

DO LIQUIDATION VALUES AFFECT FINANCIAL CONTRACTS?
EVIDENCE FROM COMMERCIAL LOAN CONTRACTS AND ZONING REGULATION*

EFRAIM BENMELECH, MARK J. GARMAISE, AND TOBIAS J. MOSKOWITZ

Abstract

We examine the impact of asset liquidation value on debt contracting using a unique set of commercial property loan contracts. We employ commercial zoning regulation to capture the flexibility of a property's permitted uses as a measure of an asset's redeployability or value in its next best use. Within a census tract, more redeployable assets receive larger loans with longer maturities and durations, lower interest rates, and fewer creditors, controlling for the property's current value, its type, and neighborhood. These results are consistent with incomplete contracting and transaction cost theories of liquidation value and financial structure.

*Benmelech is from the Harvard Economics Department, Garmaise is from the Anderson School at UCLA, and Moskowitz is from the University of Chicago, GSB and NBER. We have benefitted from the suggestions and comments of an anonymous referee, George Baker, Tony Bernardo, Marianne Bertrand, Patrick Bolton, Lauren Cohen, Doug Diamond, Eugene Fama, Oliver Hart, John Heaton, Thomas Hubbard, Eugene Kandel, Steve Kaplan, Robert Novy-Marx, Amil Petrin, Andrei Shleifer, Jeremy Stein, Per Stromberg, Luigi Zingales, and seminar participants at Harvard University, the University of Chicago Finance lunch, Indiana University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Ohio State University, and Princeton. Special thanks to Michael Arabe, John Edkins, and Peggy McNamara as well as COMPS.com for providing commercial real estate and zoning regulation data, to Bob Figlio, Dave Ingeneri, and CAP Index, Inc. for providing crime data, and to Joseph Gyourko for supplying the Wharton Land Use Control Survey. Moskowitz thanks the Center for Research in Security Prices and the James S. Kemper Foundation Research Fund for financial support.

Correspondence to: Tobias Moskowitz, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, 1101 E. 58th St., Chicago, IL 60637. E-mail: tobias.moskowitz@gsb.uchicago.edu.

Introduction

How do liquidation values affect financial contracts? An extensive theoretical literature (Williamson (1988), Harris and Raviv (1990), Aghion and Bolton (1992), Shleifer and Vishny (1992), Hart and Moore (1994), Bolton and Scharfstein (1996), and Diamond (2004)) argues that optimal debt policy critically depends on how costly it is for creditors to seize and liquidate assets. Empirical evidence on this question is scarce, however, due to the difficulty in obtaining a measure of an asset's liquidation value or value in its next best use. We provide empirical evidence on the link between liquidation value and debt contracts using a unique sample of commercial property loans and variation in property zoning ordinances.

Liquidation value is of central importance for financial decisions when contracts are incomplete and transaction costs exist. In particular, debt contracts allow the creditor to seize the debtor's assets when the latter fails to make a promised payment. Since the debtor cannot commit to not withdraw his human capital from the project (as in Hart and Moore (1994)), or to not divert cash flows to himself (as in Hart and Moore (1989) and Aghion and Bolton (1992)), creditors will agree to lend only if the debt is secured by the project's assets and default triggers its liquidation.

Testing these theories requires that the econometrician observe the liquidation value of the asset, but it is difficult to ascertain *ex ante*, when the parties enter the debt contract, what the proceeds from selling the asset to the next user might be. As a proxy for the *ex ante* value of the asset in its next best use, we employ property-specific zoning assignments to capture micro-level variation in liquidation values.

The real estate market is a natural candidate for testing financial contracting from an incomplete contracting perspective. First, the loans are typically secured and nonrecourse, thus providing a set of project-specific financings and characteristics consistent with the inalienability of human capital described by Hart and Moore (1994) and other models. Second, debt levels in commercial real estate are typically very high at initiation. Thus, it is plausible that the financing provided is closer to the maximal leverage or project debt capacity the lender will tolerate, which is closer to the underlying theories. Finally, the real estate market offers a potential measure of an asset's liquidation value through zoning ordinances which govern the permitted uses of a property.

This empirical approach is motivated by Shleifer and Vishny's (1992) argument that a broader set of buyers can potentially raise the liquidation value of an asset. Zoning regulations determine

the set of uses of a property. Properties with more allowable uses should have a greater number of potential buyers, all else equal, and therefore a higher value in the event of liquidation. A property's zoning designation is thus a measure of its *redeployability* in the sense of Williamson (1988).

We recognize that the current value of the asset is also likely to be affected by redeployability and, more specifically, zoning, which, along with the financing environment, may be jointly determined by local market unobservables (Glaeser and Gyourko (2002) and McMillen and McDonald (2002)). We argue that endogeneity concerns of this type are less relevant for our study for several reasons. First, the zoning code is set at the jurisdiction or city level. We examine property-specific zoning assignments *within* a census tract, where census tract fixed effects difference out unobservable neighborhood effects such as local market conditions, "quality," or degree of bank redlining at a level finer than the local zoning code or the typical lending market (see Berger, Demsetz, and Strahan (1999), Petersen and Rajan (2002), and Garmaise and Moskowitz (2004, 2005)). Second, we focus on the characteristics of the debt contracts *controlling for the current value* of the property to isolate the component of redeployability related to the asset's secondary or liquidation value. Current value likely soaks up other quality differences within a census tract that may be unrelated to collateral value.

We find that, controlling for the property's current value, type, general zoning, year, and census tract, greater redeployability is associated with larger loans, lower interest rates, longer maturity and duration debt, and fewer creditors. Moving from the least to the average (most) zoning flexibility lowers the interest loan rate by 27 (58) basis points per annum, increases the loan's size relative to the value of the property by 1.9 (4.1) percentage points, lengthens the loan's maturity by 1.1 (2.3) years, increases duration by 0.2 (0.5) years, and decreases the probability of borrowing from multiple lenders by 4.0 (8.5) percentage points. Including bank or buyer fixed effects in addition to census tract fixed effects to further difference out unobservables related to the lender or borrower, we find quantitatively similar effects.

We also find that these effects are magnified in districts in which survey evidence suggests zoning rules are administered more strictly and where local market liquidity is higher. In addition, our redeployability measure has a significantly larger impact on loan contracts in states in which foreclosure is relatively easy, suggesting that it is the effect of zoning on the asset's liquidation value that is driving our results, since only collateral value is relevant in foreclosure.

We also employ another measure of liquidation value using "historical" zoning districts, which

are quite restrictive and inflexible. We find that historic-zoned properties receive significantly fewer, smaller and shorter duration loans, are financed at higher interest rates, and are more likely to be financed by multiple creditors. Since it is also more difficult to obtain zoning changes within historic districts, we interact our redeployability measure with the historic designation and find that redeployability has an even greater effect on loan terms in historic areas.

Finally, since current value should be a function of liquidation value, we also note that more redeployable properties enjoy higher market prices. While we interpret this result with caution due to greater endogeneity concerns, it is consistent with flexibility-of-zoning capturing liquidation value.

Previous research has analyzed some of the implications of incomplete contracting for financial structure, but has not focused on liquidation value, which plays a prominent role in the theory (Baker and Hubbard (2001, 2003) and Kaplan and Stromberg (2002), and (Gilson (1997))). The existence of inefficient liquidation or “fire sales” has been documented (Pulvino (1998, 1999), Stromberg (2000)), but not the interplay between *ex ante* liquidation value and financial structure at the time the contract is set. Other studies examine the relation between balance-sheet figures such as tangibility (e.g., the ratio of fixed assets to total assets) and capital structure, (Braun (2003), Harris and Raviv (1991), and Rajan and Zingales (1995)), but it is not clear that such proxies either capture liquidation value or represent total debt capacity. Benmelech (2005) analyzes the relation between asset salability and capital structure among 19th century American railroads, finding a link to debt maturity, but not leverage.

In addition, we provide novel micro-level evidence on the relation between liquidation value and number of creditors that complements cross-country studies of lending relationships and creditor protection (Ongena and Smith (2000), Esty and Megginson (2003), and Detragiache, Garella, and Guiso (2000)).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section I summarizes theoretical predictions on the relation between liquidation value and financial contracting. Section II details the commercial loan data and local zoning regulations and describes our empirical strategy to measure changes in liquidation value through zoning laws. Section III presents the empirical results and Section IV concludes.

I. Liquidation Value and Financial Contracts

The value of the creditor's option to liquidate project assets affects both his willingness to provide financing and the terms on which a loan may be extended. The concept of *liquidation value* used in Harris and Raviv (1990), Hart and Moore (1994), and Bolton and Scharfstein (1996) is fairly general: an asset's liquidation value is the amount that creditors can expect to receive if they seize the asset from managers and sell it on the open market. Williamson (1988) and Shleifer and Vishny (1992) analyze two different components of liquidation value. Williamson, in his transactions cost approach, focuses on an asset's *redeployability* (i.e., its value in alternative uses). Shleifer and Vishny's industry-equilibrium model suggests that assets with few potential buyers, or with potential buyers who are likely to be financially constrained when a firm attempts liquidation, will be poor candidates for debt finance, since liquidation is likely to yield a low price. In all these models, however, project financing is highly influenced by the value of the collateral in the creditor's hands.

The following are some of the central empirical predictions arising from these models:

Prediction 1. *Debt levels increase in asset liquidation value.*

This is a general prediction emerging from Williamson (1988), Shleifer and Vishny (1992), Harris and Raviv (1990), and Hart and Moore (1994). Debt triggers liquidation in some states in all these models, and the benefits of debt are tied to the efficiency of liquidation.

Prediction 2. *The promised debt yield decreases in asset liquidation value, controlling for the debt level.*

Following Prediction 1, increased liquidation value lowers the cost of liquidation. In equilibrium, lenders therefore charge lower interest rates on loans made on assets with higher liquidation value, controlling for the debt level. This is in part why optimal debt levels also rise (Prediction 1).¹

Prediction 3. *Debt maturity increases in asset liquidation value.*

Prediction 3 emerges from Hart and Moore (1994) and from Shleifer and Vishny (1992). Hart

¹Unconditionally, an increase in the liquidation value of the asset raises the optimal debt level but also provides a greater payment to creditors. The net effect on promised debt yields is analytically ambiguous, but in numerical results Harris and Raviv (1990) show that firms with higher liquidation values consistently have higher debt yields. Controlling for the debt level of the firm, by contrast, higher liquidation values should be associated with *lower* promised yields, since creditors can expect a higher payment in the case of default.

and Moore (1994) argue that a higher profile of liquidation values over time increases the asset’s durability and makes longer maturity debt feasible. Shleifer and Vishny (1992) analyze the trade-off between the benefit of debt overhang in constraining management and liquidation costs. Since, as Benmelech (2005) shows, higher liquidation values make overhang (long-term) debt more attractive, Shleifer and Vishny (1992) thus predict an increase in debt maturity with liquidation value. Although some of these theories only consider zero-coupon debt, a reasonable extrapolation yields the implication that debt *duration* will also increase in liquidation value.

Prediction 4. *Firms borrow from multiple creditors when liquidation value is low and from a single creditor when liquidation value is high.*

This is a prediction of Bolton and Scharfstein (1996) and Diamond (2004). Multiple creditors provide discipline at the cost of inefficient liquidation.

Prediction 5. *The current market value of the asset is increasing in its liquidation value.*

Since the liquidation value of the asset is a component of its overall value, increasing the liquidation value increases current total asset value (Harris and Raviv (1990)).

A. Application to commercial real assets

In order to test these implications we employ a unique dataset of commercial property transactions and financial contracts and use property-specific zoning assignments to capture variation in liquidation value. Some discussion of the relation between the data and the models is in order.

Commercial property loans are secured, highlighting the potential importance of liquidation value, and are typically nonrecourse (Stein (1997)).² The lender may only pursue the collateral, in this case the property, and not any other assets of the borrower in case of default.³ Examining variation in financial contracts within a particular asset class also helps to reduce confounding influences such as control issues, cash flow rights, risk, industry competitiveness, etc. that may arise when examining contracts across vastly different assets, projects, or investments. Finally,

²While most commercial real estate loans are nonrecourse, our data does not specify the recourse status of individual loans. To the extent the recourse feature is related to property type and region, our use of property type and census tract fixed effects should account for recourse discrepancies. Furthermore, we verify that all of our main findings are robust to the exclusion of properties with greater than 95 percent leverage, where recourse is more likely to be used. Finally, in California and Oregon pursuing recourse against a defaulting borrower is statutorily prohibited under the preferred and most common form of foreclosure (National Mortgage Servicer’s Reference Directory (2001)). We confirm that all the main results in the paper are robust to using data from only these states.

³In addition, although very few repeat buyers exist in our sample, including borrower fixed effects to difference out borrower attributes had little effect on the coefficient estimates, but reduce power considerably.

we argue in the next section that property-specific zoning assignments within a census tract can capture micro-level variation in liquidation values used to test the predictions of the models.

II. Data and Empirical Strategy

We briefly describe the data sources used in the paper and our identification strategy for capturing asset liquidation value.

A. Transaction and financing level data of commercial real assets

Our sample consists of commercial real asset transactions drawn from across the U.S. over the period January 1, 1992 to March 30, 1999 from COMPS.com, a leading provider of commercial real estate sales data. Garmaise and Moskowitz (2003, 2004) provide an extensive description of the COMPS database and detailed summary statistics. There are 14,159 commercial transactions reported over our sample period, and the data span 11 states: California, Nevada, Oregon, Massachusetts, Maryland, Virginia, Texas, Georgia, New York, Illinois, and Colorado, plus the District of Columbia.

COMPS records for each property transaction the sale price, specific zoning designation (described below), and terms of the loan contract *at the time of sale*. As documented by Garmaise and Moskowitz (2003, 2004) debt financing dominates the financial structure of commercial properties, comprising 71 percent of the property's value on average. These magnitudes suggest that the loans are likely closer to the maximal debt capacity of the asset. COMPS also provides eight digit latitude and longitude coordinates of the property's location, which we link to Census data, survey data from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey, and crime rate data.

Table I reports summary statistics on the properties in our sample. Panel A shows that the average sale price is \$2.4 million, though values range from \$20,000 to \$750 million. Recorded details of the loan contract include loan-to-value ratio, number of creditors, maturity, interest rate, whether the loan rate is floating or fixed, the length of amortization, and whether the loan was backed by the Small Business Administration (occurring only 1.3 percent of the time). Using the reported interest rate (r), loan maturity (m) and amortization period (a), we estimate the duration of the loan assuming that the debt coupons are paid annually and that there is one final balloon

payment at maturity,

$$Duration = \frac{r + 1 - \frac{((m-1)r+r+1)}{(1+r)^{m-1}}}{r \left(1 - \frac{1}{(1+r)^a}\right)} + m \left(\frac{\frac{1}{(1+r)^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{(1+r)^a}}{1 - \frac{1}{(1+r)^a}} \right). \quad (1)$$

The mean age of our properties is just under 29 years, but ranges from zero to 200 years. Overall, the properties in the data set are relatively small and old and are financed with relatively long-term debt compared with institutional quality real estate. (See, for example, Titman, Tompaidis, and Tsyplakov, 2004.)⁴ These properties are particularly appropriate for tests of the role of liquidation value since the real option to liquidate the asset (for example, by knocking it down and constructing something new) is more important for older, lower quality buildings.

B. Zoning designations

Our sample consists of properties that are located in a variety of urban and suburban locations, 38.7 percent of the properties are located in the top 20 U.S. cities (by population), 62.3 percent are in the top 50 cities, and 83.8 percent are located in one of these major cities or have a population density of at least 100,000 residents per 3 mile radius. We match our sample to the (hand-collected) zoning codes of the corresponding urban or suburban locality. We see 161 unique zoning designations among our properties. Regulations are controlled by local units of the government and are designed to manage the physical development of land and the uses to which each individual property may be put. Zoning definitions are typically nested and classified along two facets. The first dimension spans the breadth of permitted uses. The most common categories of this dimension in urban areas are: business, commercial, manufacturing, residential, organizations, and historic. The second dimension of zoning determines the intensity and scope of the allowable use of the property *within* its broad category. It may limit the permitted size of the building relative to the size of the lot, the number of individual units permitted on the lot, or the maximum height or number of stories. An alphabetic modifier typically describes the zoning category (first dimension), while the second dimension is denoted by a numeric scale. Appendix 1 provides an example of the residential zoning codes in New York city. We term the numerical intensity the “within zoning value.” Higher values indicate broader scopes of allowable uses within its general category.

⁴The length of loan maturity is in part driven by the large fraction of apartment buildings in our sample that carry very long-term loans, perhaps due to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Although power is reduced considerably, the magnitude of our results, including maturity and duration, are robust to the exclusion of apartments.

Since zoning is a local affair, set at the county, city, or municipality level, its ordinances and classifications vary from place to place. Variation in zoning can be driven by political considerations, esthetic or historic preservation efforts, neighborhood externalities, and motives for controlling growth in an area. Some of these are endogenous and possibly related to an underlying effect that also determines the financing environment. However, since zoning is relatively stable over time, its ordinances being set some time ago may be less related to current market conditions. For example, Glaeser and Gyourko (2002) discuss the determination of zoning in an area and its conformity to local market conditions. However, by employing census tract fixed effects, which are much finer than the level at which zoning codes were set or lending markets operate (see Berger, Demsetz, and Strahan (1999), Petersen and Rajan (2002), and Garmaise and Moskowitz (2004, 2005)), we difference out local market conditions potentially affecting the zoning code and financing environment. In the next section we confirm that our within census tract measure exhibits no correlation with local financing characteristics. Table I Panels A and B report summary statistics on zoning codes and categories across properties. Panel C reports loan and price information across property types.

C. Using zoning regulations to measure liquidation values

Using the zoning designation of each property at the time of sale, we exploit variation within an area and zoning category in terms of the flexibility of permitted uses of the property. Our proxy of liquidation value is a measure of the property's redeployability or zoning flexibility *within* its general zoning category. Properties with more flexible zoning designations admit more potential uses. Creditors who seize a property subject to restrictive zoning will find it difficult to pursue alternative uses for the structure or land, whereas creditors who foreclose on a property that is only loosely zoned can redeploy the asset in many different ways.

To illustrate the dimensions of zoning and how we compute our measure of redeployability, consider the case of residential zoning districts in New York city. According to the NYC Zoning handbook, there are 18 different zoning districts within the residential category. Appendix 1 provides a detailed description of each of the residential zoning districts in NYC and a summary of their permitted uses. The allowable uses within the general residential zoning category are increasing with the zoning district numeric scale. For example, the R-2 zoning district allows for a minimum lot area of 3,800 square feet, allows only detached single- or two-family residences, and

allows a maximum number of dwelling units per acre of 11, whereas R-4 allows a minimum lot area of 970 square feet, semi-detached structures as well as single- or two-family residences, and allows up to 45 dwelling units per acre. Moving down the code, the higher the numeric value, the fewer constraints placed on property uses.

To construct our redeployability measure, we extract the numeric “within value” to capture redeployability within each broad zoning category. For comparison across locales and zoning categories, we then scale the within zoning numeric value by the numeric value of the zoning designation with maximum allowable uses within its broad category in the local area. For example, a zoning district of M-1 is first coded by a manufacturing dummy variable that is set equal to 1, and a redeployability variable within this category. If the manufacturing zoning designations for a particular locale are: M-1, M-2, M-3, and M-4 then the *within* redeployability value is 0.25.⁵ Scaling the raw within zoning value for the range of allowable uses in a given area normalizes the local zoning assignments across jurisdictions. For property p with zoning designation $A-n$ in jurisdiction j , this is $\frac{n}{\max(n \in P_{(A,j)})}$, where $P_{(A,j)}$ is the set of properties within jurisdiction j that have the same general zoning category A . We use the empirically observed maximum value in jurisdiction j for scale, where results are robust to defining j to be the zip code, 2 mile radius, 5 mile radius, county, or MSA. For convenience and uniformity we report results defining locales at the zip code level.

Our measure of redeployability treats each within numeric value equally. This is done for simplicity and to avoid imposing an arbitrary non-linear structure. We see no reason to expect any bias in the linear specification that would have any relation to loan contract terms. Moreover, we formally test and reject a nonlinear specification in favor of a linear model.⁶

A natural question arises about whether zoning laws are actually enforced and how easy it is to acquire a zoning variance. This issue is essentially an empirical one. The evidence we describe in section III in support of the effects of zoning on debt contracts suggests that zoning restrictions certainly do sometimes bind. Rezoning or obtaining a variance is typically difficult and costly (in

⁵When modifiers are used in zoning districts we refine the within numeric values further such that they account for this sub-division. For example, given the following residential zoning designations within an area: R-1, R-2A, R-2B, R-2C, and R-3, the *within* numeric value of R-2C will be 2.67 and its scaled value, which is our measure of redeployability, will equal 2.67/3.0=0.89.

⁶We check for the presence of non-linearities associated with our redeployability measure by regressing each of our loan characteristics, as well as the sale price, on dummy variables for every redeployability value (there are 427 unique values). We then take the estimated dummy coefficients from this regression, representing the effect each redeployability value has on the particular loan terms or price, and regress them on the continuous redeployability measure, its squared term, and cubed term. For all dependent variables the non-linear terms are rejected in favor of a linear specification for describing the data.

terms of time, uncertainty, and expense), and therefore zoning remains quite stable. Moreover, we exploit the variation in zoning enforcement across regions and find that the effects on contracts are magnified in districts where zoning rules are administered more strictly.

Figure 1 plots the distribution of our redeployability measure across all properties in our sample. The mean (median) scaled flexibility measure is 0.51 (0.50) with a standard deviation of 0.24 and ranges from 0.08 to 1.

III. Empirical Results of Redeployability (Through Zoning)

Using zoning flexibility to measure ex ante liquidation value, we test the predictions of the models from Section I.

A. Econometric model

Our econometric model considers the effect of our redeployability variables on the following loan characteristics: annual interest rate, frequency (i.e., whether or not a loan is granted, a binary variable), leverage (loan size divided by the sale price), loan maturity in years, loan duration in years, and presence of multiple creditors (a binary variable). The equation estimated is

$$\text{loan characteristic}_i = F(\text{redeployability}_i, \text{current value}_i, \text{controls}_i) + \epsilon_i, \quad (2)$$

where controls_i is a vector of controls containing a set of property and neighborhood attributes for asset i including census tract, year, property type, and zoning category fixed effects and ϵ_i is an error term. We mainly estimate linear models, though other functional forms are considered for the binary dependent variables.

In advance of our discussion of the empirical results, it is worthwhile to consider the econometric issues raised by our specification in equation (2). The first point is that the current value itself may be a function of the redeployability variable; we would expect more redeployable properties to realize higher prices and, indeed, we provide evidence in favor of this hypothesis in Section I. This presents no special econometric problem.

A second possibility is that the current value is higher when finance is provided. The buyer may be able to offer a higher price when he receives a bank loan. In this case, current value is an endogenous variable in equation (2) and cannot be easily interpreted. We are interested, however, only in the effects of redeployability (through zoning) on loan characteristics. The coefficient on

redeployability remains consistent even when another regressor such as sale price is endogenous (Wooldridge, 2002).⁷

The third, and most serious, concern is that some unobservable variable (such as bank redlining) has a simultaneous effect on loan provision, sale prices, and zoning regulations, rendering all of our variables endogenous and difficult to interpret. This issue is taken up in the real estate literature (e.g., McMillen and McDonald (1991), Quigley and Rosenthal (2004), and Wallace (1988)), and there is evidence that local market conditions can affect the general zoning of an area.⁸ Therefore, we employ census tract fixed effects to difference out unobservables at a level much finer than the level at which zoning is being set or local financial markets operate. A census tract typically covers between 2,500 and 8,000 persons or about a 4 square block area in most cities, and is designed to be homogeneous with respect to population characteristics, economic status, and living conditions (source: U.S. Census Bureau). In our loan sample we have 2,090 census tracts (about 4 properties per tract), of which 1,296 contain more than one property transaction, 485 have at least 5 transactions, and 170 contain more than 10 transactions.

Local debt market conditions are clearly highly uniform within a census tract, so the financing environment is unlikely to be driving the micro-level zoning variation we study. The standard definition of the local banking market in the literature (e.g., Berger, Demsetz, and Strahan (1999)) is the local Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or non-MSA county. We explicitly test whether zoning and the financing environment within a census tract are related by regressing various lending bank characteristics on our redeployability measure and census tract fixed effects. We find no significant relation between redeployability and average bank deposit size ($t=-0.74$), bank asset size ($t=-0.61$), bank fraction of deposits within the county ($t=0.01$), city ($t=-0.01$), and zip code ($t=-1.47$), nor the frequency of thrifts ($t=0.78$). Thus, it is not the case that zoning flexibility within a census tract is correlated with the financial environment.

In addition, we also show that the inclusion of bank fixed effects (and census tract fixed effects) does not materially weaken our results. This indicates that our findings are not driven by different types of banks making loans to more or less redeployable properties.

We also control for current property value, and thereby attempt to isolate the component of

⁷Although there may be some issues in small samples, given our relatively large sample size (as detailed in Table I), it is reasonable to rely on asymptotic results.

⁸Some useful references on the relationship between zoning and prices are Pogodzinski and Sass (1991), Pollakowski and Wachter (1990), Glaeser and Gyourko (2002), and McMillen and McDonald (2002).

our redeployability measure solely related to liquidation value. Variables affecting value and zoning simultaneously will be captured by current value and will, therefore, if anything, understate the effect of our zoning variable on loan terms. Potential omitted variables affecting zoning and financing on a specific property within a census tract, type, year, and zoning category *and* controlling for current value, are difficult to envision.⁹

Alternatively, unobservable variables may be property-specific, for example a characteristic of the buyer. It is highly unlikely, however, given the stability of zoning classifications, that any buyer characteristic could affect the zoning of a property *at the time of sale*. Moreover, because census tracts are designed to capture population and economic homogeneity, using tract fixed effects helps control for characteristics of buyers and sellers. In addition, despite having only a few multiple borrowers, and therefore very low power, we find our results are robust to the inclusion of borrower fixed effects in the sense that our point estimates are similar. This effectively differences out any quality differences across borrowers.

We note that we are essentially estimating reduced form equations for the price, quantity, and terms of the debt supplied. This is reasonable since we are only interested in testing the equilibrium outcomes and implications proposed by the theories in Section I. We cannot directly show whether the results are driven by demand- or supply-side effects, although as argued earlier these effects are likely closer to supply-side constraints. The similarity of the coefficients under the borrower fixed effects specification also indicate that we are likely capturing supply-side effects. However, while it would be interesting to differentiate among the theories, our data are insufficiently rich for us to do so. Hence, we can only say whether the results are consistent with these theories in general.

B. Asset redeployability (flexibility of zoning)

The first column of Table II Panel A reports results for the regression of the loan interest rate on our redeployability measure, the current value of the property, and a set of controls including census tract fixed effects. We employ the log of the sale price as a scale measure and use the capitalization rate on the property (current earnings divided by sale price) as measures of current value. In addition to fixed effects for year, property type, census tract, and zoning category, we include the Herfindahl index of banking concentration within a 15-mile radius of the property (a measure of

⁹We note that previous empirical work shows that higher “quality” areas are associated with restrictive zoning (Quigley and Rosenthal (2004)), while we find, by contrast, that it is flexible zoning that predicts greater loan provision. Thus, it is difficult to argue that “quality” effects are driving our results.

local bank competition for commercial loans), the log of property age, the cross-sectional variation in capitalization rates within a 15-mile radius, excluding the property itself (a measure of local price variation), and the 1995 crime risk and growth in crime risk from 1990 to 1995.¹⁰ In addition, we also include attributes of the loan such as maturity, amortization, leverage, and dummies for floating rate loans and Small-Business-Administration-backed loans.

We find that redeployability significantly decreases the interest rate charged, controlling for the debt level. Moving from the least-flexibly-zoned designation to the average (most)-flexibly-zoned within an area and zoning category translates into a 27 (58) basis point drop in loan interest rates. This result is consistent with Prediction 2.¹¹

The second and third columns of Table II Panel A examine the relation between leverage and redeployability. Column 2 employs a binary dependent variable for whether debt is used. We estimate a linear probability model to avoid making functional form assumptions, but a conditional logit model yields similar results. We find that properties with greater redeployability do not receive loans significantly more frequently. However, debt frequency is apparently the only loan characteristic that is not affected by a property's redeployability. As column 3 indicates, leverage, or the size of the loan as a fraction of the sale price, conditional on a loan being present, increases with redeployability. Moving from the least to average (maximum) zoning flexibility results in a 1.9 (4.1) percentage point increase in leverage.¹² This provides support for Prediction 1: Assets with greater liquidation values have higher debt levels.

Column 4 of Panel A details results in support of Prediction 3 that loan maturities significantly increase with liquidation values. A move from the least to the average (most) flexible zoning designation within a neighborhood and zoning category results in approximately 1.1 (2.3) more years of maturity on the loan. Given the mean loan maturity in the sample is roughly 15 years, this is a 7.3 (15.3) percent increase. Column 5 also shows that loan duration increases with redeployability. A move from the least to the average (most) redeployable property leads to an increase in duration of approximately 0.2 (0.5) years. This provides further support for Prediction 3.

Finally, Prediction 4 states that firms will borrow from one creditor when liquidation value

¹⁰Crime risk data come from CAP Index, Inc., who compute the crime score index for a particular location by combining geographic, economic, and population data with local police, FBI Uniform Crime Reports, victim, and loss reports. See Garmaise and Moskowitz (2005) for further discussion.

¹¹Harris and Raviv (1990) claim that when not conditioning on loan size, the promised yield should increase with liquidation value. This numerical result of their model is not borne out by the data, however, as unconditional interest rates are also decreasing in redeployability in unreported results.

¹²We report OLS results. The truncated regression models of Cragg (1971) and Powell (1986) yield similar findings.

is high and from multiple creditors when liquidation value is low. To test this prediction, we regress the presence of a second creditor on our redeployability measure. Column 6 of Table II Panel A shows that assets with higher redeployability are significantly less likely to be financed by multiple creditors, supporting this prediction. The difference between the least and average (most) redeployable assets translates into a 4.0 (8.5) percentage point decline in the probability of multiple creditors being present, which is a 33 (71) percent decline from the 12 percent frequency of multiple creditors in the sample.

In terms of the dollar benefit from these better loan terms, for the average (median) property value of \$2.4 (\$0.6) million and average (median) leverage ratio of 0.71 (0.82), the maximum interest rate savings from more redeployable assets is \$10,700 (\$3,100) per year. Over the 15-year average length of the loan, this is a present value of \$90,041 (\$27,000 at the median) assuming a discount rate equal to the average loan rate (8.28 percent). Taking into account that more redeployable assets have greater leverage (+4.5 percent) and longer maturity (+2.5 years), the present value of savings increase to \$104,360 or \$11,353 per year on average and \$31,308 or \$3,406 per year at the median. These are the maximum effects from redeployability moving from the least to most flexibly zoned in an area. Moving from least to average flexibility results in values of about half those above.

C. Bank fixed effects

In Table II Panel B we repeat the regressions in Panel A adding bank fixed effects. We analyze how the loan terms offered by a given bank in a census tract vary with the redeployability of a property. This eliminates any bank-specific lending policies or specialization that might be related to zoning, providing another control for the financing environment. As Panel B shows, the point estimates are remarkably similar to those in Panel A and, despite losing power, the results remain statistically significant (except for debt maturity). This suggests our results do not arise from the matching of redeployable properties with certain types of banks.

D. Robustness

An alternative hypothesis for our results is that lenders simply base their decisions on the current value or earnings of the property, having nothing to do with collateral or secondary value. If zoning is related to the value of the property and future earnings and the cap rate (current earnings over

price) and log of the sale price don't fully capture this, then our results may have nothing to do with collateral value, which is the basis of the theories we propose to test. This alternative story seems more relevant for interest rates and leverage, but it is more difficult to see why maturity and multiple creditors would be affected if collateral were unimportant. Nevertheless, we attempt to address this alternative hypothesis directly. First, we test the robustness of our findings to alternative specifications for current value by including interactions of the cap rate and sale price with zoning category and property type dummies, as well as adding squared and cubed terms of $\log(\text{sale price})$ and cap rate to the regression. In all these specifications, the coefficients on redeployability are virtually unchanged (statistically and economically) across the loan characteristics (results not reported but available upon request). Thus, various specifications for current value have little impact on the effect of our zoning redeployability measure.

E. Ease of foreclosure

A more direct test of whether more flexible zoning captures liquidation value or is correlated with property attributes having little to do with liquidation value, is to consider the impact of our redeployability measure when the probability of liquidation is ex ante higher or lower. If our measure has little to do with liquidation value, then the likelihood of the liquidation state should be unimportant.

To analyze this question, we consider state-level variation in the ease of foreclosure. There is substantial variation across states in the time and cost required to seize a property from a defaulted debtor (Pence, 2003). If, as we argue, redeployability affects the value of a property in the hands of a creditor, then it should be much less important in states in which foreclosure is very slow and costly, since the discounted value of seizing a property in such states is low, irrespective of its potential future uses (redeployability). If, however, the alternative theory holds, that collateral is unimportant or our measure fails to capture it, then redeployability would not be more important in states in which foreclosure is easy, since foreclosure affects only the bank's access to the collateral. Indeed, under the alternative hypothesis one might argue that expected future operating cash flows are more important for loan terms in hard-to-foreclose jurisdictions, since the creditor really wants to avoid default in those states. If under the alternative, zoning captures future profitability and not collateral value, then one might expect to see our measure having a larger rather than smaller effect on loan terms in hard-to-foreclose states.

To measure the cost of foreclosure, we make use of data on Fannie Mae’s optimum time frame within which it expects a foreclosure to be completed in various states. This time frame is highly correlated with other estimates of the average length of time required to accomplish a foreclosure (National Mortgage Servicer’s Reference Directory, 2001). We use the 1998 Fannie Mae optimum time frame, though the results are robust to using the time frames from other years. We construct a measure of foreclosure times that takes the value of three for time frames more than 200 days, two for time frames between 120 and 200 days, one for time frames between 60 and 120 days, and zero otherwise. We also consider whether the state allows non-judicial foreclosures, which are substantially less costly than judicial foreclosures (Pence, 2003). Our measure for the cost of foreclosure is the sum of a dummy for judicial foreclosures and the foreclosure time variable above, described in appendix 2 for reference.

In Table III Panel A, we report results from regressing loan terms on redeployability, the interaction between redeployability and cost of foreclosure, and the controls from the previous regressions. (Note that census tract fixed effects account for the level of the state-level foreclosure variable, but not its interaction). The results indicate that differences in redeployability across properties are less important for loan terms where the costs of foreclosure are high. Specifically, the interaction between redeployability and foreclosures costs is significantly positive for interest rates and multiple creditors and significantly negative for debt maturity and loan duration. This suggests that our redeployability proxies for the value of collateral rather than unobserved future earnings or property quality.

F. Zoning strictness

In Panel B of Table III we further examine whether the impact of zoning regulations differs across jurisdictions. In particular, we expect that zoning regulations should matter more in areas with stricter application of zoning rules. To test this, we interact our redeployability measure with variables designed to capture strictness of zoning regulation.

We capture the strictness of zoning using two measures from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey (see Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)). The first variable is an index of zoning strictness for an area, created by taking the average of the percentage of applications for zoning changes that were approved in the local MSA during 1989 (coded as follows 5=0 to 10 percent , 4=11 to 29%, 3=30 to 59%, 2=60 to 89%, 1=90 to 100%) and the estimated number of months between application for

rezoning and issuance of a building permit for the development of a property in the MSA, taking the average for single family units and office buildings (coded as follows 1=Less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 3=7 to 12 months, 4=13 to 24 months, 5=More than 24 months). Interacting the zoning strictness index with redeployability and rerunning the loan term regressions (including census tract fixed effects),¹³ Table III Panel B shows that property-specific redeployability has a stronger effect on loan characteristics in jurisdictions with strict zoning rules. In regions with the lowest level of zoning strictness, redeployability does not have statistically or economically significant effects.

The second zoning rigor measure we use is an index of the effectiveness of growth management techniques employed in the MSA through zoning ordinances and permits. Specifically, survey respondents' assessment of the effectiveness of ordinances, building permits, and zoning ordinances in controlling growth are provided on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important) and the average across the three categories is the growth management index we employ. As Panel B shows, redeployability has a greater effect on all loan characteristics in jurisdictions that use zoning ordinances and permits most effectively to control and manage growth in the area. The two sets of results in Panel B indicate that zoning flexibility is a better measure of redeployability in areas where zoning matters more and is adhered to more tightly. Appendix 2 describes in more detail the construction of these variables and their source.

G. Market liquidity

Panel C of Table III examines interactions with measures of local market liquidity. The measure we employ is the average of the qualitative ratings by the Wharton Land Use Control Survey respondents comparing the acreage of land zoned versus demanded across single family, multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses, and across various lot sizes (coded on a 1-5 rating scale: 1=Far more than demanded, 5=Far less than demanded). Appendix 2 details the construction of this measure. When demand for a type of property is high relative to supply, we expect the redeployment option to be of great use and to be exploited frequently. If, by contrast, land is plentifully available then there should be little incentive to redeploy a property. The results displayed in Panel C show that redeployability has the predicted stronger effect on all loan characteristics (though it is insignificant for duration) when relative demand is strong.

¹³Since this variable is measured at a level greater than a census tract (MSA), including census tract fixed effects accounts for the level of this variable.

H. Historic zoning

Historic zoning regulations tend to be especially conservative and well-enforced, so an historic designation can substantially reduce a property’s redeployability and liquidity. As another measure of liquidation value, we therefore employ an historic zoning designation, which certainly limits the potential uses of the property. In the first row of Table IV we analyze the effect of an historic designation on features of loan contracts. We include the usual controls and census tract fixed effects. We find that properties zoned historic receive significantly fewer, smaller and shorter duration loans, are financed at higher interest rates, and are more likely to be financed by multiple creditors. The economic magnitudes of these effects are large. An historic designation is associated with interest rates that are 59 basis points higher, a 10.8 percentage point reduction in the probability of a loan, a 4.9 percentage point smaller loan-to-value ratio, a loan duration that is 0.11 years shorter, and an 11.9 percentage point increase in the probability of multiple creditors. The effect on debt maturity is statistically insignificant.

Moreover, it is also generally quite difficult to change zoning classifications for historically zoned properties. Therefore, the current zoning designation should be more binding for historic properties and should enhance the impact of our zoning redeployability measure. Consistent with this, the interaction term between redeployability and historic designation provides even greater effects on all loan terms (other than duration, which has the right sign but is insignificant) in Table IV.

I. Liquidation value and current value

Finally, although the primary focus of our analysis is on the features of the debt contract, we also analyze the relation between redeployability and prices. We recognize that this regression is more open to endogeneity concerns, and we interpret the result with caution. Nevertheless, this analysis provides a test of Prediction 5 that an asset’s market value is increasing in its liquidation value.

We regress the log of the property sale price on our redeployability measure and current earnings as a measure of property size and profitability, and include the census tract and other fixed effects. The coefficient on redeployability is positive, 0.75, and statistically significant ($t=8.92$), indicating that higher liquidation value is associated with higher current market value, though we note that the direction of causality is not indisputable.

Interestingly, this result contrasts with the general finding in the residential real estate market that tighter zoning is associated with higher prices (Quigley and Rosenthal (2004)). This discrep-

ancy may arise largely from between- versus within-neighborhood comparisons. Our result that zoning flexibility increases property values is property-specific, relative to properties within a census tract, whereas Quigley and Rosenthal's (2004) results are between neighborhoods. It may well be that zoning flexibility is valuable for each property owner, but that the negative externalities of zoning flexibility reduce property values at the neighborhood level.

IV. Conclusion

Despite the breadth of theory on incomplete contracting for financial structure, supporting evidence is sparse. This is in part due to the difficulty in obtaining *ex ante* measures of asset liquidation value and observing asset-specific contracts. We provide novel evidence linking asset liquidation value, measured through regulation of zoning flexibility, and debt structure using asset-specific commercial loan contracts. Greater asset redeployability and higher liquidation values significantly alter the terms of loan contracts in a manner consistent with theories of incomplete contracting and transaction costs. More redeployable assets are financed at lower interest rates, receive larger, longer maturity, and longer duration loans, and are less likely to face multiple creditors. Extending these results to non-debt contracts and loans without the nonrecourse feature may shed more light on the importance of contractual incompleteness and transaction costs in determining the boundaries of the firm.

In addition to incomplete contracting theories of capital structure, our results also emphasize the importance of collateral in financial contracting and credit market rationing. While most of the literature analyzes collateral requirements rather than collateral quality (e.g., Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) and Wette (1983)), the effect of collateral quality on credit rationing is a potentially important question that has not received detailed empirical study. For instance, we show that higher liquidation values and interest rates are negatively correlated (predicted by Bester (1985)), yet we also find that higher liquidation values imply larger loans. Thus, better collateral decreases the amount of credit rationing as well as the cost of borrowing.

References

- Baker, George P., and Thomas N. Hubbard H., "Contractibility and Asset Ownership: On-Board Computers and Governance in U.S. Trucking," NBER working paper no. 7634 (2000).
- Baker, George P., and Thomas N. Hubbard H., "Make versus buy in Trucking: Asset Ownership, Job Design, and Information," *American Economic Review* 94 (2003), 551-572.
- Benmelech, Efraim, "Asset Salability and Debt Maturity: Evidence from 19th Century American Railroads," *Working paper, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago* (2005).
- Berger, Allen N, Rebecca S. Demsetz, and Philip E. Strahan, 1999, The Consolidation of the Financial Services Industry: Causes, Consequences, and Implications for the Future, *Journal of Banking and Finance* 23, 135-94.
- Bester, Helmut, "Screening vs. Rationing in Credit Markets with Imperfect Information," *American Economic Review* 75 (1985), 850-855.
- Bolton, Patrick, and David Scharfstein "Optimal Debt Structure with Multiple Creditors," *Journal of Political Economy* 104 (1996), 1-26.
- Braun, Matias, "Financial Contractibility and Assets' Hardness: Industrial composition and Growth," *Working paper, Harvard University* (2002).
- Detragiache, Enrica, Paolo Garella, and Luigi Guiso, "Multiple versus single banking relationships: Theory and evidence," *Journal of Finance* 55 (2000), 1133-1161.
- Diamond, Douglas, "Debt Maturity Structure and Liquidity Risk," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106 (1991), 709-737.
- Diamond, Douglas, "Committing to Commit," AFA Presidential Address (2004), *forthcoming Journal of Finance*.
- Ellison, Glenn, and Edward Glaesar, "Geographic concentration in U.S. manufacturing: a dart-board approach," *Journal of Political Economy* 105 (1997), 889-927.
- Esty, Benjamin C., and William L. Megginson "Creditor rights, enforcement, and debt ownership structure: Evidence from the global syndicated loan market," *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 38 (2003), 37-59.
- Garmaise, Mark J., and Tobias J. Moskowitz, "Informal Financial Networks: Theory and Evidence," *Review of Financial Studies*, (2003), Vol. 16 No. 4, 1007-1040.
- Garmaise, M., and T. Moskowitz, "Confronting Information Asymmetries: Evidence from Real Estate Markets," *Review of Financial Studies*, (2004), Vol. 17 No. 2, 405-437.
- Garmaise, M., and T. Moskowitz, "Bank Mergers and Crime: The Real and Social Effects of Bank Competition," *forthcoming, Journal of Finance*, (2005).
- Gilson, Stuart C., "Transaction Costs and Capital Structure Choice: Evidence from Financially Distressed Firms," *Journal of Finance* 52 (1997), 161-196.
- Glaeser, Edward, and Joseph Gyourko, "The Impact of Building Restrictions on Housing Affordability," *Working Paper, Wharton* (2002).
- Grossman, Sanford, and Oliver Hart, "The Costs and the Benefits of Ownership: A Theory of Vertical and Lateral Integration," *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (1986), 691-719.

- Harris, Milton and Artur Raviv, "Capital Structure and the Informational Role of Debt," *Journal of Finance* 45 (1990), 321-49.
- Harris, Milton and Artur Raviv, "The Theory of capital Structure," *Journal of Finance* 46 (1991), 297-355.
- Hart, Oliver and John Moore, "Property Rights and the Nature of the Firm," *Journal of Political Economy* 98 (1990), 1119-58.
- Hart, Oliver, "Firms, Contracts and Financial Structure," Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995.
- Hart, Oliver and John Moore, "A Theory of Debt Based on the Inalienability of Human capital," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109 (1994), 841-79.
- Kaplan, Steven N., and Per Stromberg, "Financial Contracting Theory Meets the Real World: An Empirical Analysis of Venture Capital Contracts," *Review of Economic Studies* 70 (2003), 281-315.
- Knoll, M., 1988, "Uncertainty, Efficiency, and the Brokerage Industry," *Journal-of-Law-and-Economics*, 31, 249-263.
- Krugman, Paul, "Increasing returns and economic geography," *Journal of Political Economy* 99 (1991), 483-499.
- Lall, Somik, Jun Koo, and Sanjoy Chakravorty, " Diversity Matters: The Economic Geography of Industry Location in India," World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3072, June 2003.
- McMillen, Daniel P., and John F. McDonald, "A Simultaneous Equations Model of Zoning and Land Values," *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 21 (1991), 55-72.
- McMillen , Daniel P., and John F. McDonald, "Land Values in a Newly Zoned City," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84 (2002), 62-72.
- The National Mortgage Servicer's Reference Directory*, 18th ed., (USFN: Tustin, CA), 2001.
- Ongena, Steven, and David C. Smith "What determines the number of bank relationships? Cross-country evidence," *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 9 (2000), 26-56.
- Pence, Karen, "Foreclosing on Opportunity: State Laws and Mortgage Credit", Working Paper, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, May 2003.
- Petersen, M. and R. Rajan, "."
- Pogodzinski, J.M., and Tim Sass, "Measuring the Effects of Municipal Zoning Regulations: A Survey," *Urban Studies* 28 (1991), 597-621.
- Pollakowski, H., and Susan Wachter, "The Effect of Land Use Constraints on Housing Prices," *Land Economics* 66 (1990), 315-324.
- Pulvino, Todd C., "Do Fire-Sales Exist?" An Empirical Investigation of Commercial Aircraft Transactions," *Journal of Finance* 53 (1998), 939-78.
- Pulvino, Todd C., "Effects of Bankruptcy Court Protection on Asset Sales," *Journal of Financial Economics* 52 (1998), 151-86.
- Quigley, John M., and Larry A. Rosenthal, "The Effects of Land-Use Regulation on the Price of Housing: What Do We Know? What Can We Learn?," Working Paper, University of California, Berkeley, (2004).
- Rajan, Raghuram G., and Luigi Zingales, "What Do We Know about capital Structure? Some Evidence from International Data," *Journal of Finance* 50 (1995), 1421-60.

- Shleifer, Andrei, and Robert W. Vishny, "Liquidation Values and Debt Capacity: A Market Equilibrium Approach" *Journal of Finance* 47(1992), 143-66.
- Stein, J., 1997, "Nonrecourse Carveouts: How Far is Far Enough," *Real Estate Review*, 27, 3-11.
- Stiglitz, Joseph, and Andrew Weiss, "Credit Rationing in Markets with Imperfect Information," *American Economic Review* 71 (1981), 393-410.
- Stromberg, Per, "Conflicts of Interests and Market Illiquidity in Bankruptcy Auctions: Theory and Tests," *Journal of Finance* 55 (2000), 2641-92.
- Titman, Sheridan, Stathis Tompaidis, and Sergey Tsyplakov, "Determinants of Credit Spreads in Commercial Mortgages," Working Paper, University of Texas at Austin, (2004).
- Wallace, Nancy, "The market effects of zoning undeveloped land: Does zoning follow the market?," *Journal of Urban Economics* 23 (1988), 307-326.
- Wette, Hildegard C., "Collateral in Credit Rationing in Markets with Imperfect Information: Note," *American Economic Review* 73 (1983), 442-45.
- Williams, J., 1998, "Agency and Brokerage of Real Assets in Competitive Equilibrium," *Review of Financial Studies*, 11, 239-280.
- Williamson, Oliver E., "Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications," *New York Free Press* (1975).
- Williamson, Oliver E., "Corporate finance and Corporate Governance," *Journal of Finance* 43 (1988), 567-91.
- Wooldridge, Jefferey M., "Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data," *MIT Press, Cambridge, MA* (2002).
- Yang, S., and A. Yavas, 1995, "Bigger Is Not Better: Brokerage and Time on the Market", *Journal of Real Estate Research*, 10, 23-33.

Appendix 1: An example of the zoning code from NYC zoning of residential districts

The table below presents a detailed description of each of the residential zoning districts in New York City as an example of the variation in zoning laws employed to capture liquidation values across real assets. A summary of the zoning code and the associated permitted uses of the property as defined by the code are reported for residential districts in NYC only. Similar measures are applied for the districts within the other 8 broad zoning categories: organizations, waterfront, manufacturing, business, commercial, commercial/manufacturing, historic, and residential and across all other zoning districts and cities in our sample from 1992 to 1999 covering 12 states and roughly 850 different zip codes.

An Example of the Zoning Code: NYC Zoning of Residential Districts

Zoning Designation	Uses	Maximum floor area ratio	Minimum required open space ratio	Maximum lot coverage	Minimum required lot area (sq. ft.)		Maximum number of dwelling units or rooms	
					per dwelling unit	per zoning room	units per acre	rooms
R1-1	Single-family detached residence	0.50	150	-	9500	-	4	-
R1-2	Single-family detached residence	0.50	150	-	5700	-	7	-
R2	Single-family detached residence	0.50	150	-	3800	-	11	-
R2X	Single-family detached residence	0.50	150	-	3800	-	11	-
R3-1	Single, two-family detached, semi-detached residence	0.50	-	35	1040/1450	-	30/42	-
R3-2	General residence	0.50	-	35	1040/1450	-	30/42	-
R3A	Single, two-family detached, zero lot line residence	0.50	-	35	1040/1450	-	30/42	-
R4	General residence	0.75	-	45	970	-	45	-
R4-1	Single, two-family detached, semi-detached, zero line residence	0.75	-	45	686-970	-	45/65	-
R4A	Single, two-family detached residence	0.75	-	45	686/970	-	45/65	-
R4B	Single, two-family detached residences of all types	0.75	-	45	686/970	-	45/65	-
R5	General residence	1.25	-	55	605	-	72	-
R5B	General residence	1.65	-	55	545/605	-	80	-
R6	General residence	0.78-2.43	27.5 to 39.5	-	-	109 to 99	160/176	400/460
R7	General residence	0.87-3.44	15.5 to 22.0	-	-	84 to 77	207/226	519/566
R8	General residence	0.94-6.02	5.9 to 10.7	-	-	59 to 45	295/387	738/968
R9	General residence	0.99-7.52	1.0 to 6.2	-	-	45 to 41	387/425	968/1062
R10	General residence	10	None	-	-	30	581	1452

Source: NYC Zoning Handbook

A detailed description of each of the residential zoning districts in New York City as an example of the variation in zoning laws employed to capture liquidation values across real assets. A summary of the zoning code and the associated permitted uses of the property as defined by the code are reported for residential districts in NYC only. Similar measures are applied for the districts within the other 8 broad zoning categories: organizations, waterfront, manufacturing, business, commercial, commercial/manufacturing, historic, and residential and across all other zoning districts and cities in our sample.

Appendix 2: Variable description and construction

For reference, a list of the construction of the variables used in the paper and their sources:

Redeployability (flexibility of use): the scaled within zoning category and jurisdiction numeric value associated with a given property's zoning ordinance. For property p with zoning ordinance A - n in jurisdiction j , this is $\frac{n}{\max(n \in P_{(A,j)})}$, where $P_{(A,j)}$ is the set of properties within jurisdiction j that have the same general zoning category A . Redeployability is the numeric value indicating flexibility of use n relative to the maximum flexibility within a given property type A and local jurisdiction j which sets the zoning code. (source: Comps)

Zoning category: dummy variables for the broad zoning designation of a property. For property p with zoning ordinance A . n , this is A . There are eight broad zoning categories in the sample: organizations, waterfront, manufacturing, residential, business, commercial, commercial-manufacturing, and historic. (source: Comps)

Debt frequency: a binary variable for whether the property was financed with bank debt (occurring 71 percent of the time). (source: Comps)

Leverage: the ratio of total value of bank debt borrowed on the property to the sale price. (source: Comps)

Debt maturity: the maturity of the bank loan contract in years. (source: Comps)

Loan interest rate: the annual percentage interest rate on the bank loan contract and whether it is floating or fixed. (source: Comps)

Multiple creditors: a binary variable for the presence of more than one creditor making a loan on the property. Commercial properties have first and second trust deeds (mortgages), where the latter has lower priority claim on the real asset. These occur about 12 percent of the time and indicate the presence of more than one creditor. (source: Comps)

Capitalization rate: the current or most recent annual earnings on the property divided by the sale price. (source: Comps)

Property type: dummy variables indicating 10 mutually exclusive types: retail, commercial, industrial, apartment, mobile home park, special, residential land, industrial land, office, and hotel. (source: Comps)

Crime risk: A crime score index comprising the seven part one offenses of the FBI: homicide, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, larceny, and motor vehicle theft. The crime risk scores measure the probability that a certain crime will be committed in a given location relative to the county level of crime. Hence, this is a *relative* (within county) crime risk measure. Crime scores are provided at three points in time: 1990, 1995, and 2000. Each property is matched with the crime score index for its latitude and longitude coordinates, obtaining a *property specific* crime score. Both the level of crime risk (relative to the county

level) and the growth in crime risk (change in relative crime risk from 1990 to 1995) are employed as control variables. (source: CAP Index, Inc.)

Zoning strictness index: the average of the following two measures from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey (WLUCS), Wharton Urban Decentralization Project: the percentage of applications for zoning changes that were approved in the local MSA during 1989, and the estimated number of months between application for rezoning and issuance of a building permit for the development of a property in the MSA. The first variable is ZONAPPR from the WLUCS — the estimated percentage of applications for zoning changes approved during the past twelve month period in the MSA coded from 1–5 as follows: [1=0 to 10%, 2=11 to 29%, 3=30 to 59%, 4=60 to 89%, 5=90-100%]. The second variable is the average of the following three variables:

1. PERMLT50 — the estimated number of months between application for rezoning and issuance of building permit for the development of a subdivision of less than 50 single family units coded as follows: [1=Less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 3=7 to 12 months, 4= 13 to 24 months, 5=More than 24 months, 6=N/A].
2. PERMGT50 — the estimated number of months between application for rezoning and issuance of building permit for the development of a subdivision of more than 50 single family units coded as follows: [1=Less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 3=7 to 12 months, 4= 13 to 24 months, 5=More than 24 months, 6=N/A].
3. PERMOFF — the estimated number of months between application for rezoning and issuance of building permit for the development of an office building of under 100,000 square feet coded as follows: [1=Less than 3 months, 2=3 to 6 months, 3=7 to 12 months, 4= 13 to 24 months, 5=More than 24 months, 6=N/A].

The zoning strictness index is computed as $(5 - ZONAPPR) + (PERMLT50 + PERMGT50 + PERMOFF) / 3$, excluding MSA's with 6=N/A. (source: Wharton Land Use Control Survey, Wharton Urban Decentralization Project, Development Regulation Survey Questionnaire, 1989. Also see Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)).

Growth management index: the effectiveness of growth management techniques through ordinances, zoning ordinances, and permits employed in the MSA obtained from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey. The average of the variables GROMAN2, GROMAN3, and GROMAN8 are employed as the growth management index. GROMAN2, 3, and 8 are quantitative ratings by survey respondents of the effectiveness of growth management techniques in controlling growth in their community using ordinances, building permits, and zoning ordinances, respectively. The rating is on a scale of 1–5 and is coded as follows: [1=Not important, 5=Very important]. (source: Wharton Land Use Control Survey, Wharton Urban Decentralization Project, Development Regulation Survey Questionnaire, 1989. Also see Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)).

Demand-to-supply: the average of the quantitative ratings of survey respondents from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey on the ratio of demand for land uses relative to the acreage

of land zoned for those uses across single family, multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses, and across various lot sizes. Specifically, the measure of demand to supply is the average of the following variables:

1. DLANDUS1-4 — quantitative rating by survey respondent comparing the acreage of land zoned versus demand for the following land uses: Single family, Multi-family, Commercial, and Industrial. [1-5 rating scale: 1=Far more than demanded, 5=Far less than demanded, 0=No opinion or No reply].
2. DLOTSIZ1-5 — quantitative rating by survey respondent comparing the availability of land zoned versus demand for the following single family residential lot sizes: Less than 4,000 square feet, 4,000 to 8,000 sq. ft., 8,000-10,000 sq. ft., 10,000-20,000 sq. ft., and More than 20,000 sq. ft. [1-5 rating scale: 1=Far more than demanded, 5=Far less than demanded, 0=No opinion or No reply].

excluding zeros or no replies. (source: Wharton Land Use Control Survey, Wharton Urban Decentralization Project, Development Regulation Survey Questionnaire, 1989. Also see Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)).

Foreclosure costs: the sum of two variables, time frame for foreclosure and judicial foreclosure dummy. The time frame for foreclosure is based on the 1998 Fannie Mae optimum time within which it expects a foreclosure to be completed in a given state. The time frame variable takes the value of three for time frames more than 200 days, two for time frames between 120 and 200 days, one for time frames between 60 and 120 days, and zero otherwise. The judicial foreclosure variable is zero if the state permits non-judicial foreclosures and one otherwise. (source: National Mortgage Servicer's Reference Directory, 2001)

Table I:
**Summary Statistics of Zoning Designations, Commercial
Real Estate Transactions, and Property Types**

Panel A: Characteristics of properties across general zoning category								
Zoning category	Number	Debt frequency	Leverage	Price	Maturity (Duration)	Loan rate	Multiple creditors	Zoning codes
All properties	14,159	0.71	0.71	2,386,767	15 (6.8)	8.28	0.12	161
Organizations (O)	311	0.63	0.72	3,495,907	10 (7.9)	8.25	0.10	5
Waterfront (W)	6	0.67	0.85	4,887,500	15 (8.6)	7.00	0.25	3
Manufacturing (M)	3,188	0.68	0.72	1,807,378	10 (6.8)	8.73	0.13	25
Residential (R)	7,917	0.81	0.74	1,404,530	25 (10.0)	7.84	0.13	36
Business (B)	1,827	0.67	0.72	3,478,963	7 (6.4)	8.65	0.07	21
Commercial (C)	4,878	0.68	0.67	3,138,222	10 (6.9)	8.64	0.12	53
Comm./Manu. (CM)	252	0.74	0.74	1,003,192	10 (6.6)	8.74	0.19	4
Historic (H)	258	0.68	0.66	3,581,531	10 (7.9)	9.08	0.13	4

Panel B: Distribution of zoning category across property type								
Property type	General zoning type (abbreviated), number of properties							
	O	W	M	R	B	C	CM	H
Retail	94	2	227	247	837	1,898	87	45
Commercial	35	0	107	127	218	749	31	68
Industrial	20	0	1,953	44	78	230	68	25
Apartment	28	0	253	5,860	110	383	12	65
Mobile home park	1	0	1	19	0	2	0	1
Special	10	0	5	176	18	47	3	2
Residential land	38	0	37	1,160	14	57	1	6
Industrial land	5	0	362	16	3	16	4	2
Office	74	4	227	233	520	1,396	38	27
Hotel	6	0	16	35	29	100	8	17

Panel C: Characteristics of properties across property type								
Property type	Number	Debt frequency	Leverage	Price	Maturity (Duration)	Loan rate	Multiple creditors	Cap rate
Retail	3,949	0.74	0.72	1,610,357	10 (6.6)	8.80	0.10	10.33
Commercial	1,650	0.40	0.68	1,670,517	4 (4.9)	8.97	0.07	10.38
Industrial	3,784	0.70	0.73	1,589,490	10 (6.7)	8.72	0.12	9.97
Apartment	6,997	0.90	0.74	1,529,293	25 (10.0)	7.77	0.13	10.04
Mobile home park	41	0.76	0.71	5,087,748	10 (6.8)	8.46	0.19	9.19
Special	290	0.70	0.77	2,109,284	10 (6.2)	8.88	0.20	11.00
Residential land	1,713	0.41	0.75	1,004,216	7 (4.1)	8.91	0.11	N/A
Industrial land	568	0.37	0.74	921,757	8 (4.8)	9.06	0.08	N/A
Office	3,380	0.67	0.68	6,595,045	10 (6.6)	8.60	0.10	10.17
Hotel	270	0.63	0.69	10,574,474	14 (6.6)	8.82	0.22	12.21

Panel A reports the average loan frequency, loan-to-value (LTV) ratio, sale price, median loan maturity and duration (in parentheses) in years, loan rate (percent per year), frequency of multiple lenders (second/subordinated loans), property age, and number of unique zoning code ordinances for all properties and for each general zoning category. Panel B reports the distribution of general zoning categories across 10 property types. The number of properties under each of the eight broad zoning categories for each property type are reported. Panel C reports the average loan frequency, loan-to-value (LTV) ratio, sale price, loan maturity (in years), loan rate (percent per year), frequency of multiple lenders (second/subordinated loans), and capitalization rate (net income on the property in the previous year divided by the sale price, in percent) across the property types. Data are from COMPS database covering the period January 1, 1992 to March 30, 1999.

Table II:
Asset Redeployability (Measured by Zoning Intensity of Use) and Debt Contracts

Panel A: Census tract fixed effects						
Dependent variable =	Interest rate	Debt frequency	Leverage	Debt maturity	Loan duration	Multiple creditors
Redeployability	-0.6311	0.0078	0.0447	2.4821	0.4892	-0.0926
<i>zoning intensity of use</i>	(-2.59)	(0.13)	(2.12)	(1.94)	(2.50)	(-2.36)
log(price)	-0.0850	-0.0235	-0.0022	-0.7173	-0.0678	0.0091
	(-3.85)	(-4.67)	(-6.25)	(-5.94)	(-3.65)	(2.61)
Cap rate	0.0081	0.0077	0.0042	0.2292	0.0393	-0.0027
	(1.98)	(8.01)	(2.60)	(10.11)	(11.24)	(-4.16)
<i>Fixed effects?</i>						
Census tract	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
General zoning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Property type	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
R^2	0.64	0.35	0.34	0.51	0.46	0.27
R^2 (no F.E.)	0.26	0.08	0.06	0.16	0.10	0.04
# Observations	3,536	9,365	7,733	7,733	1,971	7,733
Panel B: Census tract and bank fixed effects						
Dependent variable =	Interest rate	Debt frequency	Leverage	Debt maturity	Loan duration	Multiple creditors
Redeployability	-0.8121	0.0271	0.0477	2.0535	0.6679	-0.0964
	(-4.08)	(0.59)	(2.31)	(1.21)	(2.82)	(-2.04)
log(price)	-0.0963	-0.0321	-0.0002	-0.4951	-0.0489	0.0320
	(-3.86)	(-7.04)	(-0.61)	(-2.81)	(-1.90)	(4.41)
Cap rate	0.0280	0.0051	0.0024	0.1111	0.0327	-0.0002
	(5.85)	(5.99)	(1.57)	(3.60)	(7.62)	(-0.15)
<i>Fixed effects?</i>						
Bank	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Census tract	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
General zoning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Property type	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
R^2	0.86	0.42	0.59	0.67	0.73	0.86

Panel A reports regression results of the loan interest rate, frequency of debt, total leverage (ratio of debt to asset value, conditional on debt being present), debt maturity, loan duration (based on the loan amortization length and formula from equation 1) and the frequency of multiple creditors through second/subordinated debt contracts on a measure of real asset redeployability, using the allowable use of the property given by its zoning ordinance. Additional regressors include the log of the total sale price of the property (excluded from the loan-to-value regression), the capitalization rate of the property, which is the current earnings on the property divided by the sale price, the Herfindahl index of banking concentration within a 15 mile radius of the property, the log of property age, local price variation (cross-sectional variation of capitalization rates on properties within 5 miles of the property), and the current crime risk level and recent growth rate in crime risk for the property's location (obtained from CAP Index, Inc.). The interest rate regressions also include the leverage ratio, an indicator for floating rates, an indicator for whether the loan is backed by the Small Business Administration, and the loan maturity and amortization as regressors (coefficients are not reported for brevity). Regressions include fixed effects for general zoning category, property type, year, and census tract. Coefficient estimates for the constant and fixed effects are not reported for brevity. Regressions are run under OLS with robust standard errors. Coefficient estimates and their associated t -statistics (in parentheses) are reported along with adjusted R^2 's, including and excluding the fixed effects, and the number of observations. Panel B adds bank fixed effects to the regressions.

Table III:
Cross-Sectional Evidence on Redeployability Affecting Debt Contracts

Dependent variable =	Interest rate	Debt frequency	Leverage	Debt maturity	Loan duration	Multiple creditors
Panel A: Interactions with foreclosure costs						
Redeployability	-1.4389 (-4.11)	-0.0083 (-0.10)	0.0362 (1.24)	4.8318 (2.61)	0.6259 (2.23)	-0.1082 (-2.74)
Redeployability \times foreclosure cost	0.8076 (3.22)	0.0146 (0.30)	0.0080 (0.42)	-1.9448 (-1.75)	-0.1099 (-1.68)	0.6226 (2.88)
Panel B: Interactions with strictness of zoning						
Redeployability	1.0669 (1.94)	-0.6668 (-2.66)	-0.4448 (-4.82)	-7.5846 (-1.14)	-2.6489 (-2.85)	0.3330 (2.01)
Redeployability \times zoning strictness	-2.8903 (-2.39)	0.3669 (3.08)	0.2270 (5.39)	4.7521 (1.59)	1.6350 (3.75)	-0.1862 (-2.39)
Redeployability	1.1971 (0.57)	-0.2924 (-0.65)	-0.1370 (-0.82)	-15.4856 (-1.47)	-3.3267 (-2.13)	-0.2724 (-1.03)
Redeployability \times growth management	-0.4061 (-1.89)	0.0797 (1.81)	0.0369 (2.02)	4.0564 (1.74)	0.9022 (2.60)	0.0512 (0.87)
Panel C: Interactions with local market liquidity						
Redeployability	0.2670 (0.91)	-0.3969 (-2.49)	-0.3000 (-4.74)	-8.5374 (-1.95)	-1.8720 (-3.09)	0.1501 (1.37)
Redeployability \times demand-to-supply	-1.2878 (-1.64)	0.2108 (3.34)	0.1364 (5.79)	4.4819 (2.79)	1.1029 (4.73)	-0.0843 (-2.01)

Regression results of the loan interest rate, frequency of debt, total leverage, debt maturity, loan duration, and frequency of multiple creditors on asset redeployability (measured by the intensity of allowable property use from the property's zoning ordinance) and its interaction with characteristics of the local market in which the property resides are reported. Panel A considers the interaction with ease of foreclosure at the state level. This variable is the sum of a judicial-foreclosure-only dummy and an index for the 1998 Fannie Mae optimum foreclosure time frame. Panel B examines interactions with variables designed to capture the strictness of zoning. The first is an index of zoning strictness which is the average of the following two measures from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey under the Wharton Urban Decentralization Project (see Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)): the percentage of applications for zoning changes that were approved in the local MSA during 1989, and the estimated number of months between application for rezoning and issuance of a building permit for the development of a property in the MSA (average for single family units and office buildings). The second measure is an index of the effectiveness of growth management techniques employed in the MSA obtained from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey. Specifically, survey respondents assessment of the effectiveness of ordinances, building permits, and zoning ordinances in controlling growth are provided on a scale of 1 (not important) to 5 (very important) and the average across the three categories is the growth management index. Panel C examines the interaction with a measure of local market liquidity, namely, the average of the quantitative ratings of survey respondents from the Wharton Land Use Control Survey on the ratio of demand for land uses relative to the acreage of land zoned for those uses across single family, multi-family, commercial, and industrial uses, and across various lot sizes. All regressions include the regressors from Table II, including census tract, general zoning category, property type, and year fixed effects with robust standard errors. Appendix 2 details the sources and computations of all relevant variables.


Table IV:
Historic Zoning Designations

Dependent variable =	Interest rate	Debt frequency	Leverage	Debt maturity	Loan duration	Multiple creditors
Historic	0.5913 (3.17)	-0.1085 (-2.27)	-0.0490 (-2.17)	-0.4942 (-0.39)	-0.1109 (-1.93)	0.1187 (2.49)
Redeployability	0.8540 (1.88)	-0.1205 (-1.31)	-0.0996 (-0.80)	-3.6482 (-0.83)	0.6445 (1.69)	0.2027 (1.56)
Redeployability × historic	-1.9869 (-3.84)	0.2219 (2.03)	0.3050 (2.26)	11.2079 (2.17)	0.3075 (0.59)	-0.3126 (-2.02)

Regression results of the loan interest rate, frequency of debt, total leverage, debt maturity, loan duration, and frequency of multiple creditors on an indicator variable for properties with an historic zoning designation are reported. Results from interacting the redeployability measure with the historic dummy are also reported. The regressions include the control variables from Table II Panel A, including fixed effects for census tract, general zoning category, property type, and year with robust standard errors. Coefficient estimates and their associated t -statistics (in parentheses) are reported.

Figure 1
Distribution of Redeployability (Zoning Flexibility)

The distribution of a measure of real asset liquidation value determined by a proxy for the asset’s redeployability measured by its zoning ordinance is plotted below. The allowable use of the property within its broad zoning category and local zoning jurisdiction, scaled by the maximum allowable uses within an area and zoning category, is the measure of redeployability. Higher values indicate broader scopes of allowable uses within a general category and jurisdiction.



Summary statistics of the liquidation value measure					
	mean	median	standard deviation	minimum	maximum
Redeployability	0.51	0.50	0.24	0.08	1