

#### Valuing Vegetation in an Urban Watershed

Jonathan Kadish Pomona College Noelwah R. Netusil Reed College

July 1, 2009





Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon

• Regional Government (Metro)



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary
- Combined sewer system



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary
- Combined sewer system
- Eight months of rain



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary
- Combined sewer system
- Eight months of rain
- Water quality



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary
- Combined sewer system
- Eight months of rain
- Water quality
- Combined Sewer Overflow
  Projects



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

- Regional Government (Metro)
- Urban growth boundary
- Combined sewer system
- Eight months of rain
- Water quality
- Combined Sewer Overflow
  Projects
- New focus on residential properties



Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge Portland, Oregon.

• Is there a relationship between the sale price of single-family residential properties and land cover types?

- Is there a relationship between the sale price of single-family residential properties and land cover types?
- Do different land cover types on a property have a different effect on its sale price?

- Is there a relationship between the sale price of single-family residential properties and land cover types?
- Do different land cover types on a property have a different effect on its sale price?
- Does land cover on surrounding properties have an effect on a property's sale price?

#### Previous Research

- Trees and Tree Canopy Anderson and Cordell (1988) Donovan and Butry (2009) Netusil et al. (forthcoming)
- Vegetation

Des Rosiers et al. (2002) Kestens et al. (2004) Mansfield et al. (2005)

# Property Data

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Real Sale Price (2007 dollars)	\$310,121	\$190,816	\$53,135	\$4,349,733
Lot Square Footage	7,718	19,378	808	1,751,131
Building Square Footage	1,933	869	360	35,680
Age	53.4	31.77	Ο	137

## Land Cover Data: On-Property

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
High Structure Vegetation	26.08%	22.13%	Ο	100%
Low Structure Vegetation	29.67%	19.18%	Ο	100%
Impervious Area	44.24%	19.60%	Ο	100%
Open Water	0.01%	0.57%	Ο	72.61%

## **On-Property Land Cover**





	High Structure	Low Structure	Impervious
Property 1	84.77 <b>%</b>	0%	15.23%
Property 2	26.07 <i>%</i>	29.66%	44.26%
Property 3	0%	61.01%	38.99%

#### Buffers





#### Property

Buffer

High Structure Vegetation

Low Structure Vegetation

Impervious Surface

	High Structure	Low Structure	Impervious
200 foot	36.83%	17.45%	45.72%
200 foot- 1/4 mile	57.33%	16.64%	26.04%
1/4 mile- 1/2 mile	46.08%	23.46%	30.46%

### Land Cover: Within 200 Feet

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
High Structure Vegetation	25.59%	14.58%	Ο	99.91%
Low Structure Vegetation	28.23%	10.33%	Ο	90.19%
Impervious Area	46.09%	13.22%	Ο	96.64%
Open Water	0.09%	1.53%	О	67.71%

#### Model

- 42,722 single-family residential transactions
- January 1, 2005-December 31, 2007
- Semi-log specification
- A priori expectations about water and vegetation variables
- Impervious surface is the excluded category

# Results: On Property

Variable Name	Estimated Coefficients (robust standard errors)	
High Structure Vegetation	0.0896*** (0.0169)	
High Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.143 <sup>***</sup> (0.0224)	
Low Structure Vegetation	0.0422* (0.0224)	
Low Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.105 <sup>***</sup> (0.0332)	
Open Water	-0.333 (0.316)	

Impervious Surface is the excluded category

• 31.33%: Amount of on-property high structure vegetation that maximizes sale price

- 31.33%: Amount of on-property high structure vegetation that maximizes sale price
- 26.08%: Average for properties in our study

- 31.33%: Amount of on-property high structure vegetation that maximizes sale price
- 26.08%: Average for properties in our study
- Estimated increase in sale price of \$122

- 31.33%: Amount of on-property high structure vegetation that maximizes sale price
- 26.08%: Average for properties in our study
- Estimated increase in sale price of \$122
- Present discounted cost: \$230+

- 31.33%: Amount of on-property high structure vegetation that maximizes sale price
- 26.08%: Average for properties in our study
- Estimated increase in sale price of \$122
- Present discounted cost: \$230+
- Private benefits < private costs

#### Results: Within 200 Feet

Variable Name	Estimated Coefficients (robust standard errors)	
High Structure Vegetation	0.138*** (0.0332)	
High Structure Vegetation Squared	0.0224 (0.0509)	
Low Structure Vegetation	0.350*** (0.0576)	
Low Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.342 <sup>***</sup> (0.0872)	
Open Water	0.932*** (0.148)	

Impervious Surface is the excluded category

#### Results: 200 Feet to 1/4 Mile

Variable Name	Estimated Coefficients (robust standard errors)	
High Structure Vegetation	0.374 <sup>***</sup> (0.0536)	
High Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.0329 (0.0792)	
Low Structure Vegetation	0.392*** (0.104)	
Low Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.315 <sup>***</sup> (0.0885)	
Open Water	0.315 <sup>***</sup> (0.0885)	

Impervious Surface is the excluded category

## Results: 1/4 Mile to 1/2 Mile

Variable Name	Estimated Coefficients (robust standard errors)	
High Structure Vegetation	0.556*** (0.0584)	
High Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.298*** (0.0846)	
Low Structure Vegetation	0.812*** (0.112)	
Low Structure Vegetation Squared	-0.683*** (0.173)	
Open Water	0.479 <sup>***</sup> (0.046)	

Impervious Surface is the excluded category

#### Results



#### **Overall Benefits**

- Increase in high structure vegetation in surrounding buffers also has a positive effect on sale price
- Per-acre benefit is largest for increasing on-property high structure vegetation
- Other benefits may not be included in our estimates: water flow, water quality, carbon sequestration, air quality, aesthetics, wildlife habitat, etc.

#### Policies

- 35%-40%: Target tree canopy for residential areas set in Portland's *Urban Forest Action Plan*.
- Incentive programs: Clean River Rewards, Ecoroof grant program, etc.
- Tax incentives: proposed riparian and upland tax credits
- Education: Portland Stormwater Marketplace

#### Questions?

Jonathan Kadish Pomona College jonathan.kadish@gmail.com Noelwah R. Netusil Reed College netusil@reed.edu

Thanks to:

Niko Drake-McLaughlin Caleb Fassett Lori Hennings Justin Houk Roberta Jortner Seth Kadish Gary Odenthal Claire Puchy Matt Summers Schultz Environmental Studies Award, Pomona College



	High Structure	Low Structure	Impervious
Property 1	84.77%	0%	15.23%
Property 2	26.07%	29.66%	44.26%
Property 3	0%	61.01%	38.99%