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New Wave of Urban Research

A. New generation of urban spatial equilibrium models (Ahlfeldt et al., 2015; Allen & Arkolakis, 2016)
   - Structural counterfactuals at a high resolution
     ... but restrictive parametric assumptions and/or structural estimation

B. New generation of urban data
   - Urban economic activity can be observed in unprecedented detail
   - Mobility, expenditure, income networks (cellphone, banks, apps)
     ... but hard to implement tractable and informative empirical analysis

   - Welfare effects of an urban shock...
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A. New generation of urban spatial equilibrium models (Ahlfeldt et al., 2015; Allen & Arkolakis, 2016)
   • Structural counterfactuals at a high resolution
     ... but restrictive parametric assumptions and/or structural estimation

B. New generation of urban data
   • Urban economic activity can be observed in unprecedented detail
   • Mobility, expenditure, income networks (cellphone, banks, apps)
     ... but hard to implement tractable and informative empirical analysis

• Welfare effects of an urban shock...
  ... in a tractable way without parametric assumptions or structural estimation?
This Paper: A method to estimate welfare effects of urban shocks

1. Both simple and general:
   - Simple: Regression based framework
   - General: No parametric assumptions necessary

2. Based on two insights:
   - Envelope results from residents’ optimal (spatial) cons & commuting patterns
     ⇒ Intuitive analytical expression for intra-city welfare
   - Perturbation of market clearing identifies heterogeneous effects & GE spillovers
This Paper: A method to estimate welfare effects of urban shocks

1. Both simple and general:
   - Simple: Regression based framework
   - General: No parametric assumptions necessary

2. Based on two insights:
   - Envelope results from residents’ optimal (spatial) cons & commuting patterns
     ⇒ Intuitive analytical expression for intra-city welfare
   - Perturbation of market clearing identifies heterogeneous effects & GE spillovers

3. Apply methodology to estimate welfare effect of tourism in Barcelona:
   - Rich new data on expenditure and income spatial patterns
   - Causal (shift-share) identification from variation in vacation timing in RoW
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Tourism as an Urban Shock

- Large part of the economy
  - 7% of world exports
  - 330 million jobs
  - Spain: 11% of GDP

- Growing, especially in cities
  - BCN: 25% secular ↑ in past 5 yrs
  - BCN: 200% seasonal ↑ within year

- Unequal welfare gains
Key Findings

1. Methodological
   - Simple reduced form approach has problems (Aggr. bias + SUTVA violation)
   - Incorporating theory-predicted heterogeneity and spillovers identifies het effects
   - Predictions close to those from full structural model

2. Impact of tourism
   - Median resident not substantially affected by (seasonal changes in) tourism...
   - ...but there is substantial heterogeneity with winners and losers
Literature

**Urban Quantitative Spatial Economics**

**Big Data Spatial Economics**

**Impact of Tourism**

**First-Order Impact of Price Shocks**

**Small shocks in general equilibrium**
Outline of Talk

A General Methodology for (small) Urban Shocks

Intra-city Patterns of Consumption & Income

Empirical Strategy and Identification

Welfare Effects Across the City

Comparison with a Quantitative Model

Conclusion
An Envelope Result for the Welfare effects of Small Shocks

- Arbitrary discrete urban geography: \( N \) blocks, each with resident(s) and firm(s).

- Resident of block \( n = 1, \ldots, N \) chooses goods \( i = 1, \ldots, N \) to (spatially) consume.

\[
 u_n = \frac{v_n}{G(p_n)}
\]

- homothetic preferences
- \( v_n \) is disposable income of representative agent in block \( n \)
- \( G(\cdot) \) is a price aggregator
- \( p_n \) refers to the set of transport-cost and amenity adjusted prices
Supplies labor (spatially) to maximize income.

\[ v_n = \max_{\{\ell_i\}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i \ell_i \quad \text{s.t.} \quad H_n(\ell_n) = T_n \]

- \( T_n \) is the time endowment in location \( n \) scaled by population size
- \( H_n(\cdot) \) is a convex function that reflects congestion costs in commuting
- \( \ell_n \) is the vector of commuting cost adjusted labor supply
Intuitive analytical expression for intra-city welfare analysis

**Theorem (Welfare Effect of a (small) Shock)**

Consider a representative local residing in block \( n \). Applying envelope theorem to consumption, production optimization problems yields:

\[
\frac{d \ln u_n}{\Delta \text{Spatial Income}} = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \partial \ln w_i - \sum_i s_{ni} \times \partial \ln p_i.
\]

• Evaluating the welfare effects of an urban shock requires:
  • Income share data \( \{c_{ni}\}_{n=1,i=1}^{N,N} \)
  • Spatial expenditure data \( \{s_{ni}\}_{n=1,i=1}^{N,N} \)
  • Estimates of key elasticities: \( \{\partial \ln p_i, \partial \ln w_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \)
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city

- Goods market clearing in location $i$:
  \[
  y_i = \sum_{n=1}^{N} s_{ni} v_n + s_i^T E^T
  \]

- Labor market clearing in location $i$:
  \[
  \frac{w_i^{\ell}}{\theta_i^{\ell}} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} s_{ni} v_n + s_i^T E^T
  \]

  - where $\theta_i^{\ell}$ is the output elasticity to labor
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

Consider an external \textit{expenditure shock} $E^T$ to a city

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node[shape=circle,fill=black!20] (A) at (0,0) {$E^T$};
\node[draw,rectangle] (B) at (-2,-2) {location $i$};
\node[draw,rectangle] (C) at (2,-2) {location $j$};
\node[draw,rectangle] (D) at (-4,-4) {location $n$};
\draw[->] (A) to (B);
\draw[->] (A) to (C);
\draw[->] (A) to (D);
\node (T) at (-1,-3) {$s^T_i$};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city $\rightarrow$ Income Shock
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city → Income Shock → Demand
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city → Income Shock → Demand → Income Shock
Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city $\rightarrow$ Income Shock $\rightarrow$ Demand $\rightarrow$ Income Shock $\rightarrow$ Demand
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

**Direct Effect:**
- Expenditure shock increases prices/wages \( \propto \) to its expenditure share in that location

**Indirect Effect:**
- Increases prices/wages by increasing residential income elsewhere (spatial multiplier)
Consider an external expenditure shock $E^T$ to a city. Imposing market clearing, keeping expenditure shares and labor allocation constant, we obtain,

$$\frac{\partial \ln p_i}{\partial \ln E^T} = \frac{E^T}{y_i} \left( \sum_n s_{ni} \times v_n \times \sum_j c_{nj} \times \frac{\partial \ln w_j}{\partial \ln E^T} \right)$$

Direct Effect ($\eta_{itm}^{0,T}$)

GE Spillover via Spatial Exp Patterns

$$\frac{\partial \ln w_i}{\partial \ln E^T} = \frac{E^T}{y_i} \left( \sum_n s_{ni} \times v_n \times \sum_j c_{nj} \times \left( \frac{E^T_j}{y_j} \right) \right) + \ldots$$

Direct Effect ($\eta_{itm}^{0,T}$)

GE Spillover via Spatial Exp Patterns
Heterogeneous Effects & GE Spillovers

- A General Methodology for (small) Urban Shocks
  - Intuitive analytical formula to trace out welfare effects
  - Predictions for heterogeneous and GE effects
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New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- Working closely with Caixabank, a large Spanish bank based in Barcelona

- First paper to combine:
  1. High resolution bilateral expenditure data.
  2. High resolution residential income data.
  3. High resolution commuting data.
New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- Expenditure Data:

- Income Data:

- Commuting data:
New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- **Expenditure Data:**
  - Source: Account & point-of-sale data covering 165M+ transactions pa
  - Locals: 1095 residential tiles x 1095 cons tiles x 20 sectors x 36 months
  - Tourists: country of origin x 1095 cons tiles x 20 sectors x 36 months
  - January 2017 - December 2019
  - Covers roughly 54.4 pc of total expenditure

- **Income Data:**

- **Commuting data:**
New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- Expenditure Data:
- Income Data:
  - Source: Payrolls and UB from over 400k accounts
  - Mean and median income per census tract
  
- Commuting data:
New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- Expenditure Data:

- Income Data:

- Commuting data: Two sources:
  1. Imputed from expenditures on weekday lunches (Caixa)
  2. Commuting patterns from cell phone locations (INE)
New Generation of High Resolution Urban Datasets

- Expenditure Data:
- Income Data:
- Commuting data:
- Housing prices:
  - Source: Idealista ("Spanish Zillow")
  - House prices and rental rates
  - Monthly frequency for neighborhoods (more aggregated than census blocks)
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1. Tourism varies across space and time within the city

2. **Locals’ spending and income are spatially determined by residence**

3. Tourist spending affects local’s spending and incomes
Fact 2: Local Spending & Income is Spatial
Three Stylized Facts

1. Tourism varies across space and time within the city

2. Locals’ spending and income are spatially determined by residence

3. **Tourist spending affects local’s spending and incomes**
Fact 3: Tourist spending affects local’s spending
Fact 3: Tourist spending affects local’s incomes
Three Stylized Facts

\[ d \ln u_n = \sum_{i} c_{ni} \times \partial \ln w_i - \sum_{i} s_{ni} \times \partial \ln p_i. \]

1. **Tourist spending** varies across space and time within the city
   - Provides variation for identification

2. **Locals’ spending and income** are spatially determined by residence
   - Documents the heterogeneous incidence across space

3. **Tourist spending** affects local’s spending and incomes
   - Prima-facie evidence of the effect of tourism
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Empirics

- From Theory to Estimation
- Identification
- Results
From Theory to Estimation

- Welfare Formula

\[
d\ln u_n = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \partial \ln w_i - \sum_i s_{ni} \times \partial \ln p_i.
\]

\(\Delta\) Spatial Income \(\Delta\) Spatial Price Index

- Estimates of key elasticities: \( \left\{ \frac{\partial \ln p_i}{\partial \ln E_i}, \frac{\partial \ln w_i}{\partial \ln E_i} \right\} \) \( i=1^N \)
From Theory to Estimation

- Welfare Formula

\[ d \ln u_n = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \partial \ln w_i - \sum_i s_{ni} \times \partial \ln p_i . \]

- \( \Delta \) Spatial Income
- \( \Delta \) Spatial Price Index

- Estimates of key elasticities:

\[ \left\{ \frac{\partial \ln p_i}{\partial \ln E_i}, \frac{\partial \ln w_i}{\partial \ln E_i} \right\}_{i=1}^N \]

- Challenges

  - \( p_{it} \) includes non-pecuniary effects
  - our data: income \( v_{nt} \), not wages \( w_{it} \)
  - \( \ln E_{it} \) not exogenous (everyone likes the beach)
From Theory to Estimation: Step 1

- Recovering amenity-adjusted prices
  - From CES preferences
  - $\delta_{it}$ is the destination fixed effect of a gravity regression:

$$\ln X_{nit} = \ln \delta_{nt} + \ln \delta_{it} + \beta^{\text{dist}} \ln \text{travel}_{\text{time}}_{nit} + \epsilon_{nit}$$

- PPML estimated
- Including both prices and non-pecuniary effects of tourism
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- Recovering amenity-adjusted prices
  - From CES preferences
  - \( \delta_{it} \) is the destination fixed effect of a gravity regression:

\[
\ln X_{nit} = \ln \delta_{nt} + \ln \delta_{it} + \beta^{\text{dist}} \ln travel\_time_{nit} + \epsilon_{nit}
\]

- PPML estimated
- Including both prices and non-pecuniary effects of tourism

- Price Regressions (Average Treatment Effect)

\[
\ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^p \times \ln E^T_{it} + \epsilon_{it}
\]
From Theory to Estimation: Step 1

- Tourist shock at residential level:
  - **Commuting implied exposure** measures impact of tourism on income
    \[
    \ln C_iE_{ntm}^T = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \ln E_{itm}^T
    \]
  - Derived from income maximization problem

Derivations
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- Tourist shock at residential level:
  - **Commuting implied exposure** measures impact of tourism on income
    
    \[
    \ln \text{CiE}^T_{ntm} = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \ln E^T_{itm}
    \]

  - Derived from income maximization problem

- Income Regressions (Average Treatment Effect)
  
  \[
  \ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}^T_{ntm} + \epsilon_{it}
  \]
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- Income & Price Regressions (Average Treatment Effect)

\[
\ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^w \times \ln C_i E_{ntm}^T + \epsilon_{it}
\]

\[
\ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^p \times \ln E_{it}^T + \epsilon_{it}
\]
From Theory to Estimation: Step 1

- Income & Price Regressions (Average Treatment Effect)

\[ \ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^W \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm} + \epsilon_{it} \]

\[ \ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^P \times \ln E_{it}^T + \epsilon_{it} \]

- Challenge
  - Does not take heterog. into account when calculating welfare (Aggregation bias)
From Theory to Estimation: Step 2

- Income & Price Regressions (Heterogeneous Treatment Effect)

\[
\ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}^T_{ntm} + \beta^{w,het} \times \ln \text{CiE}^T_{ntm} \left( \eta^0_{itm} \right) + \epsilon_{it}
\]

\[
\ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^p \times \ln E^T_{it} + \beta^{p,het} \times \eta^0_{itm} \times \ln E^T_{it} + \epsilon_{it}
\]

- Variables
  - \( \eta^0_{itm} = E^T_{i} / y_i \) is the direct effect
From Theory to Estimation: Step 2

- Income & Price Regressions (Heterogeneous Treatment Effect)

\[
\ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T + \beta^{w,\text{het}} \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T \left( \eta_{itn}^0 \right) + \epsilon_{it}
\]

\[
\ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^p \times \ln E_{it}^T + \beta^{p,\text{het}} \times \eta_{itn}^0 \times \ln E_{it}^T + \epsilon_{it}
\]

- Challenge
  - Abstracts from GE spillover effects (SUTVA violation)
From Theory to Estimation: Step 3

- Income & Price Regressions (HTE and Controlling for GE Spillovers)

\[ \ln v_{nt} = \alpha + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T + \beta^{w,het} \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T \left( \eta_{l_{itm}}^0 \right) + \epsilon_{it} \]

\[ \ln \delta_{it} = \alpha + \beta^p \times \ln E_{it}^T + \beta^{p,het} \times \eta_{l_{itm}}^0 \times \ln E_{it}^T + \beta^{p,GE} \times \eta_{l_{itm}}^0 \times \log E_{itm}^{T,GE} + \epsilon_{it} \]

- Variables
  - \( \ln E_{ntm}^{T,GE} (\eta_{l_{itm}}^0) = \sum_n s_{ni} \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T (\eta_{l_{itm}}^0) \) captures (first-degree) GE spillovers
Identification: Shift-Share IV from Het Tourist Pref

- **Challenge**: Unobserved changes in attractiveness/productivity of a location
  - Induces comovement between residential expenditure and tourist expenditure
  - ...or residential income and tourist expenditure
  - ...or measurement error in independent variable (income proxy)
Identification: Shift-Share IV from Het Tourist Pref

- **Our Strategy:** Shift-share IV from Heterogeneous Tourist Preferences
  - Total tourist expenditure is given by:
    \[ B_{it}^T = \sum_{g \in T} s_{git}^0 \times E_{gt}^T \]
  - Shares \( s_{git}^0 \) capture spatial preferences for group \( g \) in baseline
  - Shifts from changes in group-specific expenditures \( E_{gt}^T \)
    - Leave-own-location-out
  - Can be derived from non-parametric tourist demand
  - With FE identification comes from unanticipated changes in Tourist expenditures

First Stage
Estimation Results
Income Regressions: Average and Heterogeneous Effects

- Recover average treatment effects

\[ \ln v_{nmt} = \gamma_i + \gamma_m + \gamma_t + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T + \epsilon_{imt}, \]

- Recover heterogeneous treatment effects

\[ \ln v_{nmt} = \gamma_i + \gamma_m + \gamma_t + \beta^w \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T + \beta^{\text{w,het}} \times \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T \left( \eta_{itm}^0 \right) + \epsilon_{imt}, \]

- Variables

  - \( \ln v_{nmt} \) is income at residential tile and is regressed on:

\[ \ln \text{CiE}_{ntm}^T = \sum_i c_{ni} \times \ln E_{itm}^T \]
## Income Regressions: Average and Heterogeneous Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model:</th>
<th>OLS (1)</th>
<th>IV - 2017 Low Season (2)</th>
<th>IV - 2017 Low Season (3)</th>
<th>IV - 2017 Low Season (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln CiE&lt;sub&gt;nt&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η&lt;sub&gt;it&lt;/sub&gt; × ln CiE&lt;sub&gt;nt&lt;/sub&gt;(η&lt;sub&gt;it&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.033)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed-effects</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit statistics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>26,472</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>26,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test = t&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (1st Stage)</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>927.0</td>
<td>927.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
Price Regressions: Step 1

- Recover average treatment effects

\[ \ln \delta_{ismt} = \gamma_{tms} + \gamma_{is} + \gamma_{ist} + \gamma_{ism} + \beta_p \times \log E_{itm}^T + \epsilon_{ismt}, \]

- Variables
  - \( \delta_{ismt} \) is destination FE from PPML specification on travel time

Binscatter Plot  Gravity Results
### Price Regressions: Step 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model:</th>
<th>OLS</th>
<th>IV - Ref: 2017 Average</th>
<th>IV - Ref: 2017 Low Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists Expenditure: $\ln E_t^T$</td>
<td>0.159***</td>
<td>0.152***</td>
<td>0.091***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.014)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month-Year $\times$ Sector (480)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location $\times$ Sector (21,920)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location $\times$ Sector $\times$ Year (43,840)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location $\times$ Sector $\times$ Month (263,040)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$-test = $f^2$ (1st Stage)</td>
<td>145.4</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
Price Regressions: Step 2 and 3

- Recover heterogeneous treatment effects

\[ \ln \delta_{ismt} = \gamma_{tms} + \gamma_{is} + \gamma_{ist} + \gamma_{ism} + \beta_{p, het} \times \eta_{itm} \times \log E_{itm}^T + \beta_{p, GE} \times \eta_{itm}^{0, Res} \times \log E_{itm}^{T, GE} + \epsilon_{ismt} \]

- Variables
  - \( \eta_{itm}^{0, Res} = E_i^R / y_i \) is the importance of residential expenditures in a tile
  - (first-order) GE spillover effect is approximated by:

\[ \ln E_{ntm}^{T, GE} (\eta_{itm}^0) = \sum_n s_{ni} \times \ln \widehat{C_i E}_{ntm}^T (\eta_{itm}^0) \]
## Price Regressions: Step 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable:</th>
<th>( \hat{\beta}_{\text{est}} )</th>
<th>( \hat{\beta}_{\text{est}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV - Ref: 2017 Average</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ln E_{iT} )</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\ln E}<em>{iT} \times \eta</em>{it} )</td>
<td>-0.523**</td>
<td>-0.467**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\ln E}<em>{GEit} (\tilde{\eta}</em>{i}) )</td>
<td>-0.004***</td>
<td>-0.009***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \hat{\ln E}<em>{GEit} (\tilde{\eta}</em>{i}) \times \eta_{it} )</td>
<td>0.007***</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fixed-effects**
- Month-Year \( \times \) Sector (480)
- Location \( \times \) Sector (21,840)
- Location \( \times \) Sector \( \times \) Year (43,680)
- Location \( \times \) Sector \( \times \) Month (262,080)

**Fit statistics**
- Observations: 524,160
- Adjusted \( R^2 \): 0.975

*Normal standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
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Is tourism good for the locals (on average)?

- Can aggregate to welfare using a simplified version of welfare results

\[
\frac{d \ln \bar{u}}{\partial \ln E^T} = \frac{\partial \ln \bar{v}}{\partial \ln E^T_i} - \frac{\partial \ln \bar{p}}{\partial \ln E^T_i}
\]

- Average Welfare effects (Low/High Season)
  - Implies net welfare deterioration of 5pc

- Caveats
  - Aggregation Bias
  - SUTVA violation
Is tourism good for the locals?

- Welfare Formula

\[ d \ln u_n = \frac{\partial \ln v_n}{\partial \ln E^n_i} \times d \ln E^n_T - \sum_i s_{ni} \times \frac{\partial \ln p_i}{\partial \ln E^n_i} \times d \ln E^n_T \]

- \( s_{ni} \) use baseline averages in 2017

- \( c_{ni} \) only one cross-section available

- Predict income and price changes from January to August
Income (Panel A) and Price Effects (Panel B)
Welfare Effects
Outline of Talk
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Comparison to Quantitative Model

• Demand

\[ G(p_n) = \left( \sum_{s=0}^{S} \alpha_s \left( \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{p}_{nis}^{1-\sigma_s} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma_s}} \right)^{1-\eta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\eta}} \]

• Wage Aggregator (\( \epsilon < 0 \))

\[ J(w_n) = \left( \sum_i (w_{ni})^{1-\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}} \]

• Production with Specific Factors

\[ Q_{is} = F_{is}(\ell_{is}, m_{is}) = z_{is} \ell_{is}^{\beta_s} m_{is}^{1-\beta_s} \]
Equilibrium

- Market Clearing Condition

\[ y_{is} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} s_{nis}v_n + \sum_{g=1}^{G} s_{gis}E_g^T \]

- Labor Market Clearing

\[ w_{i\ell i} = \sum_{s=0}^{S} \theta_s \sum_{n=1}^{N} s_{nis}v_n + \sum_{s=0}^{S} \theta_s \sum_{g=1}^{G} s_{gis}E_g^T \]

- Disposable Income

\[ v_n = \left( \sum_i \left( w_{ni} \right)^{1-\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}} \times T_n \]
Price and Income Predictions highly correlated with DEK Results

slope = 1.8, r² = 0.52

slope = 0.51, r² = 0.39
## Price Regressions Redux

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model:</th>
<th>IV - Ref: 2017 Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable:</td>
<td>$\delta_{ref}^R$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln E_{Rit}^p$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln E_{Rit}^p \times \eta_{it}^0$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln E_{Rit}^p \times p^{10E}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln E_{Rit}^{SE}(\eta_{it}^0)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ln E_{Rit}^{SE}(\eta_{it}^0) \times \eta_{it}^{0,Res}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month-Year×Sector (480)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location×Sector (21,840)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location×Sector×Year (43,680)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location×Sector×Month (262,080)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>524,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Normal standard-errors in parentheses
Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1
Outline of Talk

A General Methodology for (small) Urban Shocks

Intra-city Patterns of Consumption & Income

Empirical Strategy and Identification

Welfare Effects Across the City

Comparison with a Quantitative Model

Conclusion
Conclusion: Estimating the welfare impacts of an urban shock

- **Option A: Quantitative model**
  - (+) Incorporates full GE structure of the city
  - (-) Relies on strong parameterizations

- **Option B: Average treatment effects**
  - (+) Robust to model mis-specification
  - (-) Ignores heterogeneity, GE spillovers (SUTVA likely violated).

- **Option C: A hybrid approach.**
  - (+) Incorporates heterogeneity, (short-run) GE spillovers
  - (+) With a minimal set of model assumptions.


Commuting Implied Exposure Derivation

- Disposable income is given by
  \[ v_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i \ell_{ni} \]

- Totally differentiating and applying the envelope result from above, we obtain,
  \[ d \ln v_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{ni} d \ln w_i \]

- Impact of tourist expenditure shock,
  \[ d \ln v_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_{ni} \frac{d \ln w_i}{d \ln E^T} d \ln E^T \]
  \[ \ln CiE^T_{ntm} = \sum_{i} c_{ni} \times \ln E^T_{itm} \]
Shift-Share Instrument: Derivations

- Representative tourist for group $g$ has preferences,
  \[
  u_g = \frac{E_g^T}{G(\tilde{p})}
  \]

- Roy’s identity gives expenditure shares

- Changes in tourist expenditure are:
  \[
  dX_i^T = \sum_g s_{gi}dE_g^T + \sum_g s_{gi}db_{gi} + \sum_g s_{gi}dp_i
  \]

- Taking it to the data,
  \[
  \Delta E_{imt}^T = \sum_g s_{gi} \times \Delta E_{gt}^T + \epsilon_{imt}^T
  \]

  \[
  \epsilon_{imt}^T = \sum_g s_{gi}db_{gi} + \sum_g s_{gi}dp_i
  \]

  \text{Group Composition}
Distance Coefficient for Gravity by Sector

Distance Elasticity

Category

- Food/Beverages
- Alc Beverages
- Health
- Personal Transp
- Restaurants
- Clothing
- Personal Care
- Audio-visual
- Personal effects
- Books, etc.
- Housing/Utilities
- Cultural Services
- Furnishings
- Recreational
- Other Services
- Communications
- Education
- Hotels
- Vehicle Purchase
- Transp Services

Source: CXBK Payment Processing (2019)
## Commuting Gravity Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model:</th>
<th>(1) Poisson</th>
<th>(2) OLS</th>
<th>(3) OLS</th>
<th>(4) Poisson</th>
<th>(5) OLS</th>
<th>(6) OLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ldist</td>
<td>-4.48***</td>
<td>-1.51***</td>
<td>-1.17***</td>
<td>-1.53***</td>
<td>-0.134***</td>
<td>-0.411***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.107)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (CT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination (CT)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>24,025</td>
<td>24,025</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>1,051,159</td>
<td>1,216,609</td>
<td>42,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.343</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
### Housing Price Regressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>HPRICE</th>
<th>RENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\log E_{it}^*$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - Ref: 2017 Average</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.028***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - Ref: 2017 Low Season</td>
<td>0.059***</td>
<td>0.028***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (108)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i×month (1,296)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i×year (216)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td>2,592</td>
<td>2,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
Income Distribution across Barcelona
Shift Share: First Stage
Price Regressions: Raw vs 2SLS

![Graph 1: Local Expenditure vs Tourist Shock, Raw](Image)

- Local Expenditure, Gravity Estimates, Raw
- Tourist Shock, Raw
- N.R
- Slope = 0.31

![Graph 2: Local Expenditure vs (Predicted) Tourist Shock](Image)

- Local Expenditure, Gravity Estimates, Net of Fixed Effects
- (Predicted) Tourist Shock
- N.R
- Slope = -0.57
Fit of Gravity Specification

![Graph showing the relationship between distance (travel time) and residualized residential expenditure. The slope is indicated as -1.4.]
## Expenditure Gravity Regressions

### Dependent Variables:
- Bilateral Spending
- log(Bilateral Spending + 1)
- log(Bilateral Spending)

### Model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Model (1)</th>
<th>Model (2)</th>
<th>Model (3)</th>
<th>Model (4)</th>
<th>Model (5)</th>
<th>Model (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>log(travel time)</td>
<td>-2.17***</td>
<td>-2.17***</td>
<td>-1.37***</td>
<td>-1.37***</td>
<td>-1.36***</td>
<td>-1.36***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixed-effects

- **Origin (CT)**
  - ✓
- **Destination (CT)**
  - ✓
- **Origin (CT) × YEARMONTH**
  - ✓
- **Destination (CT) × YEARMONTH**
  - ✓

### Fit statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Pseudo R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43,204,320</td>
<td>0.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,125,480</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,204,320</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43,204,320</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,566,622</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,566,622</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
Is tourism good for the locals (on average)?

- Can aggregate to welfare using a simplified version of welfare results

\[
\frac{d \ln \bar{u}}{\partial \ln E^T} = \frac{\partial \ln \bar{v}}{\partial \ln E^T_i} - \frac{\partial \ln \bar{p}_s}{\partial \ln E^T_i}
\]

- Results
  - Income elasticity: .04
  - Consumption Price Index elasticity: [.1,.175]
  - House Price elasticity: .06
  - Welfare elasticity: [-.1,-.04]
  - Average increase between February and July \(\approx 50\text{pc}\)
  - Implies net welfare deterioration of 5pc
## Income Regressions: Step 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model:</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Lunchtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>ln MA&lt;sub&gt;nt&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln MA&lt;sub&gt;nt&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.006 (0.004)</td>
<td>0.012 (0.012)</td>
<td>0.032 (0.021)</td>
<td>0.035 (0.025)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>26,472</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.888</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-test = t&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; (1st Stage)</td>
<td>204.5</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>1,267.2</td>
<td>927.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses
*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1
Comparison with Household Budget Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COICOP (2D)</th>
<th>COICOP (2D)</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Spanish Tourists</th>
<th>Foreign Tourists</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Survey (INE)</th>
<th>Survey Adj (INE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Food/Beverages</td>
<td>32.82 (24.72)</td>
<td>1.32 (5.04)</td>
<td>4.51 (5.10)</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>23.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Alc Beverages</td>
<td>1.97 (1.48)</td>
<td>0.07 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.68)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>11.58 (8.72)</td>
<td>1.94 (7.39)</td>
<td>12.00 (13.55)</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Housing/Utilities</td>
<td>2.81 (2.12)</td>
<td>0.78 (3.00)</td>
<td>0.59 (0.67)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>10.03 (7.55)</td>
<td>3.32 (12.67)</td>
<td>2.01 (2.27)</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>10.76 (8.10)</td>
<td>1.94 (7.40)</td>
<td>1.82 (2.06)</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vehicle Purchase</td>
<td>3.14 (2.36)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.67)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.36)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Personal Transp</td>
<td>7.27 (5.47)</td>
<td>2.06 (7.89)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.79)</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Transp Services</td>
<td>10.13 (7.63)</td>
<td>6.52 (24.90)</td>
<td>9.61 (10.85)</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0.30 (0.23)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.08 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Audio-visual</td>
<td>5.06 (3.81)</td>
<td>0.57 (2.17)</td>
<td>1.78 (2.01)</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>2.62 (1.97)</td>
<td>0.27 (1.03)</td>
<td>1.21 (1.37)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Cultural Services</td>
<td>4.29 (3.23)</td>
<td>0.62 (2.38)</td>
<td>2.79 (3.15)</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Books, etc</td>
<td>1.64 (1.23)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.85)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.60)</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.11 (0.84)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.39)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.69)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>17.73 (13.35)</td>
<td>3.79 (14.46)</td>
<td>19.04 (21.50)</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>1.13 (0.85)</td>
<td>1.49 (5.69)</td>
<td>23.12 (26.11)</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Personal Care</td>
<td>4.84 (3.64)</td>
<td>0.32 (1.23)</td>
<td>0.97 (1.10)</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.49 (1.88)</td>
<td>0.36 (1.37)</td>
<td>5.69 (6.42)</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>131.72 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.88 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.97 (100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>245.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Income Regressions: Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Lunch</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Lunchtime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ln CiE&lt;sub&gt;nt&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.012 (0.012)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.004)</td>
<td>0.007 (0.029)</td>
<td>0.008 (0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ln $\widehat{\text{CiE}<em>{nt}}(\eta</em>{it})$</td>
<td>0.045 (0.030)</td>
<td>0.046 (0.033)</td>
<td>0.086*** (0.027)</td>
<td>0.092*** (0.027)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixed-effects
- Location: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
- Month: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓
- Year: ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓

### Fit statistics
- Observations: 1,776, 26,472, 1,776, 1,776, 26,472, 26,472
- Adjusted $R^2$: 0.93, 0.888, 0.93, 0.93, 0.888, 0.888
- $F$-test = $t^2$ (1st Stage): 204.5, 142.8, 1,267.2, 927.0

*Heteroskedasticity-robust standard-errors in parentheses
Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
Hat Algebra

- Market Clearing Condition

\[
\hat{y}_{is} = \pi_{is}^{local} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (\pi_{is}^{n} S_{nis} \hat{y}_{n}) + \pi_{is}^{group} \sum_{g=1}^{G} \left( \pi_{is}^{g} S_{gis} \hat{E}_{g} \right)
\]

- Labor Market Clearing

\[
\sum_{s} \frac{\beta_{s}y_{is}}{\sum_{s'} \beta_{s'y_{is'}}} \hat{y}_{is} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{w_{i\ell_{ni}}}{\sum_{n'=1}^{N} w_{i'\ell_{n'i}}} (\hat{w}_{ni})^\theta \hat{T}_{n} \hat{W}_{n}^{1-\theta}
\]

- Disposable Income

\[
\hat{v}_{n} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{l_{ni}w_{i}}{\sum_{i'=1}^{N} l_{ni'}w_{i'}} (\hat{w}_{ni})^\theta \hat{T}_{n} \hat{W}_{n}^{1-\theta}
\]
## Parameterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_s$</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>labor share of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_s$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>elasticity of substitution (within sectors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>elasticity of substitution (between sectors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>labor dispersion $(1 - \epsilon)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>[0, 0, 0, 0]</td>
<td>consumption spillovers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Data Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I_{ni}$</td>
<td>Commuting Flows</td>
<td>Lunch Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{nis}$</td>
<td>Base Local Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{gis}$</td>
<td>Base Tourist Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\hat{E}_i^T$</td>
<td>Change in Tourist Expenditures</td>
<td>Difference from Jan to July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_n$</td>
<td>Worker Incomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Roy’s Identity for Labor Supply

- Income maximization problem:

\[ v_n = \max_{\{\ell_i\}} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \ell_i \quad \text{s.t.} \quad H_n(\ell_n) = T_n \]

- Maximand is the income function \( y(w_n, T_n) \) and envelope theorem implies,

\[ \frac{\partial y(\cdot)}{\partial w_i} = \ell_i \]

- Dual is cost minimization problem, where minimand is \( h(w_n, \bar{Y}) \)

- Differentiating we obtain,

\[ \frac{\partial y(\cdot)}{\partial w_i} = -\frac{\partial h(w_n, y(w_n, T_n))}{\partial w_i} = \ell_i \]
Derivation of Welfare Formula

- Assuming both homothetic demand and a homothetic income maximization problem allows us to write the indirect utility function as,

\[ u_n = \frac{T_n J(w_n)}{G(p_n)} \]

- Totally differentiating,

\[ \frac{du_n}{u_n} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{J(w_n)} \frac{\partial (J(w_n))}{\partial w_i} w_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} G(p_n) \frac{\partial (1/G(p_n))}{\partial p_{ni}} p_{ni} \frac{dp_{ni}}{p_{ni}} \]

- Applying Roy’s identity for the income maximization and consumption problem from above,

\[ \frac{du_n}{u_n} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\ell_i}{v_n} w_i \frac{dw_i}{w_i} - \sum_{i=1}^{N} q_{ni} v_n \frac{p_{ni}}{p_{ni}} \]
### Price Regressions: Group Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables:</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^R )</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^{T.Domi} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^{T.For} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^R )</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^{T.Domi} )</th>
<th>( \delta_{ist}^{T.For} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model:</td>
<td>OLS</td>
<td>IV - Ref: 2017 Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \ln E_{it}^T )</td>
<td>0.091***</td>
<td>0.485***</td>
<td>0.454***</td>
<td>-0.576***</td>
<td>-0.277***</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.077)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month-Year ( \times ) Sector (480)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location ( \times ) Sector (21,920)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location ( \times ) Sector ( \times ) Year (43,840)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location ( \times ) Sector ( \times ) Month (263,040)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
<td>526,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted ( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Normal standard-errors in parentheses*

*Signif. Codes: ***: 0.01, **: 0.05, *: 0.1*
CES Model Example of Simple Non-Parametric Model

- Preferences
  \[ u_n(\{q_{ni}\}_{i=1,...,N}) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{ni}^{1/\sigma} q_{ni}^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma} \right)^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)} \]

- Constraint
  \[ \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{ni} q_{ni} \leq v_n \]

- Utility max. gives lagrangian
  \[ \mathcal{L}(\{q_{ni}\}_{i=1,...,N}, \lambda) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{ni}^{1/\sigma} q_{ni}^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma} \right)^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)} + \lambda \left( v_n - \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{ni} q_{ni} \right) \]
CES Model Example of Simple Non-Parametric Model

- FOCs

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial q_{ni}} = 0 \iff \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{ni}^{1/\sigma} q_{ni}^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma} \right)^{1/(\sigma-1)} \alpha_{ni}^{1/\sigma} q_{ni}^{-1/\sigma} = \lambda p_{ni} \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, N
\]

\[
\frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^{N} p_{ni} q_{ni} = \nu_n
\]

- For two consumption locations \(i\) and \(j\)

\[
\left( \frac{\alpha_{ni}}{\alpha_{nj}} \right)^{1/\sigma} \left( \frac{q_{ni}}{q_{nj}} \right)^{-1/\sigma} = \frac{p_{ni}}{p_{nj}}
\]

\[
\frac{\alpha_{ni}}{\alpha_{nj}} = \frac{p_{ni}^{\sigma} q_{ni}}{p_{nj}^{\sigma} q_{nj}}
\]
CES Model Example of Simple Non-Parametric Model

- For two consumption locations $i$ and $j$

$$\frac{\alpha_{ni}}{\alpha_{nj}} = \frac{p_{ni}^{\sigma} q_{ni}}{p_{nj}^{\sigma} q_{nj}}$$

$$q_{nj} = \frac{\alpha_{nj}}{\alpha_{ni}} \frac{p_{ni}^{\sigma}}{p_{nj}^{\sigma}} q_{ni}$$

- $\times p_{nj}$

$$q_{nj} p_{nj} = \frac{\alpha_{nj} p_{ni}^{\sigma}}{\alpha_{ni} p_{nj}^{\sigma}} q_{ni} p_{nj}$$

$$q_{nj} p_{nj} = \frac{1}{\alpha_{ni}} q_{ni} p_{ni}^{\sigma} \alpha_{nj} p_{nj}^{1-\sigma}$$
CES Model Example of Simple Non-Parametric Model

- $\sum_j$

\[
\sum_j q_{nj}p_{nj} = \frac{1}{\alpha_{ni}} q_{ni}p_{ni}^{\sigma} \sum_j \alpha_{nj}p_{nj}^{1-\sigma}
\]

- using FOC2 (BC)

\[
v_n = \frac{1}{\alpha_{ni}} q_{ni}p_{ni}^{\sigma} p_n^{1-\sigma}
\]

- and demand for good $i$

\[
q_{ni} = \alpha_{ni}p_{ni}^{-\sigma} v_n p_n^{\sigma-1}
\]
CES Model Example of Simple Non-Parametric Model

- We get indirect utility

\[ U_n = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{1}{\sigma} \left[ \alpha_{ni} P_{ni}^{-\sigma} v_n P_{n}^{\sigma-1} \right]^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma} \right)^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)} \]

\[ U_n = P_{n}^{\sigma-1} v_n \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{ni} P_{ni}^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)} = P_{n}^{\sigma-1} v_n P_{n}^{-\sigma} \]

\[ U_n = \frac{v_n}{P_n} = \frac{v_n}{\left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_{ni} P_{ni}^{1-\sigma} \right)^{1/(1-\sigma)}} \]

- We can also express demand as total spending

\[ X_{ni} = p_{ni} q_{ni} = \alpha_{ni} \left( \frac{p_{ni}}{P_n} \right)^{1-\sigma} v_n \]