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- Saiz elasticities often used to generate exogenous variation in housing prices
- No discussion of regulations in Lutz-Sand (LS) paper, only land unavailability.
- Some differences between LS measure of land unavailability and that of Saiz...
- ... but many similarities, too.
- Remark: Paper could do a better job of spelling out similarities and differences, both for point estimates and standard errors of second-stage regressions.
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- I am going to focus primarily on the “circles vs. polygons” aspect of the paper.
- There are good reasons why Saiz uses 50km radii.
- Authors could think harder about model in Saiz (2010). Could this model be
  - ...improved theoretically?
  - ...better implemented empirically?
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- Saiz adapts the “urban model” to encompass land unavailability:
  - Cities are circles with endogenously determined radii
  - Cities have different *amenities* and *productivities*
  - Houses are the same size across and within cities
  - Population/city area/city radii are all endogenous w.r.t amenities and productivities
  - Amenities/productivity $\rightarrow$ Pop. $\rightarrow$ No. of houses $\rightarrow$ city area
  - Spatial equilibrium exists both *within* and *across* cities
  - Jobs are all located in each city’s central business district (CBD)
  - Per-mile (linear) commuting costs are the same across cities
  - Rents at the edges of all cities are pinned down by construction costs (zero cost of marginal land)
  - Higher rents at the CBD equalize utility there with utility at edge of city
Saiz Picture

San Francisco
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High Productivity

Wichita
Lower Amenities
Lower Productivity

Demand Shock
Smaller effect on radius
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- $\Phi_k$: Radius of city $k$
- $\Lambda_k$: Fraction of developable land within city $k$’s radius
- $\gamma$: Size of each house in all cities
- $H_k$: Number of houses in city $k$

\[
\Lambda_k \cdot \pi \Phi_k^2 = \gamma H_k
\]

\[
\Phi_k^2 = \frac{\gamma H_k}{\Lambda_k \pi}
\]

\[
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  - High productivity/amenities in San Francisco make people want to live there ...
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- **Saiz Proposition 3:** Population in the existing distribution of cities should be independent of the degree of land availability
  - Two cities with low land availability: San Francisco (big) vs. Benton Harbor, MI (small)

- Holding $\Lambda_k$ constant, elasticities are lower in more populated areas
**Figure I**

Impact of Geography on Elasticities by Population
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1. Show that Saiz’s theoretical model can be improved using zip-code level data
   - Are commuting costs linear?
   - Are all jobs located in the CBD?

2. Show that the *empirical implementation* of the Saiz model can be improved with the use of zip code-level data.
   - Are cities really circular?
   - Saiz model has endogenous $\Phi_k$, but regressions use 50km radii that can overlap
   - How does endogenous population matter in the regressions? (Serially correlated growth?)