Supply Constraints do not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities*

Schuyler Louie† **John Mondragon**‡ **Johannes Wieland**§

February 2026

Abstract

The standard view of housing markets is that differences in the flexibility of local housing supply—shaped by factors like geography and regulation—explain differences in how house prices and quantities respond to rising demand across U.S. cities. However, from 2000 to 2020, we find that higher income growth predicts the same growth in house prices, housing quantities, and population regardless of the estimated housing supply elasticity. We find the same results when we examine rents, expand the sample to 1980, use different elasticity measures, use per capita income or population instead of total income growth, and when using plausibly exogenous variation in housing demand. Using a general demand-and-supply framework, we show that these results imply that measured housing supply constraints do not explain differences in housing dynamics across U.S. cities. We suggest that allowing for multiple margins of adjustment in housing—quantity and quality—and differential shifts in the demand along these margins helps explain the data. Our conclusions challenge the prevailing view of housing markets and suggest that relaxing regulatory housing supply constraints may not affect housing affordability.

Keywords: house prices, housing supply, affordability, regulation, zoning, land use

JEL Codes: E22, J61, R21, R31, R52

*The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco or the Federal Reserve System. For our responses to frequent questions and comments see our FAQ Louie, Mondragon and Wieland (2025a). We thank Adam Torson, Sajid Zaidi, and the Marlborough LD debate team for the provocation and Rami Najjar for the excellent research assistance. We thank Nate Baum-Snow (discussant), Max Buchholz, Gabe Chodorow-Reich, Rebecca Diamond, Mike Fellman, Salim Furth, Antoine Levy, Andreas Mense (discussant), Carolina Reid, David Sraer, Benjamin Teresa, Maxence Valentin (discussant), Tuuli Vanhapelto (discussant), Michael Wiebe and participants at Berkeley, Berkeley Finance, the Fed BoG, Micro 4 Macro 2025, the Hoover Institute EPWG, Midwest Macro Fall 2025, OSUS Spring 2026, the SF Fed, the 2025 ESCP-TAU-UCLA Conference, UEA NA 2025 and the Urban Institute for helpful comments.

† University of California at Irvine: schuyljl@uci.edu

‡ Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco: john.mondragon@sf.frb.org

§ Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, NBER, and University of California, San Diego: johannes.wieland@sf.frb.org and jfwieland@ucsd.edu

1 Introduction

> "Rent, considered as the price paid for the use of the land, is naturally the highest which the tenant can afford to pay in the actual circumstances of the land." – Adam Smith (1776)

> "The rent is too damn high." – Jimmy McMillan (2010)[1]

In this paper we ask: do measured differences in housing supply elasticities explain differences in house price and quantity growth across U.S. cities since 2000?[2] Our answer: no.[3]

The canonical view for why housing has become so expensive, particularly in some cities, is that these cities have relatively inelastic housing supply, leading to greater increases in prices rather than quantities relative to cities with more elastic supply (Glaeser, Gyourko and Saks, 2005; Saiz, 2010). Specifically, the response of city i's housing supply growth $\widehat{H}_i^S$ to local house price growth $\widehat{P}_i$, is given by the supply function

$$\widehat{H}_i^S = \psi_i \widehat{P}_i + \widehat{\sigma}_i \tag{1}$$

where $\psi_i > 0$ is the city-specific elasticity of housing supply and $\widehat{\sigma}_i$ is a housing supply shock (a change in quantity not caused by changing prices). Cities with elastic housing supply (high ψ) will increase housing production as demand starts to push prices up, while cities with inelastic housing supply (low ψ) will increase production less for the same increase in demand. As a result, there will be less housing and it will be more expensive in relatively inelastic cities, compared to elastic cities where housing will be relatively abundant and cheap (see Figure IA). To the extent that regulatory constraints reduce a city's housing supply elasticity ψ_i, relaxing these policies will moderate house price growth through increased growth in housing quantities (Gyourko, Saiz and Summers, 2008; Saiz, 2023). The 2024 Economic Report of the President devotes an entire chapter to arguing that constrained housing supply is the main impediment to affordable housing and advocating for relaxing regulatory constraints (Council of Economic Advisers, 2024, Ch. 4) and a vast body of work has documented evidence in support of this logic (Molloy, 2020).

Using four standard measures of housing supply elasticities/constraints from the literature, we find that in response to higher income growth from 2000–2020 cities measured as

[1] As quoted in the October 18th, 2010 New York gubernatorial debate. See here.

[2] We abuse terminology by using "city" and "MSA" interchangeably, but the basic units of analysis in this paper are MSAs or Metropolitan Statistical Areas.

[3] We have provided a FAQ available here to respond to common questions and comments (Louie et al., 2025a).

having more elastic housing supply show the same growth in house prices, quantities, population, rents, commuting times, and rooms per person as cities measured as having less elastic housing supply. This is true across all the measures of housing constraints that we use, if we extend our sample to 1980, if we separate income growth into per capita income growth or population growth, and if we use plausibly exogenous changes in housing demand driven by standard instruments in the literature or exposure to pandemic-era work-from-home. In short, estimated housing supply constraints do not explain differences in house price and quantity growth across cities.

Although the majority of our estimates are explicitly non-causal, in Section 2 we provide four arguments that they accurately quantify the (negligible) differences in actual housing supply elasticities across cities, at least as captured by these measures. First, if city income growth is uncorrelated with city supply shocks $\widehat{\sigma}_i$, then our estimates identify the true group-specific supply elasticities ψ_j, where $j \in \{L, H\}$ denotes the inelastic (L) and elastic (H) cities regardless of unobserved demand shocks.[4] Intuitively, income growth will move house prices and quantities along the group-specific supply curve $\widehat{H}_i = \psi_j \widehat{P}_i$ and thereby identify the group-specific supply elasticity ψ_j from the co-movement of quantities and prices.[5] Even if population growth, and therefore income growth, responds differently to demand shocks in inelastic and elastic cities because of their different supply elasticities, this does not threaten identification as house prices and quantities continue to comove along the group-specific supply curve.[6] Of course, it is well known that any variation in house price or quantity driven by demand is sufficient to identify a supply elasticity (Angrist and Krueger, 2001; Saiz, 2010).

Second, if supply shocks $\widehat{\sigma}_i$ are correlated with income growth, our estimates still reflect relative differences in supply elasticities, provided this correlation is uniform across cities. The comovement of house price growth and quantity growth conditional on income growth will then identify the supply elasticity ψ_j and a bias term, with the size of the bias corresponding to the correlation between supply shocks and income growth. If those supply shocks are equally important in inelastic and elastic cities, our estimates will still identify the relative supply elasticity $\psi_H - \psi_L$ across cities as the bias is "differenced" out. So even the presence of unobserved supply shocks is not a problem for our analysis. However, a plausible prior

[4]Grouping the data into more and less elastic cities is consistent with Glaeser, Gyourko and Saks (2006) and Ganong and Shoag (2017), among others.

[5]If the supply elasticity ψ is heterogeneous within each group, then the pooled estimate has a heterogeneous treatment effect interpretation (Louie, Mondragon and Wieland, 2025b).

[6]Therefore, the claim by Furth (2025), Wiebe (2025) and others that identification fails because population growth depends on supply elasticities is incorrect. In Louie et al. (2025b) and Louie, Mondragon and Wieland (2025c) we provide comprehensive and self-contained replies to Wiebe (2025) and Furth (2025) respectively and we illustrate this point in a standard spatial equilibrium model in Appendix A1 (second section).

derived from a standard housing production function actually suggests that supply shocks should be less important in inelastic areas, consistent with the notion that quantities vary less in these markets. This prior implies that our estimates should be biased towards finding even larger differences in supply elasticities when they exist. In order for our estimates to obscure genuine differences in supply elasticities, supply shocks would instead need to be more correlated with income growth in cities classified as inelastic.

Third, even if one is willing to assume that supply shocks are more strongly correlated with income growth in inelastic cities, our results could only be explained by a highly specific scenario, one which contradicts conventional wisdom about housing supply elasticities. Specifically, the stronger correlation could occur either because supply shocks are more positively correlated with labor demand shocks or because supply shocks are relatively more important in inelastic cities. Within a standard spatial equilibrium framework (Moretti, 2011), the hypothesis that supply shocks are relatively more important implies additional correlations that are clearly rejected by the data: it predicts substantial differences in how house prices and quantities comove with per capita income growth in more- and less-elastic cities. But the correlations between both house price and quantity growth with per capita income growth are indistinguishable across the groups of cities, clearly rejecting this hypothesis. Therefore, the only remaining scenario is that supply shocks systematically correlate more strongly with labor demand shocks in inelastic cities. Under this scenario, inelastic cities experiencing substantial per capita income growth (such as San Francisco) would need to consistently achieve relative productivity improvements in construction compared to elastic cities with similar per capita income growth (such as Austin), precisely offsetting any genuine elasticity differences. We are unaware of any literature proposing such a specific scenario persisting over the last four decades. Moreover, even if such conditions held, it would still imply that differences in supply elasticities do not explain differences in house prices and quantities across cities.

Fourth, our causal estimates, generated from both well-established instrumental variables and recent remote work shocks, give the same results: existing measures of housing supply constraints do not explain differences in house price and quantity growth across cities. Because these instruments plausibly isolate shifts in housing demand that are uncorrelated with supply-side shocks, they are not subject to the deus ex machina explanation above. The fact that these estimates give the same results as our non-causal estimates reinforces our interpretation of the non-causal estimates, suggesting that any genuine differences in housing supply elasticities are small or, if they do exist, are not captured by these widely used measures.

In summary, the simplest and most coherent interpretation of our findings is that stan-

dard measures of housing supply elasticities do not reflect actual differences in housing supply elasticities across cities, either because genuine differences are negligible or because they are measured with significant error. Because each of the constraint measures we use is estimated in a fundamentally distinct way, it is unlikely that they are all subject to the same measurement error. Instead, it is more plausible that genuine supply elasticity differences are small. Critically, our results do not imply that supply "doesn't matter." Our framework assumes the fundamental and correct premise that exogenous expansions in housing supply will expand quantities and reduce prices; equivalently, we assume that supply curves slope up and demand curves slope down at the MSA level.[7]

We next describe our results in more detail. Our empirical analysis uses four measures of housing supply constraints which have been very influential or represent the cutting edge of research in the area. These are the foundational supply elasticity from Saiz (2010), a supply elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), the Wharton Residential Land Use Regulation Index (WRLURI) from Gyourko, Saiz and Summers (2008), and the land share of value from Davis, Larson, Oliner and Shui (2021) (Section 3). We use the terms "housing supply constraint" and "housing supply elasticity" interchangeably to describe these measures.

In our benchmark analysis in Section 4, we regress house price growth and house quantity growth on total income growth, an indicator if the city's housing supply is measured as relatively less constrained (more elastic), and the interaction of income growth and the constraint indicator. We use total income growth to capture the net of changes in both average income and population as both margins reflect housing demand, but we also examine each component separately and find the same results.[8] Total income growth is strongly correlated with growth in house prices, but the interaction of income growth with the constraint is economically and statistically insignificant across all of the measures. In other words, differences in income growth predict the same differences in house price growth in cities measured to be more or less constrained. We turn to housing quantities and find the same results: income growth is strongly correlated with growth in the number of housing units and growth in population, but this correlation is not affected by any of the measures of housing supply constraints. We make this point explicit by leveraging the comovement of prices and quantities and estimating an instrumental variable specification to recover the elasticities of housing quantities to prices for more- and less-constrained cities. Our estimated elasticities

[7]The level of aggregation matters. It is almost certainly the case that geographic or regulatory constraints affect supply curves at the level of the census tract, for example. But our results show that this does not imply similar effects at the city or MSA level, which is consistent with Baum-Snow (2023), Figure 4. Thanks to Michael Wiebe for pointing this out.

[8]Total income growth need not be a comprehensive measure of housing demand. For our purposes it need only be correlated with housing demand.

are all around one and, critically, are statistically and economically indistinguishable across cities measured to be relatively more or less constrained.

As discussed above, if these results are explained by a greater importance of supply shocks in inelastic cities then specifications using per capita or population growth should give different results. Instead we find that growth in per capita income and population both have identical correlations with house price and quantity growth in more- and less-constrained cities. We also examine growth in rents, the change in the average number of rooms per person, and the change in average commuting times and find that elastic and inelastic cities all exhibit the same correlation with income growth. We extend our sample to 1980 and find the same results when looking at growth from 1980 to 2000 or from 1980 to 2020. We explore finer discretizations of the constraint measures and continuous interaction models, all with the same results. The fact that measured constraints do not affect the correlations of house price or quantity growth with income growth is a robust feature of the data for at least the 40 years from 1980 to 2020.

To maintain that supply elasticities are nevertheless different in the face of our evidence requires believing that housing supply shocks must be more positively correlated with labor demand shocks in inelastic cities. This implies that high-growth, inelastic cities have benefited from positive supply shocks that exactly nullified the impact of a lower supply elasticity. We are not aware of anyone in the literature making this claim, which is also inconsistent with the claim that supply constraints are important in explaining house price growth and housing quantity growth across cities.

A much simpler interpretation of our results is that supply elasticities are either similar across cities or genuine differences are not captured by existing measures. Our results using exogenous housing demand shock are also consistent with this view. First, we employ standard instruments from the literature (see Saiz (2010), Diamond (2016), and Chodorow-Reich, Guren and McQuade (2024) among many others), a Bartik shock and local climate measures, in our baseline sample. Using these instruments recovers estimates of average supply elasticities in line with the literature, but we find no evidence that elasticities are relatively larger in cities measured as more elastic compared to ostensibly less-elastic cities. Second, we rely on the literature documenting the effect of remote work on housing demand (Howard, Liebersohn and Ozimek, 2023; Mondragon and Wieland, 2025) and check if the shift to remote work or work from home (WFH) had differential effects from 2019 to 2023 depending on the measured housing constraints. Consistent with prior research, we find that exposure to WFH caused an increase in housing demand and house prices. Critically, the increase in house prices was essentially identical regardless of whether the city was more or less constrained. Similarly, exposure to WFH caused large increases in the growth of units

permitted for construction and, conditional on the same exposure to WFH, cities saw similar growth in permitted units regardless of the measure of housing supply constraints. Despite these estimates coming from an out-of-sample period of exceptional economic changes and the distinct source of variation, we find the same results as in our baseline analysis, further validating the view that supply elasticities are not truly different across cities or that they are different but these differences have not yet been measured well.

But if not supply constraints, how do we explain that house prices have grown more and housing quantities have grown less in San Francisco compared to Houston—two poster-children of ostensibly different supply elasticities. In Section 5, we propose that housing markets feature both quantity (units) and quality (location, finishes, size, and so on) margins and that cities can experience different demand shifts along these margins. Intuitively, increases in per capita income will tend to increase the demand for housing quality with little effect on the demand for units, while increases in population (driven by growth in employment, for example) will tend to increase the demand for housing units. This implies that the comovement of prices, quality, and quantities will depend critically on the composition of demand shifts. For example, a housing demand shock for quality will raise house prices without raising quantities, making unit supply look inelastic irrespective of the underlying unit supply elasticity.[9] Consistent with this model, per capita income growth and population growth yield very different estimates of housing supply elasticities, and the differences in house price growth and housing quantity growth across San Francisco and Houston can be largely explained by their differences in per-capita income and population growth.

In short, we establish that measures of local housing supply constraints do not help us understand how shifts in demand translate into house price and quantity growth across U.S. cities. This finding challenges the standard view that supply constraints explain rising house prices across cities and suggests that efforts to relax measured housing constraints may have negligible effects on house prices and quantities. Instead we propose that the composition of housing demand is a currently underappreciated but potentially critical factor for understanding differences in housing dynamics across cities.

Related Literature

Housing supply constraints are now generally agreed to be an important, if not the most important, impediment to affordable housing (Glaeser, Gyourko and Saks, 2005; Saiz, 2023).[10]

[9] We also show in Section A5 that this simple extension has first-order implications for recovering supply elasticities via housing demand instruments as in Saiz (2010) and Chodorow-Reich et al. (2024) among others.

[10] While critics of this perspective do exist, they are often ignored or dismissed (Been, Ellen and O'Regan, 2019). The broader impact of this argument is evinced by the rapid rise of the YIMBY movement, advocating

Gyourko (2009), Gyourko and Molloy (2015), Glaeser and Gyourko (2018), and Molloy (2020) provide surveys of this extensive literature.[11] A common theme is that supply elasticities are not uniform across U.S. cities. Gyourko, Saiz and Summers (2008) and Gyourko, Hartley and Krimmel (2021) developed indexes of regulatory constraints that ostensibly reduce supply elasticities across different metropolitan entities. Saiz (2010) recovered MSA-level elasticities incorporating geographic and regulatory constraints to show that metros with little developable land due to geographic constraints from water bodies or steep terrain are the very places often deemed to have inelastic housing supply. Baum-Snow and Han (2024) estimate supply elasticities at the census tract level and trace out how the supply response across the metro area varies with geographic and regulatory constraints. Davis, Larson, Oliner and Shui (2021) use a large micro dataset to estimate the land share of value, which indicates the relative tightness of housing supply constraints in a class of models (Glaeser and Gyourko, 2003), across a large variety of geographies. Additional papers estimating local housing supply constraints or elasticities in the U.S. include Green, Malpezzi and Mayo (2005), Glaeser, Gyourko and Saks (2005), Davis and Palumbo (2008), Kok, Monkkonen and Quigley (2014), Gorback and Keys (2020), Albouy and Stuart (2020), Guren, McKay, Nakamura and Steinsson (2021b), and Chodorow-Reich, Guren and McQuade (2024). For a review of international evidence on housing supply elasticities see Saiz (2023).

In addition to potentially driving up house prices, tight housing supply has been linked to pernicious effects on other important economic outcomes. Saks (2008), Paciorek (2013), Gyourko, Mayer and Sinai (2013), Ganong and Shoag (2017), Gaubert (2018), and Hsieh and Moretti (2019), among others, argue that differences in housing supply elasticities have important effects on outcomes ranging from housing market volatility to aggregate productivity. Been, Ellen and O'Regan (2019) surveys work linking supply restrictions to environmental costs, segregation, and inequality. Glaeser and Gyourko (2018) also provide a survey and discussion on the broader costs of tight housing supply.

There is a growing literature that examines the local effects of new construction on outcomes like neighborhood rents and demographic composition. Examples include Zahirovich-Herbert and Gibler (2014), Diamond and McQuade (2019), Pennington (2021) and Li (2022). Some, although not all, of these papers find evidence that new construction reduces rent growth in the affected area. These estimates, by studying shifts in local housing supply, identify the shape of the local demand curve. By contrast, our approach identifies the slopes of the city-level supply curves in more- and less-constrained cities, which is critical for un-

for more relaxation of housing regulation like "upzoning," and the Economic Report of the President (Council of Economic Advisers, 2024). The same claims are also central to the "Abundance" diagnosis of the housing crisis. For evidence that there is not a housing shortage see McClure and Schwartz (2025).

[11] For a seminal contribution spurring the literature on housing supply see DiPasquale (1999).

derstanding the extent to which supply constraints affect housing affordability. Therefore, our results are not in conflict with these papers. A more closely related body of work studies changes in zoning constraints and how this affects the supply of housing, which should be informative about how much the housing supply function is affected by regulatory constraints. This work is surveyed by Freemark (2023), who reports mixed and generally modest effects of zoning changes on housing prices or quantities, consistent with our results.[12]

A number of other studies have also found a limited role for supply elasticity differences in the cross-section of U.S. cities. Rodríguez-Pose and Storper (2020) give an influential critique of the idea that relaxing regulatory barriers is likely to improve affordability, reduce inequality, or spur growth and also make the argument that income growth drives house prices.[13] Similarly, Buchholz, Kemeny, Randolph and Storper (2026) argue that inequality, not regulation, is the source of the "affordability crisis." Davidoff (2013) shows that regions with the largest 2000s housing cycle also saw the highest growth in quantities and that, conditional on demand, the amplitude of the 2000s housing cycle is not larger in less-elastic cities. Davidoff (2016) further finds that cities with lower measured supply elasticity experience both higher house price and quantity growth from 1980-2012 and argues that this reflects a negative correlation of supply elasticities with demand shocks. Like Davidoff (2013, 2016) we jointly examine house prices and quantities, and show that OLS regressions interacting income with supply elasticities can help us determine the role of supply elasticities in explaining house price and quantity growth across cities.

Howard and Liebersohn (2021) show that the effect of income growth on their newly-constructed rent index from 2000-2018 is independent of the measured housing supply elasticity, which they attribute to a high migration elasticity. Similarly, Aura and Davidoff (2008) and Anenberg and Kung (2020) use quantitative calibrated models to argue that relaxing local housing supply constraints is unlikely to significantly affect local house prices due to strong migration responses. Molloy, Nathanson and Paciorek (2022) find a weak relationship between elasticities and rents, although they argue there are large effects on prices and quantities. Davis and Ortalo-Magné (2011) examine data on expenditure shares on housing for renters and find that these shares are constant across MSAs, concluding that supply elasticities will be uncorrelated with rents and prices. We depart from most of these papers by also showing that growth in housing quantities and population, not just house price growth, is independent of local supply elasticities, and thus infer a limited role for housing supply elasticities (and so migration induced by differential elasticities) in explaining the cross-section

[12] Glaeser and Gyourko (2025) argue that regulatory constraints have now tightened across all metro areas, although Pendall, Lo and Wegmann (2022) find that zoning constraints have generally eased in high-growth metro areas.

[13] See also Rodríguez-Pose and Storper (2022).

of U.S. city house price and quantity growth since at least 1980.

In his discussion (available here) of Glaeser and Gyourko (2003), O'Flaherty lays out a number of important critiques of the single-margin housing model and related empirical approaches. In particular, he shows that when there are multiple margins of housing demand then it is very challenging to infer the marginal value of housing units and land. Murray (2021) develops these critiques further. In Section 5 we extend this argument to show that higher demand for housing quality can be misinterpreted as inelastic housing supply.

2 Theoretical Framework

Using a standard demand-and-supply framework for the housing market, we demonstrate that non-causal OLS regressions predicting city-level house price and quantity growth from income growth interacted with the local supply elasticity inform whether differences in supply elasticities are important in explaining cross-city differences in house price growth and housing quantity growth.

We assume there are I cities indexed by i, each with a population N_i where individuals receive income y_i so that total income in the city is given as $Y_i = y_i N_i$ and the total quantity of housing is H_i, purchased at the price P_i. For simplicity, we assume H is a measure of total housing consumption that encompasses both the extensive and intensive margins. In our empirical work we examine measures of both margins.[14] Households also have some additional demand shifters θ_i, which can increase or decrease their demand for housing. These can be thought of as changes in the demand for amenities or changes in wealth (for example, stock market investments) that affect housing demand in the city. Therefore housing demand in the city is given by a general Marshallian demand function $H_i^D = f(Y_i, P_i, \theta_i)$. We linearize this expression to get the change in housing demand where hats indicate the percentage change and ϵ gives the relevant demand elasticity:

$$\widehat{H}_i^D = \epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i - \epsilon_p \widehat{P}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i. \tag{2}$$

This housing demand function nests the demand functions from standard spatial equilibrium models. Consider the case in which households in location i earn y_i to spend on tradable non-housing goods c_i and nontradable housing h_i with relative price P_i. Under Cobb-Douglas preferences with housing share α_i (consistent with Davis and Ortalo-Magné, 2011), housing

[14] In Section 5, Section A2, Section A5, and Louie et al. (2025c) we study models with two margins of housing consumption and argue that they help explain features of the data.

demand is

$$h_i = \alpha_i \frac{y_i}{P_i} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad H_i = h_i N_i = \alpha_i \frac{Y_i}{P_i}.$$

In this model $\epsilon_y = 1$, $\epsilon_p = 1$, and $\widehat{\theta}_i = \widehat{\alpha}_i$.

Our housing demand function (2) does not restrict the correlations between the demand shifter $\hat{\theta}$ and prices and income in any way. Intuitively, we can allow for arbitrary correlations of residual demand $\widehat{\theta}_i$ with $\widehat{Y}_i$ and $\widehat{P}_i$ because any variation in demand that is correlated with income is valid variation for identifying relative supply curves. For this reason our demand function also nests intertemporal as well as spatial equilibrium models of housing demand (see Section A1).

We assume the total supply of housing H_i^S is competitive and determined by an elasticity parameter ψ_i and supply shocks σ so that $H_i^S = P_i^{\psi_i}\sigma_i$. The elasticity ψ_i reflects the flexibility of the local housing construction sector as determined by regulations, geography, and so on. We abstract from the importance of other factors like local labor costs or financing costs. Linearizing this expression gives the change in total supply as

$$\widehat{H}_i^S = \psi_i \widehat{P}_i + \widehat{\sigma}_i. \tag{3}$$

The differences that we consider should be thought of as long-run differences, in practice 20 years or more. Housing construction is time consuming, so that in the short-run almost all supply curves are relatively inelastic regardless of the long-run supply curve elasticities (Guren, McKay, Nakamura and Steinsson, 2021a). The long view also justifies a stock-based supply curve relative to a flow-based supply curve (DiPasquale and Wheaton, 1994), although the long-run equilibrium in those frameworks is identical to our own.

The housing market clears so that the total change in housing quantities is equal to the change in the supply of housing and the change in housing demand:

$$\widehat{H}_i = \widehat{H}_i^S = \widehat{H}_i^D.$$

Solving for prices gives an intuitive expression for the change in prices as a function of changes in demand coming from income and residual demand shocks or from shifts in supply:

$$\widehat{P}_i = \frac{1}{\psi_i + \epsilon_p}\left(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i\right) - \frac{1}{\psi_i + \epsilon_p}\widehat{\sigma}_i. \tag{4}$$

The effect of changes in income on house prices depends on the elasticity of housing demand to income, but this effect will be mitigated to the extent that housing supply elasticities are

high or if demand is very sensitive to changes in the price. Shifts in supply $\widehat{\sigma}_i$ or residual demand $\widehat{\theta}_i$ affect house prices in a similar way.

Substituting for prices into the supply equation gives a reduced form expression for the change in housing quantities:

$$\widehat{H}_i = \frac{1}{1+\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}\left(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i\right) + \frac{\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}{1+\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}\widehat{\sigma}_i. \tag{5}$$

Here as ψ_i becomes smaller (less elastic) then the denominator becomes larger, reducing the size of the quantity response at the same time that the price response in Equation (4) is increasing. These expressions nest standard local labor market/spatial equilibrium models (see Section A1).

Now assume that there are two kinds of cities, those with high supply elasticities and those with low supply elasticities and denote the respective set of cities by Ω^H (high) and Ω^L (low). We have data on house prices, quantities, and the total change in income for each city. We can estimate the relationship between changes in total income and house prices and quantities within each set of cities Ω^j using the following regression where $j \in \{H, L\}$ indicates if the city is of a high- or low-elasticity type

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{P}_i &= \alpha_j + \beta_j \widehat{Y}_i + e_i, \\
\widehat{H}_i &= \delta_j + \gamma_j \widehat{Y}_i + v_i, \qquad i \in \Omega^j,\ j \in \{H, L\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Running these regressions within each set of cities will recover the following estimates:[15]

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_j &= \frac{\epsilon_y}{\psi_j + \epsilon_p} + \frac{1}{\psi_j + \epsilon_p}\frac{Cov_j(\widehat{\theta}_i - \widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Var_j(\widehat{Y}_i)}, \\
\gamma_j &= \frac{\epsilon_y}{1+\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_j}} + \frac{1}{1+\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_j}}\frac{Cov_j(\widehat{\theta}_i + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_j}\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Var_j(\widehat{Y}_i)}, \qquad j \in \{H, L\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If there is no omitted variable bias coming from unobserved demand and supply shocks then the second terms will fall out so that the regressions recover the effects of income growth on house prices and quantities as mediated by the income elasticity of demand for housing, the price elasticity of demand for housing, and the housing supply elasticity. If households across cities do not differ in their income or price elasticities, the pass-through from income

[15] We simplify by assuming that elasticities within each group are constant (or uncorrelated with other variables). In theory and in extreme cases this simplification may be problematic, but in practice it makes it more likely that we are biased towards finding large differences across high- and low-elasticity cities. See Louie et al. (2025b), available here. Thanks to Michael Wiebe for pressing this point.

growth into house prices will be lower in cities with more elastic housing supply:

$$\psi_H > \psi_L \rightarrow \beta_H < \beta_L \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_H > \gamma_L. \tag{6}$$

Figure IA illustrates this standard demand and supply logic where B^j indicates the equilibrium for each type of city after the shift in demand from the initial equilibrium. Thus, a regression of house price growth on income growth within high-elasticity cities should recover a smaller coefficient β_H relative to the coefficient β_L from the same regression of house prices on income growth within low-elasticity cities. For the regression of housing quantity growth on income growth we expect a larger response in the more elastic cities, $\gamma_H > \gamma_L$.

More generally, the ratio of the OLS estimators from the quantity and price regressions shows when the co-movement of quantity and prices with income growth is informative about a city's supply elasticity,

$$\frac{\gamma_j}{\beta_j} = \psi_j + \frac{Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Cov_j(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}, \qquad j \in \{H, L\}. \tag{7}$$

This ratio is equivalent to the IV estimator of housing quantity growth on house price growth instrumented by income growth.

When supply shocks are uncorrelated with income growth $Cov(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i) = 0$, then the ratio of quantity to price effects identifies the supply elasticity ψ_j. In particular, we can allow for arbitrary correlations of income with other demand shocks and arbitrary differences in the parameters of the housing demand function (2). Any variation in demand helps identify the slope of the supply curve (Angrist and Krueger, 2001; Saiz, 2010). For example, Figure IB illustrates the case when high elasticity places have a relatively stronger correlation between income growth and other positive demand shocks. This correlation will generate a relatively high correlation between income and house price growth pushing β_H closer to β_L. But we should then see an even larger difference in quantities, as the same demand shocks will push up housing quantities even more in more elastic cities so that $\gamma_H >> \gamma_L$. Intuitively, any demand shock moves quantity and prices along the city-specific supply curve, so their relative movements identify the slope of the supply curve ψ_j.

When supply shocks are correlated with income, then we no longer identify a city's supply elasticity, but the relative co-movement can still identify the relative supply elasticity if the

bias is the same in elastic and inelastic cities:

$$\frac{\gamma_H}{\beta_H} - \frac{\gamma_L}{\beta_L} = \psi_H - \psi_L + \frac{Cov_H(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Cov_H(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)} - \frac{Cov_L(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Cov_L(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}$$

Empirically, we find that the covariance between prices and income is nearly identical across elastic and inelastic cities $Cov_L(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i) = Cov_H(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)$. Thus, if the covariance between supply shocks and income growth is also the same across cities, then comparing the co-movement of quantities and prices conditional on income across inelastic and elastic cities will identify their relative supply elasticities.

A reasonable prior about these covariances is that supply shocks are relatively more important in elastic areas, which implies that we will be biased to recovering even larger differences in supply elasticities. Assume perfect competition and a CES production function for housing $Q_i = A_i[\alpha \bar{K}_i^{\frac{\xi-1}{\xi}} + (1-\alpha)L_i^{\frac{\xi-1}{\xi}}]^{\frac{\xi}{\xi-1}}$ where A is construction productivity, $\bar{K}$ is fixed land, L is labor, and ξ is the elasticity of substitution.[16] The supply curve is then $\widehat{Q}_i = \psi_i \widehat{P}_i + (1+\psi_i)\widehat{A}_i - \psi_i \widehat{W}_i$ where the supply elasticity is $\psi_i = \xi(1-s_i^K)/s_i^K$ and $s_i^K = 1 - \frac{WL}{PQ}$ is the land share. The microfounded housing supply shocks $\hat{\sigma}_i \equiv (1+\psi_i)\hat{A}_i - \psi_i \hat{W}_i$ scale with the supply elasticity, consistent with the intuitive notion that quantities will vary less in places where it is harder to build. Thus, to the extent that supply elasticities are different across cities, we expect supply shocks to be relatively more important in elastic cities, $Cov_L(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i) < Cov_H(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)$, and our estimates would be biased towards finding even larger differences in supply elasticities.

We understate the difference in supply elasticity if and only if supply shocks are more positively correlated with income growth in inelastic cities than in elastic cities, $Cov_L(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i) > Cov_H(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)$. Figure IIA illustrates an example in a demand-and-supply diagram, in which income growth in the inelastic city is correlated with a positive supply shock but in the elastic city there is no such correlation. The correlated positive supply shock reduces prices and increases quantities in the inelastic cities, generating housing market outcomes that are indistinguishable from those of the elastic city.

There are two possible scenarios that could generate such a correlation: supply shocks must be either more positively correlated with labor demand shocks or supply shocks must be relatively more important in inelastic cities. Through the lens of standard of a standard spatial equilibrium framework (Moretti, 2011), we can distinguish these explanations as follows. Assume the labor demand curve of a city is downward-sloping and equal to,

$$\widehat{w}_i = \widehat{Z}_i - \gamma \widehat{L}_i$$

[16] Labor can be thought of as a composite of actual labor and flexible capital inputs.

where $\widehat{Z}_i$ is non-construction productivity and $\gamma > 0$ is the labor demand elasticity. The covariance of total income growth with the supply shock is,

$$Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Y}_i) = Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Z}_i) + (1-\gamma)Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i)$$

The covariance in inelastic cities could be larger either because they are more correlated with labor demand shocks $\widehat{Z}_i$, or supply shocks are simply more important and endogenously explain more of the variation in population, $Cov_L(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i) > Cov_H(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i)$. Critically, these two explanations make different predictions about the covariance of supply shocks with per capita income growth,

$$Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{w}_i) = Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{Z}_i) - \gamma Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i).$$

Holding fixed the covariance with labor demand shocks, if $Cov_L(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i) > Cov_H(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i)$, then supply shocks are more negatively correlated with per capita income growth. This scenario then predicts that the comovement of house price growth and housing quantity growth with per capita income growth is biased towards finding large differences in supply elasticities whenever supply shocks obscure these differences for total income growth. Note that we should observe different comovements with per capita income even when allowing for agglomeration effects, $\gamma < 0$, since per capita income growth always loads less on $Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i)$ than total income growth. In contrast, the comovements of house prices and quantity growth with population growth is most biased towards find no difference, since by definition it loads the most on $Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, \widehat{L}_i)$. Therefore, if supply shocks are relatively more important in inelastic areas we should see this difference reflected in differences in our regressions depending if we use income growth, per capita income growth, or population growth.

Either scenario is theoretically problematic for the view that differences in supply elasticities explain house price and quantity growth across cities. Empirically, our regressions show no differences across total income, per capita income or population growth, rejecting the scenario that supply shocks are more important in inelastic cities. We therefore focus on the scenario that supply shocks are more correlated with labor demand shocks in inelastic cities. This scenario implies that inelastic cities experiencing the highest per capita income growth (such as San Francisco) have benefited from positive housing supply shocks relative to elastic cities experiencing the highest per capita income growth (such as Austin) exactly enough to obscure any underlying differences in supply elasticities. We are not aware of anyone making this knife-edge case. Furthermore, as Figure IIA shows, the outcomes are then observationally equivalent to the case where there is no difference in the housing supply elasticity across cities. In other words, differences in supply elasticities do not explain differences in house

price growth and quantity growth across cities.

Despite the apparent implausibility of the supply shock argument, we also test this explanation by exploiting explicitly causal variation in local housing demand. First, we follow numerous papers in the literature by instrumenting for local housing demand using exposure to labor demand via a Bartik shock and measures of local climate attractiveness (see Saiz (2010), Diamond (2016), and Chodorow-Reich et al. (2024) among many others). This literature explicitly argues that these instruments are uncorrelated with local supply shocks ($Cov_j(\widehat{\sigma}_i, X_i) = 0$ where X_i is an instrument), and therefore recover the underlying housing supply elasticities ψ_j. Second, we rely on a body of work arguing that exposure to work-from-home over the pandemic induced a large and again plausibly exogenous shock to housing demand (see Howard et al. (2023) and Mondragon and Wieland (2025) among others). Here again the explicit argument is that this shift in housing demand is uncorrelated with local shocks to housing supply, as well as other shocks to demand. Thus, even if one believes the deus ex machina resolution of our results that preserves differences in supply elasticities across locations, that explanation will not apply to the results that leverage distinct sources of plausibly exogenous variation in housing demand.

In summary, our theoretical framework shows that if differences in local supply elasticities are quantitatively important, then we should see such differences in non-causal OLS regressions of house price and quantity growth on income growth interacted with measures of the supply elasticity. To the extent that a differential exposure to supply shocks obscures differences in housing supply elasticities in these regressions, then this implies (1) that housing supply elasticities do not explain house prices and quantity growth across cities and (2) that differences in supply elasticities will be evident in our causal regressions.

3 Data

We rely on four influential measures of housing supply constraints from the literature. We take the elasticity estimates from Saiz (2010), which are available at the MSA level. Because of the influence of these estimates in the literature we use these MSA definitions as our baseline geography and match other data to these definitions. We also use the measures of the Wharton Residential Land Use Regulatory Index (WRLURI) by Gyourko et al. (2008), generated at the MSA-level by Saiz (2010), which capture variation in the regulatory environment across MSAs. We multiply this index by minus one so that increases in the value indicate a less restrictive regulatory environment and so, ostensibly, a more elastic housing supply function. Baum-Snow and Han (2024) provide a number of elasticities at the census tract level that can be aggregated to other geographies. We use their elasticity for the num-

ber of units as this has a strong correlation with house price growth that is consistent with expectations.[17] Finally, we use the 2012 "as-is" measure of the land share of value from Davis et al. (2021) at the county level and then aggregate this to the MSA-level with population weights. The share of value attributable to land reflect constraints on the construction of housing in a certain class of models (Glaeser et al., 2005), so we take one minus the land share, which we call the building share of value, so that increases in the value indicate a relatively more elastic supply function.

We measure total income (income and population) in an area using the county-level personal income estimates from the BEA and then aggregate them to the MSA level.[18] We use the broad measure "all persons from all sources" in a geography during a calendar year.[19]

We rely on several measures of housing costs. First, we use the county-level Corelogic single-family repeat-sales index and then aggregate this index to the MSA level using population weights. These data are monthly, but we convert them to annual by using the December value. Second, we use the American Community Survey (ACS) to measure the median home value and the median rent, which we aggregate from the relevant geography to the MSA level using population weights. While the median home value does not adjust for quality like the Corelogic price index, it was used in the construction of the Saiz (2010) elasticity estimates and so is a useful check on the robustness of our results.[20] Similarly, median rents are not quality adjusted, but there is no high-quality rental index with sufficient coverage across time and space.

To measure the number of housing units we rely on the Census of Housing accessed via IPUMS NHGIS, which are pulled at the county level and then summed to the MSA level. We also use the ACS to measure the average number of rooms per person, although in the years before 2000 this is only available for a smaller set of MSAs due to restrictions in county identification.

We use three distinct sources of cross-sectional variation in housing demand, building off both the classic works of Saiz (2010), Diamond (2016), and cutting-edge work from

[17] Following guidance in the documentation dated September 2023, we use the elasticity estimated by the quadratic finite mixture model and then aggregate it to the MSA level using the formula in equation 21 and provided housing quantities.

[18] Available for download at https://apps.bea.gov/regional/zip/CAINC1.zip. Note that in this version of the paper we have updated all of our tables to use the most recent updates which include data up to 2023 and revises estimates of previous years. This results in slightly different numbers than the previous version of our paper which used the previous vintage of these data. But none of our material conclusions have changed.

[19] For more detail on this measure see here and here.

[20] One potentially important difference is that Saiz (2010) adjusts home value growth for growth in construction costs. We do not have the necessary data to make this adjustment, but it is not obvious that the relevant measure of house price growth is price growth net of changes in construction costs. Saiz (2024) describes the effects of construction costs on prices as "mechanical," but it may still be the case that they are an important determinant of price growth.

Chodorow-Reich et al. (2024): a Bartik instrument for labor demand using employment growth in supersectors from 2000 to 2020 and July mean humidity and January mean temperature to measure local climate attractiveness. We select these variables because of the literature's reliance on these and similar variables to isolate plausibly exogenous variation for housing demand and estimate housing supply elasticities.

Finally, we use exposure to remote work as a recent shock to local housing demand. Mondragon and Wieland (2025) use the ACS and measure a remote worker as someone who is employed, does not commute to work, and who does not work in agriculture or the military. They show that the share of work-from-home (WFH) in the pre-pandemic period has a strong effect on post-pandemic WFH and the demand for housing, driven by both increased migration and increases in housing demand by remote workers. They also document that the effect on housing demand is uncorrelated with other shocks to local markets, so it is plausibly exogenous. While this measure only directly captures workers who are fully remote, Kmetz, Mondragon and Wieland (2023) show that this measure is strongly correlated with more holistic measures of remote work such as the surveys in Barrero, Bloom and Davis (2023) and Bick, Blandin and Mertens (2023).

Table I reports summary statistics for the primary variables used in our analysis. All of the variables are in growth rates except for the change in average rooms per person, which is more easily interpreted in levels. Because the distribution of cumulative growth rates is heavily skewed over these long horizons, we annualize all of the growth rates. This makes the distributions more symmetric and improves precision, but is not necessary for our results. We also convert prices and total income growth into real values using the CPI price index. Panel A reports statistics for 2000 to 2020, our main sample of analysis, Panel B covers the longer sample from 1980 to 2020, and Panel C looks just at 1980 to 2000. Note that the number of observations in this table will not match the analysis tables as not all MSAs are populated with every constraint measure. But every MSA reported here is populated with at least one of the four measures of constraints, so this table provides a summary of all of the MSAs used in the analysis.

Just from comparing 2000 to 2020 to 1980 to 2000 we can see that the last twenty years are marked by relatively high growth in house prices, relatively less growth in total incomes, and less growth in housing quantities, all consistent with the growing perception that there is a housing affordability crisis. At the same time, the growth in housing quantities has outpaced the growth in population and the average number of rooms per person has increased, which appears inconsistent with the view that supply constraints have held back housing quantities and consistent with the argument in McClure and Schwartz (2025) that there is no evidence of a housing shortage.

4 Empirical Results

In this section we estimate to what extent higher income growth predicts higher house price and lower quantity growth in U.S. cities with less elastic housing supply compared to cities with more elastic housing supply. As we explain in Section 2, these regressions allow us to quantify the importance of variation in housing supply elasticities for explaining variation in house price and quantity growth across cities.

4.1 Graphical Results

We first show the unconditional correlation between house price growth and the housing supply elasticity measures, which is strongly negative as emphasized in prior work. We then show the correlation of house quantity growth with those measures, which is also negative and inconsistent with a supply-centric story. Finally, we show graphically that higher income growth predicts the same increase in house price and quantity growth in more and less elastic cities and that the relationships between prices and quantities in general do not seem to depend on the elasticity measures.

Figure II divides MSAs into ventiles of each measure and then plots the average annualized real house price growth from 2000 to 2020 within each bin against the average value of the constraint measure within each bin (Stepner, 2013). All of the constraint measures are adjusted so that larger values reflect less constrained, or more elastic, housing markets (see Section 3). Every measure has the expected relationship that has been repeatedly documented in the literature: cities with relatively more elastic housing markets tend to have less house price growth. The strength of the association varies across each measure, but broadly they all point to statistically and economically significant variation in house price growth across cities. For example, moving from the bottom to the top of the range of Saiz (2010) implies real house price growth goes from over 2% to less than 0.5% a year, or cumulative growth of 50% compared to 10% over 20 years.

If housing constraints are the central factor determining the growth in house prices, then housing quantities should reflect the inverse relationship. Ceteris paribus, cities with relatively unconstrained housing markets should build more housing, thus suppressing growth in house prices. Figure III checks if this is the case by plotting the total annualized growth in housing quantities against the same measures of housing constraints. The results are not consistent with this argument. All of the measures but the building share of land value are at least weakly negatively correlated with housing quantities. It is clear that none of these measures is strongly positively correlated with growth in housing quantities, as would be the

case if most of the variation in house price growth were explained by variation in the growth of housing quantities (that is, explained by differential supply elasticities).

Of course, a critical step in this argument is that shocks to demand and supply are held constant when comparing cities with different elasticities. As demonstrated by Davidoff (2016) and Howard and Liebersohn (2021), local elasticity measures are strongly correlated with differences in housing demand. For example, coastal California has, in addition to restrictive zoning and difficult terrain, pleasant weather and excellent Mexican food, both of which increase housing demand.[21] Therefore, it is difficult to disentangle the effect of housing constraints from high demand.

Figure IV plots house price growth against the growth in house quantities. We see a strong positive relationship between growth in house prices and quantities: cities that experienced large growth in house prices are generally cities that experienced large growth in housing quantities, consistent with Davidoff (2013). This picture suggests that differential shifts in demand are important drivers of housing market dynamics. Of course, it does not indicate that differences in supply constraints are irrelevant, just that it is important to condition on demand when examining the effects of housing constraints on house price growth.

Figure V takes this approach by plotting growth in house prices for each measure of housing constraints against growth in total income separately for MSAs with above and below median values of each constraint measure. Dividing cities in this way is consistent with previous work of Glaeser et al. (2006) and Ganong and Shoag (2017). As discussed in Section 2, for the same growth in housing demand MSAs with unconstrained housing markets should show relatively less growth in house prices compared to MSAs with constrained housing markets. Across every measure, we find that house prices for more- and less-constrained cities have the same slope with respect to changes in income growth. To the extent that changes in income growth reflect different demand conditions, these pictures show that none of the measures of supply constraints translate into differences in price growth.

The fact that supply constraints do not affect the relationship between income and house price growth is not consistent with the logic of how different housing supply elasticities affect house prices given in Equation (4). But this result could be consistent with the important class of local labor market models where migration across cities is driven by the cost of housing relative to income (Moretti, 2011). At the extreme, it is possible that migration causes price-to-income ratios to be equalized so that local housing supply elasticities will have zero effect on prices but large effects on migration and the quantity of housing (Aura and Davidoff, 2008; Howard and Liebersohn, 2021). In our framework this would be reflected

[21] The fish tacos in San Diego are particularly tasty.

as the price elasticity of demand (ϵ_p) being very large in Equation (4).[22] Alternatively, income growth may be correlated with positive housing demand shocks in more elastic cities, which would make house price growth in those cities look similar to less elastic cities. Both theories imply that income growth predicts large differences in quantity growth across more and less elastic cities.

In Figure VI, we check if housing constraints affect the relationship between growth in housing quantities and income growth. Since growth in total income reflects growth in population as well as growth in average income there will be a tight relationship between housing quantities and total income growth. But if the migration mechanism is important, then relatively unconstrained cities should see more growth in housing quantities for the same change in total income compared to relatively constrained cities. These figures show that this is not the case. Across all of the measures of constraints, relatively constrained cities show the same growth in housing quantities in response to higher income growth as relatively unconstrained cities. Interestingly, there is not even a gap in the average housing quantity growth across the two types of cities, which means the price gap or "intercept" is difficult for the standard model to reconcile (Section A2).

Through the lens of the housing demand-and-supply model in Section 2, these figures imply that differences in housing supply elasticities across cities are quantitatively not important for explaining how income growth, or housing demand growth more generally, affects differences in house price and house quantity growth. But perhaps income growth is a very specific measure of housing demand and more representative measures of housing demand show different results. To check on this concern, Figure VII plots house price growth against house quantity growth, which means that the slopes are the inverse elasticities of housing supply (Saiz, 2010), $\widehat{P}_i = 1/\psi_i \widehat{H}_i^S$, when there are no confounding supply shocks. In this case, these figures will trace out different loci for cities with high and low elasticities. These figures confirm that there is no evidence that these less constrained cities tend to have relatively higher elasticities of supply, even in the unconditional relationships between housing prices and quantities. While the Baum-Snow and Han (2024) slopes appear to be slightly distinct across the two groups of cities, the higher slope among less-constrained cities is actually the opposite of what the standard model would predict (that is, the figure suggests cities that should have more-elastic housing supply actually have less-elastic housing supply).

These results highlight that from the perspective of the standard model, it is entirely legitimate to test for differential supply elasticities by regressing prices on quantities. The

[22] Another implication of this perspective is that the elasticity of supply (ψ_i) would also be very large to accommodate the changes in population driven by migration so that there is also a large quantity response in Equation (5).

only threat to identifying different supply elasticities in this way comes from differential distribution of housing supply shocks across groups of cities. However, we focus on variation correlated with income growth for several reasons. First, it is possible that even in the standard model different kinds of demand shifters will have different treatment effects on the response of housing units relative to house prices (see Section A2 and Louie et al. (2025c)). By conditioning on specific measures of demand like total income, per capita, and population growth, all of which are strongly correlated with housing market outcomes, we increase the likelihood that we will be recovering uniform treatment effects across cities. Second, by conditioning on income growth we raise the empirical hurdle in order for supply shocks to explain the irrelevance of constraint measures. If we want supply shocks to explain the unconditional correlations in Figure VII, it is necessary for supply shocks to be more important in constrained cities, which would be unexpected based on our discussion in Section 2. But if we condition on income growth it means that it must not only be true that there are more positive supply shocks in constrained cities, but also that supply shocks are more positively correlated with income growth in constrained cities. Thus, to rescue differential housing supply elasticities it is necessary to believe that the most constrained, high-growth cities actually experience the largest improvements in housing productivity. This is even less plausible than the possibility of differential likelihoods of supply shocks on average. Finally, by documenting the correlations of income growth and its components with housing market outcomes, we hope to shed light on important empirical moments that can be used to guide research on the housing market going forward.

It is also true that relatively constrained cities tend to have higher house price growth on average, as shown by the vertical gap between the two sets of cities in Figure V and Figure VII, but no such gap exists for housing quantity growth in Figure VI. We show in Section A2 that because this "intercept" term only exists for prices and not quantities, it is only consistent with differential supply elasticities if one assumes a set of ad hoc and implausible housing supply shocks:[23] if we take the Saiz (2010) elasticities at face value, then on average supply shocks must have increased housing supply in elastic cities by one percentage point per year and reduced housing supply in inelastic cities by one percentage point per year. For comparison, the housing stock grows on average by one percentage point per year. Under this interpretation it is differences in supply shocks, not differences in supply elasticities that account for differences in house price growth and quantity growth across cities. We argue that it is more plausible that this difference in price growth reflects

[23]The figures also show that low-growth cities have essentially identical—none to little—growth in house prices. This is not informative about the importance of housing supply constraints since constraints should only matter in the face of increasing demand (Glaeser and Gyourko, 2005). In our robustness checks we drop low-growth cities and find the same results.

differential amenity growth correlated with the measured supply elasticity (Davidoff, 2016) and limitations in how well price indexes adjust for changes in housing quality or local amenity valuation, both of which will be priced in any standard housing model (Harding, Rosenthal and Sirmans, 2007; Billings, 2015; Diamond, 2016).[24]

In short, none of the figures suggest an important role for housing supply constraints in explaining house price growth and quantity growth in a way that the supply-centric view predicts. We next confirm this insight in regression form and show that it is a robust conclusion.

4.2 Regression Results

We estimate the following regressions:

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{P}_i &= \alpha + \beta_1 \widehat{Y}_i + \beta_2 \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + \beta_3 \widehat{Y}_i \times \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + e_i, \\ \widehat{H}_i &= \delta + \gamma_1 \widehat{Y}_i + \gamma_2 \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + \gamma_3 \widehat{Y}_i \times \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + v_i.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The coefficients of interest are β_3 and γ_3, which recover the differential response of house price growth and house quantity growth to income growth for cities that have relatively more elastic housing supply. In terms of our discussion in Section 2, $\beta_3 = \beta_H - \beta_L$ and $\gamma_3 = \gamma_H - \gamma_L$. Thus, we expect $\beta_3 < 0$ and $\gamma_3 > 0$, or that cities with relatively more elastic housing supply experience relatively less price growth and more house quantity growth for the same income growth. In contrast, we find that the coefficients are small, statistically insignificant, and often of the wrong sign, which implies that differences in housing supply are quantitatively not important for explaining differences in house price and quantity growth across cities (Section 2). In Section 4.4 we discuss the robustness of our results to more flexible discretizations or using a continuous specification.

Table II reports the results for the Corelogic house price index where panel A uses total income growth, our preferred measure of demand. Total income growth is strongly correlated with house price growth: a one percentage point increase in total income growth predicts a 50-60 basis point increase in house price growth. However, the interaction term of total income growth with the housing supply constraint indicator is essentially zero and statistically insignificant across all measures of the elasticity.

One concern might be that we are using total income growth when we should be using only growth in per capita income or only growth in population as our measures of housing

[24] In her Spring 2025 Brookings discussion, Molloy argues that neither the ownership cost nor the rent of constant-quality housing has increased relative to the median income, consistent with large changes in housing quality.

demand. We show in Section A1 that total income is a legitimate measure of housing demand in standard models, and in Louie et al. (2025c) we show that it is appropriate even in a relatively non-standard model. The intuition is that our empirical approach only depends on the structure of the housing market and is independent of any assumptions about migration. Even so, by checking if the results depend on the measure of growth we can also determine if it is plausible for supply shocks to be more important in more constrained areas (see Section 2). Table II panel B shows that per capita income growth is strongly correlated with growth in house prices and this correlation is identical across more- and less-constrained MSAs for every measure of constraints. Interestingly, the correlation of per capita income growth with prices is somewhat stronger than the correlation of total income growth with prices. Panel C turns to population growth and, while the correlation between population growth and price growth is somewhat smaller, we again find that this correlation is unaffected by whether or not a city appears to be supply constrained. Table A2 repeats these regressions for growth in the median home value and finds the same results. There is no evidence that using total income as a regressor is affecting our results one way or another. Given these results, we use total income growth as our baseline regressor, but in Section 4.4 we repeat our quantity results using per capita and population growth as robustness checks. Importantly, the fact that all of the specifications show the same non-result is inconsistent with the hypothesis that supply shocks are more important in more constrained areas.

Table III changes the outcome variable to housing quantity growth. Panel A uses the growth in the number of housing units and panel B uses population growth. Across all of the specifications only the regulatory index seems to slighty raise the positive effect of income growth on growth in housing units and population. Even taking this small effect at face value, the fact that Table II showed that there is essentially no effect on prices as one would expect from a supply-centric view, suggests this result is likely spurious and below we confirm that this effect disappears once we exclude low-growth cities. The Saiz, Baum-Snow and Han, and building share of value measures all have no effect on the correlation between quantities and income growth and mostly have the wrong sign. Overall, we find little to no evidence for relatively more growth in housing quantities in less constrained areas for any of the constraint measures. Similarly, the coefficient on the indicator itself is not significantly or even consistently positive. So while less-constrained cities tend to have lower house price growth on average in some specifications, they do not tend to have more growth in housing units or population, inconsistent with the basic supply-side mechanism (see Section A2).

Panel C uses the change in the average number of rooms per person as an alternative measure of housing quantity outcomes. If housing markets are responding on the intensive margin (for example, larger homes) more than the extensive margin (more homes) then

this variable should capture some of the differential response. Here total income growth is negatively correlated with the change in rooms per person, suggesting that cities that are growing become more crowded or less spacious, perhaps as households opt to live closer to certain amenities associated with higher density. But this correlation is completely unaffected by the measure of housing constraints. Given differences in income growth, having a housing market that is ostensibly more or less constrained does not affect differences in the quantity of housing per person.

Together these results show that neither prices nor quantities exhibit the kind of differential correlation with income growth that we would expect if housing supply constraints are actually different across these groups. To summarize this point, we estimate instrumental variable specifications along the lines of (7), where we interact growth in house prices with the indicator for being less constrained and then instrument for that variable with total income growth interacted with the same indicator. This allows us to estimate the supply elasticity directly and focuses the threats to identification on just differential correlations between supply shocks and income growth.

Table IV reports estimates for growth in the quantity of housing with panel A using the house price index and panel B using the median home value. The coefficients on price growth give the estimated elasticities of housing quantity with respect to price growth for each type of city. We report the chi-squared test for rejecting the hypothesis that the estimated elasticities across more- and less-constrained cities are the same. We also report the first-stage F-statistics for each group of cities when estimated separately to explicitly verify that the instrument is strongly correlated with house price growth. In none of the specifications can we reject that the elasticities are equal at standard levels of significance. Only the regulatory index displays a lower supply elasticity in more constrained cities that is at least somewhat economically meaningful. But the difference in the relationship is simply quantitatively too small and imprecise to be able to say that less regulated cities have a meaningfully different response in the quantity of housing units, and robustness checks below show that this estimate is not robust to dropping low-growth cities.

Table A3 runs the regressions replacing housing unit growth with population growth and finds essentially the same results. We do not find any evidence that supply constraints are economically or statistically significant determinants of variation in the growth of house prices relative to population.

4.3 Evidence from Plausibly Exogenous Variation in Housing Demand

We argue that our analysis is particularly attractive because we do not require exogenous variation in housing demand to evaluate if differences in housing supply elasticities across

U.S. cities explain differences in house price and quantity growth (Section 2). But exogenous variation can help distinguish between the explanation that supply elasticities are not different, at least as conventionally measured, and the alternative that differentially correlated supply shocks render actual differences in supply elasticities uninformative about city house price and quantity growth. We distinguish between these explanations using two distinct approaches. First, we use three standard instruments for housing demand to re-estimate our housing supply elasticities. As explained in Section 3, these are a Bartik instrument for labor demand, July humidity, and January temperature. Second, we exploit the shock to housing demand due to the shift to work-from-home from Mondragon and Wieland (2025), who show that it is a plausibly exogenous shock to local housing demand. Both of these exercises recover little difference in supply elasticities across cities, consistent with our non-causal evidence. In addition to providing plausibly exogenous variation, these shocks are useful because we do not condition on changes in total income, per capita, or population growth, allowing us to sidestep any concerns about how those variables may be affecting our analysis.

Table V presents the results using the standard instruments. In six of the eight specifications it is the more-constrained cities that are estimated to have more elastic housing supply functions, with an economically large and statistically-significant difference for column two of panel A. These results are the opposite of the standard view. While the estimates using the regulatory index point in the standard direction, these results again disappear after dropping low-growth cities. Therefore, even when using standard approaches to isolating housing demand that do not rely at all on our measures of income growth we find that supply elasticities do not appear to be different across cities. These regressions return elasticities that are generally lower than what we find using total income growth as an instrument, which could be consistent with supply shocks biasing the income-based estimates of the supply elasticity upward. For our purposes it is sufficient to document that these elasticity estimates do not suggest that standard measures of housing supply constraints help explain house price or quantity growth across cities.

In our second exercise, we construct a measure of exposure to the rise of WFH over the pandemic, the the employment share of WFH from 2015-2019, which Mondragon and Wieland (2025) show is strongly correlated with the increase in WFH over the pandemic and plausibly exogenous. We then interact this measure with each of the indicators for being less constrained (above median). We measure outcomes from 2019 to 2023, the most recent year for which we can measure total income growth.

Because this is a single shock, we present the reduced form results in Table VI to parallel our baseline analysis. In panel A we put total income growth as the outcome to check if growth in more- and less-constrained cities loads equally on the WFH shock. We see some evidence

that growth is higher in places that are less regulated, implying there is some heterogeneity in the treatment effect. This heterogeneous treatment effect is not informative about the role of supply constraints in the housing market, but it is important for scaling the demand shock across these different cities. Panel B turns to house prices and finds that remote work does increase house prices, but there is no evidence that house prices grew less in cities that were less constrained. The one statistically significant estimate, on the regulatory constraint, has the wrong sign. Finally, panel C looks at the cumulative growth in the number of units permitted.[25] We use permitted units instead of actual units because the quantity of housing measure we use in other specifications is only available in census years. These estimates show that the increase in housing demand due to WFH had a large effect on permit growth, about two to three times larger than that on house prices. This larger response is intuitive since permits represent the response of housing investment, which is smaller and more volatile than the overall stock of housing. The interaction terms are all positive, sometimes with large coefficients, but the standard errors are far too large to distinguish these estimates from zero. These large coefficients on the interactions are actually due to outliers as quantile regressions, which are less sensitive to outliers than OLS regression, are reported in Table A4 and show that these estimates largely disappear. Critically, none of the measures gives the expected set of coefficients showing relatively less house price growth and relatively more permitting growth in elastic cities in response to the shift in demand.

In short, even when using exogenous variation the measures of housing constraints do not affect the relative growth of house prices and house quantities across cities. We again conclude that differences in housing supply elasticities are quantitatively unimportant for explaining differences in house price and house quantity growth.

4.4 Robustness

In this section we discuss robustness exercises that continue to show that income growth has the same relationship with house price growth and housing quantity growth irrespective of the measured local supply elasticity. In the interests of the reader's time, we briefly describe them here and relegate a detailed discussion to Section A3. First, we extend the sample to 1980-2020. Second, we look at just the 1980-2000 subsample. Third, we use quartiles of the housing constraint measure rather than a binary indicator to check if we are obscuring effects in parts of the distributions of constraint measures. Fourth, we use continuous interaction models. Fifth, we exclude cities that are not growing or growing very slowly to make sure we are

[25] Since permits are quite volatile we calculate the cumulative growth in permits by summing all permits from 2021 to 2023 and comparing that to the sum of permits issued from 2017 to 2019 and then annualize that growth rate.

not biasing the results since housing supply constraints should not be relevant when demand is not increasing or declining. Sixth, we examine growth in rents instead of house prices. Seventh, we examine changes in commuting times. Eighth, we examine housing quantities again but using variation in per capita income growth or in population growth to again address concerns that total income growth somehow biases our results. Finally, we check if our results are being driven by small cities. All of these results continue to show that supply constraints do not explain house price growth and housing quantity growth across cities since at least 1980.

5 What Can Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across Cities?

If supply constraints do not explain house price and quantity growth across cities, then how do we explain that house prices grew much faster and housing quantities grew much slower in say San Francisco than in Houston (2.4 vs 1% p.a. for prices, 0.6 vs 2.2% p.a. for quantities)? We argue that a model with two housing margins—quantity and quality—helps explain housing outcomes for these cities while also being consistent with other important features of the data. The intuition is the following: Labor demand shocks in San Francisco have tended to raise per capita income (2.2% p.a.), perhaps due to relatively inelastic labor supply, and so raised demand for housing quality, which pushes up prices but has little effect on the demand for housing units. In contrast, labor demand shocks in Houston have tended to increase employment with relatively little gain in per capita incomes (0.8% p.a.). Therefore per capita income, demand for housing quality, and house prices moved relatively little but housing quantities increased substantially.

In this framework, relative to the standard model of housing supply in Equation (3), there are two housing supply curves, one for housing quality and one for housing quantity:[26]

$$\widehat{q}_i^S = \psi_q \widehat{P}_{q,i},$$
$$\widehat{u}_i^S = \psi_u \widehat{P}_{u,i}.$$

where q is housing quality, u is housing quantity (units), ψ_q and ψ_u are the respective supply elasticities, and $\widehat{P}_{q,i}$ and $\widehat{P}_{u,i}$ are the respective prices of quality and quantity. We observe

[26] See also Section A2 for this model's implications for our empirical "intercept" term.

the constant-quality price so that the total price change is[27]

$$\widehat{P}_i = \widehat{P}_{q,i} + \widehat{P}_{u,i}.$$

Quality can encompass housing fixtures and house size, but also relatively fixed attributes such as an ocean view or access to specific schools.

In the two-margin model, a housing demand shock that raises the demand for housing quantity moves the housing market along the unit supply curve with elasticity ψ_u, resulting in higher quantities and prices. In contrast, a housing demand shock that raises only the demand for housing quality raises house prices without increasing quantity, seemingly implying a perfectly inelastic supply of housing quantity despite the true underlying unit elasticity still being ψ_q. Figure VIII illustrates this situation graphically and shows that because we can only observe the composite price $\widehat{P}_i$, the market for units will appear to have inelastic supply.

Consistent with this model, we find that per capita income growth and population growth imply very different housing unit supply curves. Table IX shows that the unit supply elasticity in Equation (7) is 0.2 when instrumenting with per capita income and 1.5 when instrumenting with population growth.[28] This is consistent with our results in Table II and Table VII, which show that per capita income growth is strongly correlated with prices but not quantities, and Table VIII which shows that unit growth is strongly correlated with population growth. Furthermore, as the panels in Figure IX show, San Francisco and Houston's price and quantity growth are almost exactly what one would expect given growth in per capita income and population. Of course, this does not mean that income and population growth explain all variation in prices and quantities. Expectations, wealth, amenities, changing taste, the income distribution and demographics will all affect housing markets in combination with average income and population growth. The key point is that with multiple margins of housing demand, unit supply curves may look very different depending on the composition of demand and irrespective of a city's regulatory environment.[29]

[27]Not holding quality constant would give a price change of $\widehat{P}_i = \widehat{P}_{q,i} + \widehat{P}_{u,i}\widehat{q}_i$. Thus, our formulation ignoring changes in quality actually minimizes the quality issue as it will appear in practice. Only a version of this final total price that includes quality changes tends to be observable to the econometrician as even quality-adjusted or repeat-sales indexes will struggle to capture renovations, changes in amenities, or changes in amenity valuation (Harding et al., 2007; Billings, 2015).

[28]An alternative explanation for these different coefficients is that they are differential biases from supply shocks. In Appendix A4 we show that this explanation requires supply shocks to be very large—multiple times more important than shocks to per capita income. We call this arithmetic "unpleasant" as we are not aware of work that argues for a prominent role of housing supply shocks (as opposed to different elasticities) explaining house price growth and housing quantity growth across cities.

[29]We show in Section A5 that this presents first order difficulties for the standard approaches to estimating unit supply elasticities.

6 Conclusion

This paper revisits the standard view that local housing supply constraints explain differences in local house price and quantity growth. We estimate how shifts in income growth and exogenous housing demand shocks translate into changes in house prices and quantities across U.S. cities measured to be more or less constrained in their housing supply. Contrary to prevailing beliefs and influential narratives, our empirical results consistently show that higher income growth predicts similar growth in house prices, rents, housing quantities, population, and living space per person across more and less housing constrained cities. These results imply that differences in housing supply elasticities across U.S. cities are quantitatively not important for explaining differences in house price and quantity growth. Instead, our evidence suggests that housing supply functions are broadly similar across most metro areas despite very different regulatory and geographic environments, challenging the consensus that relaxing regulatory constraints would substantially expand housing quantities and lower prices.

These results call for a reevaluation of our understanding of housing markets and housing supply, echoing the call by DiPasquale (1999) more than 25 years ago. We think there are a number of potentially fruitful directions going forward. First, the fact that per capita income growth is strongly correlated with price growth but barely correlated with quantity growth points to multiple margins of housing consumption, namely consumption of quality (or amenities) as well as the consumption of units of a given quality. We are pursuing this direction and give examples of this framework in Section A2 and Louie et al. (2025c). In this kind of framework, growth in per capita incomes will raise prices because richer households have more income to spend on high-value housing, but this income growth need not induce any growth in units since richer households do not want to consume additional units of housing in the same city. In fact, unevenly distributed income growth may even reduce population growth if the price growth of local services (including housing) caused by income growth at the top prices out lower-income households. Frameworks that only include one margin of housing demand and supply are likely obscuring critical mechanisms in the housing market. Moreover, if multiple margins are an important feature of housing markets, then standard approaches to estimate supply elasticities will generally not recover the objects of interest (see Section A5).

A second promising avenue that we are pursuing focuses on differences in the labor market and labor supply across metro areas. From the perspective of standard labor market models, the difference in house price growth and housing quantities across cities like San Francisco and Houston may reflect important differences in labor supply elasticities. Some cities, like San

Francisco, are home to high-productivity jobs where top workers are very difficult to recruit, thus resulting in very high wages.[30] Other cities may also be home to high-productivity industries, but if appropriately-skilled workers in these industries are relatively more plentiful so that labor supply is relatively higher, then there will tend to be less growth in average incomes and more growth in employment and so population. These mechanisms reinforce the core insight of local labor market models, which is that housing and labor markets are fundamentally connected, and indicate that the distribution of productivity gains may be a critical factor for understanding housing market trends.

Bibliography

Albouy, David and Bryan A Stuart, "Urban population and amenities: The neoclassical model of location," *International economic review*, 2020, *61* (1), 127–158.

Anenberg, Elliot and Edward Kung, "Can more housing supply solve the affordability crisis? Evidence from a neighborhood choice model," *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 2020, *80*, 103363.

Angrist, Joshua D and Alan B Krueger, "Instrumental variables and the search for identification: From supply and demand to natural experiments," *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 2001, *15* (4), 69–85.

Aura, Saku and Thomas Davidoff, "Supply constraints and housing prices," *Economics Letters*, 2008, *99* (2), 275–277.

Barrero, José María, Nicholas Bloom, and Steven J Davis, "The evolution of work from home," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2023, *37* (4), 23–49.

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel, "Constraints on city and neighborhood growth: The central role of housing supply," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2023, *37* (2), 53–74.

_ **and Lu Han**, "The microgeography of housing supply," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2024, *132* (6), 1897–1946.

Been, Vicki, Ingrid Gould Ellen, and Katherine O'Regan, "Supply skepticism: Housing supply and affordability," *Housing Policy Debate*, 2019, *29* (1), 25–40.

Bick, Alexander, Adam Blandin, and Karel Mertens, "Work from home before and after the COVID-19 outbreak," *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2023, *15* (4), 1–39.

Billings, Stephen B, "Hedonic amenity valuation and housing renovations," *Real Estate Economics*, 2015, *43* (3), 652–682.

[30] At the time of writing there are reports that Mark Zuckerberg is offering compensation of up to $100 million dollars to top AI engineers within their first year of employment.

Buchholz, Maximilian, Tom Kemeny, Gregory F Randolph, and Michael Storper, "Inequality, not regulation, drives America's housing affordability crisis," 2026.

Chodorow-Reich, Gabriel, Adam M Guren, and Timothy J McQuade, "The 2000s housing cycle with 2020 hindsight: A neo-kindlebergerian view," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2024, *91* (2), 785–816.

Council of Economic Advisers, *Economic Report of the President*, Council of Economic Advisers, 2024.

Davidoff, Thomas, "Supply Elasticity and the Housing Cycle of the 2000s," *Real Estate Economics*, 2013, *41* (4), 793–813.

_ , "Supply Constraints Are Not Valid Instrumental Variables for Home Prices Because They Are Correlated With Many Demand Factors," *Critical Finance Review*, 2016, *5* (2), 177–206.

Davis, Morris A and François Ortalo-Magné, "Household expenditures, wages, rents," *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 2011, *14* (2), 248–261.

_ **and Michael G Palumbo**, "The price of residential land in large US cities," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2008, *63* (1), 352–384.

_ **, William D Larson, Stephen D Oliner, and Jessica Shui**, "The price of residential land for counties, ZIP codes, and census tracts in the United States," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2021, *118*, 413–431.

Diamond, Rebecca, "The determinants and welfare implications of US workers' diverging location choices by skill: 1980–2000," *American economic review*, 2016, *106* (3), 479–524.

_ **and Cecile Gaubert**, "Spatial sorting and inequality," *Annual Review of Economics*, 2022, *14* (1), 795–819.

_ **and Tim McQuade**, "Who wants affordable housing in their backyard? An equilibrium analysis of low-income property development," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2019, *127* (3), 1063–1117.

DiPasquale, Denise, "Why don't we know more about housing supply?," *The Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics*, 1999, *18* (1), 9–23.

_ **and William C Wheaton**, "Housing market dynamics and the future of housing prices," *Journal of urban economics*, 1994, *35* (1), 1–27.

Freemark, Yonah, "Zoning change: Upzonings, downzonings, and their impacts on residential construction, housing costs, and neighborhood demographics," *Journal of Planning Literature*, 2023, *38* (4), 548–570.

Furth, Salim, "Response to Louie, Mondragon, Wieland," Technical Report 2025.

Ganong, Peter and Daniel Shoag, "Why has regional income convergence in the US declined?," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2017, *102*, 76–90.

Gaubert, Cecile, "Firm sorting and agglomeration," *American Economic Review*, 2018, *108* (11), 3117–3153.

Glaeser, Edward and Joseph Gyourko, "The economic implications of housing supply," *Journal of economic perspectives*, 2018, *32* (1), 3–30.

Glaeser, Edward L and Joseph Gyourko, "The Impact of Building Restrictions on Housing Affordability," *Economic Policy Review*, 2003, *9* (2).

_ and _, "Urban decline and durable housing," *Journal of political economy*, 2005, *113* (2), 345–375.

_ and _, "America's Housing Supply Problem: The Closing of the Suburban Frontier?," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2025.

_ , _ , and Raven E Saks, "Why have housing prices gone up?," *American Economic Review*, 2005, *95* (2), 329–333.

_ , _ , and _, "Urban growth and housing supply," *Journal of economic geography*, 2006, *6* (1), 71–89.

Goolsbee, Austan and Chad Syverson, "The strange and awful path of productivity in the US construction sector," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2023.

Gorback, Caitlin S and Benjamin J Keys, "Global capital and local assets: House prices, quantities, and elasticities," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2020.

Green, Richard K, Stephen Malpezzi, and Stephen K Mayo, "Metropolitan-specific estimates of the price elasticity of supply of housing, and their sources," *American Economic Review*, 2005, *95* (2), 334–339.

Guren, Adam, Alisdair McKay, Emi Nakamura, and Jón Steinsson, "What do we learn from cross-regional empirical estimates in macroeconomics?," *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 2021, *35* (1), 175–223.

Guren, Adam M, Alisdair McKay, Emi Nakamura, and Jón Steinsson, "Housing wealth effects: The long view," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2021, *88* (2), 669–707.

Gyourko, Joseph, "Housing supply," *Annu. Rev. Econ.*, 2009, *1* (1), 295–318.

_ , Albert Saiz, and Anita Summers, "A new measure of the local regulatory environment for housing markets: The Wharton Residential Land Use Regulatory Index," *Urban studies*, 2008, *45* (3), 693–729.

_ **and Raven Molloy**, "Regulation and housing supply," in "Handbook of regional and urban economics," Vol. 5, Elsevier, 2015, pp. 1289–1337.

_ **, Christopher Mayer, and Todd Sinai**, "Superstar cities," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2013, *5* (4), 167–199.

_ **, Jonathan S Hartley, and Jacob Krimmel**, "The local residential land use regulatory environment across US housing markets: Evidence from a new Wharton index," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2021, *124*, 103337.

Hanushek, Eric A and John M Quigley, "What is the price elasticity of housing demand?," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1980, pp. 449–454.

Harding, John P, Stuart S Rosenthal, and Clemon F Sirmans, "Depreciation of housing capital, maintenance, and house price inflation: Estimates from a repeat sales model," *Journal of urban Economics*, 2007, *61* (2), 193–217.

Howard, Greg and Jack Liebersohn, "Why is the rent so darn high? The role of growing demand to live in housing-supply-inelastic cities," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2021, *124*, 103369.

_ **,** _ **, and Adam Ozimek**, "The short-and long-run effects of remote work on US housing markets," *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2023, *150* (1), 166–184.

Hsieh, Chang-Tai and Enrico Moretti, "Housing constraints and spatial misallocation," *American economic journal: macroeconomics*, 2019, *11* (2), 1–39.

Kmetz, Augustus, John Mondragon, and Johannes F Wieland, "Measuring Work from Home in the Cross Section," in "AEA Papers and Proceedings," Vol. 113 American Economic Association 2014 Broadway, Suite 305, Nashville, TN 37203 2023, pp. 614–618.

Kok, Nils, Paavo Monkkonen, and John M Quigley, "Land use regulations and the value of land and housing: An intra-metropolitan analysis," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2014, *81*, 136–148.

Li, Xiaodi, "Do new housing units in your backyard raise your rents?," *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2022, *22* (6), 1309–1352.

Louie, Schuyler, John Mondragon, and Johannes Wieland, "Frequently Asked Questions About and Comments On 'Supply Constraints Do Not Explain House Price And Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities'," 2025.

_ **,** _ **, and** _ , "Group-Specific Bias in IV Estimates of Housing Supply Elasticity," 2025.

_ **,** _ **, and** _ , "Response to Furth (2025)," 2025.

McClure, Kirk and Alex Schwartz, "Where Is the Housing Shortage?," *Housing Policy Debate*, 2025, *35* (1), 49–63.

Molloy, Raven, "The effect of housing supply regulation on housing affordability: A review," *Regional science and urban economics*, 2020, *80* (C), 1–5.

_ , Charles G Nathanson, and Andrew Paciorek, "Housing supply and affordability: Evidence from rents, housing consumption and household location," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2022, *129*, 103427.

Mondragon, John A and Johannes Wieland, "Housing demand and remote work," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2025.

Moretti, Enrico, "Local labor markets," in "Handbook of labor economics," Vol. 4, Elsevier, 2011, pp. 1237–1313.

Murray, Cameron K, "Marginal and average prices of land lots should not be equal: A critique of Glaeser and Gyourko's method for identifying residential price effects of town planning regulations," *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 2021, *53* (1), 191–209.

Paciorek, Andrew, "Supply constraints and housing market dynamics," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2013, *77*, 11–26.

Pendall, Rolf, Lydia Lo, and Jake Wegmann, "Shifts toward the extremes: Zoning change in major US Metropolitan areas from 2003 to 2019," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 2022, *88* (1), 55–66.

Pennington, Kate, "Does building new housing cause displacement?: The supply and demand effects of construction in San Francisco," *The Supply and Demand Effects of Construction in San Francisco (June 15, 2021)*, 2021.

Rodríguez-Pose, Andrés and Michael Storper, "Housing, urban growth and inequalities: The limits to deregulation and upzoning in reducing economic and spatial inequality," *Urban Studies*, 2020, *57* (2), 223–248.

_ and _ , "Dodging the burden of proof: A reply to Manville, Lens and Mönkkönen," *Urban Studies*, 2022, *59* (1), 59–74.

Saiz, Albert, "The geographic determinants of housing supply," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2010, *125* (3), 1253–1296.

_ , "The global housing affordability crisis: Policy options and strategies," *MIT Center for Real Estate Research Paper*, 2023, (23/01).

_ , "Long Run Housing Supply: Role, Determinants, and Measurement," 2024.

Saks, Raven E, "Job creation and housing construction: Constraints on metropolitan area employment growth," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 2008, *64* (1), 178–195.

Smith, Adam, *The wealth of nations* 1776.

Stephen, Mayo et al., "Theory and estimation in the economics of housing demand," *Journal of Urban Economics*, 1981, *10*, 95–116.


Stepner, Michael, "BINSCATTER: Stata module to generate binned scatterplots," 2013.

Sveikauskas, Leo, Samuel Rowe, and James D Mildenberger, "Measuring productivity growth in construction," *Monthly Lab. Rev.*, 2018, *141*, 1.


Wiebe, Michael, "Comment on "Supply Constraints do not Explain House Price and Quantity Growth Across U.S. Cities"," 2025.

Zahirovich-Herbert, Velma and Karen M Gibler, "The effect of new residential construction on housing prices," *Journal of Housing Economics*, 2014, *26*, 1–18.


Figures



A. Effect of Income Growth




B. Effect with Correlated Demand Shocks



C. Effect with Correlated Supply Shocks

FIGURE I
Price, Quantity and Income Growth in Two Cities



A. Elasticity (Saiz, 2010)


B. Elasticity (Baum-Snow and Han, 2024)

C. Regulatory Index (Gyourko et al., 2008)

D. Building Share of Value (Davis et al., 2021)

FIGURE II
House Price Growth and Housing Constraints (2000-2020)

NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into ventiles of each measure of housing constraints and then reports the mean growth in real house prices. We multiply the regulatory index by minus one so that regulations are becoming more relaxed as it increases and we calculate the building share of value by subtracting the land share of value from one.



A. Elasticity
(Saiz, 2010)


B. Elasticity
(Baum-Snow and Han, 2024)

C. Regulatory Index
(Gyourko et al., 2008)

D. Building Share of Value
(Davis et al., 2021)


FIGURE III
Housing Quantity Growth and Housing Constraints (2000-2020)

NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into ventiles of each measure of housing constraints and then reports the mean growth of housing units. We multiply the regulatory index by minus one so that regulations are becoming more relaxed as it increases. We calculate building share of value by subtracting the land share of value from one.




NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into ventiles of house quantity growth and then reports the mean growth of real house prices against the mean growth of housing quantities within each bin.


FIGURE IV
House Price and Quantity Growth (2000-2020)




A. Elasticity
(Saiz, 2010)



B. Elasticity
(Baum-Snow and Han, 2024)




C. Regulatory Index
(Gyourko et al., 2008)




D. Land Share of Value
(Davis et al., 2021)

FIGURE V
House Price and Income Growth


NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into groups above and below the relevant measure of local housing markets and then reports the mean growth of real house prices and total income for ventiles of each group. The lines give the linear fit within each group.




A. Elasticity
(Saiz, 2010)



B. Elasticity
(Baum-Snow and Han, 2024)




C. Regulatory Index
(Gyourko et al., 2008)




D. Land Share of Value
(Davis et al., 2021)

FIGURE VI
House Quantity and Income Growth (2000-2020)


NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into groups above and below the relevant measure of local housing markets and then reports the mean growth of housing units and total income within ventiles of each group. The lines give the linear fit within each group.




A. Elasticity
(Saiz, 2010)



B. Elasticity
(Baum-Snow and Han, 2024)




C. Regulatory Index
(Gyourko et al., 2008)




D. Land Share of Value
(Davis et al., 2021)

FIGURE VII
House Quantity and Real House Price Growth (2000-2020)

NOTE.—This figure splits MSAs into groups above and below the relevant measure of local housing markets and then reports the mean growth of real house prices and housing units within ventiles of each group. The lines give the linear fit within each group. Note that the slopes of these curves are the inverse elasticities of housing supply.



A. Market for Quality




B. Market for Units

FIGURE VIII
Housing Market as Demand for Quality Increases



A. Per Capita Income Growth and Prices



B. Quantity Growth and Population Growth

NOTE.—The top panel plots real house price growth against per capita income growth along with the linear regression line. The bottom panel plots housing quantity growth against population growth along with the linear regression line.

FIGURE IX
Houston and San Francisco

Tables

TABLE I

SUMMARY STATISTICS

	Observations	Mean	SD	25th Pct	50th Pct	75th Pct
Panel A. 2000-2020						
Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)	321	1.23	1.04	0.46	1.18	1.98
Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)	321	1.44	1.00	0.77	1.36	2.22
Real Rent Growth (Annualized %)	321	0.95	0.64	0.50	0.90	1.45
Real Total Income Growth (Annualized %)	323	2.06	0.91	1.32	1.98	2.64
House Quantity Growth (Annualized %)	323	1.01	0.65	0.54	0.91	1.37
Population Growth (Annualized %)	323	0.81	0.74	0.26	0.71	1.26
Change in Average Rooms per Person	321	0.33	0.17	0.22	0.34	0.44
Panel B. 1980-2020						
Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)	321	0.97	0.91	0.28	0.90	1.55
Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)	321	1.13	0.67	0.66	1.08	1.57
Real Rent Growth (Annualized %)	163	1.06	0.55	0.61	1.02	1.47
Real Total Income Growth (Annualized %)	323	2.50	0.98	1.82	2.44	3.08
House Quantity Growth (Annualized %)	322	1.26	0.75	0.72	1.18	1.67
Population Growth (Annualized %)	323	0.98	0.86	0.34	0.94	1.50
Change in Average Rooms per Person	163	0.56	0.25	0.38	0.58	0.75
Panel C. 1980-2000						
Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)	321	0.71	1.32	-0.22	0.60	1.46
Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)	323	0.81	0.89	0.26	0.79	1.27
Real Rent Growth (Annualized %)	163	1.07	0.75	0.67	1.20	1.46
Real Total Income Growth (Annualized %)	323	2.95	1.26	2.05	2.91	3.71
House Quantity Growth (Annualized %)	322	1.51	0.93	0.85	1.44	1.95
Population Growth (Annualized %)	323	1.14	1.06	0.38	1.03	1.77
Change in Average Rooms per Person	163	0.24	0.17	0.14	0.27	0.36

This table reports summary statistics for the primary variables in our analysis across all cities with at least one constraint measure. See the text for more details.

TABLE II

House Price Growth (2000-2020)

Panel A. Total Income Growth				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.004	0.052	-0.097	-0.053
	(0.120)	(0.111)	(0.119)	(0.113)
Income Growth	0.553***	0.589***	0.607***	0.619***
	(0.098)	(0.078)	(0.094)	(0.089)
Less Constrained	-0.868***	-0.438*	-0.504*	-0.496**
	(0.262)	(0.237)	(0.262)	(0.246)
R2	0.48	0.34	0.42	0.37
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Per Capita Income Growth				
Less Constrained × Per Capita Income Growth	0.158	-0.162	-0.218	-0.222
	(0.253)	(0.248)	(0.268)	(0.232)
Per Capita Income Growth	0.984***	1.284***	1.139***	1.252***
	(0.178)	(0.187)	(0.163)	(0.170)
Less Constrained	-1.120***	-0.263	-0.492	-0.381
	(0.335)	(0.328)	(0.354)	(0.312)
R2	0.41	0.27	0.34	0.32
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel C. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Population Growth	0.061	0.117	-0.001	0.067
	(0.130)	(0.131)	(0.137)	(0.139)
Population Growth	0.460***	0.498***	0.494***	0.483***
	(0.102)	(0.090)	(0.107)	(0.110)
Less Constrained	-0.992***	-0.401**	-0.788***	-0.677***
	(0.158)	(0.158)	(0.168)	(0.166)
R2	0.38	0.20	0.32	0.24
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306

This table reports estimates of house price growth regressed on total income growth (panel A), per capita income growth (panel B), or population growth (panel C) and an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the indicator with the respective growth measure. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE III

House Quantity Growth (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.027	-0.015	0.110**	-0.012
	(0.046)	(0.048)	(0.049)	(0.050)
Income Growth	0.642***	0.635***	0.597***	0.630***
	(0.033)	(0.030)	(0.034)	(0.032)
Less Constrained	0.026	-0.001	-0.133	0.018
	(0.089)	(0.090)	(0.093)	(0.095)
R2	0.79	0.77	0.80	0.76
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.002	0.001	0.091*	0.005
	(0.052)	(0.051)	(0.053)	(0.054)
Income Growth	0.755***	0.717***	0.709***	0.710***
	(0.041)	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.038)
Less Constrained	0.027	-0.088	-0.137	-0.032
	(0.104)	(0.098)	(0.104)	(0.104)
R2	0.81	0.80	0.82	0.78
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.017	0.003	0.004	-0.013
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.019)
Income Growth	-0.055***	-0.043***	-0.046***	-0.031**
	(0.012)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.014)
Less Constrained	0.020	0.072*	0.070*	0.090**
	(0.040)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.041)
R2	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.08
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE IV

Housing Supply Elasticity Estimates (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	1.161***	1.078***	0.984***	1.018***
	(0.216)	(0.168)	(0.183)	(0.170)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	1.216***	0.965***	1.383***	1.088***
	(0.175)	(0.133)	(0.201)	(0.159)
Less Constrained	1.058***	0.447	0.443	0.547*
	(0.405)	(0.280)	(0.356)	(0.313)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.84	0.60	0.14	0.76
F-stat More Constrained	31.63	56.74	41.70	48.41
F-stat Less Constrained	64.92	66.03	48.12	65.23
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	1.112***	0.888***	0.905***	1.047***
	(0.204)	(0.127)	(0.154)	(0.183)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	1.064***	0.985***	1.251***	0.922***
	(0.113)	(0.142)	(0.145)	(0.129)
Less Constrained	0.778**	0.108	0.045	0.534
	(0.386)	(0.270)	(0.321)	(0.349)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.84	0.61	0.10	0.57
F-stat More Constrained	30.53	57.69	44.37	37.14
F-stat Less Constrained	111.82	74.86	66.61	81.47
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth regressed on house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B), where price growth is interacted with an indicator for being less constrained (above median). We instrument for house price growth with growth in total income interacted with the same constraint indicator. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE V

Housing Supply Elasticity Estimates with Alternative Instruments (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	0.694***	0.636***	0.479***	0.526***
	(0.132)	(0.120)	(0.098)	(0.097)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	0.513***	0.309***	0.811***	0.452***
	(0.126)	(0.107)	(0.190)	(0.107)
Less Constrained	0.741***	0.491**	0.044	0.349*
	(0.242)	(0.197)	(0.219)	(0.179)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.32	0.04	0.12	0.60
F-stat More Constrained	15.66	18.58	21.09	17.53
F-stat Less Constrained	17.22	13.29	8.20	19.21
Number of Observations	268	308	268	304
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	0.532***	0.503***	0.398***	0.502***
	(0.100)	(0.086)	(0.080)	(0.096)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	0.550***	0.435***	0.701***	0.444***
	(0.093)	(0.107)	(0.107)	(0.089)
Less Constrained	0.277	0.175	-0.219	0.211
	(0.197)	(0.185)	(0.180)	(0.185)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.90	0.62	0.02	0.65
F-stat More Constrained	23.76	27.80	23.24	19.71
F-stat Less Constrained	20.47	12.83	24.13	30.07
Number of Observations	267	309	267	305

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth regressed on house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B), where price growth is interacted with an indicator for being less constrained (above median). We instrument for house price growth with average July humidity, January temperature, and an employment Bartik shock all interacted with the same constraint indicator. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE VI

Effect of Work from Home Shock

	Saiz		BS-H		WRLURI		Building	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A. Total Income Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		0.082		0.146		0.325***		0.024
		(0.115)		(0.098)		(0.115)		(0.104)
WFH Shock	0.437***	0.455***	0.407***	0.366***	0.437***	0.357***	0.381***	0.408***
	(0.056)	(0.083)	(0.050)	(0.078)	(0.056)	(0.078)	(0.048)	(0.074)
Less Constrained		-0.017		-0.290		-0.812*		0.132
		(0.460)		(0.388)		(0.443)		(0.404)
R2	0.25	0.26	0.22	0.24	0.25	0.30	0.20	0.21
Number of Observations	269	269	310	310	269	269	308	308
Panel B. House Price Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		0.122		0.110		0.633***		0.203
		(0.228)		(0.213)		(0.232)		(0.229)
WFH Shock	0.344***	0.252	0.401***	0.401**	0.344***	0.086	0.449***	0.375**
	(0.116)	(0.161)	(0.108)	(0.162)	(0.116)	(0.162)	(0.107)	(0.157)
Less Constrained		-0.770		0.081		-2.382***		-0.751
		(0.917)		(0.825)		(0.893)		(0.902)
R2	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.08	0.08	0.08
Number of Observations	268	268	308	308	268	268	306	306
Panel C. Cumulative Permit Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		0.747		0.886		0.168		1.331
		(0.793)		(0.710)		(0.708)		(0.834)
WFH Shock	1.006***	0.951*	0.842**	0.623	1.006***	1.096*	0.841**	0.873*
	(0.373)	(0.501)	(0.368)	(0.468)	(0.373)	(0.566)	(0.387)	(0.522)
Less Constrained		-1.547		-1.447		0.602		-1.715
		(3.069)		(2.889)		(2.964)		(3.375)
R2	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.06
Number of Observations	269	269	310	310	269	269	308	308

This table reports estimates of total income growth (panel A), house price growth (panel B), and permit growth (panel B) regressed on a measure of exposure to WFH, an indicator for being less constrained (above median), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE VII

House Quantity Growth and Per Capita Income Growth (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Per Capita Income Growth	0.308	-0.030	0.189	0.110
	(0.226)	(0.193)	(0.232)	(0.187)
Per Capita Income Growth	0.093	0.309**	0.140	0.212
	(0.183)	(0.148)	(0.152)	(0.137)
Less Constrained	-0.459	-0.084	-0.333	-0.207
	(0.283)	(0.244)	(0.285)	(0.240)
R2	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Per Capita Income Growth	0.335	-0.015	0.131	0.175
	(0.249)	(0.211)	(0.265)	(0.207)
Per Capita Income Growth	0.070	0.312**	0.151	0.173
	(0.202)	(0.152)	(0.162)	(0.147)
Less Constrained	-0.572*	-0.168	-0.343	-0.311
	(0.316)	(0.273)	(0.327)	(0.270)
R2	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Per Capita Income Growth	0.079	-0.000	0.024	0.002
	(0.050)	(0.045)	(0.052)	(0.046)
Per Capita Income Growth	-0.096***	-0.058*	-0.063**	-0.039
	(0.028)	(0.034)	(0.030)	(0.033)
Less Constrained	-0.034	0.086	0.057	0.063
	(0.063)	(0.058)	(0.063)	(0.058)
R2	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.05
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on per capita income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index from Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value from Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE VIII

House Quantity Growth and Population Growth (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Population Growth	0.033	-0.019	0.031	-0.008
	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.027)	(0.025)
Population Growth	0.840***	0.876***	0.838***	0.867***
	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.021)	(0.020)
Less Constrained	0.025	0.057***	0.022	0.018
	(0.023)	(0.022)	(0.024)	(0.024)
R2	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.94
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Population Growth	-0.006	0.005	-0.002	-0.024
	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.021)
Population Growth	-0.046***	-0.047***	-0.045***	-0.032**
	(0.015)	(0.013)	(0.015)	(0.015)
Less Constrained	0.064**	0.072***	0.086***	0.083***
	(0.025)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.024)
R2	0.09	0.10	0.12	0.08
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and the change in average rooms per person (panel B) regressed on population growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index from Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value from Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE IX

Varying Housing Supply Elasticity Estimates (2000-2020)

	(1)	(2)
Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)		
Price Growth	0.215***	1.506***
	(0.081)	(0.178)
F-stat	92.28	75.00
Number of Observations	321	321

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth regressed on house price growth where price growth is instrumented with per capita income (1) and population (2) growth. See the text for more details.

Appendix

A1 Model Appendix

Here we show that the housing demand curve in Section 2 nests both a general dynamic housing model, as well as a general spatial equilibrium housing model. We also show that the standard spatial equilibrium/local labor markets model validates our use of total income as an explanatory regressor.

A1.1 Dynamic Housing Model

Consider an infinitely lived representative household that chooses sequences of non–housing consumption $\{C_{it}\}$ and next–period housing stock $\{H_{i,t+1}\}$ to maximize expected intertemporal utility

$$\max_{\{C_{it},H_{i,t+1}\}} E_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t \Big[(1-\alpha)\ln C_{it} + \alpha \ln H_{it}\Big],$$

subject to the flow budget constraint

$$A_{i,t+1} = (1+r_t)\big[A_{it} + Y_{it} - P_{it}\{H_{i,t+1} - (1-\delta)H_{it}\} - C_{it}\big],$$

where A_{it} is the stock of risk–free assets, r_t the real interest rate, Y_{it} labor income in location i, P_{it} the real price of one unit of housing services, and δ is the depreciation rate of housing.

Let λ_{it} be the Lagrange multiplier on the budget constraint. The intertemporal budget constraint is

$$A_{it} = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \frac{C_{i,t+s} + P_{i,t+s}\{H_{i,t+1+s} - (1-\delta)H_{i,t+s}\} - Y_{i,t+s}}{\prod_{k=1}^{s}(1+r_k)}$$

The First Order Conditions are

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(i) Consumption:} \quad & \lambda_{it} = \frac{1-\alpha}{C_{it}}, \\
\text{(ii) Consumption Euler:} \quad & \lambda_{it} = \beta(1+r_t)E_t\lambda_{i,t+1}, \\
\text{(iii) Housing Euler:} \quad & \frac{\alpha}{H_{i,t+1}} = P_{it}\lambda_t - \beta E_t\left[(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1}\lambda_{t+1}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

We combine the two Euler equations,

$$\frac{\alpha}{H_{i,t+1}} = \lambda_t \left[P_{it} - \frac{(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1}}{1+r_t}\right]$$

$$\frac{1}{H_{i,t+1}} = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha C_{it}}\left[P_{it} - \frac{(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1}}{1+r_t}\right]$$
$$H_{i,t+1} = C_{it}\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left[P_{it} - \frac{(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1}}{1+r_t}\right]^{-1}$$
$$H_{i,t+1+s} = C_{i,t+s}\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left[P_{i,t+s} - \frac{(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1+s}}{1+r_{t+s}}\right]^{-1}$$
$$H_{i,t+1+s} = C_{it}\beta^s\prod_{k=1}^{s}(1+r_{t+k})\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\left[P_{i,t+s} - \frac{(1-\delta)P_{i,t+1+s}}{1+r_{t+s}}\right]^{-1}$$

Log-linearizing this equation around a steady-state yields,

$$-\hat{H}_{i,t+1} = \hat{\lambda}_{it} + \frac{1+r}{r+\delta}\hat{P}_{it} - \frac{1-\delta}{r+\delta}E_t\hat{P}_{i,t+1} + \frac{1-\delta}{r+\delta}\hat{r}_t$$

We next solve for $\hat{\lambda}$. Combining the Euler equations and consumption FOC with the intertemporal budget constraint yields,

$$C_{it} = \alpha(1-\beta)\left[A_{it} + (1-\delta)P_{it}H_{it} + \sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\frac{Y_{i,t+s}}{\prod_{k=1}^{s}(1+r_k)}\right]$$

Log-linearizing around a steady state with zero assets, $P_{it}=1$, and $\beta(1+r)=1$ yields,[31]

$$\hat{C}_{it} = \alpha(1-\beta)\hat{A}_{it} + \alpha(1-\beta)(1-\delta)\frac{C}{H}(\hat{P}_{it}+\hat{H}_{it}) + \alpha(1-\beta)\frac{Y}{C}\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\beta^s\hat{Y}_{i,t+s} - \alpha\beta\frac{Y}{C}\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\beta^s\hat{r}_{t+s}$$

Combine with the housing demand equation:

$$\hat{H}_{i,t+1} = \underbrace{-\left[\frac{1+r}{r+\delta} - \alpha(1-\beta)(1-\delta)\frac{C}{H}\right]}_{=\epsilon_p}\hat{P}_{it} + \underbrace{\alpha(1-\beta)\frac{Y}{C}}_{=\epsilon_y}\hat{Y}_{it}$$
$$\underbrace{+\alpha(1-\beta)\frac{Y}{C}\sum_{s=1}^{\infty}\beta^s\hat{Y}_{i,t+s} - \alpha\beta\frac{Y}{C}\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\beta^s\hat{r}_{t+s} + \frac{1-\delta}{r+\delta}E_t\hat{P}_{i,t+1} - \frac{1-\delta}{r+\delta}\hat{r}_t}_{=\theta_{1it}}$$
$$\underbrace{+\alpha(1-\beta)[\hat{A}_{it} + (1-\delta)\frac{C}{H}\hat{H}_{it}]}_{=\theta_{2it}}$$

[31] In steady state $C = \frac{(1-\alpha)(r+\delta)}{\alpha\delta(1+r)+(1-\alpha)(r+\delta)}Y$ and $H = \frac{\alpha(1+r)}{\alpha\delta(1+r)+(1-\alpha)(r+\delta)}Y$.

where the last two terms are both demand shocks, so that the entire expression is a special case of the demand equation in Section 2.

A1.2 Spatial Equilibrium Housing Model

Housing Demand

Assume that households in city i consume a non-housing good c and housing h (for an extension of this model that incorporated multiple margins of housing consumption see Louie et al. (2025c)). Household utility in city i is given by the Cobb-Douglas function (Davis and Ortalo-Magné, 2011)

$$U_i = (1-\alpha)\log(c_i) + \alpha\log(h_i).$$

Given a wage w_i and a city-specific cost of housing p_i, the budget constraint is $c_i + p_i h_i = w_i$. This implies that the per capita demand for housing is simply

$$h_i^D = \frac{\alpha w_i}{p_i}.$$

Let total population in city i be N_i. Then aggregate housing demand in that city is equal to

$$H_i^D = h_i^D N_i = \frac{\alpha w_i N_i}{p_i} = \frac{\alpha Y_i}{p_i} \tag{9}$$

where Y_i is total income in city i.

The linearized housing demand function for location i is therefore,

$$\widehat{H}_i = \underbrace{1}_{=\epsilon_y} \times \widehat{Y}_i - \underbrace{1}_{=\epsilon_p} \times \widehat{p}_i$$

which is a special case of the demand equation in Section 2. We next add the supply and labor market blocks to this model in order to show that the structural relationships between total income and housing market outcomes are appropriate empirical objects to quantify housing supply elasticities.

Housing Supply

The total supply of housing is given by the following supply function with city-specific elasticity ψ_i

$$H_i^S = p_i^{\psi_i}. \tag{10}$$

Labor Market

All workers provide one unit of labor so that there is no intensive margin of labor, but the number of workers depends on the real wage offered. For simplicity, assume there is some outside option (such as another region) so that if real wages are too low, more workers will simply take their outside option and leave the region. The labor supply curve is then given by the following where η is the labor supply elasticity between regions

$$N_i^s = \left(\frac{w_i}{p_i^\alpha}\right)^\eta.$$

Output (apart from housing) has the following production function with productivity shocks Z_i

$$Y_i = Z_i N_i^\gamma$$

So the total number of workers or population demanded is given as

$$w_i = Z_i \gamma (N_i^D)^{\gamma - 1}.$$

We do not solve for the total distribution of workers across locations as this is irrelevant for the questions at hand, but such a clearing condition across regions could be easily imposed.

Equilibrium

Equilibrium in the housing market means the total quantity of housing will match the total housing demand,

$$H_i^S = H_i^D = H_i. \tag{11}$$

Labor supply must equal labor demand

$$N_i^D = N_i^S = N_i. \tag{12}$$

We can linearize and re-arrange these conditions along with the equations above to get the following linearized equilibrium conditions, where hats represent deviations from the approximation point

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{h}_i &= \widehat{w}_i - \widehat{p}_i, \\
\psi_i \widehat{p}_i &= \widehat{H}_i, \\
\widehat{H}_i &= \widehat{h}_i + \widehat{N}_i, \\
\widehat{w}_i - \widehat{Z}_i &= (\gamma - 1)\widehat{N}_i, \\
\widehat{L}_i &= \eta(\widehat{w}_i - \alpha \widehat{p}_i).
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward to derive the relationships between prices and quantities and wages and total income growth, defined as $\widehat{Y}_i = \widehat{w}_i + \widehat{N}_i$.

$$\widehat{p}_i = \frac{1+\eta}{1+\alpha\eta+\psi_i}\widehat{w}_i, \tag{13}$$

$$\widehat{p}_i = \frac{1}{1+\psi_i}\widehat{Y}_i, \tag{14}$$

$$\widehat{H}_i = \psi_i \frac{1+\eta}{1+\alpha\eta+\psi_i}\widehat{w}_i, \tag{15}$$

$$\widehat{H}_i = \psi_i \frac{1}{1+\psi_i}\widehat{Y}_i. \tag{16}$$

Thus, simple regressions of prices or quantities on wage growth (per capita income) or total income growth will be straightforward functions of housing and labor supply elasticities and housing's expenditure share.[32] In fact, the total income specifications are *simpler* than the per capita specifications because they incorporate the endogenous response of population growth to housing supply's effects on prices. This means the resulting coefficients depend *only* on the supply elasticities. This is because (14) and (16) depend only on the supply curve (10) and the within-city housing demand curve (9), and are independent of the specific migration model. That is, these results are robust to any model of inter-city migration! Models with more general demand-side features will therefore give similar results.[33]

The intuition is simple: the fact that housing supply elasticities mediate population growth through differential price growth implies that the relationships between price and

[32] If groups of low and high elasticity cities have heterogeneous elasticities within each group, then this does not pose an issue for identification but instead gives our estimates a heterogeneous treatment effect interpretation (Louie et al., 2025b).

[33] For example, with non-homothetic CES preferences, aggregate housing demand is $\widehat{H}_i^D = -\epsilon_p \widehat{p}_i + \epsilon_Y \widehat{Y}_i$, which combined with the supply equation yields the equilibrium prices and quantities $\widehat{p}_i = \frac{\epsilon_Y}{\epsilon_p+\psi_i}\widehat{Y}_i$ and $\widehat{H}_i = \psi_i \frac{\epsilon_Y}{\epsilon_p+\psi_i}\widehat{Y}_i$, see Section 2 (equations 1 and 2 with shocks set to zero).

quantity growth and total income growth will be observably different. That is, the same population growth should lead to *more* price growth and *less* quantity growth in relatively inelastic areas *because* population growth is a function of housing supply elasticities.

Note that the labor demand function is not actually needed for these derivations. This points to a broader result that the relationships between housing market outcomes and measures of housing demand really only depend on the structure of the housing market (the local supply elasticity) and the structure of housing demand (incomes and labor supply).

A2 Understanding the Correlation of Measured Constraints with Prices

The central claim of the supply-centric view of housing is that differently sloped supply curves explain differential growth in prices and quantities. We document that the interaction of income growth and supply constraints does not predict differential growth in prices or quantities, which is inconsistent with this view. However, in some of our results, especially the estimates using the Saiz elasticity, we do find a correlation between prices and constraints, with less-constrained cities appearing to have less price growth. We call this correlation the "intercept" term for brevity. Nevertheless, the reader may still harbor discomfort about how the relatively large intercept term in some specifications can be consistent with our central claim that differential supply constraints do not explain differential price and quantity growth.

We first demonstrate that this term is not evidence of different supply elasticities, but rather must point to large *shifts* in housing supply in more elastic cities. Intuitively, if supply elasticities are truly higher in cities that appear less constrained, then the differential price growth implies differential growth in housing quantities. However, there is no correlation between estimated elasticities and growth in quantities, and this fact can only be reconciled in the standard model by shifts in housing supply. If we take the Saiz estimates at face value, then the average shift in housing supply implied by the elasticity estimates and the standard framework is extremely large, equivalent to average growth in housing quantities overall. This implies that without these shifts in housing supply, overall growth in housing quantities would have been *essentially zero* in less-constrained cities. However, even with smaller elasticity estimates the core conclusion is that this intercept term can only point to shifts in supply functions, not differential elasticities because of the missing correlation with housing quantities.

We think these shifts in supply are problematic explanations of the data for a number of reasons. First, shifts in supply functions are not the central argument for why cities with elastic housing supply functions have lower prices and higher quantities. Instead the argument is that more- and less-elastic supply functions explain more and less growth in house prices and quantities. But that mechanism cannot explain these intercepts. Second, these implied shifts are far too large to be plausible, or at least they would imply enormous improvements in construction productivity that have not been documented.[34] Finally, this explanation requires a kind of epicyclic combination of shocks to supply: supply shocks

[34]Such magnitudes would be well beyond the trends discussed in Goolsbee and Syverson (2023) and those documented by Sveikauskas, Rowe and Mildenberger (2018).

uncorrelated with income growth must be *positively* correlated with elasticities to explain the intercept term, but it must also be the case that supply shocks correlated with income growth are *negatively* correlated with elasticities in order to explain our estimates of the interaction terms. It is unclear why the productivity of housing construction would have the opposite correlation with elasticities conditional on whether or not there is income growth present and to the best of our knowledge no theory with this kind of implication has been proposed in the literature. Therefore, we conclude this explanation is implausible.

Instead of these shifts in supply, we suggest that this term likely points to differential growth in the pricing of the underlying quality of housing, where quality is broadly understood as reflecting differences in physical characteristics such as an updated kitchen as well as local amenities such as a pleasant climate or wealthy neighbors (also see Section 5). If house prices are not perfectly adjusted for quality, so that the valuation of differences in both physical and amenity quality are captured in standard house price indexes, then this intercept term is easily explained by differential growth in housing quality. Intuitively, an increase in the demand for housing quality may then increase prices, but actually have no effect on the demand or supply of housing units, which would generate the intercept terms we find.

We believe this is a very plausible explanation of the intercept term. It is well-known that house price indexes are not, and likely cannot, be perfectly adjusted for differences in the quality of physical features and amenities across cities (Harding et al., 2007; Billings, 2015; Diamond, 2016) and that cities considered to be inelastic are also likely to have attractive amenities (Davidoff, 2016).[35] Additionally, our estimates show that per capita income growth is strongly correlated with growth in prices while it has no correlation with growth in the number of housing units (see Table II and Table VII), consistent with the discussion above. Therefore, if cities measured to be relatively inelastic actually are more exposed to increases in the demand for high-quality, high-amenity housing due to, for example, booming tech industry valuations that are not perfectly reflected in measured income growth, then this intercept term is exactly what one would expect to observe.

We next walk through the decomposition of the intercept term if we assume that the supply elasticities are truly different, then we make a simple extension to our standard framework to introduce a quality margin and show that how this can explain the intercept term without relying on implausible shifts in supply terms.

[35]Imagine that state-level funding improves for a school in a neighborhood. The improvement in school quality will translate into higher prices in the neighborhood, but quality-adjusted indexes will not correct for any of this change in the quality of local amenities.

A2.1 Decomposing the Intercept Term

We start with the reduced form solutions to the demand and supply, equations (4) and (5):

$$\widehat{P}_i = \frac{1}{\psi_i + \epsilon_p}(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \hat{\theta}_i) - \frac{1}{\psi_i + \epsilon_p}\widehat{\sigma}_i,$$
$$\widehat{H}_i = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i) + \frac{\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}{1 + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_i}}\widehat{\sigma}_i.$$

The intercept terms we want to understand come from the following regressions, reproduced from Section 2:

$$\widehat{P}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \widehat{Y}_i + \beta_2 \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + \beta_3 \widehat{Y}_i \times \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + e_i, \tag{A1}$$
$$\widehat{H}_i = \delta + \gamma_1 \widehat{Y}_i + \gamma_2 \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + \gamma_3 \widehat{Y}_i \times \mathbb{I}_i(\text{Less Constrained}) + v_i.$$

The coefficients β_2 and γ_2 give the relative growth in prices and quantities for more elastic cities ($j = H$), conditional on growth in income, relative to more constrained cities. So the two intercept terms can be decomposed into the following

$$\beta_2 = E\left[\frac{1}{\psi_H + \epsilon_p}(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i) - \frac{1}{\psi_H + \epsilon_p}\widehat{\sigma}_i \middle| \widehat{Y} = 0, j = H\right] - \underbrace{E\left[\widehat{P}_i | \widehat{Y} = 0, j = L\right]}_{=\alpha},$$
$$\gamma_2 = E\left[\frac{1}{1 + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_H}}(\epsilon_y \widehat{Y}_i + \widehat{\theta}_i) + \frac{\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_H}}{1 + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_H}}\widehat{\sigma}_i \middle| \widehat{Y} = 0, j = H\right] - \underbrace{E\left[\widehat{H}_i \middle| \widehat{Y} = 0, j = L\right]}_{=\delta}.$$

These expressions can be reduced to the following where, we simplify the notation so that $E[\widehat{\theta}_i | \widehat{Y}, j = H] \equiv E[\widehat{\theta}_{iYH}]$ and substitute in the constant terms from (A1):

$$\beta_2 + \alpha = \frac{1}{\psi_H + \epsilon_p}(E[\widehat{\theta}_{iYH}] - E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYH}]),$$
$$\gamma_2 + \delta = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_H}}(E[\widehat{\theta}_{iYH}] + \frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi_H}E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYH}]).$$

Given estimates of the intercept terms α, δ, β_2, and γ_2, we have two equations in two unknowns: the conditional expectations of demand and supply shocks. We can then solve for the conditional expectation of supply shocks in more elastic cities as a function of the supply elasticity and the estimates, where the demand shocks drop out

$$E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYH}] = \underbrace{\gamma_2 + \delta}_{\text{actual quantity growth}} - \underbrace{\psi_H(\beta_2 + \alpha),}_{\text{quantity growth implied by price growth}} \tag{A2}$$

This expression is nothing other than the supply function $\widehat{H}_i = \psi_i \widehat{P}_i + \sigma_i$ re-written in terms of the empirical estimates. So the conditional supply shocks are implied by the difference between realized growth in quantities and the growth in quantities consistent with the realized growth in prices and the supply elasticity. Thus, if there were positive growth in quantities, but no average price growth, then we would have to infer that less-constrained cities experienced positive supply shocks. Similarly, if the change in quantities was exactly what would be expected given the price growth and the average supply elasticity, then expected supply shocks would be zero and these intercepts would be strong evidence for the standard view of housing markets. Notice that we do not need to make any assumptions about the price or income elasticities as these demand-side factors merely rescale the demand shocks that move prices around.

Empirically, we estimate that $\psi_H = 3.56$ (Saiz, 2010), $\beta_2 = -0.868$, $\gamma_2 = 0.031$, , $\alpha = 0.52$ and $\delta = -0.34$ which implies that $E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYH}] \approx 0.93$. This implies that if less-constrained cities truly have high elasticity on average, then their observed price and quantity growth implies that less constrained cities experienced positive shocks to housing supply equivalent to a little less than 1% annualized increase in housing quantities over 20 years (that is, about 20% over 20 years).

Similarly, in less elastic cities, the average supply shock is

$$E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYL}] = \delta - \psi_L \alpha. \tag{A3}$$

Given an average $\psi_L = 1.51$ (Saiz, 2010), we obtain $E[\widehat{\sigma}_{iYL}] \approx -1.12$. Thus, more constrained cities experienced negative shocks to housing supply equivalent to a -1% annualized growth in housing quantities.

As we discussed above, there are a number of potential concerns with this explanation. First, the magnitude of this shock-driven growth is extraordinarily large. If relatively inelastic cities had not had such unfortunate supply shocks, then their growth in housing units would have been *double* the national average *despite* their low supply elasticity. Under this interpretation, it is unfortunate negative supply shocks, *not a low supply elasticity*, that is accounting for low unit growth in inelastic cities. Similarly, the supply shocks in less constrained cities are equivalent to the *average growth* in housing quantities across the entire sample, as well as the average within the sample of less constrained cities (see Table I). Therefore, these estimates imply that exogenous shifts in housing supply, not high elasticities, were responsible for *all* of the realized growth in housing quantities in elastic cities on average. Even if we thought the average elasticity in the less-constrained group was much smaller, say 2.5, it would still imply supply shocks equivalent to 50% of the realized growth

in housing quantities. In fact, we would need to assume the elasticity is about 1, 50% lower than the average estimated elasticity in the *more* constrained cities, in order for the intercept term to be consistent with estimated elasticities. This is simply too large to be credible. Setting aside these particular magnitudes, the central issue is that this intercept term requires differential supply shocks because there is no correlation between the elasticity measures and quantities. This is a fact that is fundamentally difficult to reconcile with differential supply elasticities in these groups of cities.

Second, these housing supply shocks *must* have the opposite correlation with supply elasticities as the correlation of supply shocks and elasticities necessary to explain the intercept results. That is, supply shocks must be more positively correlated with income growth in inelastic cities in order for the interaction term to be identical across cities. But here it must be the case that supply shocks uncorrelated with income growth (because it is conditioned out) are positively correlated with elasticities. It is unclear what economic mechanism would generate these patterns and, to the best of our knowledge, none has been proposed. Finally, it is important to point out that the standard argument is not that more elastic cities experience more positive productivity shocks to construction, but that their supply function is, over the long run, more elastic. That argument cannot explain the intercept terms.

A2.2 Alternative Explanation

Instead of relying on implausible supply shocks to supply curves, we introduce a simple and realistic extension of our basic framework in Section 2 to provide a plausible explanation of the intercept term. We also discuss this extension as an explanation for a broader set of results in Section 5 and as a problem for IV estimation in Section A5. First, we assume that there are two margins of housing consumption: the number of housing units u, and the quality of those housing units q. So the total quantity of housing produced and consumed is $H_i = q_i u_i$. Similarly, let P_i be the total price of housing, which is here the product of the prices for quality and units $P_i = P_{q,i} P_{u,i}$. Then the percentage change in the price of housing is given as $\widehat{p}_i = \widehat{p}_{q,i} + \widehat{p}_{u,i}$. Critically, we assume that we cannot perfectly observe housing quality. Even repeat-sales indexes will only imperfectly adjust for maintenance or renovations and they will not adjust at all for differences in amenities or amenity valuation. So in practice changes in the total price will reflect changes in the prices of both housing units and quality.

We then expand the demand side to reflect demand for quality and quantity by breaking apart total income into its components: per capita income y and population L. We assume, consistent with our estimates, that changes in per capita income do not affect the demand for the number of units and that changes in population do not affect the demand for quality,

consistent with our empirical results (see Table II, Table VII, and Table VIII).[36] Total housing demand and demand for each of the components is given by the following where $\theta_i \equiv \theta_{q,i} + \theta_{u,i}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{q}_i^D + \widehat{u}_i^D &= \epsilon_y \widehat{y}_i + \epsilon_L \widehat{L}_i - \epsilon_p \widehat{p}_i + \theta_i, \\
\widehat{q}_i^D &= \epsilon_y \widehat{y}_i - \epsilon_{p,q} \widehat{p}_{q,i} + \theta_{q,i}, \\
\widehat{u}_i^D &= \epsilon_n \widehat{N}_i - \epsilon_{p,u} \widehat{p}_{u,i} + \theta_{u,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The supply side has a parallel structure with distinct supply curves for the quality and number of units. If there are no supply shocks then we have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{q}_i^S &= \psi_{q,i} \widehat{p}_{q,i}, \\
\widehat{u}_i^S &= \psi_{u,i} \widehat{p}_{u,i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Equilibrium in each market is straightforward.

What is necessary to generate the intercept term in this extended framework? First, it must be the case that we cannot perfectly adjust prices for physical and amenity quality, so we only observe the total change in price. Then this framework will generate an intercept term whenever there are changes in the demand *for quality* that are correlated with measured constraints. This would be consistent with the arguments in Davidoff (2016), where features thought to make supply inelastic, like oceans or mountains, are also amenities attractive to high-income households.

We illustrate what happens if there is an unobserved increase in the demand for quality in Figure VIII. The shift in the demand for quality will increase the price and quantity of quality, but it will have no effect on the demand for units, and so it will not affect the price of units or the number of units. But, if we draw the equilibrium in units using the total price, then it will appear *as if* there is a vertical shift in the equilibrium, with prices increasing but no change in the number of units. So if there is some residual change in demand that is positively correlated with measures of constraints, for example if rich people prefer living in coastal areas or near other rich people, then the intercept term will easily appear in a way that is consistent with our empirical results.

Notice that this argument rests primarily on the fact that price indexes cannot perfectly adjust for quality and that constraint measures may be correlated with unobserved demand for quality. Actual supply curves do not need to shift for this explanation. Therefore, we

[36] We do not expect that these patterns would always be true as changes in per capita income can affect household formation at certain levels of income.

argue that the intercept 1) cannot be evidence of differential supply elasticities, and 2) may be additional evidence of the primary role of demand in driving variation in prices across housing markets.

A3 Robustness

In this section we describe in detail our robustness checks of the basic results in Section 4.

One important question is if the results that we document are unique to the years 2000 to 2020. In Table A5 we extend the sample to 1980 and run the reduced form price regressions. We still find that the constraints have no effect on the correlation between house prices and income growth. Table A7 turns to housing quantities and finds the same result: local constraints have no meaningful effect on the correlation between income growth and growth in housing quantities. Even the small effect of regulatory constraints on quantity growth found in Table III is not present in these estimates. The longer sample confirms that there is little evidence that housing supply constraints explain variation in housing quantity growth or house price growth at least since 1980.

A related concern might be that the supply elasticities had more relevance in the period before 2000, which would correspond with much of the sample used to estimate the elasticities from Saiz (2010) and Baum-Snow and Han (2024). To test for this possibility we restrict the sample to the years from 1980 to 2000 and run the same reduced form regressions. Table A6 reports the price results. Again we find no evidence that less constrained cities experience less house price growth, instead we even find in panel B that all the measures seem to increase the correlation between income growth and house prices, some even with statistical significance. Interestingly, the two house price measures display different correlations with income growth, with the house price index seemingly uncorrelated with income growth and with the constraint measures. This is in contrast with the median home value measure, which shows the standard correlations with both income and constraints, suggesting that the price index may have large measurement error in this earlier sample.

Table A8 turns to housing quantities and again finds no evidence that the constraints are associated with more growth in housing quantities. Consistent with panel B of Table A6, panel B shows that, by some measures, less constrained cities actually had less quantity and population growth for a given level of income growth. Low growth in population and high growth in prices is happening in the less constrained cities—the opposite of what the supply-centric view predicts.

Our results so far have focused on comparing cities above and below the median of the constraints measures. If supply constraints are the single most important factor affecting housing market dynamics, then this is likely sufficient to reveal these effects. However, these constraints are measured with noise, which may make it difficult to estimate effects, and it is theoretically possible that the economically meaningful effects are only apparent at the margins of the distribution (for example, by comparing Grand Forks, ND to San Francisco,

CA). It is also possible that discretizing the variable by the median reduces the statistical power of the analysis. To check for this possibility we re-run our baseline analyses, but this time we split cities into quartiles based on the measured constraints and then interact income growth with these quartiles. While the relatively small number of observations may mean this larger set of coefficients cannot be estimated precisely, it should still be capable of detecting economically important effects albeit with less precision. Table A9 reports the results for house prices and Table A10 does the same for house quantities. Once again, we find no evidence that income growth leads to lower house price growth even when comparing the most constrained quartile to the least constrained quartile. We also check this specification for prices and quantities in 1980 to 2020 (Table A11 and Table A12) and 1980 to 2000 (Table A13 and Table A14). None of these estimates show robust evidence that housing supply constraints matter as they should according to the supply-centric view and many of them feature the opposite relationship.

Though these results point overwhelmingly to the lack of any robust relationship between constraint measures and relative growth in prices or quantities, we also examine the interaction model where the constraint measures are included continuously. All of the constraint distributions but the Baum-Snow and Han elasticity are heavily skewed, which could result in continuous models being very misleading (in any direction) since they are particularly sensitive to outliers. But it might still be interesting if continuous interaction models give clear results in favor of the standard model. Table A15 presents the results for growth in house prices and median home values where we have standardized each constraint so that the coefficients can be interpreted as reflecting one standard deviation of the constraint measure, where one standard deviation is roughly equivalent to the difference in the Saiz elasticity estimates for San Francisco and Houston. All of the interaction terms have negative signs, which is consistent with the supply-centric view, but the magnitudes and precision vary wildly. The interaction on the Saiz elasticity is now statistically significant in both panels, but the economic magnitude is very small, implying that relaxing San Francisco's elasticity to Houston's level and assuming average growth in total incomes would reduce house prices in San Francisco by about 4%. Both the Baum-Snow and Han and building share estimates have economically larger coefficients in some specifications, but these coefficients are not mirrored in the other measure of house prices. This suggests the results are likely spurious. Additional evidence that the continuous measures are not economically important determinants of house price growth is the fact that the total amount of variation explained, given by the r-squared, changes minimally if at all when including the constraint measure as a continuous variable relative to the indicator specification (compare to Table A2).

However, one concern might be that the non-normal distributions of these constraints are

obscuring results that would be otherwise apparent, although our non-parametric specifications are evidence against this interpretation. To check further if this is the case, we winsorize the top and bottom of each distribution using the 5th and 95th percentiles. If extreme observations were having an undue influence on the linear specifications then this should lead to better behaved, more precise estimates. Table A16 gives the results, where we now see that there is no longer any evidence of even the tiny economic effect that was apparent in the Saiz estimate. The other estimates that were economically large in the previous table are now much smaller and the results are still not consistent across price measures. Therefore, continuous interaction models provide little evidence that these constraint measures are economically important determinants of variation in house price growth.

Table A17 reports the parallel results for measures of housing quantities. The Saiz elasticity now gives a statistically significant estimate on its interaction, but the economic magnitude is again miniscule: giving San Francisco the elasticity of Houston and assuming average income growth increases the total quantity of housing built over 20 years by about 40 basis points (in total!). We find the same positive but economically small coefficient on the regulatory index interaction as in our baseline results. The interaction term on the building share index is economically larger, although imprecisely estimated and still economically small. Table A16 applies the same winsorization as above and shows that these large estimates were spurious, with the interaction estimates now pointing to no economic difference. As with the price results, the sensitivity of these estimates to winsorization is evidence that the constraint measure distributions are heavily skewed and potentially subject to significant measurement error, suggesting that our baseline non-parametric approach is a more robust way to quantify these relationships.

Glaeser and Gyourko (2005) show that housing supply should be relatively inelastic as demand falls so that the housing supply curve is "kinked." Therefore, areas that are declining or growing very slowly will not be informative about the mechanisms we outline in Section 2, which apply only to increases in demand. To check if such low-growth cities are biasing our results, we drop the cities in the bottom quartile of the entire distribution of total income growth and re-run our baseline analysis. The price results are reported in Table A19 and finds broadly the same results, although some interaction estimates now have the wrong sign. Table A20 reports the quantity effects and again we find that measured constraints have no effect on the correlation with income. These results show that low-growth cities are not biasing our baseline estimates against finding large differences in supply elasticities.

It is possible that looking only at house prices may obscure important dynamics in the rental market if the purchase and rental housing markets are significantly segmented. Importantly, our quantity and population measures will capture growth across both rental and

purchase markets, so this can only be a potential concern with our price measures. Table A21 panel A replaces house prices with growth in median rents in our baseline specifications and finds again that the measured constraints do not affect how income growth predicts rent growth.[37] The correlations between income and median rent growth are about two-thirds the size of those between income and median home value growth. This does suggest some differences in composition between rental and purchase markets, but importantly these relationships never vary with measured constraints.

Another outcome where housing supply may be important is in the costs of housing quality or quality of life. While we try to capture this with the change in the number of rooms per person, another important outcome is how much time workers spend commuting to their jobs. Less regulated geographies may allow workers to live closer to their work or to efficient means of transportation, allowing them to spend less time commuting. Panel B of Table A21 uses the ACS to compute the change in the average commute time among employed individuals in each MSA.[38] Changes in commuting time are essentially uncorrelated with any of our explanatory variables, so it is not surprising that we also find that the relationship between income growth and commuting times is the same in more- and less-constrained MSAs.[39]

Finally, we check if our results are caused by cities of a certain size. While it would be unexpected and theoretically puzzling for supply elasticities to only matter in cities of a certain size, it is possible that these constraints are measured with more measurement error in relatively small cities. Additionally, if small cities have disproportionally high income growth and a low supply elasticity, then this would cause attenuation bias in our estimates of the effects of supply constraints on the correlation with income. To check for this possibility we split each of the elasticity samples into small and large cities based on the median city size and then we construct new indicators of being less constrained based on the median constraint value within each of these subsamples. We then estimate our baseline regressions in (8) within each of these subsamples and report the interaction term.

Panels A and B of Table A22 show that our baseline findings hold true in both small and large cities. Among housing quantity outcomes, only the Wharton regulatory index displays a small positive effect for both small and large cities, similar to our baseline results. But like our baseline result, that effect disappears once we drop low-growth cities (Table A23). Thus,

[37] We use median rents from the ACS because there is no high-quality rental index with sufficient coverage in earlier years in our sample.

[38] We use the average instead of the median commuting time as these survey responses exhibit a large amount of rounding to a few salient answers (for example, 30 minutes), leading the distribution of median commuting times to be sparse and non-smooth.

[39] The growth rate of commuting times behaves similarly.

we do not find evidence that measurement error in constraints or some kind of size-effect is confounding our results.

A4 Some Unpleasant Housing Supply Arithmetic

Table A24 shows that when using per capita income to instrument for demand the supply elasticity is 0.2, but when using population as an instrument we recover a supply elasticity of 1.5. In this section we show that, given the single-margin supply curve (Equation (3)), this difference can only be explained when supply shocks are multiple times as important for housing markets as per capita income growth. Intuitively, only supply shocks can bias the IV estimates, so for the two IV estimates to be very different it must be that supply shocks are quantitatively important. We call this arithmetic "unpleasant" as we are not aware of work that argues for a prominent role of housing supply shocks (as opposed to different elasticities) explaining house price growth and housing quantity growth across cities.

We briefly describe the derivations here and relegate details to the following section. The basic intuition is that our system of demand-supply equations is over-identified by the available moments, so that for a given supply elasticity ψ, we can back out the covariances of supply shocks with income growth and population growth necessary to explain our estimates. We first infer the price-elasticity of demand ϵ_p from the co-variance of income growth with prices. Intuitively, a high variance of income relative to the covariance with prices suggests that the demand elasticity is high. Our inference over ϵ_p is independent of the assumed supply elasticity ψ. While higher ψ directly lowers our inference for ϵ_p, it also implies a stronger covariance of supply shocks with income growth which directly offsets this effect.

Combining the covariances of supply shocks with population growth and income growth with the slopes of supply and demand then allows us to calculate the variance of supply shocks. Intuitively, if the covariance of supply shocks with population growth is large, then either the variance is large or the incidence factor $\frac{\epsilon_p}{\psi+\epsilon_p}$ is large. The parameters pin down the latter, allowing us to back out the variance.

Table A1 shows the result. Assuming that the true supply elasticity is $\psi = 0.5$, as suggested by the instrumental variables estimates in Table A24 (column 3) yields a typical demand elasticity of $\epsilon_p = 0.65$ (for example, Stephen et al. (1981); Hanushek and Quigley (1980); Davis and Ortalo-Magné (2011); Albouy and Stuart (2020)) and a variance ratio of supply shocks to income shocks of 3.5. This is the relative pure variance contribution of supply shocks to income shocks for house price growth. For the relative contribution to housing quantity growth, one would have to rescale by the squared ratio of demand to supply elasticity, which yields a factor of 5.9.

These calculations do not take into account covariances between income measures and supply shocks. A conservative approach is to assign the negative covariances to supply shocks, and then compare that contribution to orthogonalized income shocks. The last two columns

show these results. For $\psi = 0.5$ the relative importance of supply shocks to income shocks is 2.9 for price growth and 5.2 for quantity growth. The contributions of supply shocks become smaller but remain large as we assume a higher aggregate supply elasticity ψ. Only when we assume $\psi = 1.5$, far outside estimates from Baum-Snow and Han (2024) and those implied by standard instruments in Table V or Table A24, do supply shocks become less important than income growth for price growth, but they remain more important for quantity growth.

The second panel allows for a positive correlation between income growth and other demand shocks (Diamond, 2016). We choose this correlation to raise the demand elasticity up to 1.5, at the upper end of what is typically assumed and consistent with the evidence in the papers cited above. This reduces the importance of supply shock somewhat for prices (2.6 for $\psi = 0.5$) and raises them for quantities (22.9 for $\psi = 0.5$).

In short, interpreting the differences in our supply elasticity estimates from IV regressions with population growth and income growth through the lens of the single-margin supply curve (Equation 10) implies that supply shocks must be an extremely important driver of house price dynamics relative to income shocks.

TABLE A1

SOME UNPLEASANT HOUSING ARITHMETIC

ψ	$Cov(\sigma, \hat{y})$	$Cov(\sigma, \hat{N})$	ϵ_p	$Var(\sigma)$	$\frac{Var(\sigma)}{Var(\hat{y})}$	$\frac{\epsilon_p^2 Var(\sigma)}{\psi^2 Var(\hat{y})}$	$\frac{Var(\sigma)+2Cov(\sigma,\hat{y})}{Var(\hat{y}\|\sigma)}$	$\frac{\epsilon_p^2 Var(\sigma)+2\epsilon_p\psi Cov(\sigma,\hat{y})}{\psi^2 Var(\hat{y}\|\sigma)}$
$Cov(\theta, \hat{y}) = 0$								
0.2	0.00	0.40	0.65	0.53	3.10	32.74	3.10	32.74
0.5	-0.06	0.31	0.65	0.59	3.50	5.91	2.89	5.18
0.8	-0.12	0.22	0.65	0.63	3.72	2.45	2.66	1.51
1	-0.16	0.15	0.65	0.64	3.76	1.59	2.46	0.48
1.5	-0.26	0.00	0.65	0.60	3.53	0.66	1.40	-1.97
$Cov(\theta, \hat{y}) = 0.17$								
0.2	0.00	0.40	1.50	0.46	2.69	151.12	2.69	151.12
0.5	-0.06	0.31	1.50	0.43	2.55	22.94	1.94	21.89
0.8	-0.12	0.22	1.50	0.40	2.33	8.20	1.17	7.07
1	-0.16	0.15	1.50	0.37	2.15	4.83	0.45	3.42
1.5	-0.26	0.00	1.50	0.26	1.53	1.53		

A4.1 Details of Calculation

This is the basis of the calculation where growth in housing units is exactly equal to the growth in population, which is very close to what we see in the data:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{H}_i^S &= \psi \hat{P}_i + \sigma_i, \\
\hat{H}_i^D &= \epsilon_y \hat{Y}_i + \hat{\theta}_i - \epsilon_p \hat{P}_i, \\
\hat{Y}_i &= \hat{y}_i + \hat{N}_i \\
\hat{H}_i &= \hat{N}_i.
\end{aligned}$$

The solution is,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{P}_i &= \frac{1}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i + \hat{\theta}_i) - \frac{1}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}\sigma_i \\
\hat{H}_i = \hat{N}_i &= \frac{\psi}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i + \hat{\theta}_i) + \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_p}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}\sigma_i,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\epsilon}_y = \frac{\epsilon_y}{1+\epsilon_y}$ and $\tilde{\epsilon}_p = \frac{\epsilon_p}{1+\epsilon_y}$. From here we get the following covariances,

$$Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{N}_i) = \frac{\psi}{(\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p)^2}[Var(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i) + 2Cov(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i, \hat{\theta}_i) + Var(\hat{\theta}_i)] \tag{A4}$$

$$- \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_p}{(\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p)^2} Var(\sigma_i) - \frac{\psi - \tilde{\epsilon}_p}{(\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p)^2} Cov(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i, \sigma_i), \tag{A5}$$

$$Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{1}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}[\tilde{\epsilon}_y Var(\hat{y}_i) + Cov(\hat{\theta}_i, \hat{y}_i)] - \frac{1}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p} Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{y}_i) \tag{A6}$$

$$Cov(\hat{\sigma}_i, \hat{N}_i) = \frac{\psi}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p} Cov(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i, \sigma_i) + \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}_p}{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p} Var(\sigma_i). \tag{A7}$$

were we allow for per capita income to be correlated with both fundamental demand shocks and supply shocks.

The bias formulas using population or per capita income as instruments for house prices are simply

$$\psi^{IV,N} = \psi + \frac{Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{N}_i)}{Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{N}_i)}, \tag{A8}$$

$$\psi^{IV,y} = \psi + \frac{Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{y}_i)}{Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i)}. \tag{A9}$$

In the data $\psi^{IV,N} = 1.5$, $\psi^{IV,y} = 0.2$, $Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{N}_i) = 0.31$ and $Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i) = 0.2$. If the true supply elasticity is $\psi = 0.2$, then $Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{y}_i) = 0$ and $Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{N}_i) = 1.3 \times 0.31 = 0.4$. If the

true supply elasticity is $\psi = 0.5$, then $Cov(\sigma_i, \hat{y}_i) = -0.06$ and $Cov(\hat{\sigma}_i, \hat{N}_i) = 1 \times 0.31 = 0.31$.

The first step is to infer the effective demand elasticity, by combining A6 and A9,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_y Var(\hat{y}_i) &= Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i)(\psi + \epsilon_p) - Cov(\theta_i, \hat{y}_i) + Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i)(\psi^{IV,y} - \psi) \\ &= Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i)(\psi^{IV,y} + \epsilon_p) - Cov(\theta_i, \hat{y}_i) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:

$$\epsilon_p = \frac{\epsilon_y Var(\hat{y}_i) + Cov(\theta_i, \hat{y}_i)}{Cov(\hat{P}_i, \hat{y}_i)} - \psi^{IV,y}$$

With $\epsilon_y = 1$ this yields a very sensible $\epsilon_p = 0.65$ independent of the assumed true value of ψ. If there are additional demand shocks positively correlated with income growth, then this value for the demand elasticity is a lower bound.

We then infer the variance of supply shocks from A7,

$$Var(\sigma_i) = \frac{\psi + \tilde{\epsilon}_p}{\tilde{\epsilon}_p} Cov(\hat{\sigma}_i, \hat{N}_i) - \frac{\psi}{\tilde{\epsilon}_p} Cov(\tilde{\epsilon}_y \hat{y}_i, \sigma_i).$$

A5 Two-Margins of Housing and Hurdles to Estimating Supply Elasticities

Here we show that once we allow for housing services to be a mix of quantity and quality then the hurdles to credibly estimating supply elasticities become significantly more challenging.

Recall the IV framework in Section 2:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{H}_i &= \kappa_j + \theta_j \check{P}_i + w_i, \\ \widehat{P}_i &= \alpha_j + \beta_j Z_i + e_i, \qquad i \in \Omega^j,\ j \in \{H, L\}. \end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

The standard approach ala Saiz (2010) or Chodorow-Reich et al. (2024) is to estimate local supply elasticities with instruments for local housing demand, here summarized as Z_i, which then trace out the response of prices and quantities varies types of cities. In practice this is often done by interacting the instrument(s) with another variable or set of variables meant to capture the relative elasticity of the city i, such as the share of land with a steep gradient, a measure of the regulatory constraints or even the share of non-traditional Christians. The instrument set Z might contain Bartik-style shocks or measures of climate amenities. Our framework here, where we estimate the IV separately for each group of cities, is isomorphic to one where the constraint variables are indicators.

To see how this approach might go astray, we apply it to our setting where the instrument is total income growth or $Z_i = \widehat{Y}_i = \widehat{y}_i + \widehat{N}_i$, and where $\widehat{y}$ is per capita income growth and $\widehat{N}$ is population growth. Recall from Table II that per capita income growth is strongly correlated with house prices while Table VII shows that it is only weakly correlated with growth in housing quantities (in fact, controlling for population growth shows there is essentially no economically significant correlation with quantity growth). Population growth is strongly correlated with both prices and quantities (Table II and Table VIII). These results are consistent with a model of housing markets where there are quantity and quality margins of housing demand as we describe.

As in Section 5 and Section A2, assume there are two margins of housing consumption: the number of housing units u, and the quality of those housing units q. So the total quantity of housing produced and consumed in a city i is $H_i = q_i u_i$. Let $\widehat{P}_i$ be the observed growth in the price of housing and $\widehat{P}_{q,i}$ be the growth in the price of quality while $\widehat{P}_{u,i}$ is the growth in the price of a unit of some indexed quality, neither of which is separately observable.

As suggested by our estimates, we assume that changes in per capita income do not affect the demand for the number of units and that changes in population do not affect the demand

for quality.[40] Demand for each of the components is then given by the following where we assume for simplicity that there are no other demand shocks

$$\widehat{q}_i^D = \epsilon_y \widehat{y}_i - \epsilon_{p,q} \widehat{P}_{q,i},$$
$$\widehat{u}_i^D = \epsilon_n \widehat{N}_i - \epsilon_{p,u} \widehat{P}_{u,i}.$$

The supply side has a parallel structure with distinct supply curves for the quality and number of units so that without supply shocks we have

$$\widehat{q}_i^S = \psi_{q,j} \widehat{P}_{q,i},$$
$$\widehat{u}_i^S = \psi_{u,j} \widehat{P}_{u,i}.$$

We can use this framework to examine what we would recover from estimating Equations (A10) where we use total income growth as an instrument:

$$\theta_j = \frac{Cov(\widehat{u}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)}{Cov(\widehat{P}_i, \widehat{Y}_i)} = \frac{\psi_{u,j} \frac{\epsilon_n}{\psi_{u,j}+\epsilon_{p,u}} \sigma^2_{N,j}}{\frac{\epsilon_n}{\psi_{u,j}+\epsilon_{p,u}} \sigma^2_{N,j} + \frac{\epsilon_y}{\psi_{q,j}+\epsilon_{p,q}} \sigma^2_{y,j} + 2 \frac{\epsilon_n}{\psi_{u,j}+\epsilon_{p,u}} \frac{\epsilon_y}{\psi_{q,j}+\epsilon_{p,q}} Cov_j(\widehat{y}_i, \widehat{N}_i)}, \tag{A11}$$

where σ^2 indicates the variance of per capita income or population growth.

We will only be able to recover the unit supply elasticities if there happen to be no changes to per capita income growth at all. In this case $\sigma^2_{y,j}$ and $Cov_j(\widehat{y}_i, \widehat{N}_i)$ are both equal to zero and everything but $\psi_{u,j}$ cancels out. However, if per capita income growth does vary with total income and if there is any covariance between per capita income and population growth, then the resulting estimates will be biased away from the true elasticities.

Consider this expression if the covariance term is zero (in fact, the correlation between per capita income growth and population growth is very weak, see Table VII) and re-arrange so that we have:

$$\theta_j = \frac{\psi_{u,j}}{1 + (\frac{\epsilon_y}{\psi_{q,j}+\epsilon_{p,q}} \sigma^2_{y,j}) / (\frac{\epsilon_n}{\psi_{u,j}+\epsilon_{p,u}} \sigma^2_{N,j})}. \tag{A12}$$

If we estimate θ_j in a group where per capita income shocks are relatively unimportant ($\sigma^2_{y,j}/\sigma^2_{N,j}$ is small) then in the limit we will recover something close to the true unit supply elasticity. However, if per capita growth is relatively important ($\sigma^2_{y,j}/\sigma^2_{N,j}$ is large), then our estimate of the unit elasticity will be biased down so that supply appears relatively inelastic.

In this simple framework, we can "correct" our estimates by conditioning on either per

[40] This is an extreme assumption as in reality changes in income can affect household formation. We make this assumption in order to simplify the exposition, but all that is needed is that growth in income has a different effect on the demand for units than growth in population.

capita income growth or population growth.[41] Conditioning on population growth removes the correlation between total income and unit growth so that the numerator of the IV becomes zero. Alternatively, controlling for per capita growth will, in principle, remove the "excessive" correlation between prices and total income growth and leave just the variation from population growth driving unit growth. However, if there are additional unobserved shifts in the demand for housing quality that are correlated with per capita income growth, then we will have the exact same bias issues as in Equation (A12). This concern is more than plausible, it is likely. Davidoff (2016), Diamond (2016), and Diamond and Gaubert (2022) document the strong demand, especially from high-skill workers, for high-amenity "constrained" cities, which is exactly the kind of differential demand that would bias estimates even after conditioning on per capita income growth.

We illustrate how this all can matter in practice. We calculate each MSA's share of total income growth coming from per capita income growth and then sort MSAs into those with shares above and below the sample median. Intuitively, grouping cities where per capita income growth was more important will tend to generate a higher ratio of per capita to population variance compared to a group of cities where per capita income growth was less important. Accordingly, our high-share group has a ratio of per capita to population variances about one while the low-share group has a ratio of 0.71. This difference is driven almost entirely by a higher variance of population growth in the low-share group.

Using this grouping of cities, we estimate versions of our IV models using total income growth as an instrument, but now interacting that with indicators for having below- and above-median share of per capita income growth. Table A24 presents these results along with IV estimates using just per capita (column 1) or population growth (column 2) as instruments. Column 4 estimates the interaction model without controls and we see that the groups of cities with high per capita shares appear to be relatively inelastic, as expected from equation (A12). What appears to be evidence of low unit-supply elasticity in these cities is simply a reflection of the fact that per capita income is relatively more volatile.

Following the logic of equation (A12), we can attempt to "correct" these estimates by controlling for the unwanted demand shifts from population, so column 5 controls for population growth. In our model this should have no effect on quantities since per capita income growth only affects the demand for housing quality. We see in column 5 that this correction appears to be successful. The two elasticity estimates are effectively zero and indistinguishable from each other, consistent with our expectations.

This suggests that we may be able to do the reverse and, by controlling for per capita

[41] This is a similar to the "bad control" approach in Mondragon and Wieland (2025) used to isolate the shift in housing demand caused by remote work from the changes in migration also caused by remote work.

income growth, isolate only the variation due to changes in population growth. Theoretically, this should leave us with only variation in the demand for units so that we can recover the desired unit-supply elasticities. Column 6 implements this approach with mixed results. The elasticity estimates for both groups are twice as large as in column 4 and our estimates suggest that the low-share cities are about twice as elastic as the high-share cities. Is this credible? The basic logic of equation (A12) suggests no. Controlling for per capita income growth will address bias from per capita income growth and any unobserved shocks that are perfectly correlated with per capita income growth, but if there are any residual differences in the importance of unobserved shocks across groups of cities then our estimates will still be biased. In fact, the amount of variation explained by the relevant variables can provide a clue to how useful this control approach might be. Table VIII shows that about 95% of the variation in unit growth is accounted for by population growth, so by conditioning on population growth we are effectively removing any of the correlation between prices and units, thus correctly driving the estimated elasticities down to zero. However, per capita income growth explains only about 20% of the variation in prices, which means there is significant scope for unobserved demand shifters to bias our elasticity estimates.

Ultimately, this exercise clarifies that estimates of supply elasticities will fail to recover the true unit supply elasticities because of the potentially complex mix of housing margins, which have distinct implications for the comovement of price, quality, and quantity.

A6 Appendix Tables

TABLE A2

Median Home Value Growth (2000-2020)

Panel A. Total Income Growth				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.047	-0.089	-0.101	0.068
	(0.120)	(0.119)	(0.121)	(0.124)
Income Growth	0.577***	0.715***	0.663***	0.603***
	(0.104)	(0.094)	(0.099)	(0.099)
Less Constrained	-0.674***	-0.112	-0.205	-0.500*
	(0.254)	(0.244)	(0.258)	(0.262)
R2	0.47	0.41	0.43	0.38
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307
Panel B. Per Capita Income Growth				
Less Constrained × Per Capita Income Growth	0.057	-0.266	-0.388	0.002
	(0.257)	(0.277)	(0.263)	(0.265)
Per Capita Income Growth	1.010***	1.298***	1.199***	1.103***
	(0.198)	(0.222)	(0.214)	(0.207)
Less Constrained	-0.728**	-0.110	-0.022	-0.424
	(0.335)	(0.352)	(0.353)	(0.341)
R2	0.32	0.26	0.28	0.25
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307
Panel C. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Population Growth	0.176	-0.061	0.024	0.183
	(0.132)	(0.124)	(0.132)	(0.143)
Population Growth	0.502***	0.709***	0.580***	0.533***
	(0.110)	(0.092)	(0.105)	(0.117)
Less Constrained	-0.798***	-0.217	-0.533***	-0.533***
	(0.154)	(0.149)	(0.161)	(0.165)
R2	0.36	0.28	0.31	0.25
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth regressed on total income growth (panel A), per capita income growth (panel B), or population growth (panel C) and an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the indicator with the respective growth measure. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A3

Population Elasticity Estimates (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	1.367***	1.217***	1.168***	1.147***
	(0.241)	(0.170)	(0.192)	(0.181)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	1.381***	1.120***	1.567***	1.260***
	(0.193)	(0.150)	(0.233)	(0.171)
Less Constrained	1.219***	0.421	0.527	0.568*
	(0.454)	(0.298)	(0.386)	(0.337)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.96	0.67	0.19	0.65
CD F-stat	54.36	58.06	47.54	63.04
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
More Constrained × Price Growth	1.309***	1.003***	1.073***	1.180***
	(0.227)	(0.126)	(0.161)	(0.197)
Less Constrained × Price Growth	1.207***	1.142***	1.415***	1.065***
	(0.124)	(0.159)	(0.171)	(0.139)
Less Constrained	0.904**	0.032	0.076	0.553
	(0.433)	(0.289)	(0.350)	(0.377)
Chi-Squared Test P-value	0.70	0.49	0.15	0.63
CD F-stat	53.81	84.53	59.70	55.02
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of population growth regressed on house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B), where price growth is interacted with an indicator for being less constrained (above median). We instrument for house price growth with growth in total income interacted with the same constraint indicator. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A4

Effect of Work from Home Shock: Quantile Regressions

	Saiz		BS-H		WRLURI		Building	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A. Total Income Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		0.053		0.014		0.220*		-0.134
		(0.131)		(0.124)		(0.117)		(0.129)
WFH Shock	0.477***	0.545***	0.424***	0.463***	0.477***	0.425***	0.400***	0.475***
	(0.062)	(0.075)	(0.059)	(0.086)	(0.062)	(0.075)	(0.057)	(0.079)
Less Constrained		0.325		0.340		-0.297		0.653
		(0.513)		(0.506)		(0.476)		(0.516)
R2								
Number of Observations	269	269	310	310	269	269	308	308
Panel B. House Price Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		-0.164		-0.109		0.439*		0.023
		(0.284)		(0.222)		(0.246)		(0.248)
WFH Shock	0.248**	0.348**	0.369***	0.439***	0.248**	0.084	0.424***	0.399***
	(0.108)	(0.164)	(0.098)	(0.154)	(0.108)	(0.158)	(0.097)	(0.151)
Less Constrained		0.478		1.027		-1.698*		-0.192
		(1.114)		(0.906)		(0.998)		(0.994)
R2								
Number of Observations	268	268	308	308	268	268	306	306
Panel C. Cumulative Permit Growth (Annualized %)								
WFH Shock × Less Constrained		-0.112		0.245		-0.556		0.732
		(0.765)		(0.730)		(0.742)		(0.851)
WFH Shock	1.432***	1.432***	1.357***	1.075**	1.432***	1.652***	1.260***	1.120**
	(0.326)	(0.440)	(0.310)	(0.507)	(0.326)	(0.477)	(0.308)	(0.520)
Less Constrained		2.531		0.887		4.245		-0.359
		(2.999)		(2.978)		(3.008)		(3.405)
R2								
Number of Observations	269	269	310	310	269	269	308	308

This table reports quantile regression estimates of total income growth (panel A), house price growth (panel B), and permit growth (panel B) regressed on a measure of exposure to WFH, an indicator for being less constrained (above median), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A5

House Price Growth (1980-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.083	0.121	-0.035	-0.091
	(0.093)	(0.088)	(0.092)	(0.093)
Income Growth	0.222***	0.212***	0.211***	0.266***
	(0.073)	(0.066)	(0.072)	(0.073)
Less Constrained	-0.465*	-0.597**	-0.548**	-0.292
	(0.258)	(0.234)	(0.249)	(0.256)
R2	0.23	0.14	0.21	0.17
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.084	0.110	0.077	-0.011
	(0.072)	(0.074)	(0.076)	(0.075)
Income Growth	0.265***	0.292***	0.271***	0.307***
	(0.062)	(0.060)	(0.063)	(0.062)
Less Constrained	-0.673***	-0.517***	-0.579***	-0.385*
	(0.196)	(0.190)	(0.199)	(0.205)
R2	0.41	0.33	0.38	0.35
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A6

House Price Growth (1980-2000)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.092	0.071	-0.076	-0.133
	(0.120)	(0.112)	(0.116)	(0.117)
Income Growth	0.058	0.078	0.056	0.148*
	(0.092)	(0.093)	(0.093)	(0.090)
Less Constrained	-0.229	-0.538	-0.346	-0.108
	(0.400)	(0.359)	(0.381)	(0.383)
R2	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.225***	0.236***	0.149*	0.092
	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.089)	(0.092)
Income Growth	0.137**	0.157**	0.161**	0.182***
	(0.061)	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.060)
Less Constrained	-0.980***	-0.898***	-0.756***	-0.768***
	(0.265)	(0.260)	(0.274)	(0.284)
R2	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.22
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A7

House Quantity Growth (1980-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.002	0.017	0.025	0.050
	(0.035)	(0.037)	(0.039)	(0.039)
Income Growth	0.732***	0.714***	0.716***	0.707***
	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.025)
Less Constrained	0.148*	0.091	0.078	0.010
	(0.083)	(0.085)	(0.088)	(0.092)
R2	0.88	0.87	0.88	0.86
Number of Observations	268	309	268	307
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.032	-0.033	-0.005	0.075*
	(0.040)	(0.040)	(0.044)	(0.041)
Income Growth	0.853***	0.843***	0.835***	0.800***
	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.026)
Less Constrained	0.141	0.080	0.030	-0.106
	(0.095)	(0.093)	(0.103)	(0.098)
R2	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.89
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.013	0.045	0.001	-0.029
	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.035)	(0.039)
Income Growth	-0.098***	-0.136***	-0.096***	-0.103***
	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.029)	(0.026)
Less Constrained	0.159*	0.021	0.164*	0.185*
	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.094)	(0.095)
R2	0.25	0.28	0.29	0.24
Number of Observations	140	159	140	158

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A8

House Quantity Growth (1980-2000)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.076*	-0.010	0.014	0.048
	(0.045)	(0.048)	(0.051)	(0.049)
Income Growth	0.709***	0.668***	0.665***	0.653***
	(0.036)	(0.039)	(0.037)	(0.032)
Less Constrained	0.364***	0.279**	0.084	0.088
	(0.127)	(0.135)	(0.142)	(0.142)
R2	0.80	0.78	0.80	0.76
Number of Observations	268	309	268	307
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.123***	-0.098**	0.004	0.037
	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.053)	(0.052)
Income Growth	0.811***	0.791***	0.744***	0.741***
	(0.034)	(0.037)	(0.037)	(0.032)
Less Constrained	0.361**	0.300**	-0.111	0.011
	(0.141)	(0.139)	(0.165)	(0.155)
R2	0.81	0.79	0.81	0.77
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.017	0.020	-0.036*	-0.012
	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.022)	(0.022)
Income Growth	-0.032**	-0.054***	-0.023	-0.038**
	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Less Constrained	0.143**	-0.011	0.191***	0.076
	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.073)	(0.073)
R2	0.19	0.15	0.19	0.12
Number of Observations	140	159	140	158

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A9

House Price Growth (2000-2020): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.468	-0.544	-0.690*	-0.552
	(0.439)	(0.336)	(0.372)	(0.392)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-1.093***	-0.864**	-1.019***	-0.840**
	(0.367)	(0.339)	(0.352)	(0.394)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-1.185***	-0.566	-0.767**	-0.633*
	(0.400)	(0.388)	(0.364)	(0.358)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.008	0.029	0.085	-0.015
	(0.195)	(0.159)	(0.165)	(0.184)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.078	0.161	0.096	-0.016
	(0.159)	(0.165)	(0.165)	(0.178)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.058	-0.020	-0.191	-0.152
	(0.174)	(0.175)	(0.164)	(0.171)
Income Growth	0.516***	0.572***	0.532***	0.633***
	(0.135)	(0.130)	(0.127)	(0.140)
R2	0.52	0.37	0.47	0.41
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.417	-0.491	-0.705*	-0.456
	(0.466)	(0.419)	(0.394)	(0.439)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-1.069**	-0.619	-0.645*	-0.516
	(0.414)	(0.404)	(0.373)	(0.424)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-0.804*	-0.126	-0.602*	-0.889**
	(0.409)	(0.397)	(0.346)	(0.396)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.010	0.023	0.059	0.048
	(0.213)	(0.196)	(0.178)	(0.199)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.143	0.081	0.024	0.008
	(0.178)	(0.190)	(0.177)	(0.187)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.014	-0.220	-0.127	0.167
	(0.180)	(0.187)	(0.167)	(0.183)
Income Growth	0.554***	0.701***	0.600***	0.585***
	(0.159)	(0.167)	(0.140)	(0.156)
R2	0.49	0.45	0.48	0.40
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A10

House Quantity Growth (2000-2020): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.031	-0.025	-0.053	-0.138
	(0.140)	(0.116)	(0.156)	(0.120)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-0.008	0.035	-0.188	0.074
	(0.130)	(0.141)	(0.168)	(0.111)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.067	-0.068	-0.193	-0.112
	(0.108)	(0.107)	(0.152)	(0.152)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.050	0.034	0.073	0.168***
	(0.070)	(0.060)	(0.075)	(0.058)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.067	0.002	0.160*	0.033
	(0.065)	(0.076)	(0.087)	(0.054)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.014	0.006	0.156**	0.088
	(0.052)	(0.056)	(0.075)	(0.089)
Income Growth	0.624***	0.617***	0.549***	0.552***
	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.066)	(0.038)
R2	0.80	0.78	0.80	0.79
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.115	-0.099	-0.043	-0.179
	(0.169)	(0.130)	(0.169)	(0.139)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-0.089	-0.111	-0.197	-0.016
	(0.141)	(0.150)	(0.170)	(0.114)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.068	-0.173	-0.158	-0.150
	(0.133)	(0.115)	(0.164)	(0.156)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.101	0.046	0.050	0.195***
	(0.084)	(0.067)	(0.080)	(0.067)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.086	0.032	0.134	0.074
	(0.068)	(0.080)	(0.087)	(0.054)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.011	0.021	0.110	0.098
	(0.065)	(0.057)	(0.080)	(0.089)
Income Growth	0.715***	0.692***	0.676***	0.619***
	(0.051)	(0.042)	(0.065)	(0.042)
R2	0.82	0.80	0.82	0.81
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.069	0.153***	0.194***	-0.020
	(0.052)	(0.053)	(0.062)	(0.055)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.070	0.168***	0.207***	0.107*
	(0.057)	(0.055)	(0.067)	(0.055)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.065	0.134**	0.180***	0.044
	(0.061)	(0.061)	(0.065)	(0.056)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.000	-0.039	-0.079***	0.043*
	(0.022)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.024)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.013	-0.023	-0.057*	-0.010
	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.023)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.009	-0.013	-0.036	0.036
	(0.028)	(0.028)	(0.030)	(0.025)
Income Growth	-0.050***	-0.022	0.007	-0.051***
	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.024)	(0.017)
R2	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.12
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A11

House Price Growth (1980-2020): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.614	-0.689*	-0.693	-0.963**
	(0.441)	(0.401)	(0.420)	(0.419)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-0.712*	-1.196***	-0.945**	-0.755*
	(0.413)	(0.417)	(0.430)	(0.419)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-1.180***	-0.938**	-0.943**	-0.613
	(0.402)	(0.408)	(0.449)	(0.432)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.048	0.077	0.055	0.066
	(0.145)	(0.142)	(0.149)	(0.150)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.031	0.268*	0.066	-0.018
	(0.138)	(0.151)	(0.152)	(0.144)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.018	0.145	-0.060	-0.198
	(0.141)	(0.148)	(0.167)	(0.160)
Income Growth	0.131	0.129	0.144	0.220*
	(0.112)	(0.128)	(0.134)	(0.126)
R2	0.29	0.18	0.27	0.28
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.627*	-0.609*	-0.455	-0.664*
	(0.372)	(0.329)	(0.339)	(0.370)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-0.932***	-1.170***	-0.691**	-0.626*
	(0.357)	(0.306)	(0.326)	(0.378)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-1.143***	-0.722**	-1.081***	-0.798**
	(0.354)	(0.296)	(0.321)	(0.370)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.078	0.079	0.027	0.075
	(0.124)	(0.117)	(0.122)	(0.129)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.128	0.296***	0.075	0.006
	(0.117)	(0.110)	(0.117)	(0.132)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.152	0.097	0.169	0.041
	(0.123)	(0.110)	(0.120)	(0.137)
Income Growth	0.189*	0.215**	0.230**	0.260**
	(0.107)	(0.095)	(0.103)	(0.118)
R2	0.46	0.39	0.43	0.41
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A12

House Quantity Growth (1980-2020): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.123	0.318*	0.364**	-0.022
	(0.159)	(0.163)	(0.161)	(0.120)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.254*	0.329**	0.356**	0.123
	(0.141)	(0.158)	(0.162)	(0.133)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.275*	0.281*	0.264*	-0.126
	(0.147)	(0.167)	(0.155)	(0.136)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.019	-0.039	-0.088	0.105**
	(0.062)	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.045)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.004	-0.028	-0.059	0.057
	(0.053)	(0.064)	(0.065)	(0.053)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.025	-0.016	-0.010	0.163***
	(0.060)	(0.068)	(0.062)	(0.059)
Income Growth	0.741***	0.753***	0.783***	0.658***
	(0.049)	(0.058)	(0.054)	(0.040)
R2	0.89	0.88	0.89	0.89
Number of Observations	268	309	268	307
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.050	0.308*	0.219	-0.039
	(0.178)	(0.161)	(0.168)	(0.116)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.115	0.291**	0.178	0.078
	(0.160)	(0.144)	(0.165)	(0.132)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.299*	0.263*	0.188	-0.283**
	(0.166)	(0.151)	(0.154)	(0.130)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.026	-0.066	-0.071	0.101**
	(0.070)	(0.066)	(0.066)	(0.044)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.002	-0.077	-0.051	0.061
	(0.061)	(0.060)	(0.067)	(0.052)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.079	-0.084	-0.061	0.184***
	(0.067)	(0.062)	(0.062)	(0.057)
Income Growth	0.853***	0.892***	0.885***	0.752***
	(0.056)	(0.052)	(0.052)	(0.035)
R2	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.91
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.101	0.180	0.525***	0.059
	(0.151)	(0.124)	(0.174)	(0.150)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.318**	0.148	0.530***	0.152
	(0.148)	(0.119)	(0.175)	(0.168)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.152	0.092	0.473***	0.269*
	(0.123)	(0.136)	(0.175)	(0.144)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.009	-0.029	-0.151**	0.022
	(0.058)	(0.048)	(0.064)	(0.054)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.055	0.027	-0.120*	-0.005
	(0.053)	(0.042)	(0.061)	(0.062)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.002	0.024	-0.072	-0.025
	(0.045)	(0.055)	(0.066)	(0.057)
Income Growth	-0.085**	-0.113***	0.011	-0.110**
	(0.034)	(0.035)	(0.057)	(0.045)
R2	0.27	0.31	0.36	0.28
Number of Observations	140	159	140	158

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A13

House Price Growth (1980-2000): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.736	-0.933	-0.330	-1.052*
	(0.656)	(0.671)	(0.651)	(0.620)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-0.620	-1.357**	-0.365	-0.412
	(0.632)	(0.662)	(0.659)	(0.614)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-1.176**	-1.080*	-0.652	-0.776
	(0.588)	(0.641)	(0.675)	(0.624)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.060	0.115	-0.078	0.013
	(0.180)	(0.199)	(0.198)	(0.180)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.025	0.239	-0.119	-0.142
	(0.179)	(0.195)	(0.194)	(0.182)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.057	0.145	-0.106	-0.160
	(0.176)	(0.194)	(0.210)	(0.192)
Income Growth	-0.049	-0.042	0.083	0.115
	(0.139)	(0.175)	(0.172)	(0.155)
R2	0.08	0.06	0.09	0.14
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median Home Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	-0.987**	-0.964**	0.227	-0.890**
	(0.416)	(0.446)	(0.460)	(0.409)
Qtl 3 Constraint	-1.216***	-1.718***	-0.245	-1.226***
	(0.410)	(0.440)	(0.450)	(0.432)
Qtl 4 Constraint	-1.940***	-1.435***	-1.095**	-1.348***
	(0.444)	(0.439)	(0.460)	(0.489)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.181	0.163	-0.121	0.089
	(0.113)	(0.129)	(0.135)	(0.118)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	0.245**	0.410***	-0.033	0.134
	(0.115)	(0.130)	(0.136)	(0.129)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	0.452***	0.336**	0.264*	0.189
	(0.137)	(0.134)	(0.141)	(0.175)
Income Growth	0.014	0.019	0.237**	0.120
	(0.095)	(0.109)	(0.115)	(0.101)
R2	0.26	0.24	0.24	0.28
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A14

House Quantity Growth (1980-2000): Quartiles

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.405*	0.627**	0.022	0.040
	(0.220)	(0.264)	(0.261)	(0.227)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.737***	0.810***	0.112	0.142
	(0.206)	(0.264)	(0.256)	(0.228)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.605**	0.684**	0.041	0.141
	(0.235)	(0.267)	(0.255)	(0.275)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.049	-0.078	0.024	0.081
	(0.067)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.069)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.141**	-0.132	0.014	0.084
	(0.062)	(0.084)	(0.082)	(0.072)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.120	-0.057	0.051	0.069
	(0.084)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.101)
Income Growth	0.758***	0.750***	0.653***	0.619***
	(0.058)	(0.077)	(0.067)	(0.061)
R2	0.81	0.80	0.80	0.78
Number of Observations	268	309	268	307
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.437*	0.579**	-0.385	-0.015
	(0.224)	(0.250)	(0.328)	(0.229)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.641***	0.776***	-0.402	0.252
	(0.210)	(0.241)	(0.326)	(0.241)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.667***	0.645***	-0.322	-0.093
	(0.225)	(0.247)	(0.312)	(0.275)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.105*	-0.103	0.095	0.075
	(0.063)	(0.076)	(0.089)	(0.066)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.183***	-0.212***	0.088	0.022
	(0.060)	(0.074)	(0.094)	(0.070)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.205***	-0.155**	0.040	0.075
	(0.079)	(0.078)	(0.088)	(0.104)
Income Growth	0.876***	0.875***	0.675***	0.708***
	(0.052)	(0.067)	(0.079)	(0.053)
R2	0.81	0.79	0.81	0.79
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Qtl 2 Constraint	0.023	0.134	0.330***	0.144
	(0.113)	(0.105)	(0.120)	(0.129)
Qtl 3 Constraint	0.153	0.069	0.453***	0.097
	(0.114)	(0.092)	(0.111)	(0.141)
Qtl 4 Constraint	0.204*	0.068	0.318***	0.199
	(0.105)	(0.111)	(0.114)	(0.121)
Qtl 2 Constraint × Income Growth	0.008	-0.029	-0.067**	-0.022
	(0.030)	(0.032)	(0.033)	(0.036)
Qtl 3 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.010	0.002	-0.095***	-0.014
	(0.032)	(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.040)
Qtl 4 Constraint × Income Growth	-0.041	0.004	-0.058*	-0.028
	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.034)
Income Growth	-0.031	-0.037*	0.024	-0.023
	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.032)
R2	0.21	0.16	0.29	0.16
Number of Observations	140	159	140	158

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, quartiles of the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with each quartile. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A15

House Price Growth (2000-2020): Continuous

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure × Income Growth	-0.191***	-0.003	-0.103	-0.122**
	(0.071)	(0.061)	(0.077)	(0.058)
Elasticity Measure	-0.088	-0.251*	-0.187	-0.150
	(0.154)	(0.136)	(0.162)	(0.124)
Income Growth	0.533***	0.612***	0.556***	0.605***
	(0.061)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.057)
R2	0.49	0.37	0.45	0.44
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure × Income Growth	-0.122**	-0.122*	-0.076	-0.048
	(0.049)	(0.063)	(0.066)	(0.083)
Elasticity Measure	-0.043	0.032	-0.129	-0.146
	(0.095)	(0.145)	(0.128)	(0.194)
Income Growth	0.593***	0.670***	0.601***	0.643***
	(0.063)	(0.059)	(0.058)	(0.066)
R2	0.46	0.45	0.46	0.41
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with the constraint measure. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A16

House Price Growth (2000-2020): Continuous Winsorized

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)				
× Income Growth	-0.078	-0.007	-0.072	-0.124**
	(0.060)	(0.061)	(0.066)	(0.055)
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)	-0.312**	-0.234*	-0.265*	-0.149
	(0.135)	(0.136)	(0.143)	(0.115)
Income Growth	0.528***	0.613***	0.537***	0.599***
	(0.059)	(0.055)	(0.054)	(0.057)
R2	0.50	0.37	0.46	0.44
Number of Observations	268	308	268	306
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)				
× Income Growth	-0.052	-0.124*	-0.065	-0.036
	(0.054)	(0.064)	(0.058)	(0.074)
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)	-0.192*	0.041	-0.159	-0.178
	(0.114)	(0.145)	(0.118)	(0.163)
Income Growth	0.588***	0.671***	0.589***	0.639***
	(0.061)	(0.059)	(0.057)	(0.065)
R2	0.47	0.45	0.47	0.41
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with the constraint measure where we have winsorized each constraint measure at the top and bottom 5th percentiles. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A17

House Quantity Growth (2000-2020): Continuous

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure × Income Growth	0.038***	0.013	0.070**	0.038
	(0.014)	(0.025)	(0.027)	(0.037)
Elasticity Measure	-0.029	-0.030	-0.094*	-0.028
	(0.021)	(0.045)	(0.051)	(0.064)
Income Growth	0.656***	0.627***	0.648***	0.623***
	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.026)
R2	0.79	0.77	0.80	0.77
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure × Income Growth	0.024	0.018	0.057*	0.042
	(0.019)	(0.025)	(0.031)	(0.038)
Elasticity Measure	-0.025	-0.071	-0.087	-0.041
	(0.034)	(0.046)	(0.061)	(0.068)
Income Growth	0.757***	0.717***	0.751***	0.711***
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)
R2	0.81	0.80	0.82	0.79
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Elasticity Measure × Income Growth	0.015*	-0.005	0.005	0.015
	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.010)
Elasticity Measure	-0.012	0.062**	0.019	0.013
	(0.013)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.023)
Income Growth	-0.048***	-0.039***	-0.046***	-0.039***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.009)
R2	0.09	0.15	0.11	0.11
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with the constraint measure. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A18

House Quantity Growth (2000-2020): Continuous Winsorized

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)				
× Income Growth	0.025	0.009	0.065**	0.037
	(0.019)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.033)
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)	-0.007	-0.025	-0.083*	-0.032
	(0.037)	(0.044)	(0.049)	(0.058)
Income Growth	0.657***	0.627***	0.652***	0.623***
	(0.023)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.026)
R2	0.79	0.77	0.80	0.77
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)				
× Income Growth	0.006	0.014	0.052*	0.042
	(0.024)	(0.024)	(0.028)	(0.035)
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)	0.010	-0.067	-0.082	-0.048
	(0.048)	(0.045)	(0.057)	(0.061)
Income Growth	0.758***	0.717***	0.753***	0.712***
	(0.026)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.027)
R2	0.81	0.80	0.82	0.79
Number of Observations	269	310	269	308
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized) × Income Growth	0.013	-0.005	0.005	0.013
	(0.009)	(0.012)	(0.012)	(0.010)
Elasticity Measure (Winsorized)	-0.001	0.060**	0.028	0.018
	(0.020)	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.022)
Income Growth	-0.046***	-0.040***	-0.043***	-0.038***
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
R2	0.10	0.14	0.12	0.12
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, the constraint measure, and the interaction of income growth with the constraint measure where we have winsorized each constraint measure at the top and bottom 5th percentiles. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A19

House Price Growth without Low Growth Cities (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.375***	0.202	0.148	0.158
	(0.119)	(0.136)	(0.140)	(0.131)
Income Growth	0.156**	0.354***	0.328***	0.333***
	(0.079)	(0.089)	(0.098)	(0.101)
Less Constrained	-1.944***	-0.853**	-1.185***	-1.089***
	(0.297)	(0.343)	(0.361)	(0.333)
R2	0.45	0.18	0.32	0.26
Number of Observations	197	231	197	239
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.392***	0.049	-0.032	0.334**
	(0.135)	(0.171)	(0.156)	(0.167)
Income Growth	0.211**	0.518***	0.462***	0.321**
	(0.104)	(0.127)	(0.125)	(0.129)
Less Constrained	-1.660***	-0.501	-0.406	-1.243***
	(0.341)	(0.421)	(0.395)	(0.418)
R2	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.25
Number of Observations	196	231	196	238

This table reports estimates of house price growth (panel A) and median home value growth (panel B) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A20

House Quantity Growth without Low Growth Cities (2000-2020)

	(1) Saiz	(2) BS-H	(3) WRLURI	(4) Building
Panel A. Housing Quantities Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.050	-0.090	0.067	-0.096
	(0.070)	(0.072)	(0.071)	(0.071)
Income Growth	0.698***	0.680***	0.635***	0.688***
	(0.050)	(0.041)	(0.045)	(0.046)
Less Constrained	0.242	0.212	-0.012	0.259
	(0.156)	(0.162)	(0.161)	(0.159)
R2	0.71	0.68	0.72	0.69
Number of Observations	197	231	197	239
Panel B. Population Growth (Annualized %)				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.072	-0.039	0.055	-0.045
	(0.080)	(0.076)	(0.077)	(0.077)
Income Growth	0.788***	0.731***	0.723***	0.739***
	(0.065)	(0.048)	(0.051)	(0.056)
Less Constrained	0.231	0.027	-0.038	0.113
	(0.185)	(0.174)	(0.176)	(0.176)
R2	0.73	0.71	0.73	0.70
Number of Observations	197	231	197	239
Panel C. Change in Average Rooms per Person				
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.036	0.012	0.015	-0.004
	(0.025)	(0.024)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Income Growth	-0.052***	-0.038**	-0.044***	-0.029
	(0.015)	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.019)
Less Constrained	-0.031	0.045	0.039	0.060
	(0.065)	(0.063)	(0.064)	(0.064)
R2	0.06	0.07	0.08	0.04
Number of Observations	196	231	196	238

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth (panel A) and population growth (panel B), and the change in average rooms per person (panel C) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A21

Median Rent Growth and Change in Commuting Times (2000-2020)

Panel A. Real Rent Growth (Annualized %)

Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.015	0.033	-0.009	-0.084
	(0.081)	(0.081)	(0.082)	(0.084)
Income Growth	0.315***	0.332***	0.316***	0.375***
	(0.062)	(0.054)	(0.062)	(0.058)
Less Constrained	-0.378**	-0.267	-0.281*	-0.120
	(0.169)	(0.162)	(0.170)	(0.171)
R2	0.34	0.28	0.29	0.29
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

Panel B. Change in Average Commute Times

Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.147	-0.036	-0.132	-0.020
	(0.242)	(0.226)	(0.241)	(0.242)
Income Growth	0.185	0.204	0.165	0.178
	(0.177)	(0.168)	(0.185)	(0.175)
Less Constrained	0.498	0.202	0.255	0.354
	(0.549)	(0.520)	(0.551)	(0.565)
R2	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01
Number of Observations	267	309	267	307

This table reports estimates of real rent growth (panel A) and changes in average commuting times (panel B) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two. Each column uses a different measure of housing constraints where column 1 uses the elasticity from Saiz (2010), column 2 uses an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), column 3 uses the regulation index from Gyourko et al. (2008), and column 4 uses the land share of value from Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A22

Effects By Population (2000-2020)

	Saiz		BS-H		WRLURI		Building	
	(1) Below	(2) Above	(3) Below	(4) Above	(5) Below	(6) Above	(7) Below	(8) Above
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.157	-0.059	-0.032	0.052	-0.062	-0.031	-0.108	-0.072
	(0.163)	(0.178)	(0.152)	(0.168)	(0.156)	(0.182)	(0.163)	(0.180)
R2	0.36	0.59	0.30	0.41	0.36	0.50	0.33	0.40
Number of Observations	134	134	154	154	134	134	153	153
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.132	0.064	-0.207	-0.076	-0.009	0.009	0.216	-0.078
	(0.134)	(0.189)	(0.140)	(0.190)	(0.151)	(0.192)	(0.165)	(0.187)
R2	0.37	0.55	0.42	0.44	0.36	0.52	0.35	0.44
Number of Observations	134	133	155	154	134	133	154	153
Panel C. Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.003	0.019	0.023	0.012	0.126**	0.204***	0.038	0.027
	(0.060)	(0.067)	(0.070)	(0.062)	(0.057)	(0.066)	(0.070)	(0.067)
R2	0.82	0.77	0.79	0.76	0.82	0.80	0.77	0.77
Number of Observations	135	134	155	155	135	134	154	154
Panel D. Population Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.051	0.007	0.039	0.040	0.112	0.200***	0.024	0.085
	(0.072)	(0.065)	(0.069)	(0.060)	(0.071)	(0.060)	(0.077)	(0.065)
R2	0.83	0.81	0.81	0.80	0.83	0.82	0.79	0.81
Number of Observations	135	134	155	155	135	134	154	154
Panel E. Change in Average Rooms per Person (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.053*	0.002	-0.012	-0.007	-0.004	-0.003	-0.018	-0.004
	(0.030)	(0.021)	(0.028)	(0.021)	(0.035)	(0.021)	(0.029)	(0.023)
R2	0.10	0.18	0.06	0.26	0.07	0.29	0.05	0.16
Number of Observations	134	133	155	154	134	133	154	153

This table reports the estimates of the interaction term for house price growth (panel A), median home value growth (panel B), house quantity growth (panel C), population growth (panel D), and the change in average rooms per person (panel E) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two for cities with above and below median population size in 2000. Each group of columns uses a different measure of housing constraints where columns 1-2 use the elasticity from Saiz (2010), columns 3-4 use an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), columns 5-6 use the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and columns 7-8 use the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A23

Effects By Population without Low Growth Cities (2000-2020)

	Saiz		BS-H		WRLURI		Building	
	(1) Below	(2) Above	(3) Below	(4) Above	(5) Below	(6) Above	(7) Below	(8) Above
Panel A. Real House Price Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.406**	0.324*	0.163	0.195	0.278*	0.041	0.143	0.073
	(0.178)	(0.180)	(0.194)	(0.189)	(0.161)	(0.260)	(0.200)	(0.214)
R2	0.33	0.56	0.19	0.27	0.34	0.35	0.27	0.25
Number of Observations	99	98	116	115	99	98	120	119
Panel B. Real Median House Value Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.313*	0.433*	-0.217	0.022	-0.083	-0.044	0.422*	0.099
	(0.171)	(0.219)	(0.204)	(0.273)	(0.179)	(0.286)	(0.215)	(0.259)
R2	0.26	0.48	0.29	0.27	0.23	0.35	0.26	0.24
Number of Observations	98	98	116	115	98	98	119	119
Panel C. Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.016	-0.016	0.043	0.005	-0.003	0.125	-0.000	0.010
	(0.079)	(0.095)	(0.095)	(0.090)	(0.078)	(0.119)	(0.093)	(0.097)
R2	0.74	0.73	0.67	0.72	0.74	0.73	0.68	0.73
Number of Observations	99	98	116	115	99	98	120	119
Panel D. Population Growth (Annualized %)								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	-0.063	-0.056	0.033	0.023	0.015	0.066	0.048	0.102
	(0.084)	(0.096)	(0.094)	(0.095)	(0.089)	(0.117)	(0.106)	(0.099)
R2	0.76	0.74	0.70	0.74	0.76	0.74	0.71	0.75
Number of Observations	99	98	116	115	99	98	120	119
Panel E. Change in Average Rooms per Person								
Less Constrained × Income Growth	0.050	0.018	-0.011	0.012	0.033	-0.023	-0.017	0.001
	(0.037)	(0.038)	(0.038)	(0.029)	(0.036)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.032)
R2	0.05	0.16	0.02	0.17	0.04	0.27	0.02	0.11
Number of Observations	98	98	116	115	98	98	119	119

This table reports the estimates of the interaction term for house price growth (panel A), median home value growth (panel B), house quantity growth (panel C), population growth (panel D), and the change in average rooms per person (panel E) regressed on total income growth, an indicator for an MSA having an above-median constraint measure (less constrained), and the interaction of the two for cities with above and below median population size in 2000 after dropping cities with total income growth in the bottom quartile. Each group of columns uses a different measure of housing constraints where columns 1-2 use the elasticity from Saiz (2010), columns 3-4 use an elasticity from Baum-Snow and Han (2024), columns 5-6 use the regulation index Gyourko et al. (2008), and columns 7-8 use the land share of value Davis et al. (2021). See the text for more details.

TABLE A24

Varying Housing Supply Elasticity Estimates (2000-2020)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Housing Quantity Growth (Annualized %)						
Price Growth	0.215***	1.506***	0.589***			
	(0.081)	(0.178)	(0.082)			
Low PC Share × Price Growth				1.122***	0.085	2.204***
				(0.193)	(0.054)	(0.547)
High PC Share × Price Growth				0.420***	0.010	1.078***
				(0.054)	(0.022)	(0.236)
High PC Share Indicator				0.245	0.114**	1.270*
				(0.287)	(0.056)	(0.742)
Population Growth					0.840***	
					(0.031)	
Per Capita Income Growth						-1.428***
						(0.438)
F-stat	92.28	75.00	32.40			
Chi-Squared Test P-value				0.00	0.12	0.02
F-stat Low PC Share				41.43	16.23	12.53
F-stat High PC Share				65.65	40.98	17.42
Number of Observations	321	321	319	321	321	321

This table reports estimates of house quantity growth regressed on house price growth where price growth is instrumented with per capita income (1), population (2), and a Bartik and two climate instruments (3). Columns 4-6 use total income growth as an instrument with various controls. See the text for more details.