

**Discussion by Christopher R. Knittel (UC Davis and NBER) of “Urban Policy Effects on Carbon Mitigation,” by Matthew E. Kahn (UCLA and NBER)**

Reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions typically focus on increased use of lower GHG technologies that already exist, such as increases in insulation and shifts to higher mileage vehicles, and the advent new technologies, such as more efficient air conditioning units and vehicles. The chapter by Matthew Kahn adds to our understanding of a third mechanism for GHG reductions: shifts in where economic activity takes place. Understanding this mechanism can have large implications for how we regulated GHG emissions and the social costs associated with those regulations.

The main question that Kahn wants to answer is essentially the following: Suppose we moved everyone living in Houston to San Francisco, how would their carbon footprint change? Reductions are likely to come from this move for a number of reasons. First, California electricity is generated from cleaner sources. Second, San Francisco is more walking-friendly than Houston. And third, there is an income effect given the higher land prices.

Kahn uses a variety of data sources to answer this question. Using these data he documents that households living closer to the center of cities drive less, relying on public transit more, and consume less electricity than those households living in the suburbs. These effects are largest in the Northeast’s “monocentric” cities.

To analyze how household location affects miles driven, Professor Kahn uses the 2009 National Household Transportation Survey, which surveys a large number of households and reports household location and miles driven. Kahn then regresses miles driven on the distance the household is from the center of the city (in logs), the population density of the household’s Census tract (in logs), a dummy for whether the household is within rail transit, household size, the age of the head of household, and household income. The results suggest that the correlation between miles driven and distance from center of the city, population density, and distance from a rail transit system are large.

Kahn then uses Census-tract-level data to analyze how the share of public transit use correlates with distance from the center of a city and proximity to a rail transit station. In these empirical models, Kahn controls for the decade the data are taken from, the tract’s share of college graduates and the tract’s share of African Americans. In two specifications, he includes metropolitan area fixed effects, and in a third, he includes tract fixed effects. The results, again, are quite intuitive. He finds that the further the tract is from the city’s center, the lower is public transit usage, and those tracts with a rail station within one mile have higher public transit usage. This last correlation exists even when he uses “within tract” changes in the variable. That is, if we take the same tract in two different time periods, one where there is not a transit station, the other where there is, transit usage is higher, on average, in the period where there is a transit system.

Finally, Kahn looks at electricity and natural gas usage. Here Kahn regresses the log of electricity and natural gas usage on a dummy for whether the household is in the suburbs, the number of household members, the age of the head of household, dummies for eight regions, and the number of cooling degree days. Kahn finds that a suburban household is associated roughly 10 percent greater electricity usage and 4 percent higher natural gas usage. These effects quadruple in size in the country's northeast region!

To summarize, Kahn provides compelling evidence that living closer to the center of the city and public transit are correlated with lower energy use, both in terms of transportation and home energy use. This is an important set of results and, I hope, sparks further research in this area. The elephant in the room, entirely visible to Professor Kahn, is whether these results represent correlations or are they causal relationships. That is, for the latter, if we were to pick up the Knittel family, who lives in the suburbs, and move them to the center of Sacramento, would we observe the same changes in energy usage as represented by Kahn's statistical analysis?

The results in Kahn's paper can be viewed as upper-bounds on these effects, highlighting the importance of his analysis. Had the correlations not been as large, policy makers might have concluded that land use policies are unlikely to lead to large greenhouse gas reductions. The size of the estimated correlations leaves open the door for these policy instruments. Whether policy makers should go through the door requires more analysis. For one, it may be the case that those households living further from the city differ from city-dwellers for reasons other than simple geography. They may prefer larger vehicles, cooler in-home temperatures in the summer, larger homes, etc. All of these other factors are not controlled for in Kahn's analysis. Kahn understands this, but the data limitations are severe; it will take more time and more data to be able to control for these factors. Second, Kahn's analysis only speaks to the external-benefit side of land use policies. We still don't know how costly it is to the Knittels to "force" them from their lakefront home in the suburbs to the city center.

As is often the case in Kahn's research, this paper is sure to launch a stream of important papers on this topic. Kahn has established an important set of initial results. Future work will continue to refine these estimates insofar as they are causal linkages between where people live and their energy use.