
Do higher property values increase fire suppression costs?

Connor Lennon Fall 2021



Over the last ten years, the US spent \$21.4 billion on fire suppression

Increasing number of homes are being built in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)




[2] What is causing these higher costs?

What causes fires to be **more** or **less** expensive to suppress in the first place?

Major policy concern: association between **property values** and **expense of fire** suppression (observed by existing literature) \rightarrow regressive!

Is this association due to a bias towards protecting wealth directly or due to expensive homes being built in places that are expensive to fight fires?



Complication: Dynamic expectations.

Which paths a fire could take impact expected costs. Suppression decisions impact actual paths AND costs.

Expected paths affect suppression decisions, homes at risk, and costs.

Simultaneity problem arises if statistically analyzed ex-post, but disappears if examined using ex-ante data.

[3] Outline

Research goal: Decompose the fire manager's problem to identify:

1: Do fire managers preferentially assign more resources to fires near expensive properties?

2: How much of this correlation between fire suppression and property values is due to physical attributes common to expensive properties and higher suppression costs?

Note: Could be a combination of both!


Methods: Double/Debiased Machine Learning

- Uses **C**ompact **C**onvolutional **T**ransformer (**CCT**), to model nonlinear confounders in a regression model (e.g., Slope, Fuels, Canopy Cover, Accessibility ...)
- Produces causal estimates of property value on fire suppression costs, controlling for machine-learned fire risk attributes


Research Question




Basic Hedonics



Basic Physics



Fire Manager's Expectation/Information (Unobserved)



Goal: To disentangle physical components of expected fire suppression costs and amenities from a tendency to protect expensive property. Use models of fire spread and risk of damage to assets that fire managers expect to protect in order to identify important control variables - elevation, fuels, water-features, telephone, etc.

D/DML uses out-of-sample estimates from two **CCT** models performing nonlinear regressions of Property Values and Suppression Costs $f(\cdot), g(\cdot)$ respectively, using the control variable set X_i for each. For fire i:

Estimating θ with linear estimators in this system of equations produces estimation error in f in equation (2) that may produce bias. For D/DML estimation to yield valid causal estimates, two assumptions are required:

 $\mathbf{A_1}$ u_i and v_i exist, are additively separable from g, f and are unassociated to one another. I.e - unlearnable non-physical factors in property values (eg, interest rates at valuation time) are not associated with non-physical factors in fire-level suppression (eg, changes in wind speed during burn) except via changes in property values.

 $\mathbf{A_2} \sum_{i \in N} (\hat{g}(X_i) - g(X_i)) (\hat{f}(X_i) - f(X_i))$ converges at rate \sqrt{N} , or that either estimation error converges at least at rate $\sqrt[4]{N}$. This assumes the estimation errors of \hat{f} and \hat{g} are not systematically associated or **CCT** is a reasonable estimator for f or g, and that X_i does not contain any bad controls

Nascent Results

My estimates indicate a smaller effect from property values on suppression costs than existing literature: for a **1% increase in property values**, costs **increase by** .038%. Compares to **reported .11%** increase in Gebert et al. 2007 (SCI) and **a .16% increase** when replicating SCI on data from 2020-2021. This difference is statistically significant.