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## Today's Class

- Valuation: Household Production
- Travel Cost Method and Discrete Choice
- One of my favorite parts of the course because it is both intuitive and more broadly useful in other branches of economics
- Agenda

1. Introduce the Question
2. Travel Cost Method
3. Multiple sites: The Logit Model
4. An Empirical Example

## Mt. Monadnock
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## Mt. Monadnock Overview

- 3165 feet high
- Many hiking trails
- Spectacular views of Boston and Eastern Massachusetts
- Supposedly the second most popular mountain climb in the world after Mt. Fuji.
- This is pure rumor, although I may treat it as fact on the final exam
- Policy question: How much is Mount Monadnock worth?
- Why do we care?
- Keeping land protected for recreational use has opportunity costs: could be used for logging, farming, vacation homes, wind farms, etc.


## Travel Cost Method

- Intuition: Visiting a park takes time and money.
- Time to drive, gas, etc.
- Plus entrance fees.
- Implications:
- The more awesome the park, the more l'm willing to give up to visit it.
- The closer I live to a park, the more likely I am to visit it.
- We can use this to trace out a WTP curve for a park
- Number of visitors from towns at different distances away
- Distance to park gives variation in price
- Variation in visitors gives variation in quantity


## Travel Cost Method: Data for Mt. Monadnock

|  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Visitors/ |
| Town | Distance | Year (k) |
| Boston | 62 | 52.34 |
| Concord | 38 | 27.1925 |
| Jaffrey | 4 | 3.3096 |
| Dublin | 5 | 1.18232 |
| Amherst | 51 | 5.6232 |
| Northampton | 42 | 3.89698 |
| New York | 171 | 44.5 |
| Other |  | 11.9554 |
| Total |  | 150 |

## "Demand Curve" for Visitation?

Visitors to Mt. Monadnock


## Data for Visitors/Population

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Visitors/ |  |  |
| Town | Distance | Year (k) | Population (k) | Population |
| Boston | 62 | 52.3 | 2100 | 0.02 |
| Concord | 38 | 27.2 | 125 | 0.22 |
| Jaffrey | 4 | 3.3 | 15 | 0.22 |
| Dublin | 5 | 1.2 | 4 | 0.30 |
| Amherst | 51 | 5.6 | 38 | 0.15 |
| Northampton | 42 | 3.9 | 23 | 0.17 |
| New York | 171 | 44.5 | 15000 | 0.00 |

## "Demand Curve" for Mt. Monadnock

## Visitors to Mt. Monadnock



Annual Visitation Rate (Percent of Population)

## Additional Control: Income

| Town | Distance | Visitors/ <br> Year (k) | Population (k) | Visitors/ <br> Population | Average Household Income (\$k) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boston | 62 | 52.3 | 2100 | 0.02 | 80 |
| Concord | 38 | 27.2 | 125 | 0.22 | 67 |
| Jaffrey | 4 | 3.3 | 15 | 0.22 | 52 |
| Dublin | 5 | 1.2 | 4 | 0.30 | 54 |
| Amherst | 51 | 5.6 | 38 | 0.15 | 75 |
| Northampton | 42 | 3.9 | 23 | 0.17 | 73 |
| New York | 171 | 44.5 | 15000 | 0.00 |  |

## The Presidentials
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## Demand Curve for Visiting the Presidentials



## Relative Demand Curves



## Discrete Choice Models: Motivation

- The demand for Monadnock is really a function of the price of the Presidentials and of all other sites:

$$
v_{M}=v_{M}\left(p_{M}, p_{P}, \ldots, y\right)
$$

- Why is this important from a policy perspective? The welfare gains from protecting Monadnock depend on whether or not the Presidentials are also protected!
- Daniel McFadden developed an approach to this problem, for which he won the Nobel Prize in 2000.


## Logistic Distribution

- Consider the choice of one site (Monadnock) vs. an outside option (any other Saturday activity, such as Nintendo at home).
- Normalize the utility of the outside option to 0 .
- Assume that $\varepsilon$ is distributed logistic: CDF F $(\varepsilon)=1 /\left(1+e^{-\varepsilon}\right)$



## The Discrete Choice Utility Function

- Random Utility
- Utility from visiting a site has a homogeneous portion $\delta$ and an unobserved portion $\varepsilon$.
- Characteristic Space
- Assume that consumers get utility from consuming park attributes, not consuming the park itself
- Characterize sites by these attributes that enter utility
- This reduces the problem to estimating demand for a small number of attributes.


## Discrete Choice Estimation: Empirical Example

- Say we have data on parks, amenities, and visitation from different cities at different distances
- We can estimate with Ordinary Least Squares: $\log \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{j}}-\log \mathrm{s}_{0}=\beta \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{j}}-\eta p_{\mathrm{vj}}+\xi_{\mathrm{j}}$
- Technical Note: This only works under the assumption that the variance in error terms $\varepsilon$ ij is the same across different cities. Otherwise we need to use more complicated statistical techniques.


## Dataset on Parks and Characteristics

|  | ParkName | Acres | MaxHeight | TrailLength |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Monadnock | 48.58585 | 1.929516 | . 7791026 |
| 2 | Presidentials | 80.43579 | 2.533749 | . 0429583 |
| 3 | Yosemite | 33.86095 | 1.006582 | . 5626552 |
| 4 | Grand Canyon | 24.03083 | 1.082295 | . 1891081 |
| 5 | Big Bend | 42.68494 | . 0498568 | . 7989277 |
| 6 | Blue Ridge Parkway | 77.67514 | 1.11445 | . 526118 |
| 7 | Lincoln Birthplace NHP | 45.66599 | 3.839486 | . 977658 |
| 8 | Chatthoochee River | 76.24398 | 3.150046 | . 6018055 |
| 9 | Boston Harbor Islands | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 10 | Fort Sumter | 34.37448 | 2.199283 | . 5084499 |
| 11 | Gates of the Arctic | 27.76 | . 1591121 | . 448964 |
| 12 | Governors Island NM | 85.82054 | 2.589531 | . 6232119 |

## Dataset of Parks and Visitation

|  | ParkName | Source | Distance | TravelCost | Visitors | Insj_so | Acres | MaxHeight | TrailLength |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Blue Ridge Parkway | NewYork | . 277292 | . 0831876 | 23.2941 | . 0290542 | 77.67514 | 1.11445 | . 526118 |
| 24 | Blue Ridge Parkway | Northampton | . 48656 | . 145968 | 20.78289 | . 0259035 | 77.67514 | 1.11445 | . 526118 |
| 25 | Boston Harbor Islands | Amherst | . 7039295 | . 2111788 | 13.50256 | . 018042 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 26 | Boston Harbor Islands | Boston | . 6155605 | . 1846681 | 14.56299 | . 0191954 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 27 | Boston Harbor Islands | Chicago | . 6658635 | . 199759 | 13.95935 | . 018522 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 28 | Boston Harbor Islands | Concord | . 8131885 | . 2439566 | 12.19145 | . 0183717 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 29 | Boston Harbor Islands | DC | . 5171654 | . 1551496 | 15.74373 | . 0198453 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 30 | Boston Harbor Islands | Dublin | . 020989 | . 0062967 | 21.69785 | . 0293142 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 31 | Boston Harbor Islands | Jaffrey | . 6832927 | . 2049878 | 13.7502 | . 0165809 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 32 | Boston Harbor Islands | LA | . 6123968 | . 183719 | 14.60095 | . 0211112 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 33 | Boston Harbor Islands | Lincoln | . 2602195 | . 0780658 | 18.82708 | . 0253402 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 34 | Boston Harbor Islands | NewHaven | . 4179728 | . 1253918 | 16.93404 | . 0213142 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 35 | Boston Harbor Islands | NewYork | . 9557287 | . 2867186 | 10.48097 | . 0130727 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 36 | Boston Harbor Islands | Northampton | . 7440961 | . 2232288 | 13.02056 | . 0162286 | 77.40028 | 1.282077 | . 0378999 |
| 37 | Chatthoochee River | Amherst | . 9267887 | . 2780366 | 24.86536 | . 0332249 | 76.24398 | 3.150046 | . 6018055 |
| 38 | Chatthoochee River | Boston | . 6268046 | . 1880414 | 28.46517 | . 0375198 | 76.24398 | 3.150046 | . 6018055 |
| 39 | Chatthoochee River | Chicago | . 6887722 | . 2066317 | 27.72156 | . 0367823 | 76.24398 | 3.150046 | . 6018055 |

I mage by MIT OpenCourseWare.

## Unconditional Relationship Between Visitation and Amenities



## Unconditional Relationship Between Visitation and Amenities



## Unconditional Relationship Between Visitation and Travel Cost



## Multivariate Regression

## - reg Insj_s0 TravelCost Acres MaxHeight TrailLength, Robust

Linear regression

| Insj_s0 | Coef. | Robust <br> Std. Err. | t | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{t}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| TravelCost | -.0456047 | .0016308 | -27.96 | 0.000 | -.0488291 | -.0423803 |
| Acres | .000249 | $6.92 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 35.99 | 0.000 | .0002353 | .0002626 |
| MaxHeight | .00507 | .0001469 | 34.50 | 0.000 | .0047795 | .0053606 |
| TrailLength | .016068 | .000488 | 32.93 | 0.000 | .0151031 | .0170329 |
| _cons | .0012306 | .0004548 | 2.71 | 0.008 | .0003313 | .0021298 |


| Number of obs $=$ | 144 |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\mathrm{~F}(4,139)=$ | 1564.70 |
| Prob $>\mathrm{F}=$ | 0.0000 |
| R-squared $=$ | 0.9782 |
| Root MSE $=$ | .00166 |

## Recap: Valuation with Revealed <br> Preference

- We need to value environmental goods because we want to trade of costs of environmental protection with benefits.
- Problem: Public goods don't have prices, so we can't estimate a demand curve
- Instead, look at how the environmental good affects demand for a market good
- Two approaches to "revealed preference" valuation.
- Hedonics
- Environmental good enters utility function directly.
- Environmental quality directly affects the price of a market good
- E.g. risk affects wages, pollution affects WTP for houses.
- Household Production
- Utility derived by combining market goods and environmental goods.
- Spending on complements or substitutes tells us the value of environmental good.
- E.g. expenditures on travel to park, health care, or air pollution masks


## Recap: Travel Cost Method and Discrete Choice

## Travel Cost

- Demand curve needed to estimate welfare.
- Variation in prices and quantities needed for demand curve.
- Travel costs give variation in prices and quantities.


## Discrete Choice

- When considering multiple sites, demand depends on prices of all sites.
- The logit model and characteristics space dramatically reduce the dimensionality of the problem.
- We can estimate how demand varies with prices and relevant attributes.
- This can be used for welfare analysis under counterfactuals: e.g. we remove a park, or add trails.
- This is broadly useful in environmental economics as well as in other economic applications.


## Readings for Next Thursday

- Next time: Renewable and non-renewable resources
- Are we running out of oil?
-What is the best way to manage a fishery?
- This is heavy on math, but the math is very interesting and insightful
- No required readings: I will teach what is necessary for the exam
- Optional readings for people who want to deeply understand the math:
- Sweeney
- Slade and Thille
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