Regional Heterogeneity and Monetary Policy By Beraja, Fuster, Hurst, and Vavra

Discussion: Daniel L. Greenwald (MIT Sloan)

MIT Sloan

Econometric Society Meetings January 8, 2016

Summary

- Main question: how did QE1 differentially impact regions of US with different housing market experiences?
- Empirical results: QE1 had smallest effects on mortgage issuance and spending in regions with largest house price/employment declines.
 - Increases regional consumption inequality.
 - Explanation: limited extractable home equity made refinancing less sensitive to interest rates in depressed regions.
- Heterogeneous agent model: reproduce empirical findings, but show that result specific to circumstances of QE1.
 - With more favorable equity distribution, cutting mortgage rates can both stimulate economy and reduce consumption inequality.

Evaluation

- Paper highlights important and intuitive mechanism.
- Main limitation: exogenous house prices.
 - Equity extraction decision depends both on interest rate incentives and amount of extractable equity.
 - Evidence that house prices move strongly with rates (e.g., Aladangady (2014)) \implies QE1 could act through house prices, credit limits.
- House prices one of the main targets of QE1:

This action is being taken to reduce the cost and increase the availability of credit for the purchase of houses, which in turn should support housing markets and foster improved conditions in financial markets more generally.

▶ This discussion: evaluate house price effects using Greenwald (2016).

- Important for quantitative strength of QE.
- But authors' mechanism confirmed (likely stronger).

Greenwald (2016) Model

- Limited heterogeneity: representative borrower, saver.
- Endogenous house prices.
- New borrowing limited by both loan-to-value (LTV) and payment-to-income (PTI) constraints.
 - Strong transmission from interest rates to house prices.
- Mortgage contract: long-term prepayable FRMs.
 - Heterogeneity in prepayment decision \implies Transaction cost shocks.
- Monetary policy: shocks to trend inflation move mortgage rates.
- Closed economy, endogenous labor supply, sticky prices.

GE vs. Exogenous Debt Limits

 QE experiment (normal times): near-permanent 100bp fall in nominal rates. Computation: nonlinear deterministic transitions.



GE vs. Exogenous Debt Limits

 Model with endogenous house prices (GE Limit) delivers much stronger responses than economy with fixed debt limit (Exog Limit).



GE vs. Exogenous Debt Limits

▶ BFHV model excludes house price effects, may understate impact.



Boom-Bust Experiment

Previous results start at steady state. What about the housing crash?



Boom-Bust Experiment

Simulate housing boom-bust using relaxation of PTI limits, unrealized house price expectations. Experiment: apply QE at start of bust.



Boom-Bust Experiment

Take difference between the two as QE response in housing bust.



State-Dependent Responses

 Compare response in normal times, bust to approximate regional variation.



State-Dependent Responses

▶ QE in depressed housing conditions still effective at raising house prices.



State-Dependent Responses

 However, authors mechanism (little refinancing, new issuance in depressed state) completely validated.



Conclusion

- Combined empirical and theoretical approach lays out compelling channel from monetary policy to regional inequality.
- Treating house prices as exogenous initial conditions rather than outcomes may limit response.
 - QE1 may have been effective stimulus for housing market.
- But inequality channel appears to hold up strongly under endogenous house prices.
 - Very little debt response in bust experiment, despite house price boost.