NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

UNREGULATED CONTAMINANTS IN DRINKING WATER: EVIDENCE FROM PFAS AND HOUSING PRICES

Michelle M. Marcus
Rosie Mueller

Working Paper 31731
http://www.nber.org/papers/w31731

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
September 2023, Revised April 2024

For their helpful comments, we thank Benjamin Gilbert, Dennis Guignet, Robyn Meeks, Michael Papenfus, Carly Urban, Barton Willage, participants at the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists 2022 summer conference, seminar attendees at Vanderbilt University, participants of the 2023 Montana State University Applied Economics Conference and members of the PFAS Project Lab. Data provided by Zillow through the Zillow Transaction and Assessment Dataset (ZTRAX). More information on accessing the data can be found at http://www.zillow.com/ztrax. The results and opinions are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the position of Zillow Group. This paper was previously circulated as, "Discovery of Unregulated Contaminants in Drinking Water: Evidence from PFAS and Housing Prices." All remaining errors are our own. The authors have no material and relevant financial relationships to disclose. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

Unregulated Contaminants in Drinking Water: Evidence from PFAS and Housing Prices
Michelle M. Marcus and Rosie Mueller
NBER Working Paper No. 31731
September 2023, Revised April 2024
JEL No. Q52,Q53,R21,R23

ABSTRACT

Our understanding of individuals' response to information about unregulated contaminants is limited. We leverage the highly publicized social discovery of unregulated PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) contamination in public drinking water to study the impact of information about unregulated contaminants on housing prices. Using residential property transaction data, we employ a difference-in-differences research design and show that high profile media coverage about PFAS contamination significantly decreased property values of affected homes. We also find suggestive evidence of residential sorting that may have worsened environmental inequality.

Michelle M. Marcus
Department of Economics
Vanderbilt University
310 Calhoun Hall
Nashville, TN 37240
and NBER
michelle.marcus@vanderbilt.edu

Rosie Mueller
345 Boyer Ave
Walla Walla, WA 99362
United States
muellerm@whitman.edu

While the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) sets enforceable standards for a variety of pollutants through regulations such as the Clean Air Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act, many potentially harmful contaminants remain unregulated and unmonitored (Levin et al., 2023). Without systematic monitoring and public notification requirements, the public has little opportunity to avoid exposure, especially when contaminants are undetectable by smell, sight or taste. While existing research has documented public response to information about a variety of regulated contaminants, we know much less about how individuals might respond to an information shock about the presence of harmful unregulated contaminants.

In this paper, we investigate the impact of an information shock about the presence of unregulated chemical contaminants in drinking water on housing prices and neighborhood sorting. We take advantage of the sharp timing of social discovery of contamination to compare home prices in contaminated water systems relative to uncontaminated water systems in a difference-in-differences research design using property-level home sales data. We also leverage information on newspaper articles covering the contamination to explore the role of media coverage and public scrutiny, and we explore impacts on residential sorting and neighborhood change using data from the Census and the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA).

Our study focuses on the social discovery of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) contamination in drinking water systems in New Jersey. PFAS are a widely used class of unregulated chemicals that are extremely resistant to degradation, are difficult to remove from the environment, and are undetectable in drinking water by sight, taste, or smell (Cousins et al., 2020). Adverse health effects associated with PFAS exposure include cancer, immune system hypersensitivity and suppression, endocrine disruption, and adverse reproductive outcomes (ATSDR, 2020; Averina et al., 2019; Barry et al., 2013; Fenton et al., 2021; Shane et al., 2020; Waterfield et al., 2020).

In July 2013, a nonprofit organization obtained results from tests conducted in 2009 by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) showing significant levels of PFAS in several drinking water systems throughout the state. Contamination was of particular concern in Paulsboro, an industrial Philadelphia suburb in southwestern New Jersey. The Paulsboro Water Department had especially high levels of PFNA in one of the drinking water wells and was unable to take the well offline immediately due to naturally occurring radium in its other offline wells (Post et al., 2013).[1] Shortly after the nonprofit publicly released this information, Paulsboro received extensive attention from both the media and regulators. Not only did the NJDEP issue a public health advisory in Paulsboro (Comegno, 2014), but newspaper articles barraged residents with information about the presence of PFAS in their drinking water, and also pointed out that the contamination was initially discovered four years prior to public notification. This delayed notification may have had an impact on the public's distrust of the water system and local regulators and/or the public's perception of future contamination risk if individuals believe revealed and unobserved risks are correlated (Hausman and Stolper, 2021) .

Across multiple counterfactual groups, we find that housing prices decreased by about 31 to 42 percent in Paulsboro after the release of information about PFAS contamination in local drinking water supplies. Notably, the decreases in property values observed in Paulsboro were larger than the cost of installing a whole home filter, and we observe no rebound in property values after the contaminated source well was moved offline. This persistent and large decline in property values may reflect, in part, a lasting increase in public distrust and stigma associated with living there. We do not find any evidence of changes in housing prices in other water systems with elevated PFAS

---

[1] Perfluorononanoic Acid, also known as heptadecafluorononanoic acid, or PFNA, is a synthetic chemical which is part of the larger class of PFAS chemicals. There are more than 12,000 PFAS in the chemical class (USEPA, 2022), and alternatives continue to be developed (Wang et al., 2017).

levels or in other neighborhoods close to identified PFAS polluters in general or the industrial source responsible for contamination in Paulsboro specifically. These findings are consistent with high publicity and public scrutiny of Paulsboro playing a role in the effect on housing prices. Exploring the subsequent changes in neighborhood demographics in Paulsboro relative to other areas, we observe a large decline in the proportion of the population under 18, who are more at risk from exposure, a decrease in the proportion of renter occupied homes, and an increase in the proportion of vacant homes. We also see a decrease in the proportion of white applicants for new mortgages, along with an increase in the proportion of Hispanic applicants, suggesting a possible impact on environmental justice through residential sorting.

This paper contributes to a literature spanning several disciplines that has consistently documented disproportionate pollution exposure in low-income and disadvantaged communities (Agyeman et al., 2016; Mohai et al., 2009; Tessum et al., 2021). Understanding the mechanisms behind these patterns has been the focus of much work in economics (Shapiro and Walker, 2021; Banzhaf et al., 2019; Burda and Harding, 2014). For example, previous research has documented aggregate neighborhood demographic changes in response to remediation of pollution, reflective of sorting behavior (Gamper-Rabindran and Timmins, 2011; Banzhaf and Walsh, 2008; Currie, 2011). Information has also been shown to impact avoidance behaviors (Moretti and Neidell, 2011; Neidell, 2009, 2004).[2] In the context of drinking water, public notification of poor water quality allows households to avoid exposure by drinking bottled water, for example (Marcus, 2022; Allaire et al., 2019; Zivin et al., 2011). Information may also impact more extreme avoidance through residential sorting (Marcus, 2021; Currie, 2011). To the extent that this behavior differs across demographic

---

[2] Imperfect information may also play an important role in generating disparities in pollution exposure (Hausman and Stolper, 2021).

groups, it may contribute to broader patterns of elevated pollution exposure among disadvantaged communities. We provide novel evidence of the impact of new information about an unregulated contaminant on the housing market and suggestive evidence of how this may have affected residential sorting.

This study also contributes to the rich literature on how housing markets respond to changes in environmental quality. Existing work finds impacts on property values from air quality (Bayer et al., 2009; Chay and Greenstone, 2005; Smith and Huang, 1995), lead remediation (Gazze, 2021; Billings and Schnepel, 2017), hazardous waste remediation (Gamper-Rabindran and Timmins, 2013; Greenstone and Gallagher, 2008), train derailments involving hazardous materials (Tang et al., 2020), toxic plant openings and closings (Currie et al., 2015), and power plant openings (Davis, 2011). While estimates from hedonic studies theoretically measure consumer willingness to pay to avoid the particular pollution exposure, they are widely contingent on whether residents are properly informed about environmental quality. Moreover, these estimates can also capture misinformation and public stigma (McCluskey and Rausser, 2003; Boyle et al., 2010). Given that we find the impact on housing prices exceeds the cost of avoidance through purchasing a water filtration system and that housing prices remain depressed even after remediation, we interpret our large housing price impacts as reflecting, at least in part, an increase in public distrust and stigma.

A relatively small literature studies the effect of information about water contamination on property values. While many sources of pollution are already visible or publicized widely, water pollution is particularly difficult to observe compared to other types of environmental pollutants. Even when water quality data are available, it is often unclear whether residents are properly informed (Marcus, 2022). When contaminants are unregulated and unmonitored, the public is even less likely to be informed. The limited research in this area has documented that leaking under-ground storage tanks and nearby shale gas development impact property values for homes served by private groundwater wells (Guignet et al., 2016; Muehlenbachs et al., 2015). Surface water quality, such as harmful algal blooms, can also impact nearby property values, for example through impacts on recreational activities (Melstrom, 2022; Zhang et al., 2022; Keiser and Shapiro, 2018; Leggett and Bockstael, 2000). However, research on the impact of public drinking water contamination on property values is much more limited. Christensen et al. (2023) find that information about dangerous levels of lead in drinking water in Flint, Michigan lead to significant decreases in housing values that remained depressed well after the water was declared safe for human consumption. While previous work has focused on information about regulated contaminants in public drinking water, such as lead, we show that information about the presence of harmful unregulated contaminants can yield sizable impacts on home values as well.

Studying the causal effects of unregulated contaminants, such as PFAS, poses several challenges. First, the unregulated nature of these contaminants leads to a scarcity of systematic testing, contamination, and remediation data. Thus, individuals lack information on the presence of contamination as well as the potential harms to their health, which limits their ability to avoid exposure. Given full information, individuals may prefer to avoid exposure through obtaining an alternate drinking water source or changing residential locations, for example. In addition, even if the timing of contamination is known, the persistence of PFAS in the environment means that the timing of release and human exposure may not align. Given these limitations, very few studies identify causal effects associated with exposure to PFAS (Waterfield et al., 2020), and to our knowledge no previous studies analyze how individuals change their behavior in response to information about PFAS contamination in their drinking water.

These findings are especially timely as, in April 2024, the EPA announced new drinking water standards for six PFAS, including PFNA.[3] Our findings may assist regulators in assessing the value of these new public drinking water standards that will require regular sampling for PFAS and public notification of elevated PFAS levels.

1 Background

1.1 Background on PFAS

The PFAS class consists of over 12,000 chemicals (USEPA, 2022), and the compounds are used in over 200 consumer and industrial applications, such as non-stick cookware, waterproof clothing, mattresses, carpets, cosmetics, and firefighting foam (Gluge et al., 2020). Humans are primarily exposed to PFAS through ingestion, primarily the consumption of contaminated food and drinking water and the migration of PFAS from food packaging or cookware (Domingo and Nadal, 2019). While other exposure pathways are possible, there is sparse research on exposure to PFAS through dermal uptake, i.e. absorption through the skin (Ragnarsdóttir et al., 2022). PFAS contamination in drinking water can originate from a number of point sources, including airports, military sites, and landfills, as well as from the industrial production sites of these chemicals (Hu et al., 2016).

Numerous studies have documented adverse health effects associated with exposure to PFAS, including kidney and testicular cancer, immune system hypersensitivity and suppression, endocrine disruption, and adverse reproductive outcomes including decreased fertility rates and lower birth weights (ATSDR, 2020; Averina et al., 2019; Barry et al., 2013; Fenton et al., 2021; Shane et al., 2020; Waterfield et al., 2020). Among the many possible exposure pathways, exposure through

---

[3] The USEPA's MCLs for perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS) are each 4 nanograms per liter (ng/L). The MCL for PFNA is 10 ng/L (USEPA, 2024).

contaminated drinking water is of particular concern. Even relatively low levels of PFAS in drinking water have been shown to contribute to blood serum concentrations (Post, 2021; Hu et al., 2019; Hurley et al., 2016). Estimates suggest that about 98 percent of US residents have detectable levels of PFAS in their blood (Calafat et al., 2019) and 200 million US residents receive PFAS contaminated drinking water in the US (Andrews and Naidenko, 2020).

Most evidence of health effects from exposure to PFAS has focused on exposure to PFOA and PFOS (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023d).[4] Research on health effects from exposure to PFNA, in particular, is relatively sparse and inconclusive. However, there is some suggestive evidence of associations between exposure to PFNA and effects on cardiovascular disease risk, birth weight effects, and immune antibody response (ATSDR, 2021).

There are several options for water systems to remediate PFAS in drinking water. A contaminated source (such as a groundwater well) can be turned off and an alternative water source may be used, the water system can blend contaminated water with cleaner water sources to dilute the contamination, or a water system can install filtration technology to remove PFAS from drinking water prior to delivery to residents. Reverse osmosis, nano filtration, ion exchange resins, and granular activated carbon have been found to be the most effective technologies for water systems to remove PFAS from drinking water (Appleman et al., 2013, 2014; Tang et al., 2006; Xiao et al., 2017). Other water treatment technologies such as ferric or alum coagulation, granular filtration, aeration, oxidation, and disinfection are mostly ineffective for removing PFAS (Appleman et al., 2014).

Absent utility scale water treatment, households may avoid PFAS exposure in drinking water

---

[4] PFOA and PFOS are the most widely studied chemicals of the broader PFAS class. These chemicals were produced in large amounts in the U.S. for decades and garnered the earliest attention from regulators and researchers (Interstate Technology Regulatory Council, 2020).

through filtering their water before consumption, purchasing bottled water, or moving residential locations. Point-of-use reverse osmosis systems and under sink dual stage filters are the most effective household systems for removing PFAS (achieving 60-70 percent removal for long chain PFASs, including PFNA), but can be expensive (Herkert et al., 2020).[5] Pitcher and fridge filters are less expensive options, but are generally less effective for removing PFAS (Herkert et al., 2020; Lacey et al., 2023).

1.2 Background on Paulsboro, NJ

In this study, we focus on contamination in Paulsboro, NJ. Paulsboro is a lower-middle income suburb of Philadelphia with approximately 6,000 residents. Paulsboro is an industrial town with ties to several polluting industries. It is home to a large oil refinery, which has been listed as one of the largest polluters in the state (Romalino, 2014). Paulsboro was also the site of a train derailment in 2012 which caused release of vinyl chloride into the air (Mulvihill, 2012). Additionally, Paulsboro is located near a chemical plant in West Deptford, which was identified as the second largest industrial producer of PFNA in the world (Prevedouros et al., 2006). The plant has been linked to PFNA contamination throughout southwestern New Jersey, including in surface water, groundwater and local community water system (CWS) drinking water supplies. While the plant reportedly stopped using PFNA in 2010, environmental contamination remains widespread long after its release due to the persistence of PFAS in the environment (Cousins et al., 2020).

---

[5] The average costs of point-of-use reverse osmosis systems range from $300 to $1,800, plus average installation cost of $1,200. Filter replacements and maintenance can cost $100 to $200 per year.

1.3 Early PFAS Regulation and Testing

New Jersey was an early adopter of testing and monitoring for several PFAS in a sample of water systems across the state. PFAS testing on a national scale was first conducted in 2013 to 2015 during the EPA's third Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR3) (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023b). Thus, the early discovery of PFAS contamination in public drinking water supplies in New Jersey from early testing in 2009 serves as an interesting case study for better understanding public response to information about unregulated contaminants, like PFAS. Table A1 documents a timeline including key PFAS testing initiatives.

Concern about PFAS in drinking water originated in the early 2000s after contamination from a chemical plant in Parkersburg, West Virginia garnered significant media coverage and regulatory attention.[6] In 2006, USEPA launched the PFOA Stewardship Program encouraging the leading manufacturers of PFOA to eliminate the chemicals from production and emissions, citing potential health effects (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023a). NJDEP first conducted PFAS testing in 2006 with a study of PFOA in 23 CWSs (Post et al., 2009). PFOA was detected in 65 percent of the samples, but concentrations were below 40 ng/L. Although there were no official health standards at that time, in 2007, NJDEP issued a preliminary drinking water guidance level for PFOA of 40 ng/L (New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 2021). In 2009, the EPA established provisional health advisories for PFOA at 400 ng/L and for PFOS at 200 ng/L (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2009).

Between August 2009 and February 2010, NJDEP conducted a second PFAS study, sampling at 29 CWSs throughout the state for 10 different PFAS. These 10 individual PFAS were chosen based on available analytic capabilities (Post et al., 2013). PFAS were detected in 21 of the 29

---

[6] This was dramatized in the 2019 film *Dark Waters*.

CWSs (see Figure A1). While NJDEP contacted municipalities and told them about the PFAS detection, no residents were notified and the results were not publicly released.[7]

1.4 Timeline of Public Discovery of PFAS Contamination in New Jersey

Between July 16 and 18th, 2013, a nonprofit organization received the PFAS sampling results from the 2009 NJDEP study through an Open Public Records Act request. Upon receiving the information, the non-profit contacted the NJDEP, made the information publicly available on their website, and contacted news media. (Carluccio, 2013a,b).[8] While PFAS were detected in other NJ water systems included in the 2009 NJDEP study, there were a few reasons why Paulsboro experienced relatively more scrutiny by the media and regulators.

First, the level of PFAS detected in both initial and follow-up testing in Paulsboro was very high. The NJDEP sampling results revealed that the Paulsboro Water Department had a drinking water source well with PFNA of 96 ng/L (Post et al., 2013). While PFNA is not necessarily more harmful than other individual PFAS, such as PFOA or PFOS, the level of PFNA detected in Paulsboro was the second highest level of any other individual PFAS detected during the 2009 testing.[9] At the time of testing, regulators were mainly focused on individual contaminant levels and were not necessarily concerned about the sum of several contaminants.[10]

Follow-up testing in September 2013 found even higher PFNA levels of 150 ng/L in the water delivered to residents, which was reported to be the highest level of PFNA that had ever been

---

[7] The 2006 and 2009 NJDEP studies were stand alone PFAS occurrence studies. Statewide, regular PFAS testing did not begin until 2019 after a state MCL for PFNA was adopted in 2018.

[8] Appendix B provides a copy of the press release on August 5th, 2013 from the nonprofit organization, the Delaware Riverkeeper Network.

[9] Brick Township was reported to have PFOA of 100 ng/L (Post et al., 2013).

[10] Even though Atlantic City had the highest total PFAS contamination across all 10 individual PFAS (see Figure A1), the highest individual contaminant detected in Atlantic City was 46 ng/L of PFHxS.

recorded in drinking water worldwide (Carluccio, 2013b). While there was no threshold specific to PFNA, this was significantly higher than the NJDEP's threshold of concern for PFOA of 40 ng/L. While Southeast Morris County MUA also was found to have high PFNA in the 2009 NJDEP study, a follow-up sample did not detect PFNA above the minimum reporting level of 5 ng/L (Post et al., 2013).

Second, Paulsboro was unable to take immediate action to address the contamination. Although elevated PFAS levels were detected in only one of Paulsboro's source wells, they were unable to take the contaminated well offline due to the presence of naturally occurring radium contamination in Paulsboro's other offline wells (Comegno, 2014). In contrast, other water systems with elevated levels of PFAS were able to mitigate the contamination quickly. For example, Brick Township concluded elevated PFOA contamination was originating from the Metedeconk River Watershed and were able to adjust the blending of water sources to reduce PFOA detected in drinking water (Procopio et al., 2017).

Both the elevated levels of PFNA and the inability of the Paulsboro water system to take immediate action sparked widespread scrutiny by the media and regulators. We document a sharp increase in public knowledge of the contamination in Paulsboro after July 2013, as measured by the number of newspaper articles referencing PFNA and Paulsboro.

About 6 months after the NJDEP testing data was released to the public, the mayor of Paulsboro published a letter to residents in January 2014 informing the public about the contamination and calling for action (Campbell, 2014).[11] In the same month, the NJDEP issued a public health advisory to Paulsboro for PFNA (Comegno, 2014). No other New Jersey CWSs were issued a public health advisory related to PFAS in drinking water at this time. The state public health ad-

---

[11] Appendix B provides a copy of the mayor's letter to residents.

visory for Paulsboro recommended that infants be given "only bottled water or formula to ensure an abundance of precaution," since the contaminant was a newly investigated pollutant for which there was no federal standard in drinking water. Beginning in January 2014, residents were offered free bottled water for several months, until after the PFNA-contaminated well was taken offline (Laday, 2014).

The PFNA-contaminated well was taken offline in April 2014, after the installation of a radium treatment system at Paulsboro's two other drinking water source wells was completed (Laday, 2014). In October 2014, the NJDEP lifted its health advisory in Paulsboro, and announced that free bottled water would no longer be offered to residents after November 1.[12] A timeline of notable dates relevant to this information discovery and the subsequent events is available in Table A1.

2 Empirical Strategy

To study how the information shock about the presence of unregulated contaminants in drinking water impacted households' behavior, we estimate a difference-in-differences specification. We compare changes in housing prices in drinking water systems with and without elevated contamination before and after the public release of information about PFAS levels in late 2013. Because Paulsboro received the most public scrutiny and media attention, we focus primarily on the public response in Paulsboro. We estimate:

$$Log(Price_{pcst}) = \beta_1 Post_t \times Pauslboro_s + \gamma_s + \theta_{ct} + \mathbf{X}_{pt} + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

---

[12] Appendix B provides a copy of the NJDEP letter lifting the health advisory.

for property p in county c in CWS s that sold in year-month t. In this specification, $Post_t$ = 1 if after August 2013 and $Paulsboro_s$ = 1 if property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area.[13] In other specifications, we define treatment as properties in all water systems with any detection of PFAS, any detection of PFNA, or elevated PFAS over 50 ng/L. The specification includes CWS fixed effects, γ_s, county-year-month fixed effects, θ_{ct}, and other property-level controls, $\mathbf{X}_{pt}$ including acres and square footage. The results are robust to using alternative sets of fixed effects and excluding property-level controls. Our main outcome of interest is the log of the sale price of the home. We also estimate the effect on the probability that the property is sold by creating a panel at the property-by-year level. We estimate:

$$AnySale_{pcsy} = \phi_1 Post_y \times Pauslboro_s + \gamma_s + \theta_{cy} + \mathbf{X}_{py} + \epsilon \tag{2}$$

for property p in county c in CWS s in year y. The outcome variable is equal to 1 in a year where the property was sold and 0 otherwise. Because the panel is at the year level, we include county-year fixed effects, θ_{cy}, instead of county-year-month fixed effects. There are 21 counties in New Jersey. For both regressions, standard errors are clustered at the CWS level, but we show results are robust to clustering at alternate levels and performing randomization inference. Additionally, we present specifications with alternative levels of fixed effects, including zip code, block group, and property fixed effects specifications. We also show results using an alternate set of counterfactual comparison tracts based on nearest neighbor matching to Paulsboro following Christensen et al. (2023).

We plot event study estimates of yearly changes in housing prices to assess whether housing

---

[13] In the robustness section, we show that our results are nearly identical whether we define the post period as beginning in July, August, or September.

prices were trending similarly in Paulsboro relative to control areas, prior to the social discovery of contamination. The event study specification is as follows:

$$Log(Price_{pcst}) = \sum_{\tau=2007}^{2012} \alpha_{\tau} 1\{y=\tau\} \times Treat_s + \sum_{\tau=2014}^{2018} \pi_{\tau} 1\{y=\tau\} \times Treat_s \tag{3}$$

$$+ \gamma_s + \theta_{ct} + \mathbf{X}_{pt} + \epsilon$$

where α_τ and π_τ describe the effect on housing prices in areas served by Paulsboro CWS relative to other areas for the years, y before and after information dissemination, respectively.[14] We omit the indicator for the year 2013, normalizing to zero in that year. All other variables are defined as in equation 1. The α_τ show the trend in housing prices before information dissemination, and the π_τ describe how housing prices evolved after information dissemination.

In order to interpret our estimates as the effect of the social discovery of PFAS in the drinking water on home prices, it must be the case that home prices in Paulsboro would have trended similarly to home prices elsewhere after 2013 in the absences of treatment. While this assumption is not directly testable, our event study estimates document parallel trends in periods prior to treatment and we provide sensitivity analysis of violations of the parallel trends assumption based on Rambachan and Roth (2023). Trends also remain parallel in the pre-period under a number of alternative specifications with different sets of fixed effects and counterfactual groups.

In addition, it is important that the stable unit treatment variable assumption holds. This assumption would be violated if, for example, households leaving Paulsboro in response to this information shock drive housing prices upward in neighboring towns. Comparing home prices in Paulsboro to neighboring areas would then overstate the impact on home prices in response to

---

[14] The coefficient for 2007 includes 2007 and earlier years, but the results are not sensitive to this binning.

this information shock. While the small size of Paulsboro makes this unlikely, we test for spatial spillovers directly. We estimate:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Log(Price_{pcst}) = \psi_1 Post_t \times Pauslboro_s + \psi_2 Post_t \times Within\_Xkm_s \\
+ \gamma_s + \theta_{ct} + \mathbf{X}_{pt} + \epsilon
\end{aligned}
\tag{4}
$$

where $Within\_Xkm_s$ is equal to one if the water system is within one of the following distance ranges from the source of pollution: 5km, 10km, 20km. Other variables are defined analogously to the main specification in equation 1. We do not detect any significant price impacts in nearby communities, which helps support this assumption.

3 Data

We combine data from a number of sources, including newspaper articles, property-level home sales data, census tract level demographic information, and geographic information on community water supply drinking water boundaries. We describe each data source in detail below.

3.1 Home Sales Data

Our main data on housing prices comes from the Zillow Transaction and Assessment Database (ZTRAX) data, which is a national database of real estate data managed by Zillow Inc. Property transaction data from 2000 to 2018 were restricted to arms-length single family real estate transactions with consistent geocoding (Zillow Group, 2021).[15] Table 1 shows summary statistics

---

[15] Non-arms length sales were identified based on sales amount code which indicates some non-market transactions, document type, and a variable denoting intra-family transfers.

for home characteristics in Paulsboro and elsewhere before and after treatment. Figure A2 in the appendix shows the number of sales over time in the treatment and control groups. We observe 1,477 sales in the treatment group and 941 of those are in our repeat sale sub-sample. Property characteristics used as controls include acres and square footage.[16] Our baseline estimates exclude sales below $1,000 and above $1 million to avoid the influence of outliers in the data. In robustness exercises, we show the results are also robust to including outliers and including non-residential sales as well.

We supplement these data with an additional source of property transaction data for Gloucester County from the County Tax Assessor's office.[17] Tax assessor data include property transactions from 2011 to 2018. We restrict the sample to residential properties.[18] Square footage is used as a control.

3.2 Demographic Data

We have two sources of demographic data. First, to observe changes in demographics of mortgage applicants, we use data from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) including the fraction of applicants by race and ethnicity, and the average loan amount and income of the applicant.

---

[16] We top-code acres above 10 to reduce the influence of extreme outliers. Less than 1 percent of observations have a value over 10 acres and the results are nearly identical without this top-coding.

[17] ZTRAX data is similar but not identical to County Tax Assessor data, because both obtain data from County Tax Assessor offices. Zillow sources ZTRAX from a major large third-party provider and through an internal initiative they call County Direct. Some data coverage gaps arise through the third-party source due to both county recording procedures and the data collection process of the third party. Because of the gaps in coverage, Zillow instituted its County Direct program. This program prioritizes counties on a dimension of characteristics and supplements the third-party coverage by collecting data directly from county Assessor and Recorder's offices. (See `https://www.zillow.com/research/ztrax/ztrax-faqs/` for more information.) In addition, differences across ZTRAX and County Tax Assessor data may exist due to any data editing, processing, or reclassification by Zillow or the third party provider. Some differences may also stem from when each dataset was constructed or updated.

[18] As we cannot observe "arms length sales" in the tax assessor data, we drop properties sold for less than $100 to match the range of sales values observed in the ZTRAX data. This restriction only becomes relevant in robustness tests that relax the restriction to sales between $1,000 and $1 million.

We compare averages of the pre-period before social discovery (2007-2013) to the post period (2014-2017).

Second, to observe broader changes in demographics and housing characteristics, we use 5-year estimates from the American Community Survey (ACS). These data include the fraction of residents by race and ethnicity and the fraction of households with income classified as below the poverty line or low income (defined as income below 200 percent of the federal poverty level), the proportion of the population under 18, vacant households and renter-occupied households. We take the average of the 5-year estimates from the period before social discovery (2009 to 2013) and after social discovery (2018 to 2021). We exclude 5-year estimates from 2014 to 2017, because they contain values from both before and after social discovery.

In robustness checks, we also use the ACS data to construct a matched sample of census tracts using nearest neighbor matching to Paulsboro. We matched based on 2013 5-year ACS estimates of proportion Black, proportion Hispanic, proportion low income, proportion of the population under 18, proportion renter-occupied homes and median housing value. To make the sample comparable to Paulsboro, we exclude tracts that are not served by a CWS or where a large CWS (serving $>$10,000 people) serves more than 50 percent of the tract. The top 30 nearest neighbor matches to Paulsboro are listed in Table A2 and mapped in Figure A3.

3.3 Geographic Data

As elevated PFAS levels were detected within the Paulsboro public water system, it is important to identify homes and individuals living within the water system boundaries. We obtain the geographic boundaries of each community water system service area from the NJDEP Bureau of

GIS (NJDEP Bureau of GIS, 2022), which were collected and digitized to enable long term water supply planning and to aid in emergency management during drought. Figure A4 provides a map of all CWS service areas in the state in panel (a) and CWS service areas in Gloucester county in panel (b). Our main estimates focus only on homes within a CWS service area. Homes outside CWS service areas typically rely on private groundwater wells, which lack systematic monitoring and regulation. In robustness exercises, we also show our results are robust to including homes outside CWS service areas.

To combine our property-level home sales data with public water systems, we use the locations of each property from ZTRAX to identify property locations within the geographic boundaries of each CWS service area. For property transaction data from the Gloucester County Tax Assessor's office, we match transactions to parcel data (NJ Geographic Information Network, 2021) to identify properties within each CWS service area.

To combine our demographic data with public water systems, we use census tracts, the smallest geography available for both the ACS and HMDA. For Paulsboro, we use the census tract that overlaps with 99.5 percent of the Paulsboro CWS service area.[19] This tract is depicted in panel (c) of Figure A4. We compare with other census tracts in NJ, Gloucester County, and the top 20 counterfactual tracts based on nearest neighbor matching.

3.4 Newspaper Data

We collect information on the number of newspaper articles referencing PFAS in drinking water from *Access World News*. We conducted an international article search of New Jersey water

---

[19] There are no other CWSs that serve the Paulsboro census tract, and no other tracts that are served by the Paulsboro CWS. This is not typical, as other CWSs in NJ serve portions of multiple census tracts.

systems and references to PFAS. We searched (“Water System Name” AND “New Jersey”) AND (“PFNA” or “PFOA” or “PFOS”) from 2006 to 2018. We focus on water systems with elevated PFAS levels, defined as systems with the total sum of all tested PFAS over 50 ng/L (see Figure A1). We exclude two systems that changed names during our sample period and are therefore difficult to track over time. We count the articles by month and year for each water system.

To inform our analysis of descriptive changes in neighborhood demographics, we also look for articles in languages other than English. There were no articles found in our database in languages other than English using these search terms.[20]

4 Results

4.1 Descriptive Results

Our research design leverages the sharp timing of social discovery of PFAS contamination in Paulsboro. We start by documenting the impact and timing of newspaper coverage, as a way to measure information dissemination to the public. Using data from Access World News, Panel (a) of Figure 1 shows the number of newspaper articles referencing PFNA and Paulsboro between 2007 and 2018. News coverage began in August 2013, denoted by a vertical line, and peaked in the beginning of 2014. Figure 1 Panel (b) shows the cumulative number of articles covering PFAS detection in water systems with elevated levels of PFAS in New Jersey.[21] Newspaper coverage of PFAS contamination in Paulsboro was much higher as compared to other systems.

---

[20] Access World News includes a wide variety of global news sources from 16,379 sources, of which 567 are in Spanish. Specifically in New Jersey, there are 232 sources of which 5 are in Spanish.

[21] We report articles for systems with the total sum of all tested PFAS over 50 ng/L (see Figure A1), excluding two systems that changed names during our sample period and are therefore difficult to track over time.

As media coverage occurred immediately after the public release of elevated PFAS test results and coverage was concentrated in Paulsboro, our main estimates compare changes in home prices within the Paulsboro water system service area, relative to changes in home prices in other NJ water systems. Before presenting regression results, we start by showing raw differences in mean home prices. Table 1 shows mean home prices and other home characteristics for residential homes served by Paulsboro water system and other water systems, before and after 2013. Mean home prices in Paulsboro were much lower than in other CWS service areas. The average home value in Pauslboro prior to PFAS discovery was $94,816 as compared to an average of $297,386 for homes served by other water systems in NJ. When we focus on home prices in Gloucester county or in the top 20 matched census tracts, average home prices are more similar to Paulsboro. Regardless of the comparison group, after the release of information about PFAS contamination in 2013, the average home prices dropped by the largest amount in Paulsboro. After 2013, average home prices in Paulsboro dropped to $61,678. This raw comparison of means suggests that home values declined substantially in Paulsboro in response to contamination information.

4.2 Effects on Property Values

Our regression results are consistent with this raw comparison of means. We estimate our main specification of the effect on housing prices from equation (1) in Panel (a) of Table 2. Column (1) presents results with only county-year-month and CWS fixed effects. Column (2) includes property specific controls and represents our preferred specification from equation (1). Columns (3)-(5) show alternative levels of fixed effects including zip code, block group and property fixed effects, respectively. In all specifications, standard errors are clustered at the CWS level.[22] Across all specifications, we find large and statistically significant negative effects on property values in Paulsboro following discovery of PFNA contamination. In Panel (b), we estimate equation 2 and find little evidence of a systematic shift in the probability of homes being sold. Across specifications, we find no statistically significant changes.[23] However, it is important to note that we can only observe completed home sales and have no information on the number of homes on the market or duration of homes on the market.

Our estimates on property values range from a 42-48 percent decline within the Paulsboro CWS following the discovery of contamination.[24] Compared to the mean home value in Paulsboro prior to the discovery of PFAS contamination, \$94,816, a 42 percent decline represents a decrease in home value of about \$39,822. This is much larger than the cost of installing a home water filtration system to avoid exposure to contamination, which suggests that this response captures not only willingness to pay to avoid exposure, but also an increase in public distrust with respect to future contamination and the stigma associated with living in this community.

Figure 2 plots the corresponding event study style estimates from equation (3).[25] Panels (a) and (b) show results including CWS and property fixed effects, respectively. The omitted year is 2013, as information was released in late 2013. Across both specifications, we see little evidence

---

[22] Table A3 shows that the main results are robust to alternate levels of clustering. Table A4 shows our results are robust to replacing county-by-year-by-month fixed effects with county and year-by-month fixed effects.

[23] It is important to note that the type of home sold may be changing even if total sales remain constant. To the extent that home characteristics change systematically with treatment, these changes may effect our price estimates. Table A5 shows there are some changes in property characteristics after treatment, but these changes are small in magnitude and are statistically insignificant when we use the top 20 matched tracts as the counterfactual. To further address this concern, we include home characteristics as controls in all specifications and show that the results are robust after including property fixed effects, which control for all time-invariant property characteristics.

[24] Percent changes are calculated by $(e^{\beta} - 1) \times 100$.

[25] Table A6 and Figure A5 replicate Table 2 and Figure 2a using the Gloucester County tax assessor data rather than the ZTRAX data. Results are very similar in magnitude, although slightly smaller in the property fixed effects specification for the tax assessor data. Across all specifications results are statistically significant.

of pre-trends in property values prior to social discovery of PFAS drinking water contamination in Paulsboro, which we test more formally in section 4.2.1. This supports the assumption that property values would have trended similarly in the absence of the information shock. Yet, after information is released, we see large and persistent decreases in house prices over time, even after the contaminated well is moved offline in 2014. As property values remain depressed, even after the contamination was resolved, this further supports the idea that this information had an impact on public distrust and stigma. Figure A5 shows the event study results are very similar across alternative specifications that include zip code fixed effects and block group fixed effects. The results are also robust to including minimal fixed effects and using Gloucester county tax assessor data.

Although Paulsboro received the vast majority of media attention and was the only water system to have a health advisory issued, it is possible that other areas with reported PFAS detections may have been impacted.[26] We test for changes in property values at other water systems with some level of detected PFAS in Panel (a) of Table 3.[27] Columns (1)-(3) define treated areas as water systems with any level of PFAS detected, any level of PFNA detected, and where the sum of all tested PFAS was over 50 ng/L, respectively. Regardless of the specification, there is no statistically significant impact on property values in these other water systems.

Similarly, if the public responded to this information by changing their perception of PFAS exposure risk from not only the chemical plant near Paulsboro, but other PFAS sources as well, we might expect to find declines in home prices near other producers and users of PFAS. We test for

---

[26] During the 2009 testing, water samples were collected at 29 CWSs across the state and tested for 10 different PFAS, including PFNA. Figure A1 shows the level of total PFAS (sum of the 10 PFAS tested) and level of PFNA at systems with elevated levels.

[27] Table A7 shows the robustness of these results to replacing county-by-year-by-month fixed effects from the baseline specification with county and year-by-month fixed effects.

this in panel (b) of Table 3. We fail to find evidence of changes in property values near other suspected or known sources of PFAS.[28] Panel (b) reports changes in housing prices for homes served by other water systems that were very near, within 2km, of any industrial site that manufactures or imports PFAS and/or any federal site with known or suspected PFAS contamination. Columns (1)-(3) show there was no statistically significant impact on property values in these other water systems after the release of information about PFAS contamination in Paulsboro.

These findings suggest that it was not simply the testing results or proximity to other suspected or known PFAS polluters that resulted in decreased home values, but that media attention played an important role. The decline in property values was unique to Paulsboro, which received the majority of negative media attention. This publicity likely increased both the salience of contamination in Paulsboro and the stigma of living in this community.

Finally, we consider whether there were spillovers to other communities nearby Paulsboro in order to test whether the stable unit treatment variable assumption holds in this setting. A priori, the direction of these spillovers is ambiguous. Nearby home prices may decrease if communities are concerned that they may also experience PFAS contamination. Alternatively, prices may increase if homeowners leaving Paulsboro move to neighboring communities, thus driving up home prices. This would bias our estimates upwards. Panel (c) of Table 3 estimates equation 4 and shows the change in home prices for homes served by water systems within 5km, 10km, and 20km of the chemical plant near Paulsboro. Across all distances, the effects are small in magnitude and statistically insignificant. These findings suggest that the large decline in home values from this information shock was concentrated in Paulsboro, where both contamination and public scrutiny

---

[28] Data on suspected PFAS sources are from US EPA's PFAS Analytic Tools (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023c).

were especially high.

4.2.1 Additional Robustness Tests

Our main results are robust to a variety of alternative specifications and tests. First, we provide a more formal test of the parallel trends assumption. Figure A6 reports a sensitivity analysis of violations of the parallel trends assumption based on Rambachan and Roth (2023). In Panels (a) and (b), we bound the maximum post-treatment violation of parallel trends in consecutive periods by $\bar{M}$ times the maximum pre-treatment violation of parallel trends. Panels (a) and (c) focus on the first post period, 2014, while Panels (b) and (d) use the average of the post period (2014-2018). Our baseline 95 percent confidence intervals are reported in blue, and we report confidence intervals as we relax the constraint on $\bar{M}$. The decrease in house prices in Paulsboro is significant for parallel trend violations in the post period up to about 1.25 times as large as the maximum violation in the pre-treatment period for both Panels (a) and (b). Panels (c) and (d) shows the sensitivity of the results to smooth deviations from an underlying trend. We impose that the change in the slope of the trend is no more than M between consecutive periods, where M = 0 restricts violations of parallel trends to be linear. The breakdown value for M is about 0.18 in Panel (c) and 0.08 in Panel (d). This shows the result is robust to a fairly large deviation from linearity.

To the extent that one is concerned that the vinyl chloride spill from the 2012 train derailment may have contributed to the impact on housing prices we find, the parallel pre-treatment trends we observe are reassuring. If the train derailment in Paulsboro had a meaningful impact on housing prices, we should expect to see effects arising a year earlier, but our event-study figures do not show any pre-trends and are robust to the sensitivity analysis described above. Moreover, we think that any impact on local housing prices from the train derailment is likely to be temporary and relatively small in magnitude for a few reasons. First, the vinyl chloride was released into the air and did not enter the water system. NJDEP concluded that most of the contaminant dissipated quickly with exposures highest in the first 1-2 hours after the derailment in the area closest to the site (New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 2014). Second, even if there were a delayed impact of the train derailment on housing prices, the existing empirical research shows that the effect of train derailments involving hazardous materials is relatively small and temporary. Tang et al. (2020) find that derailments of trains involving hazardous materials depreciate housing values within a one-mile radius by 5–8 percent, which is small relative to our estimated effect on housing prices. Moreover, the authors find that housing prices of affected properties return to pre-accident levels after about 480 days. In contrast, our effects persist for at least 5 years.

Next, Table A8 presents results from a variety of robustness tests. Panel (a) uses the full sample of ZTRAX data, Panel (b) restricts the ZTRAX data to include only Gloucester county sales from 2011-2018 in order to compare to the Gloucester county tax assessor data in Panel (c). Column (1) replicates the main specification across all three different datasets. First, we explore whether the results are sensitive to including outliers in sales price. While our main results restrict to sales between $1,000 and $1 million, columns (2)-(4) show the results are not sensitive to this choice. Column (2) includes all sales, column (3) restricts only to sales below $1 million, and column (4) restricts only to sales above $1,000. Our main results remain significant across each specification. The magnitudes are remarkably similar, with the exception of columns (2) and (3) for the tax assessor data in Panel (c). These are the specifications that include property transactions where the sale price is less than $1,000. The difference in results likely reflects our inability to directly identify arms-length transactions in the tax assessor data, unlike the ZTRAX data. Thus, many of the transactions with low sale prices likely reflect non-arms length transactions.

While our main specification restricts to residential properties served by community water systems, we show that our results are not sensitive to this sample choice. We show in column (5) that the results remain statistically significant when we include non-residential properties. The magnitude is very similar in the tax assessor data and only slightly smaller in the ZTRAX data. Next, column (6) shows the robustness to including rural properties reliant on private wells as additional controls. In this specification, we cluster at the block group level instead of CWS level since not all properties are assigned to a CWS. To ensure that our control group is not experiencing any impact of the information shock, Column (7) excludes any properties served by other CWSs that found positive PFAS levels in the 2009 NJDEP testing. However, we do not see much change in the results when these properties are excluded. This is not surprising, given we observed no change in property values for these properties in panel (a) of Table 3.

We also show in Table A9 that our results are not sensitive to alternate definitions of the post period. Our regression results define home sales as treated if they occur in September 2013 or later. As the first information on PFAS contamination in newspapers is recorded in August 2013 and the average time to close on a home purchase is typically 30-45 days, we expect that sales in August were initiated prior to the release of information. Nevertheless, we show that our results are nearly identical whether we define the post period as beginning in July, August, or September.

Next, we use randomization inference to test the robustness of our main estimate on property values. We randomly assign placebo treatment across all community water supply systems in the data. The "randomized inference p-value" is 0.027, which is based on the proportion of placebo point estimates that are larger in magnitude than the main point estimate. Figure A7 shows the distribution of placebo point estimates is centered around zero, as expected, and the vertical line denotes our main estimate, which is in the lower tail of the distribution. This gives additional confidence that our estimated effect is statistically significant.

Finally, we also consider an alternate set of counterfactual comparison tracts based on nearest neighbor matching. As described in section 3, we construct a counterfactual sample of census tracts matched to Paulsboro based on the proportion Black, proportion Hispanic, proportion low income, proportion of the population under 18, proportion renter-occupied homes and median housing value. We focus on the top 20 matched tracts for simplicity, but show the results are robust to using the top 30, top 20, or top 10 in Table A10. Figure A8 shows the event study figures using the top 30, top 20, or top 10 matched tracts as the counterfactual. For both the specification using CWS fixed effects in panel (a) and the specification using property fixed effects in panel (b), the results are very similar to the main specifications and show little evidence of any pre-trends. Next, Table A11 replicates the main results using the top 20 matched census tracts as the counterfactual. Across all specifications, the results for home sales price remain statistically significant. The magnitude is somewhat smaller than our main specification, but still suggests a large and significant decline in home values of about 31-33 percent. Lastly, we repeat the robustness exercises from Table A8 for the matched counterfactual specification in Table A12. The estimates remain similar across all robustness checks as well.

4.3 Effect on Sorting and Neighborhood Characteristics

Given the large decrease in property values we document, it is important to consider how this information shock may have impacted residential sorting and broader changes in neighborhood characteristics. While we cannot observe property-level demographic characteristics, we explore descriptive changes in neighborhood demographics and housing characteristics in Paulsboro before and after information about the drinking water contamination was discovered. Table 4 compares demographic and housing characteristics before and after 2013 in Paulsboro compared to three counterfactuals, including the rest of New Jersey, the rest of Gloucester County, and the top 20 matched census tracts from the nearest neighbor matching described in section 3.

Before 2013, compared to the rest of New Jersey in column (1), Paulsboro had a smaller fraction of white residents and higher fractions of Black residents, households below the poverty line or classified as low-income, and a slightly higher fraction of renter-occupied homes. These patterns are even more pronounced when comparing Paulsboro to other census tracts in Gloucester County in column (3). These patterns are consistent with the broader environmental justice literature that has documented higher exposure to pollution among disadvantaged communities in the cross-section. As expected, the top 20 matched census tracts from the nearest neighbor matching shown in column (5) are much more similar to Paulsboro before 2013.

After 2013, one notable change in Paulsboro is a large decrease in the fraction of children under 18, which declined by almost 14 percentage points from about 30 percent to 16 percent. For non-Paulsboro areas, there was also a decline in the population-share of children, but it was much smaller, representing just a 2-3 percentage point change. Because children are still developing, they may be more sensitive to the harmful effects of PFAS. The large decline in the share of children under 18 in Paulsboro relative to other areas after treatment may reflect higher avoidance among families with children, due to parental concern over the health risks of PFAS exposure for children.

In addition, both the fraction of households below the poverty line and the fraction of renter-occupied households decreased in Paulsboro after 2013. We do not observe similar declines for non-Pauslboro neighborhoods. This may indicate that many renter-occupied households with children, which are more likely to be low-income, were more likely to leave Paulsboro after learning about the drinking water contamination. Consistent with the reduced desirability of this neighborhood, we also see a relative increase in the share of vacant homes in Paulsboro after 2013. The share of vacant homes in Paulsboro increased by about 7 percentage points. Compared to renters, homeowners typically have higher moving costs.

To explore the changes in homeowner demographics further, Table 5 compares the demographics of applicants for new mortgages before and after 2013 in Paulsboro compared to three counterfactuals, including the rest of New Jersey, the rest of Gloucester County, and the top 20 matched census tracts. We see a large decrease in share of white, non-Hispanic applicants for new mortgages and an increase in the share of Hispanic applicants in Paulsboro after the contamination was discovered in 2013. The decrease in the share of white, non-Hispanic applicants for non-Paulsboro areas are much smaller in magnitude. While changes in demographics are less pronounced in the ACS data, which includes renters and residents who are not moving, a decrease in white mortgage applicants is an indicator that the relative demand for homes in Paulsboro decreased for white New Jersey homebuyers, and increased among Hispanic homebuyers. However, we do not see large changes in the share of lower-income mortgage applicants in Paulsboro relative to other areas. The increase in the share of Hispanic applicants, in particular, may be explained by the salience of information about drinking water contamination if English proficiency among the Hispanic population is lower than the non-Hispanic population, and if most of the information was presented in English. Based on our newspaper article search, we did not find any articles about PFAS in Paulsboro drinking water that were published in Spanish. In addition, existing literature has documented lower perceived tap water safety and higher bottled water consumption among Hispanics in the US (Pierce and Gonzalez, 2017; Drewnowski et al., 2013; Hobson et al., 2007). To the extent that Hispanic households were already distrustful of public drinking water and already avoiding tap water consumption, this information shock may had less of an impact on their perception of neighborhood quality.

Overall, these patterns document the differential demographic sorting behaviors that accompany the large decline in housing values in Paulsboro. Persistence in the property value decline and the relative increase in vacant homes in this neighborhood may also lead to deterioration in public services and other amenities.

5 Discussion & Conclusion

We find that high profile media coverage about unregulated contaminants in drinking water significantly impacted housing values in Paulsboro. We find a large statistically significant decrease in home values of about 31 to 42 percent on average after the social discovery of contamination for properties within the Paulsboro water system service area relative to properties in the top 20 matched census tracts or other properties across the state. This decline was concentrated in Paulsboro, the community which received the greatest publicity in the news, suggesting the public scrutiny through the media may have increased the salience of contamination in this community and also the perceived risk and stigma associated with living there. As this contamination was hidden from the public for four years prior to public notification, public distrust may have contributed to housing prices remaining depressed even after remediation.

This 31 to 42 percent decline in property values is large relative to the cost of installing a whole home water filtration system. Yet, this effect likely reflects, at least in part, an increase in public distrust and stigma surrounding the contamination in Paulsboro. While Paulsboro received significant media attention and scrutiny by regulators from August 2013 through April 2014, we observe the negative effects on housing values were sustained through at least 2018, long after the contaminated source well was taken offline, suggesting that the perceived risk of future environmental concerns may be an important driver of households' willingness to pay. Moreover, a history of environmental issues stemming from the presence of several large oil and gas facilities and the 2012 vinyl chloride spill may have led to increasing distrust of the local government in Paulsboro and may have set the stage for these large effects.

Our estimates of a 31 to 42 percent decrease in property values represent a change in value of about \$29,393 to \$39,822 relative to the pre-treatment mean in Paulsboro. Similarly large housing price effects have been estimated for other drinking water crises. Following the switch in the water supply that exposed residents to elevated levels of lead, housing values in Flint, Michigan declined by 27 to 43 percent (Christensen et al., 2023). In terms of total valuation, the PFAS contamination in Paulsboro led to a decline in housing values of about \$34 to \$46 million in total.[29]

The decline in property values in Paulsboro was accompanied by changes in neighborhood demographics in Paulsboro relative to other areas. Large declines in the proportion of the population under 18 may reflect the greater risk of harm to children from exposure to PFAS. We also document a decrease in the proportion of renter occupied households and an increase in the proportion of vacant homes, relative to other areas. Higher moving costs for homeowners and the large negative shock to their home value may have limited homeowners' ability to relocate. We also document a relative decrease in the percent of white applicants for new mortgages, along with an increase in the proportion of Hispanic applicants. These findings contribute to our understanding of the mechanisms behind the widely documented disproportionate exposure to pollution among

---

[29] There are 1,448 parcels within the Paulsboro water system boundaries and we estimate that about 80 percent of these are single family residential homes based on the percent of occupied housing units that are detached one-unit homes in 2018 ACS data.

disadvantaged communities and how high profile media coverage about pollution exposure in a community may lead to residential sorting that may exacerbate environmental inequality.

Our estimates contribute to the ongoing policy discussion surrounding the regulation of PFAS. These results are especially timely given the EPA's April 2024 announcement of new federal drinking water standards for PFAS that are lower than all existing PFAS standards. The rule will require systems to monitor, notify the public, and remediate if the standards are violated (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023e). Improvements to public notification and transparency of drinking water quality may mitigate the likelihood that another high profile contamination event increases public distrust and stigma, causing sustained reputational damage and property value declines, in other local communities.

References

Agyeman, Julian, David Schlosberg, Luke Craven, and Caitlin Matthews, "Trends and Directions in Environmental Justice: From Inequity to Everyday Life, Community, and Just Sustainabilities," in Gadgil, A and Gadgil, TP, ed., *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 41 of *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 2016, pp. 321–340.

Allaire, Maura, Taylor Mackay, Shuyan Zheng, and Upmanu Lall, "Detecting community response to water quality violations using bottled water sales," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2019, *116* (42), 20917–20922.

Andrews, David Q. and Olga Naidenko V, "Population-Wide Exposure to Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances from Drinking Water in the United States," *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, DEC 8 2020, *7* (12), 931–936.

Appleman, Timothy D., Christopher P. Higgins, Oscar Quinones, Brett J. Vanderford, Chad Kolstad, Janie C. Zeigler-Holady, and Eric R.V. Dickenson, "Treatment of poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances in U.S. full-scale water treatment systems," *Water Research*, 2014, *51*, 246–255.

_ , Eric R.V. Dickenson, Christopher Bellona, and Christopher P. Higgins, "Nanofiltration and granular activated carbon treatment of perfluoroalkyl acids," *Journal of Hazardous Materials*, 2013, *260*, 740–746.

ATSDR, *PFAS Exposure Assessments* Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) / Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) 2020.

_ , "Toxicological Profile for Perfluoroalkyls," 2021.

Averina, Maria, Jan Brox, Sandra Huber, Anne-Sofie Furberg, and Martin Sorensen, "Serum perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and risk of asthma and various allergies in adolescents. The Tromso study Fit Futures in Northern Norway," *Environmental Research*, FEB 2019, *169*, 114–121.

Banzhaf, H Spencer and Randall P Walsh, "Do people vote with their feet? An empirical test of Tiebout's mechanism," *American economic review*, 2008, *98* (3), 843–863.

Banzhaf, Spencer, Lala Ma, and Christopher Timmins, "Environmental Justice: The Economics of Race, Place, and Pollution," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, WIN 2019, *33* (1), 185–208.

Barry, Vaughn, Andrea Winquist, and Kyle Steenland, "Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) Exposures and Incident Cancers among Adults Living Near a Chemical Plant," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, Nov-Dec 2013, *121* (11-12), 1313–1318.

Bayer, Patrick, Nathaniel Keohane, and Christopher Timmins, "Migration and hedonic valuation: The case of air quality," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 2009, *58* (1), 1–14.

Billings, Stephen B and Kevin T Schnepel, "The value of a healthy home: Lead paint remediation and housing values," *Journal of Public Economics*, 2017, *153*, 69–81.

Boyle, Kevin J., Nicolai V. Kuminoff, Congwen Zhang, Michael Devanney, and Kathleen P. Bell, "Does a property-specific environmental health risk create a "neighborhood" housing price stigma? Arsenic in private well water," *Water Resources Research*, 2010, *46* (3).

Burda, Martin and Matthew Harding, "Environmental justice: Evidence from superfund cleanup durations," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 2014, *107*, 380–401.

Calafat, Antonia M., Kayoko Kato, Kendra Hubbard, Tao Jia, Julianne Cook Botelho, and Lee-Yang Wong, "Legacy and alternative per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances in the U.S. general population: Paired serum-urine data from the 2013–2014 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey," *Environment International*, 2019, *131*, 105048.

Campbell, Brad, "Paulsboro Puts Polluter on Notice," *Delaware Riverkeeper Network*, January 2014.

Carluccio, Tracy, "Delaware Riverkeeper Network Petitions Federal Agency to Address Contaminated Drinking Water in New Jersey," *Delaware Riverkeeper Network*, August 2013.

_ , "Drinking Water Contamination in Paulsboro Requires Urgent Attention," *Delaware Riverkeeper Network*, December 2013.

Chay, Kenneth and Michael Greenstone, "Does Air Quality Matter? Evidence from the Housing Market," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2005, *113* (2), 376–424.

Christensen, Peter, David A. Keiser, and Gabriel E. Lade, "Economic Effects of Environmental Crises: Evidence from Flint, Michigan," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2023, *15* (1), 196–232.

Comegno, Carol, "Contaminant at West Deptford plant draws state advisory," *Courier-Post*, January 2014.

Cousins, Ian T., Jamie C. Dewitt, Juliane Glüge, Gretta Goldenman, Dorte Herzke, Rainer Lohmann, Carla A. Ng, Martin Scheringer, and Zhanyun Wang, "The high persistence of PFAS is sufficient for their management as a chemical class," *Environmental Science: Processes & Impacts*, 2020, *22* (12), 2307–2312.

Currie, Janet, "Inequality at Birth: Some Causes and Consequences," *American Economic Review*, May 2011, *101* (3), 1–22.

_ , Lucas Davis, Michael Greenstone, and Reed Walker, "Environmental health risks and housing values: evidence from 1,600 toxic plant openings and closings," *American Economic Review*, 2015, *105* (2), 678–709.

Davis, Lucas W, "The effect of power plants on local housing values and rents," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2011, *93* (4), 1391–1402.

Domingo, Jose L. and Marti Nadal, "Human exposure to per-and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) through drinking water: A review of the recent scientific literature," *Environmental Research*, OCT 2019, *177.*

Drewnowski, Adam, Colin D Rehm, and Florence Constant, "Water and beverage consumption among children age 4-13y in the United States: analyses of 2005–2010 NHANES data," *Nutrition journal*, 2013, *12*, 1–9.

Fenton, Suzanne E., Alan Ducatman, Alan Boobis, Jamie C. DeWitt, Christopher Lau, Carla Ng, James S. Smith, and Stephen M. Roberts, "Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substance Toxicity and Human Health Review: Current State of Knowledge and Strategies for Informing Future Research," *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, MAR 2021, *40* (3, SI), 606–630.

Gamper-Rabindran, Shanti and Christopher Timmins, "Hazardous waste cleanup, neighborhood gentrification, and environmental justice: Evidence from restricted access census block data," *American Economic Review*, 2011, *101* (3), 620–624.

_ and _ , "Does cleanup of hazardous waste sites raise housing values? Evidence of spatially localized benefits," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 2013, *65* (3), 345–360.

Gazze, Ludovica, "The price and allocation effects of targeted mandates: Evidence from lead hazards," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2021, *123*, 103345.

Gluge, Juliane, Martin Scheringer, Ian T. Cousins, Jamie C. DeWitt, Gretta Goldenman, Dorte Herzke, Rainer Lohmann, Carla A. Ng, Xenia Trier, and Zhanyun Wang, "An overview of the uses of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)," *Environ. Sci.: Processes Impacts*, 2020, *22*, 2345–2373.

Greenstone, Michael and Justin Gallagher, "Does Hazardous Waste Matter? Evidence from the Housing Market and the Superfund Program*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2008, *123* (3), 951–1003.

Guignet, Dennis, Patrick J. Walsh, and Rachel Northcutt, "Impacts of Ground Water Contamination on Property Values: Agricultural Run-off and Private Wells," *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*, 2016, *45* (2), 293–318.

Hausman, Catherine and Samuel Stolper, "Inequality, information failures, and air pollution," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 2021, *110*, 102552.

Herkert, Nicholas J, John Merrill, Cara Peters, David Bollinger, Sharon Zhang, Kate Hoffman, P Lee Ferguson, Detlef RU Knappe, and Heather M Stapleton, "Assessing the effectiveness of point-of-use residential drinking water filters for perfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs)," *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 2020, *7* (3), 178–184.

Hobson, Wendy L, Miguel L Knochel, Carrie L Byington, Paul C Young, Charles J Hoff, and Karen F Buchi, "Bottled, filtered, and tap water use in Latino and non-Latino children," *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*, 2007, *161* (5), 457–461.

Hu, Xindi C., Andrea K. Tokranov, Jahred Liddie, Xianming Zhang, Philippe Grandjean, Jaime E. Hart, Francine Laden, Qi Sun, Leo W. Y. Yeung, and Elsie M. Sunderland, "Tap Water Contributions to Plasma Concentrations of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) in a Nationwide Prospective Cohort of U.S. Women," *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 2019, *127* (6), 067006.

—, David Q. Andrews, Andrew B. Lindstrom, Thomas A. Bruton, Laurel A. Schaider, Philippe Grandjean, Rainer Lohmann, Courtney C. Carignan, Arlene Blum, Simona A. Balan, Christopher P. Higgins, and Elsie M. Sunderland, "Detection of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) in US Drinking Water Linked to Industrial Sites, Military Fire Training Areas, and Wastewater Treatment Plants," *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, Oct 2016, *3* (10), 344–350.

Hurley, Susan, Erika Houtz, Debbie Goldberg, Miaomiao Wang, June-Soo Park, David O. Nelson, Peggy Reynolds, Leslie Bernstein, Hoda Anton-Culver, Pamela Horn-Ross, and Myrto Petreas, "Preliminary Associations between the Detection of Perfluoroalkyl Acids (PFAAs) in Drinking Water and Serum Concentrations in a Sample of California Women," *Environmental Science & Technology Letters*, 07 2016, *3* (7), 264–269.

Interstate Technology Regulatory Council, "History and Use of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) found in the Environment," `https://pfas-1.itrcweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/history_and_use_508_2020Aug_Final.pdf` 2020. Accessed: 2024-1-10.

Keiser, David A and Joseph S Shapiro, "Consequences of the Clean Water Act and the Demand for Water Quality*," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 09 2018, *134* (1), 349–396.

Lacey, Anthony, Sydney Evans, and Tasha Stoiber, "Getting 'forever chemicals' out of drinking water: EWG's guide to PFAS water filters," `https://www.ewg.org/research/getting-forever-chemicals-out-drinking-water-ewgs-guide-pfas-water-filter` 2023. Accessed: 2023-08-10.

Laday, Jason, "DEP lifts Paulsboro water advisory, Solvay to cease free bottled water," *South Jersey Times*, October 2014.

Leggett, Christopher G and Nancy E Bockstael, "Evidence of the effects of water quality on residential land prices," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 2000, *39* (2), 121–144.

Levin, Ronnie, Cristina M. Villanueva, Daniel Beene, Angie L. Cradock, Carolina Donat-Vargas, Johnnye Lewis, Irene Martinez-Morata, Darya Minovi, Anne E. Nigra, Erik D. Olson, and et al., "US drinking water quality: exposure risk profiles for seven legacy and emerging contaminants," *Journal of Exposure Science & Environmental Epidemiology*, 2023.

Marcus, Michelle, "Going Beneath the Surface: Petroleum Pollution, Regulation, and Health," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2021, *13* (1), 72–104.

_ , "Testing the water: Drinking water quality, public notification, and child outcomes," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2022, *104* (6), 1289–1303.

McCluskey, Jill J. and Gordon C. Rausser, "Stigmatized Asset Value: Is It Temporary or Long-Term?," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 05 2003, *85* (2), 276–285.

Melstrom, Richard T, "Residential demand for sediment remediation to restore water quality: Evidence from Milwaukee," *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, 2022, *116*, 102731.

Mohai, Paul, David Pellow, and J. Timmons Roberts, "Environmental Justice," *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 2009, *34*, 405–430.

Moretti, Enrico and Matthew Neidell, "Pollution, Health, and Avoidance Behavior," *Journal of Human Resources*, 2011, *46* (1), 154–175.

Muehlenbachs, Lucija, Elisheba Spiller, and Christopher Timmins, "The Housing Market Impacts of Shale Gas Development," *American Economic Review*, 2015, *105* (12), 3633–3659.

Mulvihill, Geoff, "Delicate cleanup ahead after NJ train derailment," *The Spokesman Review*, December 2012.

Neidell, Matthew, "Air pollution, health, and socio-economic status: the effect of outdoor air quality on childhood asthma," *Journal of Health Economics*, 2004, *23* (6), 1209–1236.

_ , "Information, Avoidance Behavior, and Health," *Journal of Human Resources*, 2009, *44* (2), 450–478.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, "Paulsboro Train Derailment and Vinyl Chloride Release, November 30, 2012 Health Survey Findings and Air Quality Impacts," `https://www.nj.gov/health/ceohs/documents/eohap/haz_sites/gloucester/train_derail/factsheet.pdf` 2014. Accessed: 2024-1-14.

_ , "Contaminants of Emerging Concern," `https://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/emerging-contaminants/` 2021. Accessed: 2023-1-9.

NJ Geographic Information Network, "Parcels," `https://nj.gov/njgin/edata/parcels/#!/` 2021. Accessed: 2022-11-15.

NJDEP Bureau of GIS, "Purveyor Service Areas of New Jersey," `https://njogis-newjersey.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/00e7ff046ddb4302abe7b49b2ddee07e/` 2022. Accessed: 2022-11-15.

Pierce, Gregory and Silvia Gonzalez, "Mistrust at the tap? Factors contributing to public drinking water (mis) perception across US households," *Water Policy*, 2017, *19* (1), 1–12.

Post, Gloria B., "Recent US State and Federal Drinking Water Guidelines for Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances," *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 2021, *40* (3), 550–563.

_ , Judith B. Louis, Keith R. Cooper, Betty Jane Boros-Russo, and R. Lee Lippincott, “Occurrence and Potential Significance of Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) Detected in New Jersey Public Drinking Water Systems,” *Environmental Science & Technology*, JUN 15 2009, *43* (12), 4547–4554.

_ , _ , R. Lee Lippincott, and Nicholas A. Procopio, “Occurrence of Perfluorinated Compounds in Raw Water from New Jersey Public Drinking Water Systems,” *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2013, *47* (23), 13266–13275.

Prevedouros, Konstantinos, Ian T. Cousins, Robert C. Buck, and Stephen H. Korzeniowski, “Sources, Fate and Transport of Perfluorocarboxylates,” *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2006, *40* (1), 32–44.

Procopio, Nicholas A., Robert Karl, Sandra M. Goodrow, Joseph Maggio, Judith B. Louis, and Thomas B. Atherholt, “Occurrence and source identification of perfluoroalkyl acids (PFAAs) in the Metedeconk River Watershed, New Jersey,” *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 2017, *24* (35), 27125–27135.

Ragnarsdóttir, Oddný, Mohamed Abou-Elwafa Abdallah, and Stuart Harrad, “Dermal uptake: An important pathway of human exposure to perfluoroalkyl substances?,” *Environmental Pollution*, 2022, *307*, 119478.

Rambachan, Ashesh and Jonathan Roth, “A more credible approach to parallel trends,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2023, p. rdad018.

Romalino, Carly Q, “Paulsboro site among N.J’s worst water polluters,” `https://www.courierpostonline.com/story/news/local/south-jersey/2014/06/19/paulsboro-refinery-among-states-worst-water-polluters/10862763/` 2014. Accessed: 2024-1-23.

Shane, Hillary L., Rachel Baur, Ewa Lukomska, Lisa Weatherly, and Stacey E. Anderson, “Immunotoxicity and allergenic potential induced by topical application of perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) in a murine model,” *Food and Chemical Toxicology*, FEB 2020, *136.*

Shapiro, Joseph S and Reed Walker, “Where is pollution moving? Environmental markets and environmental justice,” in “AEA Papers and Proceedings,” Vol. 111 American Economic Association 2014 Broadway, Suite 305, Nashville, TN 37203 2021, pp. 410–414.

Smith, V Kerry and Ju-Chin Huang, “Can markets value air quality? A meta-analysis of hedonic property value models,” *Journal of political economy*, 1995, *103* (1), 209–227.

Tang, Chuan, Jeffrey Czajkowski, Martin D Heintzelman, Minghao Li, and Marilyn Montgomery, “Rail accidents and property values in the era of unconventional energy production,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2020, *120*, 103295.

Tang, Chuyang Y., Q. Shiang Fu, A. P. Robertson, Craig S. Criddle, and James O. Leckie, “Use of Reverse Osmosis Membranes to Remove Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS) from Semiconductor Wastewater,” *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2006, *40* (23), 7343–7349. PMID: 17180987.

Tessum, Christopher W., David A. Paolella, Sarah E. Chambliss, Joshua S. Apte, Jason D. Hill, and Julian D. Marshall, "PM2.5 polluters disproportionately and systemically affect people of color in the United States," *Science Advances*, 2021, *7* (18).

United States Environmental Protection Agency, "Provisional Health Advisories for Perfluorooctanoic Acid (PFOA) and Perfluorooctane Sulfonate (PFOS)," `https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/drinking-water-health-advisories-pfoa-and-pfos` 2009. Accessed: 2023-1-9.

_ , "Fact Sheet: 2010/2015 PFOA Stewardship Program," `https://www.epa.gov/assessing-and-managing-chemicals-under-tsca/fact-sheet-20102015-pfoa-stewardship-program` 2023. Accessed: 2024-1-18.

_ , "Monitoring Unregulated Drinking Water Contaminants," `https://www.epa.gov/dwucmr/learn-about-unregulated-contaminant-monitoring-rule` 2023. Accessed: 2022-11-28.

_ , "PFAS Analytic Tools," `https://echo.epa.gov/trends/pfas-tools` 2023. Accessed: 2023-03-14.

_ , "Pre-Publication Federal Register Notice: PFAS Primary Drinking Water Regulation," `https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-03/Pre-Publication%20Federal%20Register%20Notice_PFAS%20NPDWR_NPRM_Final_3.13.23.pdf` March 2023. Accessed: 2023-03-14.

_ , "Proposed PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation," `https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfas` March 2023. Accessed: 2023-03-14.

USEPA, "PFAS Master List of PFAS Substances. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency," `https://comptox.epa.gov/dashboard/chemical_lists/pfasmaster` 2022. Accessed: 2023-01-09.

_ , "Final PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation," `https://www.epa.gov/sdwa/and-polyfluoroalkyl-substances-pfas` 2024. Accessed: 2024-04-10.

Wang, Zhanyun, Jamie C. DeWitt, Christopher P. Higgins, and Ian T. Cousins, "A Never-Ending Story of Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs)?," *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2017, *51* (5), 2508–2518.

Waterfield, Gina, Martha Rogers, Philippe Grandjean, Maximilian Auffhammer, and David Sunding, "Reducing exposure to high levels of perfluorinated compounds in drinking water improves reproductive outcomes: evidence from an intervention in Minnesota," *Environmental Health*, APR 22 2020, *19* (1).

Xiao, Xin, Bridget A. Ulrich, Baoliang Chen, and Christopher P. Higgins, "Sorption of Poly- and Perfluoroalkyl Substances (PFASs) Relevant to Aqueous Film-Forming Foam (AFFF)-Impacted Groundwater by Biochars and Activated Carbon," *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2017, *51* (11), 6342–6351.

Zhang, Jiarui, Daniel J Phaneuf, and Blake A Schaeffer, "Property values and cyanobacterial algal blooms: Evidence from satellite monitoring of Inland Lakes," *Ecological Economics*, 2022, *199*, 107481.

Zillow Group, "Zillow's Transaction and Assessment Database (ZTRAX).," `https://www.zillow.com/research/ztrax/` 2021.

Zivin, Joshua Graff, Matthew Neidell, and Wolfram Schlenker, "Water Quality Violations and Avoidance Behavior: Evidence from Bottled Water Consumption," *American Economic Review*, May 2011, *101* (3), 448–53.

6 Figures

Figure 1: News Articles on PFAS



(a) Paulsboro Articles per Month



(b) Cumulative Articles for Systems with PFAS

Note: Panel (a) plots the number of newspaper articles published per month from an *Access World News* search for articles mentioning both "Paulsboro" and "New Jersey" and ("PFNA" or "PFOA" or "PFOS"). Panel (b) plots cumulative newspaper articles on PFAS for water systems with elevated detection. Searches were conducted for articles mentioning the water system name and either "PFNA" or "PFOA" or "PFOS." The other 5 systems included in Panel (b) were selected due to elevated levels of PFAS detected in the 2009 NJDEP study, as depicted in Figure A1. Full CWS names include Paulsboro Water Department, Atlantic City MUA, Brick Township MUA, Southeast Morris County MUA, Ridgewood Water, and Camden City Department of Public Works. The vertical line denotes August 2013, when news coverage begins.

Figure 2: Effect on Log(House Prices) in Paulsboro



(a) CWS fixed effects



(b) Property fixed effects

Note: Figure plots results from estimation of equation 3 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. The omitted reference year is 2013. All panels include year-by-month-by-county fixed effects and controls for acres and square footage. Panels (a) and (b) show results including CWS and property fixed effects, respectively. Vertical lines denote 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level in Panel (a) and at the property level in Panel (b).

7 Tables

Table 1: Mean Property Characteristics

	All NJ		**Gloucester**		**Matched Top 20**		**Paulsboro**	
	Before 2013 (1)	After 2013 (2)	Before 2013 (3)	After 2013 (4)	Before 2013 (5)	After 2013 (6)	Before 2013 (7)	After 2013 (8)
Sales Price	297,386	307,476	194,906	182,465	147,505	133,910	94,816	61,678
	(186,939)	(204,607)	(103,997)	(102,448)	(103,440)	(112,873)	(60,550)	(59,448)
Acres	0.35	0.35	0.37	0.37	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.16
	(0.93)	(0.89)	(0.55)	(0.56)	(0.34)	(0.24)	(0.25)	(0.100)
Sqft	1946.1	1896.2	1941.7	1865.8	1507.2	1487.5	1399.3	1405.7
	(851.3)	(800.4)	(741.0)	(682.1)	(611.6)	(576.6)	(447.2)	(423.8)
Stories	1.81	1.70	1.62	1.58	1.58	1.57	1.53	1.51
	(29.1)	(6.41)	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.49)	(0.49)
Year Built	1960	1959	1973	1970	1952	1950	1939	1939
	(34)	(33)	(32)	(32)	(32)	(33)	(27)	(25)

Note: Table reports mean characteristics and standard deviations in parentheses for residential homes served by CWSs from 2000 to 2018 using ZTRAX data. Columns (1)-(6) report means for three different control groups: the rest of NJ in columns (1)-(2), the rest of Gloucester county in columns (3)-(4), and the top 20 matched census tracts in columns (5)-(6). Columns (7)-(8) report averages for homes served by the Paulsboro water system. Odd columns report values prior to 2013, while even columns report values for after 2013.

Table 2: Effect on Home Sales in Paulsboro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			Panel A. Log(House Price)		
Post × Paulsboro	-0.541***	-0.561***	-0.557***	-0.569***	-0.648***
	(0.0234)	(0.0231)	(0.0226)	(0.0220)	(0.0216)
Observations	1,466,797	1,352,418	1,352,417	1,352,377	834,825
R-squared	0.436	0.537	0.596	0.643	0.803
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
			Panel B. Pr(Any Sale)		
Post × Paulsboro	0.00192	0.00238	0.00238	0.00238	0.00171
	(0.00174)	(0.00173)	(0.00173)	(0.00173)	(0.00174)
Observations	19,036,824	17,509,113	17,509,113	17,509,113	19,036,795
R-squared	0.012	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.032
County-year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Controls		yes	yes	yes	
Zip FE			yes		
Blk group FE				yes	
Property FE					yes

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The unit of observation is at the property-year-month level in Panel (a) and the property-year level in Panel (b). The outcome in Panel (a) is the log of sales price and the outcome in Panel (b) is equal to one if a property sold. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 in Panel (a) and after 2013 in Panel (b). All columns include county-by-year-by-month fixed effects in Panel (a) and county-by-year fixed effects in Panel (b). Columns (1)-(4) include CWS fixed effects, column (2) adds controls for acres and square footage, column (3) adds zip code fixed effects, while column (4) adds block group fixed effects. Column (5) includes property level fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 3: Effects on Other Systems

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A. Other Systems with Detected PFAS			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.576***	-0.484***	-0.544***
	(0.0408)	(0.0621)	(0.0495)
Post × Any PFAS	0.0149		
	(0.0337)		
Post × Any PFNA		-0.0771	
		(0.0578)	
Post × Elevated PFAS			-0.0168
			(0.0438)
Panel B. Other Systems Near PFAS Facilities			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.569***	-0.561***	-0.583***
	(0.0334)	(0.0231)	(0.0302)
Post × Near Any Site	0.00860		
	(0.0265)		
Post × Near Fed Site		-0.0210	
		(0.0779)	
Post × Near PFAS Producer			0.0245
			(0.0212)
Panel C. Spatial Spillovers			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.566***	-0.575***	-0.563***
	(0.0672)	(0.0345)	(0.0232)
Post × Within 5km	0.00720		
	(0.0703)		
Post × Within 10km		0.0270	
		(0.0452)	
Post × Within 20km			0.0330
			(0.0416)
Observations	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,352,418
R-squared	0.537	0.537	0.537

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013. In Panel (a), $Any\ PFAS$ and $Any\ PFNA$ are equal to one for water systems with any level of detected PFAS and PFNA in 2006-2009 testing, respectively. $Elevated\ PFAS$ is equal to one for water systems with the sum total of any PFAS category over 50 ng/L. In Panel (b), $Near\ PFAS\ Producer$ equals one if the water system is within 2km of any industrial site that manufactures or imports PFAS. $Near\ Fed\ Site$ equals one if the water system is within 2km of any federal site with known or suspected PFAS. $Near\ Any\ Site$ equals one if the water system is near either type of site. In Panel (c), $Within\ 5km$, $Within\ 10km$, and $Within\ 20km$ equal one if the water system is within 5km, 10km, or 20km of the chemical plant near Paulsboro, respectively. All columns include county-by-year-by-month fixed effects, CWS fixed effects, and controls. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table 4: ACS: Changes in Demographics

	All NJ		**Gloucester**		**Matched Top 20**		**Paulsboro**	
	Before 2013 (1)	After 2013 (2)	Before 2013 (3)	After 2013 (4)	Before 2013 (5)	After 2013 (6)	Before 2013 (7)	After 2013 (8)
Population	4,378	4,279	4,586	4,425	4,135	4,088	6,114	5,989
White, non-Hispanic	58.99	54.43	82.47	78.91	52.66	46.12	55.45	55.46
Black, non-Hispanic	14.62	13.87	8.96	9.22	27.55	29.14	33.97	29.09
Hispanic	17.15	20.32	4.48	6.55	13.54	17.3	5.82	8.98
Low Income	24.00	23.82	18.71	17.93	35.7	35.53	41.78	37.45
Below Poverty Line	10.39	10.65	7.77	7.81	15.59	16.21	23.37	14.81
Children under 18	23.18	21.65	23.47	21.66	26.39	23.28	30.19	16.45
Households								
Vacant Homes	9.21	9.16	5.41	6.78	9.74	13.51	10.82	17.83
Renter-Occupied Homes	35.15	37.12	18.57	19.86	39.18	42.99	40.19	27.96

Note: Table reports summary statistics by Census Tract from ACS 5 year estimates. After 2013 consists of ACS 5 year estimates starting with 2018 to exclude 5 year estimates that include both before and after 2013. Notably, Paulsboro predominately consists of one Census Tract depicted in panel (c) of Figure A4. All NJ consists of all non-Paulsboro census tracts in NJ, Gloucester consists of all non-Paulsboro census tracts in Gloucester County, Matched Top 20 consists of 20 nearest neighbor matches of other census tracts to Paulsboro, NJ.

Table 5: HMDA: Characteristics of Mortgage Applications

	All NJ		Gloucester		Matched Top 20		Paulsboro	
	Before 2013 (1)	After 2013 (2)	Before 2013 (3)	After 2013 (4)	Before 2013 (5)	After 2013 (6)	Before 2013 (7)	After 2013 (8)
White, non-Hispanic	57.39	55.13	81.36	79.72	54.02	52.00	71.83	59.81
Black, non-Hispanic	10.19	10.14	5.10	6.55	21.34	22.55	14.92	15.05
Hispanic	13.41	15.80	3.15	4.18	11.74	13.96	5.85	13.70
Loan Amount	270,494	285,678	193,208	191,201	153,414	149,368	117,025	104,882
Applicant Income	112,880	118,987	84,814	90,046	63,801	68,523	52,480	55,204
Percent Income over 70k	63.54	66.41	51.15	56.54	30.56	36.13	14.03	17.37

Note: Table reports summary statistics of mortgage applicants from Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) data. All NJ consists of all non-Paulsboro census tracts in NJ, Gloucester consists of all non-Paulsboro census tracts in Gloucester County, Matched Top 20 consists of 20 nearest neighbor matches of other census tracts to Paulsboro, NJ.

Online Appendix

Appendix A: Additional Figures and Tables

Table A1: Timeline of Information Discovery

2006	An EPA program encourages all major manufacturers to stop making PFAS, citing health effects and other risks (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023a). NJDEP tested 24 NJ CWSs for PFOA (Post et al., 2009).
2007	NJDEP issued a preliminary drinking water guidance level for PFOA of 40 ng/L (New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 2021).
2009	EPA established provisional health advisories (HAs) for PFOA at 400 ng/L and PFOS at 200 ng/L (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2009). NJDEP tested 29 NJ CWSs for ten different PFAS, including PFNA (Post et al., 2013).
2013	National testing for six PFAS begins under USEPA's third Unregulated Contaminants Monitoring Rule and continues through 2015 (United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2023b).
July 16-18, 2013	A local nonprofit organization obtained 2009 NJDEP testing data via an OPRA request and released the results to the public, which showed a Paulsboro drinking water well reported PFNA of 96 ng/L in 2009 (Carluccio, 2013a).
Aug 5, 2013	A press release was issued about PFNA in the Paulsboro drinking water system (see Appendix B).
Sep 2013	New samples reported PFNA of 150 ng/L in the water that was delivered to residents in Paulsboro (Carluccio, 2013b).
Nov 2013	The NJDEP study, Post et al. (2013) based on the 2009 testing was published (Post et al., 2013).
Jan 15, 2014	The Mayor of Paulsboro sent a letter to residents (see Appendix B).
Jan 17, 2014	NJDEP issued a public Health Advisory regarding PFNA contamination in the Paulsboro water system (Comegno, 2014). Solvay began providing free bottled water to residents (Comegno, 2014).
April 7, 2014	The Paulsboro well that was contaminated with PFNA was shut down (Laday, 2014).
Oct 3, 2014	NJDEP lifted its Health Advisory in Paulsboro (See Appendix B).
Nov 1, 2014	Free bottled water distribution in Paulsboro is ended (Laday, 2014).

Note: This table depicts a timeline of events relevant to the discovery of PFNA contamination in Paulsboro.

Figure A1: Level of PFNA and Total PFAS Detected



Note: Figure shows levels of PFAS detection from the 2009 NJDEP testing. The level of PFNA detected on the y-axis and the sum total of all types of PFAS detected on the x-axis for any systems with positive detection. Full CWS names of the named systems in the Figure above (from highest to lowest Total PFAS) include Atlantic City MUA, Paulsboro Water Department, Brick Township MUA, Southeast Morris County MUA, Ridgewood Water, and Camden City Department of Public Works. The two systems with PFAS detections above 50 ng/L that are not named in the Figure and not included in Figure 1b changed their name during our sample: Suez Water New Jersey - Birch Hill (formerly West Milford MUA - Birch Hill) and NJ American Water Co. - Raritan (formerly NJ American Elizabethtown-Netherwood Wellfield). While Southeast Morris County MUA also was found to have high PFNA in the 2009 NJDEP study, "PFNA was not detected in a followup sample" while a follow up study at Paulsboro detected even higher levels of PFNA (Post et al., 2013).

Figure A2: Transactions in Treatment and Control Groups



(a) Transactions by Year-Month, Relative to 2005



(b) Number of Transactions by Year-Month

Note: Sample includes residential sales in community water service areas in New Jersey. Non-Paulsboro includes sales for all of NJ, excluding Paulsboro. Top 20 matches include sales in the top 20 census tracts matched to Paulsboro based on nearest neighbor matches using 2013 5-year ACS estimates of proportion Black, proportion Hispanic, proportion low income, proportion of the population under 18, proportion renter-occupied homes and median housing value. Transactions for each group are normalized to one in 2005 in panel (a). Panel (b) shows the total number of transactions for each group in each year-month.

Table A2: Nearest Neighbor Matched Sample

Tract Name	Black	Hispanic	Low Income	Under 18	Median Value	Renter-Occupied
Census Tract 5004, Gloucester County	35.86%	6.81%	47.32%	33.09%	$136,700	38.37%
Census Tract 309, Warren County	13.61%	15.25%	56.93%	30.84%	$136,900	60.89%
Census Tract 204, Salem County	23.65%	19.17%	43.38%	24.70%	$178,600	48.95%
Census Tract 5010.01, Gloucester County	25.93%	15.49%	35.22%	25.20%	$163,700	22.87%
Census Tract 219, Salem County	35.97%	2.81%	63.13%	24.83%	$127,500	55.79%
Census Tract 6092.04, Camden County	64.27%	11.60%	41.53%	28.20%	$137,200	29.46%
Census Tract 303, Cumberland County	25.52%	15.41%	52.73%	23.67%	$118,200	54.39%
Census Tract 8113.01, Monmouth County	8.06%	11.66%	28.75%	25.43%	$235,100	20.38%
Census Tract 218.04, Cape May County	4.47%	8.10%	33.70%	24.10%	$198,100	26.41%
Census Tract 5016.04, Gloucester County	7.49%	4.13%	19.21%	29.40%	$220,700	25.51%
Census Tract 27.01, Mercer County	21.44%	18.92%	22.31%	23.22%	$198,200	33.29%
Census Tract 8017, Monmouth County	7.53%	16.59%	41.00%	23.32%	$210,900	58.10%
Census Tract 5017.04, Gloucester County	12.50%	1.83%	25.26%	24.75%	$193,200	16.61%
Census Tract 6018, Camden County	55.78%	31.59%	72.07%	36.11%	$70,400	52.56%
Census Tract 12, Middlesex County	15.40%	17.64%	27.21%	27.83%	$342,100	64.28%
Census Tract 355, Union County	19.06%	25.41%	31.54%	23.25%	$284,100	49.19%
Census Tract 7028.09, Burlington County	69.18%	10.50%	35.92%	23.14%	$142,300	31.01%
Census Tract 6116, Camden County	15.43%	14.37%	30.91%	22.52%	$221,400	61.66%
Census Tract 6082.09, Camden County	20.26%	6.26%	19.16%	24.19%	$269,600	52.74%
Census Tract 6030.02, Camden County	27.58%	37.06%	36.44%	23.28%	$149,000	23.36%
Census Tract 6014, Camden County	78.72%	17.39%	62.19%	30.44%	$87,800	33.62%
Census Tract 69, Middlesex County	12.29%	34.25%	43.47%	24.73%	$261,900	49.18%
Census Tract 48, Hudson County	19.58%	16.52%	27.19%	21.74%	$272,000	50.64%
Census Tract 7028.07, Burlington County	59.18%	14.41%	25.06%	21.96%	$158,500	33.82%
Census Tract 7045, Burlington County	12.52%	8.23%	27.99%	21.41%	$247,000	29.18%
Census Tract 94, Middlesex County	9.01%	12.78%	24.96%	23.00%	$249,300	38.54%
Census Tract 5011.01, Gloucester County	19.66%	12.58%	31.56%	18.90%	$167,100	40.08%
Census Tract 532, Somerset County	46.57%	20.86%	21.53%	22.61%	$291,000	34.82%
Census Tract 6089.01, Camden County	2.03%	5.86%	25.63%	25.47%	$207,200	20.83%
Census Tract 30.01, Middlesex County	7.87%	20.66%	23.31%	27.77%	$309,700	22.04%
Census Tract 403, Cumberland County	16.36%	41.70%	31.14%	26.58%	$167,300	36.31%

Nearest neighbor matches are listed based on 2013 5-year ACS estimates of proportion Black, proportion Hispanic, proportion low income, proportion of the population under 18, proportion renter-occupied homes and median housing value.

Figure A3: Nearest Neighbor Matched Sample



Note: Figure depicts nearest neighbor matched sample (n=30). Paulsboro (Census Tract 5004) is highlighted in red.

Figure A4: CWS Service Area and Census Tract Boundaries



(a) New Jersey CWSs



(b) Gloucester County CWSs

(c) Gloucester County Census Tracts

Note: Figure depicts CWS service area boundaries for the full state of New Jersey in panel (a) and just Gloucester County in panel (b). Panel (c) depicts Census Tract boundaries in Gloucester County. The boundary for the Paulsboro CWS is darkened in both figures (a) and (b). The boundary for the Census Tract that comprises most of the Paulsboro CWS is darkened in panel (c). Notably, the Paulsboro CWS overlaps 99.5% of the census tract. There are no other CWSs that serve the tract, and no other tracts that are served by the Paulsboro CWS. This is not typical, as other CWSs in NJ serve portions of multiple census tracts.

Table A3: Robustness to Level of Clustering

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post × Paulsboro	-0.561***	-0.561***	-0.561***	-0.561***	-0.561***
	(0.0567)	(0.0890)	(0.0213)	(0.0231)	(0.00123)
Observations	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,352,418
R-squared	0.537	0.537	0.537	0.537	0.537
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Cluster	Property	Blk group	Zip code	PWS	County

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 and $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. All columns include county-by-year-by-month and CWS fixed effects, as well as controls for acres and square footage. Standard errors are clustered at the property, block group, zip code, CWS, and county level in columns (1)-(5), respectively. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A4: Effect on Home Sales in Paulsboro - Alternative Fixed Effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post × Paulsboro	-0.584***	-0.597***	-0.596***	-0.597***	-0.642***
	(0.0187)	(0.0188)	(0.0194)	(0.0194)	(0.0236)
Observations	1,466,813	1,352,435	1,352,434	1,352,394	834,861
R-squared	0.424	0.526	0.586	0.633	0.794
County FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Controls		yes	yes	yes	
Zip FE			yes		
Blk group FE				yes	
Property FE					yes

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The unit of observation is at the property-year-month level. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013. All columns include county and year-by-month fixed effects. Columns (1)-(4) include CWS fixed effects, column (2) adds controls for acres and square footage, column (3) adds zip code fixed effects, while column (4) adds block group fixed effects. Column (5) includes property level fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A5: Changes in Home Characteristics

	Acres (1)	Sqft (2)	Stories (3)	Year Built (4)
Panel A. NJ Counterfactual				
Post × Paulsboro	-0.0255***	50.63***	0.00569	1.240**
	(0.00444)	(19.38)	(0.00956)	(0.602)
Observations	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,087,352	1,329,059
R-squared	0.250	0.166	0.185	0.324
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Panel B. Matched Top 20 Counterfactual				
Post × Paulsboro	-0.0139*	27.39	0.00557	0.00311
	(0.00689)	(21.71)	(0.0183)	(1.240)
Observations	18,730	18,730	14,008	18,728
R-squared	0.110	0.287	0.269	0.477
County FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The unit of observation is at the property-year-month level. The outcomes are acres, square footage, number of stores, and the year built. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013. Panel (a) uses all sales in NJ and includes county-by-year-by-month fixed effects, and CWS fixed effects. Panel (b) uses the top 20 matched census tracts as the counterfactual and includes county, year-by-month, and CWS fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure A5: Robustness to Alternative Specifications and Data



Note: Figure plots results from estimation of equation 3 and the outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. The omitted reference year is 2013. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. The baseline specification is depicted with red circles. Estimates depicted with a gree diamond and blue square additionally control for block group and zip code fixed effects, respectively. Estimates depicted with a purple triangle include only year and CWS fixed effects, dropping county-by-year-by-month fixed effects from the baseline specification. Estimates depicted with an orange X include year-by-month, county, and CWS fixed effects. Estimates depicted with a navy blue + estimate the baseline specification using Gloucester county tax assessor data.

Table A6: Tax Assessor Data: Effect on Log(House Prices) - Paulsboro

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Post × Paulsboro	-0.574***	-0.569***	-0.571***	-0.541***	-0.217***
	(0.0306)	(0.0339)	(0.0341)	(0.0319)	(0.0609)
Observations	12,872	12,872	12,871	12,864	4,219
R-squared	0.230	0.492	0.497	0.529	0.774
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Controls		yes	yes	yes	
Zip FE			yes		
Blk group FE				yes	
Property FE					yes

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using Gloucester county tax assessor data from 2011-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 and $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. Columns (1)-(4) include county-by-year-by-month and CWS fixed effects, column (2) adds controls for total assessment and square footage, column (3) adds zip code fixed effects, while column (4) adds block group fixed effects. Column (5) includes county-by-year-by-month and property level fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A7: Effects on Other Systems - Alternative Fixed Effects

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A. Other Systems with Detected PFAS			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.639***	-0.550***	-0.596***
	(0.0330)	(0.0765)	(0.0369)
Post × Any PFAS	0.0564		
	(0.0374)		
Post × Any PFNA		-0.0498	
		(0.0785)	
Post × Elevated PFAS			-0.00121
			(0.0409)
Panel B. Other Systems Near PFAS Facilities			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.609***	-0.602***	-0.633***
	(0.0433)	(0.0129)	(0.0231)
Post × Near Any Site	0.0197		
	(0.0437)		
Post × Near Fed Site		-0.0492	
		(0.127)	
Post × Near PFAS Producer			0.0490
			(0.0305)
Panel C. Spatial Spillovers			
Post × Paulsboro	-0.572***	-0.543***	-0.538***
	(0.0691)	(0.0448)	(0.0335)
Post × Within 5km	-0.0249		
	(0.0714)		
Post × Within 10km		-0.0587	
		(0.0485)	
Post × Within 20km			-0.0668*
			(0.0387)
Observations	1,352,435	1,352,435	1,352,435
R-squared	0.526	0.526	0.526

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013. In Panel (a), $Any\ PFAS$ and $Any\ PFNA$ are equal to one for water systems with any level of detected PFAS and PFNA in 2006-2009 testing, respectively. $Elevated\ PFAS$ is equal to one for water systems with the sum total of any PFAS category over 50 ng/L. In Panel (b), $Near\ PFAS\ Producer$ equals one if the water system is within 2km of any industrial site that manufactures or imports PFAS. $Near\ Fed\ Site$ equals one if the water system is within 2km of any federal site with known or suspected PFAS. $Near\ Any\ Site$ equals one if the water system is near either type of site. In Panel (c), $Within\ 5km$, $Within\ 10km$, and $Within\ 20km$ equal one if the water system is within 5km, 10km, or 20km of the chemical plant near Paulsboro, respectively. All columns include county fixed effects, year-by-month fixed effects, CWS fixed effects, and controls. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure A6: Robustness to Violations in Parallel Trends



(a) Relative Magnitude - Effect in 2014 (b) Relative Magnitude - Average (2014-18)



(c) Smoothness Restriction - Effect in 2014 (d) Smoothness Restriction - Average (2014-18)

Note: Figure plots results from the Rambachan and Roth (2023) approach to test the sensitivity of DiD results to violations in parallel trends. The sample includes ZTRAX data from 2007 to 2018, with 2013 denoted as the treatment year. Panel (a) focuses on the first post period, 2014, while Panel (b) uses the average of the post period (2014-2018). In Panels (a) and (b), we bound the maximum post-treatment violation of parallel trends in consecutive periods by $\bar{M}$ times the maximum pre-treatment violation of parallel trends. The blue band ("Original") is the 95% confidence interval of the standard DiD treatment effect estimate. The red bands ("Adjusted CI") report the robust confidence intervals as we vary $\bar{M}$. The breakdown value for $\bar{M}$ is about 1.25, which means the results are robust to violations of parallel trends in the post period up to 1.25 times as large as the maximum violation in the pre-treatment period. Panels (c) and (d) depict sensitivity of results to non-linearity for the effect in 2014 in Panel (c) and the average post-period effect in Panel (d). We impose that the change in the slope of the trend is no more than M between consecutive periods, where M = 0 restricts violations of parallel trends to be linear. The breakdown value for M is about 0.18 in Panel (c) and 0.08 in Panel (d). This shows the result is statistically significant for non-linearity associated with a fairly large change in the slope of the differential trend.

Table A8: Effect on Log(House Prices) - Robustness

	(1) Baseline	(2) Any Price	(3) Price $< 1m$	(4) Price $> 1k$	(5) Include non-residential	(6) Include non-PWS	(7) Exclude any PFAS
Panel A. ZTRAX (full sample)							
Post × Paulsboro	-0.561***	-0.593***	-0.580***	-0.574***	-0.504***	-0.580***	-0.561***
	(0.0231)	(0.0240)	(0.0240)	(0.0231)	(0.0240)	(0.0731)	(0.0231)
Observations	1,352,418	1,397,293	1,359,148	1,390,563	1,376,620	1,500,989	998,738
R-squared	0.537	0.501	0.467	0.568	0.486	0.623	0.532
Panel B. ZTRAX (2011-2018, Gloucester county only)							
Post × Paulsboro	-0.581***	-0.620***	-0.609***	-0.593***	-0.540***	-0.532***	-0.581***
	(0.0287)	(0.0300)	(0.0301)	(0.0287)	(0.0283)	(0.102)	(0.0287)
Observations	15,283	15,382	15,313	15,352	18,507	17,797	15,283
R-squared	0.336	0.299	0.311	0.321	0.352	0.368	0.336
Panel C. Tax Assessor (2011-2018, Gloucester county only)							
Post × Paulsboro	-0.594***	-1.071***	-1.071***	-0.593***	-0.563***	-0.561***	-0.594***
	(0.0275)	(0.0825)	(0.0820)	(0.0276)	(0.0294)	(0.0416)	(0.0275)
Observations	12,872	14,839	14,834	12,877	14,452	16,484	12,872
R-squared	0.430	0.109	0.109	0.424	0.297	0.457	0.430
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Block grp FE						yes	

Note: Table reports regression results from estimating equation 1. Panel (a) uses ZTRAX data from 2000-2018 from all of NJ, Panel (b) uses ZTRAX data from 2011-2018 from Gloucester county only, and Panel (c) uses Gloucester county tax assessor data from 2011-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 and $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. Column (1) replicates the baseline specification with county-year-month, CWS fixed effects, and controls. Results are replicated for each data sample in Panels (a)-(c). Column (2) includes price outliers (above \$1 million and below \$1,000), column (3) restricts only to prices below \$1 million, and column (4) restricts only to prices above \$1,000. Column (5) includes non-residential properties. Column (6) includes properties outside CWS boundaries and includes block group fixed effects rather than CWS fixed effects. Column (7) excludes any properties served by a CWS with any detected level of PFAS. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Figure A7: Randomization Inference: Effect on Log(House Prices)



Note: Figure plots the distribution of placebo point estimates from randomizing treatment across CWSs throughout the state. The vertical line denotes the main point estimate from the treatment effect estimated for Paulsboro. The "randomized inference p-value" is 0.027.

Table A9: Robustness to Alternate Definitions of the Post-Treatment Period

	Sep (1)	Aug (2)	Jul (3)
Post × Paulsboro	-0.561***	-0.561***	-0.561***
	(0.0231)	(0.0231)	(0.0224)
Observations	1,352,418	1,352,418	1,352,418
R-squared	0.537	0.537	0.537
Controls	yes	yes	yes
County-year-month FE	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes

Note: Table reports regression results estimating equation 1 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. All specifications include county-year-month, CWS fixed effects, and controls. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. Column (1) replicates the baseline specification where $Post$ equals one if the home is sold in Sept 2013 or later. Columns (2) and (3) define $Post$ as equal to one if the home is sold in Aug or July or later, respectively. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$

Table A10: Robustness to Alternate Matched Counterfactuals

	(1) Top 30	(2) Top 20	(3) Top 10
Post × Paulsboro	-0.403***	-0.369***	-0.387***
	(0.0371)	(0.0527)	(0.0751)
Observations	26,034	18,730	11,065
R-squared	0.546	0.548	0.503
County FE	yes	yes	yes
Year-month FE	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes
Controls	yes	yes	yes

The sample includes ZTRAX data from 2000-2018 from Paulsboro and the top 30, top 20 and top 10 matched counterfactual census tracts in columns 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Nearest neighbor matches are based on 2013 5-year ACS estimates of proportion Black, proportion Hispanic, proportion low income, proportion of the population under 18, proportion renter-occupied homes and median housing value. All columns include county fixed effects, year-by-month fixed effects, CWS fixed effects, and controls for acres and square footage. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Figure A8: Effect on Log(House Prices) in Paulsboro: Matched Counterfactuals



(a) CWS fixed effects

(b) Property fixed effects

Note: Figure plots results from estimation of equation 3 using ZTRAX data from 2000-2018. The outcome is the log of sales price. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS in Paulsboro or any of the top 20 matched census tracts. The omitted reference year is 2013. All panels include year-by-month and county fixed effects and controls for acres and square footage. Panels (a) and (b) show results including CWS and property fixed effects, respectively. Vertical lines denote 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level in Panel (a) and at the property level in Panel (b).

Table A11: Effects on Home Sales in Paulsboro: Matched Counterfactual

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
			Panel A. Log(House Price)		
Post × Paulsboro	-0.363***	-0.369***	-0.367***	-0.363***	-0.387***
	(0.0533)	(0.0527)	(0.0528)	(0.0513)	(0.0642)
Observations	19,363	18,730	18,730	18,730	12,173
R-squared	0.502	0.548	0.554	0.582	0.766
County FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
			Panel B. Pr(Any Sale)		
Post × Paulsboro	-0.00520	-0.00376	-0.00376	-0.00375	-0.00539
	(0.00364)	(0.00345)	(0.00345)	(0.00345)	(0.00363)
Observations	230,887	222,432	222,432	222,432	230,887
R-squared	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.015	0.037
County FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Controls		yes	yes	yes	
Zip FE			yes		
Blk group FE				yes	
Property FE					yes

Note: The sample includes ZTRAX data from 2000-2018 from Paulsboro and the top 20 matched counterfactual census tracts. The unit of observation is at the property-year-month level in Panel (a) and the property-year level in Panel (b). The outcome in Panel (a) is the log of sales price and the outcome in Panel (b) is equal to one if a property sold. The sample includes residential homes served by a CWS. $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 in Panel (a) and after 2013 in Panel (b). All columns include county and year-by-month fixed effects in Panel (a) and county and year fixed effects in Panel (b). Columns (1)-(4) include CWS fixed effects, column (2) adds controls for acres and square footage, column (3) adds zip code fixed effects, while column (4) adds block group fixed effects. Column (5) includes property level fixed effects. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table A12: Robustness: Matched Counterfactual

	(1) Baseline	(2) Any Price	(3) Price $< 1m$	(4) Price $> 1k$	(5) Include non-residential	(6) Include non-PWS	(7) Exclude any PFAS
Post × Paulsboro	-0.369***	-0.259**	-0.251**	-0.376***	-0.342***	-0.389***	-0.360***
	(0.0527)	(0.101)	(0.0990)	(0.0543)	(0.0531)	(0.0770)	(0.0580)
Observations	18,730	18,948	18,928	18,750	19,118	20,268	16,540
R-squared	0.548	0.450	0.455	0.541	0.546	0.568	0.454
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year-month FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
County FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CWS FE	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		yes
Block grp FE						yes	

Note: Table reports regression results from estimating equation 1. The sample includes ZTRAX data from 2000-2018 from Paulsboro and the top 20 matched counterfactual census tracts. The outcome is the log of sales price. $Post$ equals one if the home is sold after August 2013 and $Paulsboro$ equals one if the property is located within the Paulsboro CWS service area. Standard errors are clustered at the CWS level. Column (1) replicates the baseline specification with county fixed effects, Year-month fixed effects, CWS fixed effects, and controls. Column (2) includes price outliers (above \$1 million and below \$1,000), column (3) restricts only to prices below \$1 million, and column (4) restricts only to prices above \$1,000. Column (5) includes non-residential properties. Column (6) includes properties outside CWS boundaries and includes block group fixed effects rather than CWS fixed effects. Column (7) excludes any properties served by a CWS with any detected level of PFAS. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Appendix B: Public Notices

DELAWARE
RIVERKEEPER
NETWORK™

For Immediate Release
August 5, 2013

Contact: Tracy Carluccio, Deputy Director,
(o) 215-369-1188 x 104 (c) 215-692-2329

Delaware Riverkeeper Network Petitions Federal Agency to Address Contaminated Drinking Water in New Jersey

NJDEP takes no action on perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs) despite known toxic health effects

Bristol, PA - Delaware Riverkeeper Network (DRN) filed a Petition with the U.S. Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) on August 2nd, requesting the Agency to conduct a public health assessment of perfluorononanoate acid (PFNA) and other perfluorinated chemicals in the water supply for communities located near the Solvay Solexis Inc. facility in Thorofare/West Deptford and near Paulsboro, NJ. The ATSDR is a federal public health agency, part of the Public Health Service in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services that works to prevent exposure and adverse human health effects from pollution releases in the environment. http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/com/pha.html

DRN focused the Petition on Paulsboro because the raw groundwater that feeds the water supply for Paulsboro was found to contain extremely high levels of PFNA, a dangerous chemical that has toxic health effects in humans and is bioaccumulative. PFNA is in the family of perfluorinated chemicals (PFCs) that is being investigated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and is recognized as a contaminant of concern that is so dangerous it is subject to programs to phase out, control, and monitor its use.

EPA set a Provisional Health Advisory for short-term drinking water exposure to perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS), two of the most widely distributed PFCs, and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) issued an Occurrence Study for PFOA in New Jersey public drinking water in 2007 and established a PFOA drinking water guidance level of 0.04 ppb based on lifetime health effects. In 2009, NJDEP conducted a second occurrence study on PFCs, including PFNA, but the report has not been released yet.

“Delaware Riverkeeper Network is sounding an alarm bell by filing this Petition with ATSDR. We received files under an open records request that shows that many of New Jersey’s water supplies are contaminated with perfluorinated chemicals. The highest level found in raw groundwater tested by NJDEP in 2009 was 96 ng/L in Paulsboro -- an extraordinarily high level. The highest level in surface water was in Brick Township. We submitted a letter to NJDEP on July 25 calling for immediate action on getting these chemicals out of New Jersey’s water but have had no response. Due to the urgency of this drinking water issue, we have now filed with this federal agency to try to get some action on these toxic chemicals in these communities’ groundwater,” said **Tracy Carluccio, Deputy Director, Delaware Riverkeeper Network**.

In addition to NJDEP’s sampling that revealed PFCs in raw water supplies, data collected by the Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC) and published in a report in July 2012 revealed very high levels of PFNA in surface water in samples between 2007-2009 in the Delaware River: http://www.state.nj.us/drbc/library/documents/contaminants-of-emerging-concernJuly2012.pdf.

Available information strongly suggests that the source of the PFNA in the Delaware River beginning at River Mile 88/90 was the Solvay Solexis plastics plant in West Deptford/Thorofare, NJ, on the Delaware River near River Mile 90. Fluorocarbons and fluoroelstomers are manufactured there using PFNA in their patented product. At this location, near River Mile 90, Solvay Solexis is reported to have the second highest production capacity for PVDF (2002) in the world and is known to have emitted huge quantities of PFNA. http://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es0512475 According to a Solvay Solexis report to EPA, a large percentage of PFNA used in manufacturing at the facility is exhausted to the air or released as wastewater. http://www.epa.gov/opptintr/pfoa/pubs/!Solvay%20Solexis%20report.pdf

Extensive independent studies have concluded that there is a probable link between exposure to PFOA and testicular cancer, kidney cancer, and four other diseases, based on studies in these communities and other information. (http://www.c8sciencepanel.org/pdfs/Probable_Link_C8_Cancer_16April2012_v2.pdf) The Panel has also found many other health impacts in human populations exposed to PFOA in drinking water (http://www.c8sciencepanel.org/index.html). PFNA studies report similar health effects but at lower doses.

“We are making what we have learned public, hoping public concern will make NJDEP do something about PFCs in the State. It’s scandalous that the current Administration has shut down the Drinking Water Quality Institute, the agency that was working on developing safe drinking water standards for PFOA and investigating other PFCs. This has really hidden this drinking water pollution issue from the public, prolonging exposure and risk, and that is wrong and simply can’t be tolerated,” said Carluccio.

A copy of DRN’s letter to NJDEP is at: http://bit.ly/njdepltr

A copy of DRN's investigative Memo regarding PFNA and other PFCs is at: http://bit.ly/pfnamemo.

To view the ATSDR Petition go to: http://www.delawareriverkeeper.org/resources/Letters/ATSDR%20Petition%20Final%208.2.13.pdf

To view the full file of documents DRN received under New Jersey's Open Public Records Act: http://www.delawareriverkeeper.org/resources/Reports/Perfluoronated_Chemicals_in_NJ_Drinking_Water.pdf

###

.

BOROUGH of PAULSBORO
1211 Delaware Street · Paulsboro, NJ 08066
Phone: (856) 423-1500 · Fax: (856) 423-9117
www.paulsboronj.org

January 15, 2014

Dear residents:

I am writing you to address a very serious issue concerning the quality of Paulsboro's drinking water.

Groundwater testing has confirmed that the Solvay Solexis facility in neighboring West Deptford has contaminated our public water supply system with perfluorochemical compounds (PFCs), measured, in the case of the PFC perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA), in excess of 100 parts per trillion. These PFCs have entered the Borough of Paulsboro's groundwater, have migrated to the Borough's public drinking water supply wells, and permeate Mantua Creek and the Delaware River in and adjoining Paulsboro. The testing results are posted on the Borough's web site.

Our drinking water still meets all current federal and state safety standards for maximum contaminant levels. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is reviewing each round of sampling results and has not declared the water unsafe to drink or use.

But the Borough believes the presence of these PFCs in the water supply is unacceptable. In response, Mayor Hamilton and the Borough Council are following a three-prong strategy to address this urgent problem.

> **1. Community Right-to-Know:** Test results, fact sheets, and other relevant information about this issue will be posted on the Borough's web site, made available at Borough Hall, or otherwise provided to the community. These will be updated as we get additional information.
>
> **2. Short-term actions:** Mayor Hamilton has asked Governor Christie to take the following immediate actions: a) direct DEP and the Department of Health (DOH) to have a public meeting to inform residents about the problem and any potential health impacts; b) have DEP order Solvay to provide and fund alternate drinking water sources; and c) direct DOH to conduct health studies to determine if PFCs are showing up in the blood of residents.
>
> **3. Long-term solution:** In December, the Borough's special environmental counsel served notice on Solvay under federal law that it must pay for the costs of treating the Borough's drinking water to remove PFCs, and to clean

up other PFC contamination in ours soils and rivers, or the Borough will seek a court order forcing them to do so.

Additional information is posted on the Borough's web site and on the enclosed responses to frequently asked questions.

Every Paulsboro resident has a right to clean, safe drinking water, and the Council and I are fighting to protect that right.

Very truly yours,

W. Jeffery Hamilton, Mayor
Borough of Paulsboro

Cc: Borough Council

State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
MAIL CODE 401-04Q
DIVISION OF WATER SUPPLY AND GEOSCIENCE
401 EAST STATE STREET
P.O. BOX 420
Trenton, NJ 08625-0420
TEL: # (609) 292-7219
FAX # (609) 633-1495
www.nj.gov/dep/watersupply

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

BOB MARTIN
Commissioner

October 3, 2014

Leeann Ruggeri
Paulsboro Water Department
1211 Delaware Street North
Paulsboro, NJ 08066

Dear Ms. Ruggeri:

This letter is being written to update the drinking water advice provided to Paulsboro by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (Department) on January 17, 2014. As you may recall, due to perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA) levels of up to 150 parts per trillion in Paulsboro's primary source of drinking water (Well 7) and to ensure an abundance of caution the Department advised that children and infants under one year of age should be drinking bottled water instead of the tap water.

At the time the advice was provided, Paulsboro Well 8 had gross alpha and combined radium 226 and 228 that exceeded the drinking water standard. Although Well 8 had PFNA levels that were below the Department's proposed guidance level of 20 parts per trillion, the elevated radiological levels precluded its use as a primary source of drinking water. Subsequently, installation of radium treatment on Well 8 was completed April 7, 2014. Paulsboro Water Department began using Well 8 as its primary drinking water source again, and Well 7 was turned off.

The Department has reviewed the radium and PFNA monitoring data from Well 8 collected since April 2014. The data show that the radium removal treatment is currently working and the drinking water is consistently below the drinking water standards (maximum contaminant levels or "MCLs") for both gross alpha particle radioactivity and combined radium 226 and 228. In addition, the PFNA concentrations from Well 8 continue to be consistently below the Department's proposed guidance level for PFNA of 20 parts per trillion at Well 8. Paulsboro Water Department also uses Well 9 occasionally to supplement the drinking water provided by Well 8. The PFNA concentrations from Well 9 are also consistently below the Department's proposed guidance level for PFNA.

Therefore, the Department does not believe it is necessary to continue the restriction on the consumption of drinking water in Paulsboro that is currently in place as Well 7 is no longer in use.

However, to provide further assurances that the concentrations of PFNA in the drinking water are consistently below the Department's PFNA guidance level in Wells 8 and 9 (untreated water) and in the water leaving the Paulsboro Water Department treatment plant (treated water), the Department recommends monthly sampling of these sources for PFNA and other perfluorinated compounds for a period of six months. At the end of six months, the future sampling frequency for perfluorinated compounds should be reevaluated by the Paulsboro Water Department.

Should you have any additional questions or concerns, feel free to contact me at fred.sickels@dep.nj.gov or 609-292-7219.

Sincerely,

Fred Sickels, Director
Division of Water Supply & Geoscience

c: Honorable W. Jeffery Hamilton, Mayor