruction cost back to period r , the date of the initial home sale, as

$$s_{i,z,r}^n = s_{i,z,T}^n \cdot \left(\frac{p_{z,r}^c}{p_{z,T}^c} \right) \quad (1)$$

In words, the reconstruction cost in period r (the year the structure was built) is assumed to

¹¹[Bokhari and Geltner \(2016\)](#) make a similar point for commercial properties, showing that the value of these properties when they reach 100 years of age is essentially just the option value to redevelop the site.

equal the reconstruction cost in period T times the ratio of the construction cost index in r to the index value in T . Given this estimate, and the (standard) assumption that the value of housing is equal to the sum of the reconstruction cost of the structure and the market value of the land, we can compute the value of land when the home was first built, $l_{i,z,r}^n$, as the residual

$$l_{i,z,r}^n = h_{i,z,r}^n - s_{i,z,r}^n \quad (2)$$

For this method to work, the estimated reconstruction cost in period T must reflect the same structure as when the house was built. Homes that have had a major renovation or expansion fail this requirement and thus cannot be used in equation (2). Because our dataset does not provide the history of improvements for a property, we assume that homes built in 2000 or after have not had major structural changes by 2013. Thus, the earliest period for which we use equation 2 is 2000:Q1.

Two other considerations define the sales used in equation (2). First, we employ only arms-length sales of non-distressed property to help ensure that the implied land values will be applicable to the full population of properties. And second, we include sales that occur not only in the year the home was built, but also in the year after, as some new homes may sit on the market for a while before being sold.

An implicit assumption behind equation (2) is that reconstruction cost serves as a good proxy for the unobserved market value of the new housing structure. We believe this is a reasonable assumption. The equality of reconstruction cost and structure value is a basic equilibrium condition in a housing market with ongoing construction activity by profit-maximizing builders (see [Rosenthal \(1999\)](#) and [Schulz and Werwatz \(2011\)](#), for example). Although this condition will not hold exactly at all times, builders have an incentive to adjust the level of construction activity to close gaps that open up. The limited available evidence ([Rosenthal, 1999](#)) suggests that the adjustment occurs fairly rapidly, which bounds the measurement error from using reconstruction cost as a proxy for the market value of a new structure.

The transactions in our dataset include some sales of vacant land in addition to sales of finished homes, but the two types of sales are not identified explicitly.¹² It is important to distinguish new home sales from land sales because equation (2) is only applicable to the former; for land transactions, the sale price itself measures the property's land value. We classify the sales in our dataset as follows. Let $\hat{l}_{i,z,r}^n$ denote the estimate of land value from

¹²The presumed land sales are a mix of previously undeveloped land and land with existing houses that had been torn down. We cannot distinguish the two types of land sales but believe that teardowns represent a small minority of the sales. For an empirical analysis of teardowns, see [Dye and McMillen \(2007\)](#).

blindly applying equation (2) without knowledge of whether the sale involves a finished home or land. If $\widehat{l}_{i,z,r}^n$ is positive and greater than 10 percent of the sale price $h_{i,z,r}^n$, we assume this is a new home sale and use equation (2) to value the land. Conversely, if $\widehat{l}_{i,z,r}^n$ is negative and greater than 10 percent of the sale price in absolute value, we assume the reported sale is a land sale (since the sale price is significantly below the cost of the structure that ultimately appears on the site); in such cases, we set the land value equal to the observed sale price. Finally, when $\widehat{l}_{i,z,r}^n$ is within 10 percent of the sale price in absolute value, we do not classify the transaction as either a land or new home sale and set it aside.¹³ After applying this procedure, about 11 percent of the properties in the full dataset have an estimated land value.

The number of parcels for which we have an estimate of $l_{i,z,r}^n$ differs widely by zip group. Not surprisingly, there are many observations in outlying areas where the housing stock is relatively new and far fewer observations in closer-in areas that were almost completely developed before 2000. As shown in the “# Sales-based land values” column of appendix table A.1, six of the ten zip groups in Washington, DC have fewer than 25 estimates of land value over the entire 2000-2013 period, while most zip groups in Prince William County have more than 1,000. Although more observations clearly would be preferred to fewer, even a small number of land values – if reasonably representative – can provide the required stake in the ground for our methodology.¹⁴

3.1.2 Land Value for All Homes

The next step is to use the market-based land values for new homes in zip group z to impute land values for all homes in that zip group. One approach would be to regress the market-based land values on lot size, time, and possibly other variables, using the regression coefficients to compute fitted land values for other houses in the zip group. The difficulty, however, is that some zip groups have too few observations to produce reliable coefficients

¹³We also exclude duplicate sales for a given property and sales with apparent data errors. Specifically, we drop transactions classified as land sales that occur in the year after the house was built (which is logically impossible), transactions for which the sale price is more than five times greater than the property’s AVM or less than 10 percent of the AVM, and properties with multiple transactions when the highest imputed land value is more than five times greater than the lowest imputed value (true changes of that magnitude are highly unlikely given that they would have had to occur within a window that included, at most, the year in which the house was built and the following year). In addition, we exclude properties with multiple sales records on a single date when the lowest and highest sale prices differ by more than \$5,000; when the prices differed by less than \$5,000, we use the first sales record.

¹⁴For the zip groups with the fewest new-home or land sales, there is some spatial bunching among these sales, which raises the possibility that the implied land value may not be representative for the zip group as a whole. As discussed below, we address this issue with a robustness test that omits zip groups with relatively few new-home or land sales.

from such a regression.

In light of this issue, we use an alternative approach. To begin, we designate a “reference quarter,” denoted using the time subscript R , for each zip group. The reference quarter is the period in which we place the stake in the ground. If the initial year in our analysis, 2000, contains at least ten market-based land values for a given zip group, we define the reference quarter to be the median quarter (in 2000) of the included sales. Most zip groups have more than the minimum of ten sales in 2000, often many times more. For other zip groups, we add years one at a time until we have at least ten market-based land values or until we reach 2006, whichever comes first. The reference quarter in this case is the median quarter of the included land values across the included years.¹⁵

For each zip group, we then calculate the median land value per square foot and median lot size for the same sale properties used to define the reference quarter.¹⁶ These two variables are the key inputs for estimating land value for all properties in the reference quarter. We use medians to reduce the influence of outliers, and we separate total land value into the value per square foot and lot size in order to account for the established finding that land value per square foot declines with lot size.¹⁷

Our procedure is as follows. Let $\bar{\ell}_{z,R}^n$ denote the median land price per square foot of the newly-built sale properties used to determine the reference quarter R for zip group z , and let $\bar{q}_{z,R}^n$ denote the median lot size of those properties. In addition, for the full set of properties in zip group z , let $q_{j,z}$ denote the lot size of the j th property in zip group z (no time subscript is needed because lot size for any individual property is constant). We estimate an “adjustment function” f , described below, to take account of the effect on land price per square foot that arises because the median lot size for the newly-built sale properties differs from the lot size for any individual property j in the zip group. With this notation, the

¹⁵We set 2006 as the final year to ensure that every zip group has a reference quarter as close to the beginning of the sample period as possible. For all but a handful of zip groups, the final year used to determine the reference quarter is 2004 or earlier, so the 2006 cutoff seldom comes into play.

¹⁶In 38 of the zip groups, we calculate the reference quarter, the median land value per square foot, and the median lot size based solely on the presumed home sales, omitting the presumed land sales. We do this because the land values from these latter sales tend to be substantially higher than the land values from the presumed home sales. In all likelihood, these presumed land sales are actually home sales that we misclassified when using the allocation rule described above. The column in appendix table A.1 labeled “Type of sales used” indicates the zip groups for which we use only the presumed home sales.

¹⁷This is the so-called plattage effect that has been documented in many previous empirical studies of land prices. In our dataset, larger residential lots sell for less per square foot than otherwise identical smaller lots subject to the same zoning because the extra square footage cannot be used to build an additional house. Discussions of the lack of proportionality between square footage and lot value date back as far as [Babcock \(1932\)](#), [Bernard \(1913\)](#), [Hurd \(1903\)](#) and [Mertzke \(1927\)](#). See [Thorsnes and McMillen \(1998\)](#) and [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#) for two examples of studies that have found a concave relationship between lot size and lot value.

estimated land value for property j in zip group z in reference period R is

$$l_{j,z,R} \equiv [\bar{\ell}_{z,R}^n \cdot f(q_{j,z}, \bar{q}_{z,R}^n)] q_{j,z} \quad (3)$$

where the term in brackets is the estimated land value per square foot after adjusting for the lot-size effect.

To calculate f , we pool the sale properties across all the zip groups within a given jurisdiction and regress the natural log of the land price per square foot for each property on a set of zip group dummy variables, a third-order polynomial in time, and the natural log of lot size. The dummy variables control for differences in the average level of land prices across zip groups, while the polynomial in time controls for the cycle in land prices. We estimate the regression separately for each jurisdiction to allow for differences in the size of the plattage effect, as reflected in the estimated coefficient on the natural log of lot size. This coefficient, denoted by α , determines the adjustment factor for each property:

$$f(q_{j,z}, \bar{q}_{z,R}^n) = \exp[\alpha \ln(q_{j,z}) - \alpha \ln(\bar{q}_{z,R}^n)] = \left(\frac{q_{j,z}}{\bar{q}_{z,R}^n}\right)^\alpha \quad (4)$$

where the middle expression is exponentiated to convert the fitted land price per square foot from natural logs to levels.

The upper panel of figure 2 plots the estimated adjustment factor for Montgomery County for lots ranging in size from 5,000 square feet to 45,000 square feet (roughly one acre), relative to a baseline quarter-acre lot (10,890 square feet).¹⁸ As shown, large lots have a much lower price per square foot than small lots, consistent with the findings in the literature. For example, the price per square foot for a half-acre lot (21,780 square feet) is less than 60 percent of that for the baseline quarter-acre lot. The lower panel shows the implied variation in total lot value (lot size times land price per square foot) as lot size varies. The estimated premium for additional square footage in Montgomery County is modest – only about 10 percent for a half-acre lot relative to an otherwise identical quarter-acre lot. This small

¹⁸The estimated value of α for Montgomery County is -0.86, close to the center of the range of -0.73 to -0.96 for the eight jurisdictions. To check for possible time variation in the plattage effect, we re-estimated α over two separate periods, the 2000-06 boom and the 2007-13 bust and recovery. For the five largest jurisdictions (Fairfax, Loudoun, Montgomery, Prince George's, and Prince William Counties), α is quite stable across the two periods; the largest change, in Montgomery County, is from -0.87 in the first period to -0.80 in the second. For the three smaller jurisdictions (Arlington County, City of Alexandria, and Washington, DC), the changes in α are larger, but these changes are not statistically significant. All in all, the subperiod regressions support our assumption of time-invariant plattage effects. At the suggestion of one of the referees, we also checked whether the estimates of α are sensitive to controlling for the time pattern of land prices with annual dummies rather than the third-order polynomial in time. This change had very little effect on the estimates of α .

premium reflects the fact that the extra land cannot be used to build another house.

3.1.3 Home and Structure Value for All Homes

Given the property-level estimate of land value in the reference quarter from equation (3), we complete the picture for each property by estimating its total market value (land plus structure) and the structure value alone in the reference quarter. Recall that the dataset includes an AVM estimate for any home j 's market value in a specific quarter in either 2013 or 2014. Denote this estimate as $h_{j,z,T}$. We move that estimate back to the reference quarter with the FNC house price index for the home's zip group. That is, denoting the FNC house price index for the home's zip group z for any period t as $p_{z,t}^h$, we compute the estimated market value of any home j in reference period R as

$$h_{j,z,R} = h_{j,z,T} \cdot \left(\frac{p_{z,R}^h}{p_{z,T}^h} \right) \quad (5)$$

Given this estimate of the market value of home j in reference period R , and given the estimate of the value of the land for home j in the reference period, we can estimate the structure value for each home in the reference period as

$$s_{j,z,R} = h_{j,z,R} - l_{j,z,R} \quad (6)$$

3.2 Time Series of Land, Home, and Structure Values

The property-level estimates of total home value, land value, and structure value in the reference period R provide the stake in the ground from which we can compute property-level time series from 2000:Q1 to 2013:Q4.

We create an estimate of total home value for home j in zip z in each period t from 2000:Q1 through 2013:Q4 as the home value in the reference period times the ratio of the home price index in period t to the home price index in reference period R , i.e.

$$h_{j,z,t} = h_{j,z,R} \cdot \left(\frac{p_{z,t}^h}{p_{z,R}^h} \right) \quad (7)$$

Similarly, we create an estimate of structure value of home j in zip group z for each period t from 2000:Q1 through 2013:Q4 as

$$s_{j,z,t} = s_{j,z,R} \cdot \left(\frac{p_{z,t}^c}{p_{z,R}^c} \right) \quad (8)$$

where, as mentioned, p^c is the Marshall & Swift construction cost index for zip group z .¹⁹ We then compute the value of land in each period as the residual:

$$l_{j,z,t} = h_{j,z,t} - s_{j,z,t} \tag{9}$$

These property-level time series are the building blocks for the analysis that follows. We aggregate across the properties in a zip group to obtain time series for average home, land, and structure values, along with the average land share of home value. Obviously, our property-level estimates are subject to measurement errors: for example, not every house in the same zip group will appreciate at the same rate. Those errors, however, will not bias the zip-group aggregates as long as the property-level errors reflect classical measurement error.²⁰

As a check, we examine the implied land shares for the zip groups. For the large majority of zip groups, the land shares present no obvious issues. However, in some zip groups, the estimated land share in 2000:Q1 is close to zero or even negative, before rising over time, while in other zip groups, the land share exceeded 90 percent in some periods. Anomalous values such as these could arise if the sale properties – from which the market-based land values are determined – are not representative of the full set of properties in the zip group. This could occur, for example, if the homes built since 2000 are located in parts of the zip group for which land prices are generally higher (or lower) than average.

For these groups, we adjust the starting value for the land shares in 2000:Q1. Specifically, any shares below five percent are adjusted to be exactly five percent, while those greater than 60 percent are lowered to that value.²¹ These adjustments nudge the 2000:Q1 land shares toward reasonable values. For each property in an affected zip group, we multiply the

¹⁹Since we do not make any adjustments for improvements or depreciation when we apply the construction cost indexes in equation (8), our analysis embeds the assumption that the quality and quantity of the structure remains constant over our sample period.

²⁰Of course, any measurement error that is correlated across the properties in a zip group can cause the zip-group aggregates to be biased. In this regard, correlated measurement error could affect our estimates of land prices after the housing crash in areas where the market value of existing structures fell below replacement cost. In that situation, construction of new homes would cease but could not drop below zero, as would be needed to quickly bring the market value of structures back up to replacement cost. Because we rely on that equality to create the time series of structure and land values (see equations (8) and (9)), it is possible that some of what we measure as the post-crash decline in land prices actually was a drop in structure value below replacement cost. However, any such bias does not appear to be large overall, judging by the results in [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#) for the Washington, DC area based on land transactions. They found that land prices in the Washington area fell about 40 percent between 2006 and 2009, similar to what we estimate over the same period when we aggregate across the zip groups.

²¹Note that [Davis and Palumbo \(2008\)](#) make similar adjustments in their data set. There were also two zip groups with no estimated land share because of an absence of new home sales through 2006. For these zip groups, we estimate the 2000:Q1 land share as the fitted value from a regression – estimated with data for all the other zip groups – of the 2000:Q1 land share on a constant and the 2000:Q1 average AVM value.

adjusted 2000:Q1 land share by the original estimate of home value in 2000:Q1 to produce an adjusted estimates of land value and structure value (as home value less land value).²² With this revised stake in the ground for 2000:Q1, we re-create the time series for each property using equations (7), (8) and (9).

4 Cross-Sectional Patterns

This section presents a snapshot of the variation across the zip groups for house prices, land values, and other property characteristics. We use a series of heat maps that divide the zip groups into quintiles, using data for 2013:Q4, the latest period in our dataset. In each map, the darkest shade represents the quintile with the highest values for each variable and the lightest shade represents the lowest quintile.

Figure 3 shows the pattern of house prices in 2013:Q4 across the zip groups, where the house price for each zip group is the average AVM for the homes in that group. As shown, house prices are the highest in Alexandria, Arlington County, Fairfax County, the southwestern part of Montgomery County (Bethesda, Chevy Chase, and Potomac), and the part of Washington, DC that borders Arlington and Montgomery Counties. These areas include the most sought-after addresses in the Washington area. House prices are lower in outlying areas and in locales with relatively low income and generally high proportions of Black and Hispanic residents (Prince George’s County and the adjoining parts of Montgomery County and Washington, DC). The spread of average AVM values across the zip groups is wide, ranging from less than \$315,000 for every zip group in the lowest quintile to as much as \$1.7 million in the highest quintile.

Figure 4 presents the parallel distribution of average lot values, calculated as described in section 3. As can be seen by comparing figures 3 and 4, the geographic pattern for lot values is quite close to that for home prices. Moreover, the range of average lot values across zip groups is extremely wide, from as little as \$24,000 to more than \$1.2 million. Clearly, house prices are high in some places and lower in others largely because of differences in the

²²Appendix table A.1 identifies the 41 zip groups (of 141 in total) for which these adjustments were made. The time-series results presented in section 5 are essentially the same whether we include or exclude the 41 zip groups from the analysis. This can be seen by comparing figures 10-13 to appendix figures A.4-A.7. Additional robustness tests, available from the authors, show that the results are also little affected when we limit the analysis (1) to the zip groups with a reference period in 2000 or 2001 (thus omitting zip groups with relatively few home or land sales), (2) to the zip groups in which both the presumed home sales and presumed land sales were used to calculate land values (thus eliminating a judgmental component of the baseline results) or (3) to the zip groups for which the share of homes built during or after 2000 was at or above the median share for the full dataset (thus removing zip groups where the level of construction activity may have been too low to enforce the equality between the market value of a structure and its construction cost).

value of the underlying land.

As indicated in figure 5, lots tend to be relatively small in close-in areas and larger further out. None of the zip groups in Washington, DC proper has an average lot size greater than 9,000 square feet, while zip groups in the exurbs have lots that average as much as nearly four acres. This pattern is consistent with the canonical urban model of Muth (1969) and Mills (1972) which predicts that households respond to the higher price of land closer to the city center by economizing on land use.²³

Given the wide differences in average lot size across the zip groups, measured land prices per square foot will be influenced by the plattage effect described in section 3. That is, large lots will have a lower value per square foot, all else equal, simply because much of the square footage is above and beyond that needed to build a house at that location. To control for this effect, we calculated the average land price per square foot for a quarter-acre lot in each zip group, using the adjustment function in the top panel of figure 2 for Montgomery County and parallel adjustment functions for other jurisdictions. This standardized land price does a better job than the raw price per square foot of capturing the amenity value of land in various locations.

As shown in figure 6, the spatial pattern for the quarter-acre land price is very similar to that for house prices from figure 3. This high correlation confirms that differences in location-specific amenity value are an important driver of the variation in house prices across zip groups.

Finally, figure 7 portrays the average land share of property value across the zip groups in 2013:Q4. Comparing figures 6 and 7 shows that the land share tends to be high in the zip groups with high land prices and vice versa. Notably, nearly all the zip groups in Arlington County, Alexandria, the affluent part of Washington, DC and the close-in parts of Fairfax and Montgomery Counties have land shares in the highest quintile or the next quintile. In contrast, most of the zip groups in Prince George's county are in the lowest or second-lowest quintile. This difference in land shares will play a central role in the analysis of the housing cycle in the next section.²⁴

²³Technically, the prediction of the model relates to the size of the housing structure relative to the lot, rather than to lot size per se (see McMillen (2006)). The heat map for the land-to-structure ratio (not shown) displays qualitatively the same pattern as figure 5.

²⁴Despite this general pattern, some zip groups have land shares that differ considerably from those in neighboring zip groups. More often than not, these zip groups are ones for which we adjusted the land shares from the raw values produced by the estimation procedure. These zip groups include 20720 and 20721 in Prince George's County, the combination of 22134 and 22172 in Prince William County, and 20120 in Fairfax and Loudoun Counties, all of which have land shares (even after adjustment) above those in adjacent zips. The land shares for these zip groups likely are less reliable than for those for other zip groups.

5 The Price Cycle Since 2000

5.1 House Prices

We use the zip-level hedonic price indexes produced by FNC to examine the appreciation in house prices from 2000 and 2006 and the subsequent decline from 2006 to 2012. The heat maps in figures 8 and 9 portray the respective periods.

Both figures show substantial variation across the zip groups, consistent with the heterogeneity found in other recent studies of house prices using data at a fine level of geography as in Ferreira and Gyourko (2011), Guerrieri, Hartley, and Hurst (2013), McMillen (2016) and Mian and Sufi (2009). From 2000 to 2006, prices in the lowest quintile of zip groups rose 89 to 127 percent, compared with a range that tops 200 percent in the highest quintile. Then, from 2006 to 2012, prices in the quintile with the largest declines fell 40 to 51 percent, while prices dropped less than 10 percent in the quintile with the smallest declines. Eight zip groups in this latter quintile actually saw prices rise on net over 2006-12. Moreover, one of those zips (20815, in Montgomery County) is located less than five miles from another zip in the same county (20902) where prices dropped 34 percent. Clearly, the Washington, DC area cannot be characterized as a single, homogeneous housing market.

Interestingly, the house price declines shown in figure 9 have a pronounced geographic pattern. Prices fell the least in affluent, close-in areas while the steepest declines were concentrated in the outlying areas and in Prince George’s County. That is, the exurbs and places with large Black and Hispanic populations were hit the hardest during the bust.

These two seemingly distinct areas share an important characteristic: they both have relatively low land prices (as we saw in figure 6). Thus, the places in the metropolitan area with cheap land experienced the most severe house-price crash.²⁵ This pattern suggests that land could play a key role in house-price dynamics, a connection we explore in the rest of this section.

5.2 Land Prices, House Prices and Construction Costs

We begin by examining the movement in land prices over our full sample period. To focus on the connection between the level of land prices and the magnitude of the price cycle, we

²⁵Figure 6 displays land prices in 2013:Q4, the latest period in our dataset. The use of 2013:Q4 could raise concerns that the magnitude of the post-2006 house price decline mechanically influenced the zip-group distribution of land prices shown in figure 6, making the correlation uninteresting. However, as we will show, the same correlation emerges between the level of land prices in 2000:Q1 (the initial period in the dataset) and the post-2006 house price decline. Hence, the connection between the level of land prices and the severity of the house price decline is not an artifact of using land prices as of 2013:Q4.

aggregate the 141 zip groups into quintiles based on the quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1.

Figure 10 presents the resulting time series for land prices. The figure demonstrates that the amplitude of the price cycle was systematically related to the initial level of land prices. The price swing – both the rise and then the decline – was the greatest for the zip groups where land was initially the cheapest. As one moves from the lowest quintile of land prices to each higher quintile, the price cycle becomes progressively milder.²⁶

To provide perspective on the size of the swing in land prices, figures 11 and 12 compare the percent changes in land prices, house prices, and construction costs for the zip groups aggregated into the same land-price quintiles as in figure 10. Figure 11 presents the comparison for the boom phase of the cycle (2000-06), while figure 12 covers the bust (2006-12). In both figures, house prices are measured by the FNC zip-level indices, while the construction cost indices are those produced by Marshall & Swift.

Three important results are immediately evident from figure 11. First, during the boom phase of the cycle, land prices rose much more than house prices in every quintile, while construction costs increased only modestly. Hence, the rise in house prices over 2000-06 largely reflected the appreciation in land value. Second, house prices increased by similar amounts in each of the quintiles. This implies that monitoring the rise in house prices in each of the land-price quintiles would have provided little information about the magnitude of the post-2006 price drop, which we know from figure 10 was especially large in the quintiles with low land prices. Third, unlike the nearly uniform rise in house prices, the increase in land prices was exceptionally large in the lowest land-price quintile, at more than 700 percent, and then moderated from quintile to quintile (though it remained large even in the highest quintile). Consequently, land prices may contain information about potential overvaluation beyond that in house prices themselves.

Turning to figure 12, what we observe after the 2006 peak mirrors in some respects what happened during the run-up through 2006. Land prices fell more than house prices in every quintile, with staggering losses in the lowest price quintile, where land prices plunged 75 percent. Because construction costs continued to rise over 2006-12, the drop in land prices more than accounted for the decline in house prices, emphasizing the central role of land in house-price swings. One difference, however, from figure 11 is that the magnitude of the house-price drop varies across the quintiles, and markedly so. Whereas house prices retreated only 10 percent on net in the zip groups in the highest land-price quintile, they fell more

²⁶This result is the land-price counterpart to the pattern shown for house prices in the Case-Shiller indexes for separate price tiers, available at <http://us.spindices.com/index-family/real-estate/sp-case-shiller>. For each of the 20 included metropolitan areas, the magnitude of the post-2000 house price increase and the subsequent decline was greater for low-price homes than for high-price homes. Guerrieri, Hartley, and Hurst (2013) document the same pattern over 2000-06 for a broader set of metropolitan areas.

than 35 percent in the lowest quintile.

5.3 Land Share of Property Value

Another key difference across the quintiles relates to the land share of property value. Figure 13 plots the time series of the average land share in each land-price quintile. Figure 13 shows that the land share is low in the locations where land is cheap and high where land is expensive. For example, in 2000, the land share ranged from about 20 percent in the lowest land-price quintile to more than 55 percent in the highest quintile. At the end of the sample period in 2013, the gap was even a bit wider.

The difference in land shares across the quintiles explains arithmetically why land prices rose so much more than house prices over 2000-06 in the lowest quintiles. With land representing a small share of house value, the accounting relationship that connects house prices to land and structure prices could only hold if land prices had risen much more than house prices. In the quintiles with higher land shares, the same accounting relationship would hold with a smaller rise in land prices relative to house prices.

Our results concerning land shares have important implications for the land-leverage hypothesis of [Bostic, Longhofer, and Redfearn \(2007\)](#). This hypothesis states that house prices will be more volatile, all else equal, in places where land represents a relatively large share of property value.²⁷ [Bostic, Longhofer, and Redfearn \(2007\)](#) found that the hypothesis was supported in their detailed study of house prices in Wichita, Kansas. A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the hypothesis to be valid is that land prices have wider swings than structures prices (so that land prices are more volatile than house prices). The findings from numerous previous studies have satisfied this condition.²⁸ Our results for the Washington, DC area do as well, as we found that land prices rose more and then fell more than house prices in every land-price quintile.

Nonetheless, our results do not support the central prediction of the hypothesis. That is, we do not find that house-price volatility is the greatest in the zip groups with the highest

²⁷The fundamental equation of the land-leverage hypothesis – that house price growth is a weighted average of growth in land prices and construction costs – is an accounting identity, as emphasized by [Davis and Heathcote \(2007\)](#). The “hypothesis” is that the size of demand shocks to land is roughly constant everywhere inside a metropolitan area. If that were true, then house prices would be more volatile in places where land’s share of housing is high.

²⁸See [Davis and Heathcote \(2007\)](#), [Davis and Palumbo \(2008\)](#), [Haughwout, Orr, and Bedoll \(2008\)](#), [Nichols, Oliner, and Mulhall \(2013\)](#) and [Sirmans and Slade \(2012\)](#) for supporting evidence in U.S. metropolitan areas. For international evidence, see [Bourassa, Haurin, Haurin, Hoesli, and Sun \(2009\)](#), [Bourassa, Hoesli, Scognamiglio, and Zhang \(2011\)](#), [Schulz and Werwatz \(2011\)](#) and [Wu, Gyourko, and Deng \(2012\)](#). The difference in price volatility arises because the supply of structures is much more elastic than the supply of land; see [Gyourko and Saiz \(2006\)](#), [Gyourko \(2009\)](#) and [Saiz \(2010\)](#).

land shares. Rather, we see the opposite pattern, as shown in table 3. The zip-group quintile with the lowest land prices and the lowest land shares experienced the most severe drop in house prices after 2006. Conversely, the quintile with the highest land share had the mildest post-2006 decline in house prices. During the 2000-06 boom, there were only small differences in house price appreciation across the quintiles, but the slight differences go against the land-leverage hypothesis, with house prices rising the least in the quintile with the highest land share in 2000.

Our results do not support the land-leverage hypothesis because land prices were so much more volatile in the zip groups with low land shares than in the zip groups with high shares.²⁹

5.4 Predictive Power of Changes in Land Share

Reflecting these differential movements in land prices, the land share has been more volatile since 2000 in the zip groups with initially cheap land than in the zip groups with more expensive land (recall figure 13). An important question is whether the amount by which the land share rose during the boom helps predict the magnitude of the house price decline during the bust. If so, real-time monitoring of land prices and land shares would be useful for market participants and policymakers.

To address this question, we regressed the percent change in the house price index from 2006 to 2012 on the percent change in the index from 2000 to 2006 by itself, then on the change in the land share from 2000 to its peak annual value through 2006 by itself, and finally on both variables together.³⁰ Table 4 reports the results of these cross-section regressions for the 141 zip groups, estimated first without zip-group weights (columns 1 through 3) and then with weights that reflect the number of properties in each zip group (columns 4 through 6). Robust standard errors clustered at the jurisdiction level are in parentheses.

As shown, a large rise in house prices during 2000-06 (column 1) or a large rise in the land share (column 2) each predicted a steeper house price decline during 2006-12. Both effects are statistically significant on their own, and they remain so when they enter the regression together (column 3). Weighting slightly increases the size of all the estimated effects.

The key takeaway is that the rise in the land share contained predictive information for

²⁹Although we have documented the difference in land price volatility across zip groups, explaining why this difference arose is beyond the scope of this paper. One possibility is that it reflects the easing of lending standards during the housing boom and the subsequent tightening of credit. If the borrowers that took advantage of the easier credit were primarily located in the exurbs and other areas with low land shares, that could help account for the large jump in land prices in those areas and the crash that followed. We intend to examine this hypothesis in future research.

³⁰To measure the rise in the land share, we use the peak value through 2006 because the land share peaked in 2005 rather than 2006 for some zip groups.

house prices beyond that in the history of house prices themselves. The weighted results in column 6 show that each additional 10 percentage point rise in the land share was associated with an 8.1 percentage point drop in house prices after the peak – a very substantial effect.

To interpret this result, note that a rise in the land share indicates that the gap between house prices and construction costs has widened. Large increases in this gap proved to be unsustainable over the recent housing cycle.

6 Conclusions

We have provided a detailed picture of the recent boom-bust cycle in house prices and land prices for the Washington, DC metropolitan area, using an unprecedented dataset that covers close to the universe of detached single-family homes in the area under study. To our knowledge, no previous research has estimated residential land values at the property level on such a large scale. In addition, the results are based on a new methodology for measuring land prices that avoids the challenging task of estimating depreciation for housing structures.

The paper yields important new facts about the recent housing cycle in the Washington area. First, the swing in house prices and land prices varied widely across locations. The cycle was mildest in the affluent, close-in parts of the metro area. It was considerably greater in the more distant suburbs and in areas with a large Black or Hispanic population – places where land is relatively cheap. Second, land prices were more volatile than house prices everywhere, but especially so in the areas with initially inexpensive land. This held true even for different locations in relatively close proximity. Third, changes in the land share of property value were a useful predictor of subsequent change in house prices: the areas with the largest increases in the land share tended to suffer the sharpest drop in house prices during the bust. The predictive power of this single variable is especially notable because it works across a large, diverse metropolitan area subject to a variety of shocks. These results highlight the value of focusing on land for assessing house-price risk and suggest that market participants and policymakers should be particularly attentive to situations that involve a rapid appreciation of land prices from initially low levels.

Our results cut against the land-leverage hypothesis, which holds that house prices will be more volatile in areas where land represents a large share of property value. Previous research has supported the hypothesis when assessed across cities, but our study is the first to examine it within a large, diverse metropolitan area. We find the opposite of what the hypothesis predicts. House prices were most volatile in the parts of the metropolitan area with low land shares because the land price swing in those areas was much wider than elsewhere.

References

- AHLFELDT, G. M., AND D. P. McMILLEN (2014): “Land Values in Chicago, 1913-2010: A City’s Spatial History Revealed,” *Land Lines, Lincoln Institute for Land Policy*, April, 15–21. [1](#)
- ALBOUY, D., AND G. EHRlich (2013a): “The Distribution of Urban Land Values: Evidence from Market Transactions,” University of Illinois Working Paper. [7](#)
- (2013b): “Metropolitan Land Values and Housing Productivity,” University of Illinois Working Paper. [7](#)
- BABCOCK, F. M. (1932): *The Valuation of Real Estate*. McGraw-Hill. [7](#), [11](#)
- BERNARD, A. D. (1913): *Some Principles and Problems of Real Estate Valuation*. United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company. [11](#)
- BOKHARI, S., AND D. GELTNER (2016): “Commercial Buildings Capital Consumption and the United States National Accounts,” Unpublished Working Paper. [8](#)
- BOSTIC, R. W., S. D. LONGHOFFER, AND C. L. REDFEARN (2007): “Land Leverage: Decomposing Home Price Dynamics,” *Real Estate Economics*, 35(2), 183–208. [3](#), [19](#)
- BOURASSA, S. C., D. R. HAURIN, J. L. HAURIN, M. HOESLI, AND J. SUN (2009): “House Price Changes and Idiosyncratic Risk: The Impact of Property Characteristics,” *Real Estate Economics*, 37(2), 259–278. [19](#)
- BOURASSA, S. C., M. HOESLI, D. SCOGNAMIGLIO, AND S. ZHANG (2011): “Land Leverage and House Prices,” *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 41(2), 134–144. [19](#)
- CLAPP, J. M., AND K. SALAVEI (2010): “Hedonic Pricing with Redevelopment Options: A New Approach to Estimating Depreciation Effects,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 67(3), 362–377. [8](#)
- DAVIS, M. A., AND J. HEATHCOTE (2005): “Housing and the Business Cycle,” *International Economic Review*, 46(3), 751–784. [1](#), [7](#)
- (2007): “The Price and Quantity of Residential Land in the United States,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(8), 2595–2620. [1](#), [19](#)
- DAVIS, M. A., AND M. G. PALUMBO (2008): “The Price of Residential Land in Large U.S. Cities,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63(1), 352–384. [1](#), [2](#), [7](#), [8](#), [14](#), [19](#)
- DIEWERT, W. E., J. DE HAAN, AND R. HENDRIKS (2015): “Hedonic Regressions and the Decomposition of a House Price Index into Land and Structure Components,” *Econometric Reviews*, 34(1-2), 106–126. [8](#)

- DORSEY, R. E., H. HU, W. J. MAYER, AND H.-C. WANG (2010): “Hedonic Versus Repeat-Sales Housing Price Indexes for Measuring the Recent Boom-Bust Cycle,” *Journal of Housing Economics*, 19(2), 75–93. 4, 5
- DYE, R. F., AND D. P. McMILLEN (2007): “Teardowns and land values in the Chicago metropolitan area,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 61(1), 45–63. 9
- FAVILUKIS, J., S. C. LUDVIGSON, AND S. VAN NIEUWERBURGH (2015): “The Macroeconomic Effects of Housing Wealth, Housing Finance and Limited Risk-Sharing in General Equilibrium,” *Journal of Political Economy*, Forthcoming. 1
- FERREIRA, F., AND J. GYOURKO (2011): “Anatomy of the Beginning of the Housing Boom: U.S. Neighborhoods and Metropolitan Areas, 1993-2009,” NBER Working Paper 17374. 17
- GARRIGA, C., R. MANUELLI, AND A. PERALTA-ALVA (2012): “A Model of Price Swings in the Housing Market,” Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Working Paper 2012-022A. 1
- GUERRIERI, V., D. HARTLEY, AND E. HURST (2013): “Endogenous Gentrification and House Price Dynamics,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 100(C), 45–60. 17, 18
- GYOURKO, J. (2009): “Housing Supply,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 1(1), 295–318. 1, 19
- GYOURKO, J., AND A. SAIZ (2006): “Construction Costs and the Supply of Housing Structure,” *Journal of Regional Science*, 46(4), 661–680. 1, 19
- HAUGHWOUT, A. F., J. A. ORR, AND D. BEDOLL (2008): “The Price of Land in the New York Metropolitan Area,” Discussion Paper 14, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Current Issues in Economics and Finance. 1, 19
- HOYT, H. (1933): *One Hundred Years of Land Value in Chicago*. University of Chicago Press. 1
- HURD, R. M. (1903): *Principles of City Land Values*. Real Estate Record Association. 11
- KOK, N., P. MONKKONEN, AND J. M. QUIGLEY (2014): “Land Use Regulations and the Value of Land and Housing: An Intra-Metropolitan Analysis,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 81, 136–148. 1, 7
- McMILLEN, D. P. (1996): “One Hundred Fifty Years of Land Values in Chicago: A Nonparametric Approach,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 40(1), 100–124. 1
- (2006): “Testing for Monocentricity,” in *A Companion to Urban Economics*, ed. by R. J. Arnott, and D. P. McMillen. 16
- (2016): “Local Quantile House Price Indices,” Unpublished Working Paper. 17

- MERTZKE, A. J. (1927): “Real Estate Appraising,” National Association of Real Estate Boards. 11
- MIAN, A., AND A. SUFI (2009): “The Consequences of Mortgage Credit Expansion: Evidence from the U.S. Mortgage Default Crisis,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4), 1449–96. 17
- MILLS, E. S. (1972): *Studies in the Structure of the Urban Economy*. Johns Hopkins Press. 2, 16
- MUNNEKE, H. J., AND K. S. WOMACK (2017): “Valuing the Redevelopment Option Component of Urban Land Values,” *Real Estate Economics*, forthcoming. 8
- MUTH, R. F. (1969): *Cities and Housing: The Spatial Pattern of Urban Residential Land Use*. University of Chicago Press. 2, 16
- NICHOLS, J. B., S. D. OLINER, AND M. R. MULHALL (2013): “Swings in Commercial and Residential Land Prices in the United States,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 73(1), 57–76. 1, 7, 11, 14, 19
- ROSENTHAL, S. S. (1999): “Residential Buildings and the Cost of Construction: New Evidence on the Efficiency of the Housing Market,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81(2), 288–302. 9
- SAIZ, A. (2010): “The Geographic Determinants of Housing Supply,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(3), 1253–1296. 1, 19
- SCHULZ, R., AND A. WERWATZ (2011): “Is There an Equilibrating Relationship between House Prices and Replacement Cost? Empirical Evidence from Berlin,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 69(3), 288–302. 9, 19
- SIRMANS, C. F., AND B. A. SLADE (2012): “National Transaction-based Land Price Indices,” *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 45(4), 829–845. 19
- THORSNES, P., AND D. P. McMILLEN (1998): “Land Value and Parcel Size: A Semiparametric Analysis,” *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 17(3), 233–244. 11
- WU, J., J. GYOURKO, AND Y. DENG (2012): “Evaluating Conditions in Major Chinese Housing Markets,” *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 42(3), 531–543. 19

Table 1: Population and Demographic Characteristics in 2014

County/city	Population	Median household income	Percent bachelors degree	Percent Black or Hispanic
Arlington Co., VA	226,908	\$109,266	71.5	23.8
City of Alexandria, VA	150,575	\$86,809	62.8	37.3
Fairfax Co., VA	1,137,538	\$110,674	60.3	25.6
Loudoun Co., VA	363,050	\$122,294	58.7	20.4
Montgomery Co., MD	1,030,447	\$97,765	58.5	36.1
Prince George's Co., MD	904,430	\$72,290	31.0	78.9
Prince William Co., VA	446,094	\$92,104	39.2	41.3
Washington, DC	658,893	\$71,648	55.0	58.1
Memo: U.S. total	318,857,056	\$53,046	30.1	29.7

Note: The definition of Black or Hispanic is Hispanic or Latino of any race plus Black or African American alone and not Hispanic or Latino. Median household income is in 2013 dollars.

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, 2014 American Community Survey, Tables DP02 (percent with bachelors degree), DP03 (median household income), and DP05 (population and percent Black or Hispanic).

Table 2: Count of Detached Single-family Homes

County/city	Dataset	Census	Percent coverage
Arlington Co., VA	25,886	28,436	91.0
City of Alexandria, VA	8,001	10,673	75.0
Fairfax Co., VA	189,559	193,704	97.9
Loudoun Co., VA	51,649	61,903	83.4
Montgomery Co., MD	170,942	183,395	93.2
Prince George's Co., MD	161,293	167,121	96.5
Prince William Co., VA	81,391	78,439	103.8
Washington, DC	29,026	35,886	80.9
Total	717,747	759,557	94.5

Sources: Authors' calculations based on dataset created from data provided by the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift; U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey, one-year estimates, Table DP04.

Table 3: Land Shares and Changes in House Prices by Zip-Group Quintiles

Quintiles, quarter-acre land price, 2000:Q1	Land share (pct., annual average)			House-price change (pct.)	
	2000	2006	2012	2000-06	2006-12
Lowest	18.6	57.1	24.6	144.0	-36.5
Second	28.6	62.7	38.8	146.1	-33.0
Third	38.0	66.6	47.9	142.9	-29.1
Fourth	47.5	72.1	59.6	147.9	-23.2
Highest	56.5	74.6	68.7	124.0	-8.8

Sources: Authors' calculations based on dataset created from data provided by the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Table 4: Predictive Regressions for House Price Change from 2006 to 2012

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
constant	7.86 (8.08)	-0.53 (4.98)	20.51* (6.43)	11.74 (7.34)	1.52 (4.74)	24.33** (6.10)
$\% \Delta HPI_{00-06}$	-0.232** (0.053)		-0.170* (0.057)	-0.267** (0.042)		-0.193** (0.050)
$\Delta LSHR_{00-max}$		-0.873** (0.144)	-0.758** (0.162)		-0.971** (0.150)	-0.813** (0.163)
Weighted?	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adj. R^2	0.149	0.261	0.335	0.216	0.320	0.424

Note: These results are from cross-sectional OLS regressions estimated over the 141 zip groups. The dependent variable in each regression is the percent change in the FNC house price index from 2006 to 2012. The independent variables include the percent change in the FNC house price index from 2000 to 2006 (denoted $\% \Delta HPI_{00-06}$) and the percentage point change in the land share from 2000 to its peak annual value through 2006 (denoted $\Delta LSHR_{00-max}$). Robust standard errors clustered at the jurisdiction level are shown in parentheses. The weights in the weighted regressions reflect the number of properties in each zip group. * and ** indicate statistical significance at the 5 percent and 1 percent levels respectively.

Sources: Authors' calculations based on dataset created from data provided by the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure 1: Single-family Housing Starts and Real House Prices, 1975:1 - 2013:4




Note: Real house prices are measured as the FHFA all-transactions house price index divided by the price index for personal consumption expenditures.

Sources: Single-family housing starts, Census Bureau; real house prices, FHFA and Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Figure 2: Estimated Effect of Lot Size on Land Price per Square Foot and Lot Value in Montgomery County, MD




(a) Land Price per Square Foot



(b) Lot Value

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure 3: Average AVM, 2013:Q4



* Range of average AVM values by quintile (rounded to the nearest \$1000) is \$129,000 to \$315,000, \$315,000 to \$434,000, \$434,000 to \$563,000, \$563,000 to \$679,000, and \$679,000 to \$1,727,000.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic company FNC Inc.


Figure 4: Average Lot Value, 2013:Q4



* Range of average lot value by quintile (rounded to the nearest \$1000) is \$24,000 to \$135,000, \$135,000 to \$210,000, \$210,000 to \$307,000, \$307,000 to \$448,000, and \$448,000 to \$1,232,000.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure 5: Average Lot Size, 2013:Q4



* Range of average lot size by quintile (rounded to the nearest 1000 square feet) is 5,000 to 9,000, 9,000 to 13,000, 13,000 to 17,000, 17,000 to 29,000, and 29,000 to 181,000.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic company FNC Inc.


Figure 6: Average Land Price for a Quarter-Acre Lot, 2013:Q4



* Range of average land price for a quarter-acre lot by quintile (rounded to the nearest \$1000) is \$22,000 to \$132,000, \$132,000 to \$187,000, \$187,000 to \$275,000, \$275,000 to \$428,000, and \$428,000 to \$1,400,000.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure 7: Average Land Share of Property Value, 2013:Q4



* Range of average land share of property value by quintile (rounded to the nearest 1%) is 7% to 36%, 36% to 48%, 48% to 57%, 57% to 71%, and 71% to 81%.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure 8: House Price Increase, 2000-2006



* Range of average house price increase by quintile (rounded to the nearest 1%) is 89% to 127%, 127% to 131%, 131% to 147%, 147% to 165%, and 165% to 204%.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic company FNC Inc.

Figure 9: House Price Decline, 2006-2012




* Range of average house price decline by quintile (rounded to the nearest 1%) less than 13%, 13% to 21%, 21% to 31%, 31% to 40%, and 40% to 51%.

Note: the 'Smallest' quintile includes zips 20007, 20008, 20016, 20815, 22201, 22203, 22205, 22207, 22209, and 22213, where house prices increased between 2006 and 2012.


Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic company FNC Inc.

Figure 10: Average Land Prices: 2000-2013
 (for zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)



Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure 11: Prices and Construction Costs: 2000-2006
 (for zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)




Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure 12: Prices and Construction Costs: 2006-2012
 (for zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)



Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure 13: Average Land Share of Home Value: 2000-2013
 (for zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)



Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

A Appendix

The appendix contains exhibits with supplementary information mentioned in the main part of the paper. Table A.1 provides detailed information on every zip code and zip group in the dataset. Figures A.1 through A.3 are versions of the maps in figures 4, 6 and 7, respectively, that remove the shading for zip groups with adjusted land shares; similarly, figures A.4 through A.7 are versions of figures 10 through 13, respectively, that exclude the zip groups with adjusted land shares.

Table A.1: Detailed Information on Zip Groups

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
1	20007	DC	1,450	31	2003:Q2	H,L	22.6	No
2	20008	DC	2,170	22	2002:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
3	20012	DC	2,891	3	2004:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
4	20015	DC	3,978	16	2003:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
5	20016	DC	5,173	79	2000:Q3	H,L	49.7	No
6	20017	DC	1,554	3	2005:Q1	H,L	5.0	Yes
7	20018	DC	2,730	18	2002:Q3	H,L	39.1	No
8	20020, 20032	DC	2,861	79	2000:Q4	H,L	5.0	Yes
9	20001, 20009, 20010, 20011	DC	3,043	12	2004:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
10	20002, 20003, 20019	DC	3,176	137	2002:Q1	H,L	21.2	No
11	20814	MG	5,014	265	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
12	20815	MG	6,255	151	2000:Q2	H,L	58.3	No
13	20832	MG	5,000	192	2000:Q2	H	24.0	No
14	20837	MG	1,466	59	2000:Q2	H	52.9	No
15	20850	MG	6,352	648	2000:Q3	H	24.5	No
16	20851	MG	3,397	1	NA	H,L	34.2	No
17	20852	MG	4,462	26	2003:Q1	H,L	15.1	No
18	20853	MG	8,330	119	2000:Q2	H	29.3	No
19	20854	MG	13,902	347	2000:Q2	H	25.0	No
20	20855	MG	3,542	26	2001:Q2	H	10.0	No
21	20871	MG	2,275	1,374	2000:Q2	H	5.0	Yes
22	20874	MG	4,041	574	2000:Q2	H,L	33.2	No
23	20876	MG	3,201	231	2000:Q2	H,L	31.4	No
24	20878	MG	9,071	637	2000:Q2	H,L	45.8	No

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;

MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
25	20879	MG	2,855	173	2000:Q3	H,L	35.3	No
26	20886	MG	1,684	0	NA	H,L	36.9	No
27	20901	MG	7,983	9	2003:Q2	H,L	33.6	No
28	20902	MG	9,343	31	2001:Q2	H,L	29.0	No
29	20904	MG	7,955	422	2001:Q3	H,L	45.6	No
30	20906	MG	8,995	193	2001:Q3	H,L	54.9	No
31	20910	MG	5,270	61	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
32	20777, 20833, 20860, 20861, 20862	MG	3,227	350	2000:Q2	H	27.8	No
33	20812, 20816	MG	4,586	127	2001:Q1	H,L	44.9	No
34	20817, 20818	MG	11,172	532	2000:Q3	H,L	36.4	No
35	20838, 20839, 20841, 20842	MG	2,506	1,294	2000:Q3	H	21.5	No
36	20868, 20905	MG	5,430	303	2000:Q2	H	21.2	No
37	20872, 21771	MG	3,036	158	2000:Q3	H,L	36.0	No
38	20877, 20880	MG	3,060	75	2000:Q4	H,L	25.7	No
39	20882, 21797	MG	4,087	344	2000:Q2	H	20.3	No
40	20895, 20896	MG	6,266	142	2000:Q3	H,L	23.1	No
41	20705	PG	4,812	629	2000:Q2	H,L	36.2	No
42	20706	PG	8,007	192	2001:Q3	H,L	29.2	No
43	20708	PG	2,744	245	2000:Q2	H,L	28.5	No
44	20715	PG	8,225	400	2000:Q2	H	5.0	Yes
45	20716	PG	3,909	203	2000:Q2	H	21.0	No
46	20720	PG	5,248	1,100	2000:Q2	H	60.0	Yes
47	20721	PG	6,498	968	2000:Q3	H	60.0	Yes
48	20737	PG	3,144	75	2006:Q3	H,L	5.0	Yes
49	20743	PG	7,661	167	2000:Q2	H,L	30.6	No

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;

MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
50	20744	PG	14,982	909	2000:Q2	H	20.0	No
51	20745	PG	3,965	3	2002:Q2	H	48.3	No
52	20746	PG	3,360	29	2002:Q3	H	47.1	No
53	20747	PG	5,804	238	2000:Q3	H,L	37.8	No
54	20748	PG	6,953	156	2000:Q2	H,L	29.4	No
55	20769	PG	2,059	328	2001:Q2	H	5.0	Yes
56	20772	PG	10,487	1,821	2000:Q2	H	24.3	No
57	20774	PG	8,994	2,138	2000:Q2	H	19.2	No
58	20781	PG	2,192	4	2003:Q4	H,L	6.3	No
59	20782	PG	4,233	3	2000:Q4	H,L	39.8	No
60	20784	PG	5,472	1	2000:Q3	H	29.5	No
61	20785	PG	4,051	126	2000:Q1	H,L	32.9	No
62	20601, 20607	PG	3,420	868	2000:Q2	H	31.4	No
63	20608, 20613	PG	3,422	935	2000:Q3	H	22.0	No
64	20623, 20735	PG	11,747	1,115	2000:Q2	H	19.0	No
65	20710, 20712, 20722	PG	3,208	23	2001:Q3	H,L	26.8	No
66	20740, 20770	PG	6,273	21	2005:Q4	H,L	5.0	Yes
67	20707, 20866	PG/MG	6,055	1,402	2000:Q2	H,L	43.1	No
68	20783, 20903, 20912	PG/MG	11,547	38	2001:Q1	H,L	23.9	No
69	22202	AR	1,599	21	2002:Q1	H,L	60.0	Yes
70	22203	AR	1,863	16	2003:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
71	22205	AR	5,162	145	2001:Q1	H,L	60.0	Yes
72	22206, 22204	AR	5,058	124	2002:Q1	H,L	60.0	Yes
73	22209, 22201	AR	2,689	153	2002:Q1	H,L	45.6	No
74	22213, 22207	AR/FF	9,558	578	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;

MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
75	22302	AX/FF	1,970	20	2001:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
76	22304	AX	1,838	48	2002:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
77	22301, 22305	AX	3,266	26	2002:Q2	H,L	13.3	No
78	22311, 22312	AX/FF	3,692	132	2000:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
79	20121	FF	1,561	117	2002:Q2	H,L	28.0	No
80	20124	FF	3,751	193	2000:Q2	H,L	31.4	No
81	20151	FF	4,149	525	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
82	20170	FF	6,873	330	2000:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
83	20171	FF	7,970	618	2000:Q3	H,L	54.6	No
84	20194	FF	1,847	67	2000:Q3	H,L	26.3	No
85	22003	FF	10,389	171	2000:Q4	H,L	53.4	No
86	22015	FF	7,226	122	2000:Q3	H,L	41.7	No
87	22030	FF	8,006	856	2000:Q3	H,L	33.9	No
88	22031	FF	3,396	249	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
89	22032	FF	7,470	200	2000:Q4	H,L	34.0	No
90	22033	FF	4,498	546	2000:Q3	H,L	25.2	No
91	22039	FF	5,686	151	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
92	22042	FF	6,586	75	2001:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
93	22043	FF	4,184	247	2000:Q3	H,L	54.3	No
94	22046	FF	3,446	141	2000:Q1	H,L	60.0	Yes
95	22079	FF	3,910	1,872	2000:Q3	H,L	47.6	No
96	22101	FF	8,878	431	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
97	22102	FF	3,173	334	2000:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
98	22124	FF	3,867	442	2000:Q3	H,L	33.7	No
99	22150	FF	4,703	274	2000:Q2	H,L	49.7	No

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;

MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
100	22151	FF	4,636	39	2003:Q4	H,L	38.4	No
101	22152	FF	4,732	123	2001:Q2	H,L	50.7	No
102	22153	FF	6,135	259	2000:Q2	H,L	41.1	No
103	22181	FF	3,152	129	2000:Q3	H,L	40.3	No
104	22182	FF	6,545	468	2000:Q3	H,L	43.4	No
105	22306	FF	3,446	134	2001:Q1	H,L	59.4	No
106	22308	FF	4,688	71	2000:Q4	H,L	60.0	Yes
107	22315	FF	2,339	322	2000:Q3	H,L	37.7	No
108	20190, 20191	FF	3,936	7	2001:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
109	22027, 22180	FF	6,479	448	2000:Q4	H,L	54.2	No
110	22041, 22044	FF	3,546	122	2001:Q4	H,L	50.6	No
111	22060, 22309	FF	4,956	248	2000:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
112	22303, 22310	FF	6,596	310	2000:Q2	H,L	60.0	Yes
113	22314, 22307	FF/AX	2,838	40	2001:Q4	H,L	60.0	Yes
114	20120	FF/LD	6,004	813	2000:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes
115	22066	FF/LD	5,475	382	2000:Q2	H,L	31.8	No
116	20105	LD	2,067	1,524	2001:Q3	H	7.4	No
117	20147	LD	6,820	2,235	2000:Q3	H,L	24.2	No
118	20148	LD	5,283	4,389	2000:Q3	H,L	20.5	No
119	20152	LD	4,168	2,737	2000:Q3	H	14.4	No
120	20165	LD	4,741	290	2000:Q3	H	12.5	No
121	20175	LD	5,180	1,415	2000:Q3	H	11.3	No
122	20176	LD	6,639	2,814	2000:Q3	H	22.7	No
123	20180	LD	1,884	843	2000:Q3	H,L	36.7	No
124	20132	LD	3,781	1,098	2000:Q3	H	5.0	Yes

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;

MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Table A.1 – Continued from previous page

Group	Zips	County/City	# Homes	# Sales-based land values	Reference period	Type of sales used	Land Share 2000:Q1 (%)	Adjusted?
125	20117, 20184, 20130, 20135, 20141	LD	2,292	557	2001:Q3	H	5.0	Yes
126	20164, 20166	LD	6,688	276	2002:Q4	H,L	5.0	Yes
127	20197, 20129, 20158	LD	1,785	438	2000:Q3	H,L	7.3	No
128	20109	PW	2,393	222	2002:Q3	H	59.2	No
129	20110	PW	6,511	376	2000:Q2	H,L	39.7	No
130	20111	PW	6,061	788	2000:Q3	H	52.7	No
131	20112	PW	7,875	2,268	2000:Q2	H,L	43.9	No
132	20136	PW	5,503	4,229	2000:Q3	H,L	32.4	No
133	22026	PW	1,777	1,152	2000:Q3	H,L	46.9	No
134	22191	PW	7,516	1,802	2000:Q3	H,L	44.7	No
135	22192	PW	7,648	1,132	2000:Q2	H	27.0	No
136	22193	PW	15,552	2,401	2000:Q3	H	46.9	No
137	22025	PW	3,858	1,071	2000:Q2	H	38.3	No
138	20119, 20181	PW	2,261	405	2001:Q4	H,L	40.3	No
139	20143, 20155	PW	7,016	5,132	2000:Q3	H,L	38.2	No
140	20169, 20137	PW	5,630	3,169	2000:Q3	H	14.9	No
141	22134, 22172	PW	1,790	823	2002:Q3	H,L	60.0	Yes

Jurisdictions: AR = Arlington Co., VA; AX = City of Alexandria, VA; DC = Washington, DC; FF = Fairfax Co., VA; LD = Loudoun Co., VA;


MG = Montgomery Co., MD; PG = Prince George's Co., MD; PW = Prince William Co., VA.

Type of sales: H,L = home and land sales, H = home sales only.

Note: The zip groups with “Yes” in the final column had 2000:Q1 land shares either below 5 percent or above 60 percent prior to adjustment. The 2000:Q1 shares below 5 percent were adjusted up to 5 percent and the 2000:Q1 shares above 60 percent were adjusted down to 60 percent. See the text for additional discussion.

Sources: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure A.2: Average Land Price for a Quarter-Acre Lot, 2013:Q4
 With Crosshatching Instead of Shading for Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares



* Range of average land price for a quarter-acre lot by quintile (rounded to the nearest \$1000) is \$22,000 to \$132,000, \$132,000 to \$187,000, \$187,000 to \$275,000, \$275,000 to \$428,000, and \$428,000 to \$1,400,000.

Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.


Figure A.3: Average Land Share of Property Value, 2013:Q4
 With Crosshatching Instead of Shading for Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares



* Range of average land share of property value by quintile (rounded to the nearest 1%) is 7% to 36%, 36% to 48%, 48% to 57%, 57% to 71%, and 71% to 81%.


Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure A.4: Average Land Prices: 2000-2013
 Excluding Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares
 (remaining zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)




Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure A.5: Prices and Construction Costs: 2000-2006
 Excluding Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares
 (remaining zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)




Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure A.6: Prices and Construction Costs: 2006-2012
 Excluding Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares
 (remaining zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)



Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.

Figure A.7: Average Land Share of Home Value: 2000-2013
 Excluding Zip Groups with Adjusted Land Shares
 (remaining zips grouped into quintiles by quarter-acre land price in 2000:Q1)



Source: Authors' calculations using data from the CoreLogic companies FNC Inc. and Marshall & Swift.