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## Online Appendix

## Appendix \#1: Data Coverage

Starting Dates for Each MSA in the Final Sample

| start | msa_name | start | msa_name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1993q1 | Providence-New Bedford-Fall River, RI-MA | 1995q3 | Nashville-Davidson--Murfreesboro, TN |
| 1993q1 | Sacramento--Arden-Arcade--Roseville, CA | 1996q1 | Flagstaff, AZ |
| 1993q1 | San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara, CA | 1996q1 | Kingston, NY |
| 1993q1 | Reno-Sparks, NV | 1996q1 | New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ-PA2/ |
| 1993q1 | Portland-Vancouver-Beaverton, OR-WA | 1996q1 | Deltona-Daytona Beach-Ormond Beach, FL |
| 1993q1 | Olympia, WA | 1996q1 | Ocala, FL |
| 1993q1 | Pittsfield, MA | 1996q1 | Gainesville, FL |
| 1993q1 | Springfield, MA | 1996q1 | Port St. Lucie-Fort Pierce, FL |
| 1993q1 | Visalia-Porterville, CA | 1996q1 | Cape Coral-Fort Myers, FL |
| 1993q1 | Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario, CA | 1996q1 | Knoxville, TN |
| 1993q1 | Tucson, AZ | 1996q1 | Yuma, AZ |
| 1993q1 | Oxnard-Thousand Oaks-Ventura, CA | 1996q2 | Panama City-Lynn Haven, FL |
| 1993q1 | Redding, CA | 1996q2 | Fort Walton Beach-Crestview-Destin, FL |
| 1993q1 | Modesto, CA | 1996q3 | Salem, OR |
| 1993q1 | Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale, AZ | 1997q1 | Barnstable Town, MA |
| 1993q1 | Merced, CA | 1997q1 | Erie, PA |
| 1993q1 | Hartford-West Hartford-East Hartford, CT | 1997q1 | Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, PA-NJ |
| 1993q1 | Stockton, CA | 1997q1 | Palm Bay-Melbourne-Titusville, FL |
| 1993q1 | Madera, CA | 1997q1 | Sarasota-Bradenton-Venice, FL |
| 1993q1 | Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, CT | 1997q1 | Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater, FL |
| 1993q1 | Las Vegas-Paradise, NV | 1997q1 | Tallahassee, FL |
| 1993q1 | Fresno, CA | 1997q1 | Vero Beach, FL |
| 1993q1 | Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA | 1997q1 | Orlando, FL |
| 1993q1 | Napa, CA | 1997q2 | Baltimore-Towson, MD |
| 1993q1 | Hanford-Corcoran, CA | 1997q2 | Columbus, OH |
| 1993q1 | New Haven-Milford, CT | 1997q2 | Akron, OH |
| 1993q1 | Salinas, CA | 1997q2 | Lakeland-Winter Haven, FL |
| 1993q1 | Worcester, MA | 1997q3 | Jacksonville, FL |
| 1993q1 | Boston-Cambridge-Quincy, MA-NH | 1997q3 | Yakima, WA |
| 1993q1 | Bakersfield, CA | 1997q3 | Pensacola-Ferry Pass-Brent, FL |
| 1993q1 | Los Angeles-Long Beach-Santa Ana, CA | 1997q3 | Washington-Arlington-Alexandria, DC-VA-MD |
| 1993q1 | Norwich-New London, CT | 1997q3 | Cincinnati-Middletown, OH-KY-IN |
| 1993q1 | Vallejo-Fairfield, CA | 1997q4 | Springfield, OH |
| 1993q1 | Santa Rosa-Petaluma, CA | 1998q1 | Lincoln, NE |
| 1993q1 | San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont, CA | 1998q1 | Cleveland-Elyria-Mentor, OH |
| 1993q2 | Yuba City-Marysville, CA | 1998q1 | Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-W |
| 1993q3 | Chico, CA | 1998q1 | Honolulu, HI |
| 1994q1 | Bremerton-Silverdale, WA | 1998q1 | Fort Collins-Loveland, CO |
| 1994q1 | San Diego-Carlsbad-San Marcos, CA | 1998q1 | Denver-Aurora, CO |
| 1995q1 | Corvallis, OR | 1998q1 | Dayton, OH |
| 1995q1 | Spokane, WA | 1998q1 | Detroit-Warren-Livonia, MI |
| 1995q1 | Eugene-Springfield, OR | 1998q1 | Colorado Springs, CO |
| 1995q1 | Medford, OR | 1998q2 | Oklahoma City, OK |
| 1995q1 | Bellingham, WA | 1998q2 | Tulsa, OK |
| 1995q1 | Carson City, NV | 1998q2 | Grand Junction, CO |
| 1995q1 | Mount Vernon-Anacortes, WA | 1998q4 | Richmond, VA |
| 1995q1 | Prescott, AZ | 1998q4 | Memphis, TN-MS-AR |

## Appendix \#2: Summary Statistics on Key Housing Characteristics

|  | MSAs <br> (1) | Neighborhoods (2) | Neighborhoods, >10 transactions (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sale Price | 255,409 | 256,759 | 251,082 |
|  | $(94,028)$ | $(160,139)$ | $(152,062)$ |
| Number of Bedrooms | 3.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 |
|  | (0.2) | (0.4) | (0.4) |
| Number of Bathrooms | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.4 |
|  | (0.3) | (7.8) | (8.5) |
| Square Footage | 1,856 | 1,893 | 1,961 |
|  | (144) | $(3,839)$ | $(4,691)$ |
| Age of House | 30 | 29 | 26 |
|  | (12) | (21) | (21) |
| Mean Number of Transactions | 249,585 | 1,724 | 2,260 |
|  | $(333,188)$ | $(2,001)$ | $(2,810)$ |

Notes: First column presents weighted averages and standard deviations (in parenthesis) for all MSAs in our final sample. Weights are based on number of transactions. Column 2 shows summary statistics by tract groups, while Column 3 presents descriptives for a subsample of tracts with more than 10 transactions in every half-year period.

## Appendix \#3: Hedonic Regression Specifications

The hedonic regression in Equation (1) contains a number of categorical variables created to control for differences in housing quality. Separate vectors were created for the number of bedrooms (Bed), the number of bathrooms (Bath) and the age of the home (Age).

In the case of bedrooms, ten dichotomous dummies were used to control for the number of bedrooms ranging from less than 1 (which includes 0 and 0.5 bedrooms in the raw data) to a top code of 9 for homes with nine or more bedrooms. In this case, each dummy represented a unit increase in the number of bedrooms (e.g. there are dichotomous dummies created for homes with $<1,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8$, and $9+$ bedrooms).

In the case of bathrooms, we included controls for homes with fewer than 1 bathroom (again, 0 or more typically, 0.5 bathrooms), a top code for units with seven or more bathrooms, dummies for each half unit increase from 1 through 5 , and then controls for each unit increase until seven. More specifically, the twelve categories were: <1, $1,1.5,2,2.5,3,3.5,4,4.5,5,6$, and 7+.

There are nine categories of the Age vector from Equation (1). They range from newly built homes with an age of zero to homes at least 40 years old. The specific age categories are as follows: 0, 1, 2-5, 6-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-29, 30-39, and 40+ years old.

The other quality control in the hedonic estimation, the square footage of the living space in the home, is continuous in nature and was entered in quadratic form as noted in Equation (1).

## Appendix \#4: Breakpoint Estimates Summary

MSAs

|  | estimated <br> coefficient | t-stat | R2 | number of <br> quarters | number of <br> MSAs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| all MSAs | 0.14 | 7.34 | 0.63 | 31 | 94 |
| by year:1997 | 0.12 | 8.43 | 0.65 | 39 | 5 |
| 1998 | 0.12 | 9.10 | 0.66 | 38 | 8 |
| 1999 | 0.13 | 7.61 | 0.64 | 33 | 8 |
| 2000 | 0.13 | 7.84 | 0.63 | 36 | 4 |
| 2001 | 0.13 | 7.96 | 0.63 | 36 | 3 |
| 2002 | 0.17 | 8.21 | 0.64 | 36 | 11 |
| 2003 | 0.16 | 7.62 | 0.61 | 34 | 12 |
| 2004 | 0.19 | 9.25 | 0.68 | 35 | 20 |
| 2005 | 0.18 | 8.15 | 0.62 | 36 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| not stat. significant | -0.01 | -1.74 | 0.27 | 14 | 6 |
| not enough data | 0.08 | 4.18 | 0.70 | 7 | 9 |

Neighborhoods

|  | estimated <br> coefficient | t -stat | $R^{2}$ | number of <br> half-years | number of <br> neighborhoods |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| all tract groups | 0.17 | 3.59 | 0.49 | 14 | 7335 |
| by year:1994 | 0.29 | 2.91 | 0.36 | 16 | 19 |
| 1995 | 0.23 | 3.45 | 0.41 | 18 | 61 |
| 1996 | 0.18 | 3.66 | 0.44 | 18 | 116 |
| 1997 | 0.18 | 3.98 | 0.50 | 16 | 353 |
| 1998 | 0.18 | 4.50 | 0.53 | 17 | 656 |
| 1999 | 0.20 | 4.40 | 0.54 | 16 | 540 |
| 2000 | 0.21 | 4.56 | 0.56 | 16 | 495 |
| 2001 | 0.19 | 4.24 | 0.55 | 15 | 377 |
| 2002 | 0.20 | 4.18 | 0.52 | 16 | 463 |
| 2003 | 0.22 | 4.25 | 0.50 | 17 | 503 |
| 2004 | 0.24 | 4.67 | 0.52 | 18 | 837 |
| 2005 | 0.25 | 5.59 | 0.56 | 20 | 680 |
| 2006 | 0.21 | 2.91 | 0.32 | 20 | 29 |
| 2007 | 0.27 | 2.98 | 0.25 | 27 | 4 |
| 2008 | 0.12 | 2.75 | 0.29 | 20 | 4 |
|  |  | 0.43 | 0.28 | 8 | 1728 |
| not stat. significant | 0.06 | 0.21 | 5.07 | 0.78 | 4 |
| not enough data | 0 |  |  |  |  |

Notes: Both panels show summary stats of the break point estimation for MSAs and tract groups. The first column shows averages of the estimated coefficients d's from equation (4), the second column show the average $t$-stat, the $3^{\text {rd }}$ column shows average $R^{2} s$, the fourth column shows the average number of periods used in the estimation, and the last column shows the total number of MSAs or tract groups.

## Appendix \#5: Geographic Heterogeneity in the Starting Points of Housing Booms: MSAs

Timing of Breakpoints by Metro Area


Note: Each red circle denotes a metropolitan area that is new to the time frame noted just above each map. Each black ' $x$ ' represents a metropolitan area from all previous maps. Shaded states are not represented in our sample. See the discussion in the text for more details.

The first map in Appendix \#5 shows that the 15 MSAs that never had a meaningful boom in price growth are all located in the interior of the country. These markets are not shown in any subsequent map, each of which plots the geographic distribution and spreading of initial booms.

The first housing booms according to our metric occurred in the $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ quarter of 1997 in two California markets (Los Angeles and Napa) and three New England regions (Springfield, MA, New Haven, CT, and Stamford, CT). The second map in the figure shows the location of all the markets that boomed between 1997 and 1999. This group includes other markets, both big and small, also in northern New England and coastal California, as well as the first market in Washington state. An interesting pattern emerges after that initial set of booms: from coastal California, booms proliferate in the west and north directions, while from northern New England new booms occur in the east and south directions.

For example, the third map in the figure adds in the seven metropolitan areas that first boomed at some point in 2000 or 2001. In addition to three smaller interior markets in California (Modesto, Merced, and Redding) and a couple of east coast markets (Providence-New BedfordFall River, RI-MA and Baltimore-Towson, MD), this time span sees the first major Midwestern market (Chicago-Naperville-Joliet, IL-IN-WI) and the first Florida market (Gainesville) experience their major jumps in price growth.

Calendar year 2002 sees the beginning of the bigger wave of housing booms. The fourth map in the figure shows this group of 11 to be a fairly disparate group. There are a number of smaller California markets that start booming (Yuba City-Marysville, Chico, Bakersfield, Madera, and Fresno), but we see other places in different western states boom, too. They include the first market in Nevada (Carson City), as well as one in Oregon (Medford). On the east coast, the major metropolitan areas of New York-Northern New Jersey-Long Island, NY-NJ, and Washington, DC, also experienced their global breakpoints, in addition to the smaller NJ-PA market of Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton.

Calendar year 2003 then sees another twelve markets start to boom. Markets in the socalled 'sand states’ are prevalent in this group. It includes three more Florida markets, along with the first Arizona metropolitan area (Tucson). Honolulu, three Washington state metros, and two more California markets also boom in 2003, as the geographic extent of the boom widens across the western states.

The largest number of metropolitan areas (20) boomed in 2004. This group also has a high concentration in the sand states. There are nine such metropolitan areas in Florida alone, including Orlando and Tampa. In Nevada, the Las Vegas-Paradise and Reno-Sparks metros experienced a boom. Other Arizona markets also begin experiencing a boom this year (Flagstaff and Prescott), although the Phoenix-Mesa-Scottsdale area does not do so until the beginning of 2005. This time period also sees a further widening of boom markets in the Pacific Northwest, including the large metros of Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue, WA, and Portland-VancouverBeaverton, OR-WA.

## Appendix \#6: Price and Income Correlations at Breakpoint

## a) Price and income OLS correlations, MSAs




Notes: We first estimate a regression of price on quarter and MSA fixed effects using the complete data set, and then use the residuals to measure the magnitude of the price changes around the breakpoint for each. A similar procedure is used for income. The figures above plot the MSA-level estimated changes, weighted by MSA population. The red line shows the estimate coefficient from OLS regressions that use the plotted data.

## b) Price and income OLS and IV correlations, MSAs

| dependent variable: log price | pre-trend | breakpoint |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OLS | OLS | OLS | IV |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| log income | 0.06 | 0.68 | 0.63 | 0.84 |
|  | 0.05 | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.26) |
| MSA and quarter effects | Y | Y | Y | Y |
| covariates | N | N | Y | Y |
| Observations | 94 | 94 | 89 | 86 |
| R-squared | 0.02 | 0.37 | 0.48 | 0.46 |

Notes: We first estimate a regression of price on quarter and MSA fixed effects using the complete data set and save the residuals. A similar procedure is used for income. The table above shows separate OLS and IV regressions of the residual price on the residual income, for the pre-trend and breakpoint periods. Covariates include percent minority, migration flow, percent speculators, average LTV, fraction subprime, and fraction FHA loans. Per capita income is used as instrumental variable for log homebuyer income in column IV. Bold coefficients are significant at 5\% level.

## Appendix \#7: Demand shifters and robustness tests around the breakpoint, MSA level

a) Other buyer characteristics
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b) Credit markets
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c) Rents and income
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d) Quantities, and new supply





e) Other robustness


