

## TRANSCRIPT

### Environmental Insights

**Guest:** Michael Greenstone

**Record Date:** September 28, 2022

**Posting Date:** October 6, 2022

LINK to podcast: <https://on.soundcloud.com/4wzWA>

Michael Greenstone: I do not think that the right way to confront climate change is by treating it as a moral issue or as an issue that is beyond economics.

Rob Stavins: Welcome to [Environmental Insights](#), a podcast from the [Harvard Environmental Economics Program](#). I'm your host, Rob Stavins, a professor here at the [Harvard Kennedy School](#) and director of our Environmental Economics Program. We've had the pleasure of including in these podcast conversations over the past three years, a significant number of truly outstanding economists who have carried out important work, often pathbreaking work, in the realm of environment, energy, and resource economics. And today is certainly no exception, because I'm joined by [Michael Greenstone](#), the Milton Friedman Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago. Welcome, Michael.

Michael Greenstone: Thank you for having me, Rob. It's my delight to be here.

Rob Stavins: Before we talk about your research, and for that matter, your current thinking about environmental and climate change policy, let's go back to how you came to be where you are. Let's start with where did you grow up?

Michael Greenstone: Oh, I grew up in Chicago, about three blocks from where I'm sitting right now.

Rob Stavins: Are you in Hyde Park?

Michael Greenstone: I'm in Hyde Park.

Rob Stavins: Does that mean that primary school and high school were both in Chicago?

Michael Greenstone: Yes, I went to the Chicago Public Schools for K through 8, and then I went to... The University of Chicago, has an elementary school and high school, and I went there for high school.

Rob Stavins: Does that still exist, that University of Chicago High School?

Michael Greenstone: Yeah, the Lab School.

Rob Stavins: The Lab School. I see.

Michael Greenstone: I have kids there now.

Rob Stavins: Is that right? So you graduate from high school, and then did you immediately go on to Swarthmore or did you take some time off?

Michael Greenstone: I went right to Swarthmore.

Rob Stavins: And you graduated with the degree in Economics. I noted from the year of your graduation and the location, that not only was it the same institution that Marty Weitzman did his undergraduate degree, but it was just about 30 years earlier that he had done his degree there.

Michael Greenstone: Indeed, Marty and I had discovered that. I don't think either of us knew that. You may not remember this, but a turning point or big moment in my career was when you and Marty generously invited me to come give a seminar when I was a postdoc at UC Berkeley. And halfway through the seminar, maybe at the end, I was like, "Oh, maybe I can do this." It gave me confidence that I certainly was not abundant at that time. And I think in that visit, Marty and I made that connection.

Rob Stavins: Oh, I see. That's great. Well, I can validate that you definitely can do it. So you graduate from Swarthmore in 1991?

Michael Greenstone: Yeah, having failed to make it to the NBA, which was my goal when I went to Swarthmore. But that didn't work out.

Rob Stavins: Are you serious?

Michael Greenstone: Oh, I didn't think it was super realistic, but I devoted an obscene amount of time to basketball.

Rob Stavins: Oh you did?

Michael Greenstone: Yeah.

Rob Stavins: And now you graduate, did you immediately go on to Princeton? Or once again, my question is, did you take time off

Michael Greenstone: Like a lot of college students, I didn't really know what I wanted to do. And it's less true now, but law school was kind of a default at that period of time.

Rob Stavins: That's right. Also when I graduated college.

Michael Greenstone: Yeah, so I actually applied to law school. My senior year, I took the LSAT, the whole thing.

Rob Stavins: So did I.

Michael Greenstone: And I got in, and I deferred, and I took a job in Washington kind of at a think tank, thinking, "I got to figure this law school thing out. Do I really want to go? Why would I want to go?" And basically halfway through the first year of that job, I decided I can't affirmatively answer that I want to, that I have some reason that I should or would like to go to law school. I then quit my job, and actually there was this super... Life has these forks in the road, and I did two things. One, I figured out how to take math classes at Drexel University in Philadelphia, where I could do that to get myself ready to apply to graduate school for economics. Or, there was this very high intervention kind of diversion program for teenagers involved in the criminal justice system. They were kind of trying to keep them out of jail in a very, very high intensive probation in inner city Baltimore. And I got that job, and I was completely torn, "Should I go to Drexel and take math classes? Or should I take this job interacting several times a day with kids who were ensnared in the criminal justice system?" Anyway, I went to Drexel. But I have often wondered what would've been.

Rob Stavins: Right. No, there are those forks in the road. And interesting about the law school, myself, I was having a hard time deciding between a PhD in economics and law school. I initially took the easy route in decision making to do a joint degree, do them both.

Michael Greenstone: Oh, I didn't know that.

Rob Stavins: Yes. But after one year in the economics program, it wasn't necessarily because of love of economics. It was, "I don't think I want to do that many years of school." So I proceeded only with the PhD in economics. Now, yours was at Princeton. Am I correct that you worked with Orley Ashenfelter?

Michael Greenstone: Orley Ashenfelter and David Card.

Rob Stavins: And David Card.

Michael Greenstone: [inaudible 00:05:52] my thesis advisors.

Rob Stavins: What was your thesis?

Michael Greenstone: It was on... So I went there, kind of my alternate path to, in inner city Baltimore. I went there, I thought for sure to be a labor economist, and to work on questions of poverty and welfare and things like that. And for the life of me, I could not find a question where I felt like I could gain a lot of traction on it in a way that at least I would find convincing. So I was casting about for dissertation topics, and I kind of bumped into environmental questions. Then I found this really what I thought was clever, or not clever, but interesting feature of the Clean Air Act, which is that some parts of the country are regulated more heavily than others. So I basically wrote a dissertation exploiting this non-attainment attainment designations of the Clean Air Act, and using that to look at what happens to the costs of... What are the costs for manufacturers who

face the heavier regulation, and what are some of the benefits in terms of reductions in air pollution, and then the degree to which that makes it into housing prices. And maybe you can infer people's willingness to pay. So, that was my dissertation.

Rob Stavins: So you went into the PhD program as a potential labor economist, and you very much came out of it as an environmental economist then?

Michael Greenstone: Absolutely. As Orley still likes to joke to this day... Because the Princeton department is... It's a little... There's islands, so I was definitely in the labor group. And the group there is called the Industrial Relations Section. And Orley to this day likes to say, "Well, the thing is Michael, you're the greatest environmental economist that the Industrial Relations Section has ever produced." The unstated part is I'm the only one.

Rob Stavins: I can hear Orley saying that. I communicate with him probably two or three times every week, because we're co-founders and co-editors of the [Journal of Wine Economics](#), which is a very different topic. So you graduate from Princeton, and then as I recall, you took on a Robert Wood Johnson Fellowship at UC Berkeley. Was that right away, or is that-

Michael Greenstone: Yeah, so I think with the healingness of time, what happened is I thought I was going to go on the job market in my fifth year like a lot of students, and the norm has now switched kind of to six. But at the time the norm was five. I gave kind of a spectacularly terrible practice job talk in October. And I think Orley and David both... I think they were a little taken aback and a little horrified at how bad I did. I owe them a tremendous amount for this. I think they both saw that I could do something interesting. And so more or less, they arranged for me to get this postdoc at UC Berkeley, where David actually had now moved at that point. That was... Anyways, I did that postdoc for two years, and in that period, that's when you and Marty invited me to come give a talk.

Rob Stavins: That's right. And you were ahead of your time, because although at that point back around... What is that, 1998, 99-

Michael Greenstone: Yeah.

Rob Stavins: Doing a postdoc was unusual in economics, obviously common in the natural sciences. But nowadays, as you well know, that's become part of the norm of many absolutely top students. Even if they get an offer of an assistant professorship, they'll want to delay it for two years to do a post-doctoral fellowship somewhere.

Michael Greenstone: Yeah, absolutely. And I will say that it was a warehouse where I could try to rehabilitate myself after giving a bad practice job talk, and focus on how to give a better one, and work on my research. But it was not, I would say, a very prestigious thing to do at the time. But now... I'll say in hindsight, by the way, it

was... I don't know if it was my best job ever, but it was an awesome job. My only job was to work on my research, and it was really... I loved that, and in many ways wish for that to happen again.

Rob Stavins: Well, it paid off, because then I believe you accepted a position as an Assistant Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago.

Michael Greenstone: That is what happened, and that was really wonderful too.

Rob Stavins: Which was a homecoming for you, as you've already said. But at some point, to my delight, for geographic reasons, you moved to work in Cambridge, Massachusetts as the 3M Professor of Environmental Economics at MIT. How did that come about?

Michael Greenstone: Well, I had the two-year head start, and it wasn't really counting against my tenure clock it seemed. So I guess in my second year at Chicago, MIT had called and said, "Would you like to come for a lateral move?" And it just seemed too disruptive. We'd gotten settled. We were trying to have children, things like that. Then a year later they called again and said, "Well, would you come for tenure?" We were actually... My wife at the time was trying... We were trying to decide, and she just got held up at gunpoint two days before we were supposed to decide. And I was like, "Oh, I guess we've decided."

Rob Stavins: Yes, indeed.

Michael Greenstone: In any event, I love both... I loved, then, both places, and I love both places now. I think they're two just terrific places to do research, and the students are terrific. So I was happy to go, and sad to leave at the same time.

Rob Stavins: And you took on a significant leadership position at MIT, but I think even more leadership in terms of running programs in your return to the University of Chicago. Isn't that right?

Michael Greenstone: Yes, that's right. I came back to run the [Energy Policy Institute](#), along with normal faculty job stuff. And that was... Bob Zimmer was the president then, and it just felt like we're cut from the same cloth. He had this... And this is something that you have been a real pioneer on, is making sure that ideas don't get stuck inside dusty journals, and that they get out there into the outside world. And that had something I had always struggled with about academia is was, was this a game for me and 10 of my friends, and could I get their approval or pat on the back about work I'd done? And for sure I want that. I value their judgment, things like that. But I knew even before I went to graduate school, that couldn't be my life. So I was constantly kind of scratching and clawing and searching for a way to engage with the outside world. And there were some ways to do that at MIT, and then it seemed like there were even greater opportunities to do that at Chicago, and it was just too hard to turn down.

Rob Stavins: Then what validates, I think the importance to you of making sure that your work, your contributions are not wholly within academia but affect the wider world, is that along the way you took time to become the Chief Economist at the [Council of Economic Advisers](#) in the Obama Administration. Again, at what point did that happen? You were already back at Chicago when that happened?

Michael Greenstone: No, so I still at MIT. And actually I was very desperate to prove that I could do research at high level. And I felt like as much as I wanted to get engaged in the interactions in the outside world when I was an assistant professor and just after tenure, I just felt like I had to prove my chops. So, I kind of sat down and did that, and wrote papers that go in journals that people like and things like that, and hopefully expand our understanding about the world. Then this opportunity came in 2009. I was still at MIT. Really 2008, I guess after the election. And it felt like, "Okay, well I know a couple things now, and maybe this is an opportunity to explore this other side." So I went there. I learned a ton from going there. I learned a ton, which I think probably you had already discovered a lot of it, on how to communicate in ways that were not a turnoff.

You could see very quickly that economists could get the volume turned to zero on them, by talking in ways that we do. So that was really, really informative. Anyway, so I did that for a year while... I took a year break from MIT to do that, and I came back from that thinking, "Whoa, there is an... There's this space in between academia and the policy world, and it's not really being filled." You are serving an important role in that route. But there's... It's not filled, and then when things don't get filled, it gets filled by people who have agendas, and not by evidence, as you and I might think of evidence. And it just felt like that's a mistake. It's like we owe that, maybe to ourselves, maybe to the world, it's owed in one way or another. We get to have these crazy jobs where we can study the world. When I say things like that in front of my high school friends, they think I'm crazy, but we get to do that. Don't we owe something back? And it seemed... That's one of the reasons I went to Chicago. It felt like that was a better way to try and pay it forward a little bit.

Rob Stavins: So, of that year of government service in the Obama Administration, can you say, was there a single aspect that you got involved in, a single event that you would characterize as the high point, or the low point or both?

Michael Greenstone: Yeah. So, Obama had run, and then... It's a little hard to think back on this, but McCain had also run on there being a cap-and-trade for CO<sub>2</sub>. So that was... Well, that sounds kind of like outer space history right now. That was kind of plain vanilla activity that was clear that I wanted to work on. There's lots of very, very subtle and important details, and I thought I would go there and be technocrat and try to iron some of those things out, along with other people who were there, including several of your former students. Then in February 2009, I'd been there a couple weeks. We were in the Great Recession. We're losing... It was like you're walking to work, back and forth at work with weights on your shoulders. The economy was losing 700,000 jobs a month. No one knew where the bottom would come, or how it would come.

And I thought to myself, "Whoa, I don't think this is going to work. We're going to pass a bill that increases energy prices in the middle of all this? There has to be a plan B?" The president had been very clear that carbon was a top goal, so I began to just scuffle around. And didn't take too much digging until you realized regulation was plan B, and there was this gaping problem in regulation, which is that the benefits were all measured in tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, and the costs were in dollars. And very obviously dollars are always going to beat tons of CO<sub>2</sub>. So, you needed a way to convert the benefits, that is the tons of CO<sub>2</sub> into dollars, and the US government had no coherent way to do that.

You had the EPA effectively saying that a ton of CO<sub>2</sub> was invaluable. I don't know, infinite or something. And you had the Department of Transportation, it's not today's Department of Transportation, saying that it was basically zero, because they wanted more driving. So, I had this idea, why shouldn't the government have a coherent and uniform social cost of carbon? And I suggested it to Cass Sunstein at lunch one day, and we decided to set off on this journey to set a social cost of carbon for the US government. And we co-ran an inter-agency process and one thing led to another, and there was a US government social cost of carbon at the end.

Rob Stavins:

Which is very much an ongoing story, because of course the Biden Administration, as you well know, more or less reinstated the Obama era number. I think adjusting for inflation, it was 51 dollars a ton. Said they're going to come up with a new number. Looks like they'll be lowering the discount rate from 3 percent to 2 percent, other adjustments with the actual biophysical models. And I'm sure you're aware you were probably helping with the RFF coordinated study that is looking at a number more on the order of 200 dollars a ton now.

Michael Greenstone:

Actually, the RFF group has been at a terrific enterprise. And I'm actually co-leading a different enterprise, which has got the same goal, called the [Climate Impact Lab](#). That was at least partially born out of my experience in the Obama White House, where I left there thinking, "Hey, I kind of think we got this right in terms of describing the frontier of our understanding of the climate damages. But boy could we do a ton better." And Bill Nordhaus, who had set the foundation for the way we think about the problem and everything, through his dice model is enormously influential, and rightly so. Bill was stuck with crappy computers from the '90s, and not a lot of data. And I saw this intellectual arbitrage of this explosion of data and improving and computing power that was taking place in other fields in economics, and I was like, "We can do this in climate." So along with Trevor Houser, Sol Hsiang and Bob Kopp, we set up this climate impact lab, that has really tried to go beyond... Build an empirically founded social cost for carbon is maybe the way to say it.

Rob Stavins:

I want to turn to your work in the world of environmental economics and policy scholarship.

Michael Greenstone: There's one thing I do want to... I just want to point out. It was an eye-opening moment that I think helps see the connective tissue between working on the US government's social cost of carbon and research. I had actually written a couple papers about the impacts of climate change before I went to work in government. And I would say they were careful econometric studies of the impacts of trying to project the impacts of climate change on say, US agriculture or on US mortality. And I thought, "Whoa, this is"... And I think inside the world of academia, they were like... Those were real advances. But what I found in government is how they were so far off the mark of the question that was being asked. There needed to be a global answer, and having this very careful econometric study of one sector in one economy in the world was not super useful for answering the big question. And I don't think I had seen that so clearly before.

Rob Stavins: That's a natural connection to my asking you to reflect on not just your scholarship, but the scholarly world. Because I assume, Michael, that you've seen some significant changes in the scholarly world of environmental economics since your 1998 PhD degree, which is... That's more than two decades ago now. Although, I'll still think of you and we'll always think of you as a very young man. So what changes-

Michael Greenstone: Less and less true every second.

Rob Stavins: Well indeed, for all of us. So what changes in the scholarly world of environmental economics stand out to you? Can you comment on what's the most prominent change or trend you've seen?

Michael Greenstone: I think the most prominent change has been that there were a series of questions that we could only answer with assumptions, and we now have data and techniques and computing power that let us answer them empirically. And the answers have often been surprising. Not always, sometimes are what we thought. I think that has... We have a common friend who I don't want to implicate, who said to me... And I think it's... Maybe, I don't even know if they meant to compliment. I think they did. Said to me once, "The thing about you, Michael, is I don't know the answer to the question you pose in your paper until I read the paper." That's not something special about me. That's like now we've got data, and the world is confusing place, and there's, as we would like to say here at Chicago, frictions and all kinds of market imperfections that mean that our first order intuition is not always going to be right. And I think that's the biggest change. But I would like to turn the question back at you. How do you think it has changed in the last 25 years? You have a good perspective on all this.

Rob Stavins: Well, I think that that's a big part of it. There is obviously... If you were thinking more broadly, it's in terms of relying more on empirical evidence, both because of the availability of the empirical evidence. And then the development of techniques that lead people to be able to do a better job of identification of what that empirical evidence can tell us. Then the scope has changed, but the



scope is also narrowed. What I mean by that is that more and more environmental problems were falling within environmental economics. But over the past decade, there's been tremendous focus on the economics of climate change policy. This leads me to want to ask you about your own research in writing. I know this is like asking you to identify your favorite child, but what's the one research publication, if it can only be one, what's the one publication that you are just most proud of?

Michael Greenstone: Yes, I have three children, so let's start there. I love all three of them equally. Pride is a deadly sin, so I'm going to try not to say proud. But here is a problem that I worked on, I'm going to say for 15 years, and I feel like made great progress on. I, back to when I was in graduate school, was very interested in what were the impacts of air pollution on people's health. And the problem is most of the data we had were like, "Did you die today, and what was air pollution today?" Which is kind of like running the cigarette study. "Did you smoke today, and did you die today?" That's not really the right question. The right question is, "How much did you smoke over your life, and how does that change your odds of dying?" So I was always kind of mortified that we... I didn't want to write papers about adult death and today's air pollution because I didn't know where those people lived and know their lifetime exposure.

So that kind of pushed me to start writing papers about infant mortality, because I was like, "Okay, we've solved part a good portion of the problem here", which is we kind of know the infant... Even through the prenatal period, we know their lifetime exposure. But that's not the answer to the most interesting question. The most interesting question is, "What is the impact of lifetime exposure?" So I just carried that around, and was writing papers here and there about infant mortality. But it was like, I've got to find a way. I just have to be able to find a way to get at this bigger question. Then one day, I learned about this very, very idiosyncratic policy in China, which is dating from the planning period when there was a much less wealthy country than it is now. They just didn't have enough money to provide winter heating for everyone.

So they drew a line across the middle of the country, and pretty arbitrarily and said, "If you live north of this line, we're going to build you heating units for your apartment buildings, little boilers with and we're going to give you free coal. And if you live south of the line, you are out of luck. No coal there's no heating unit. There's going to be no heating." And I thought... And this dated to a period when migration was basically illegal in China. So if you could know where people were today, you knew where they were for their whole lives. The idea of this was to compare people who were born and lived just to the north of the river, who face very, very high levels of air pollution, to people who live just to south, who also face high levels, but not nearly as high. It's called a regression discontinuity technique. I don't know. That's a problem I carried around for a long time, and I feel like I've now written a couple papers based on that, and was eventually able to make some progress on it.

Rob Stavins: Now, something that stands out nowadays, and perhaps for the past several years, is that there's been increasing attention in both the scholarly world of environmental economics and certainly in the policy world of environmental policy. And I'm thinking of the US government, to distributional equity, in the form of the phrases, "environmental justice" on the benefit side or the damages side, and "just transition" on the abatement cost side, particularly in the context of climate change. Can you tell me what is your reaction to that increased attention? We've seen it a lot. It is one contrast between the Biden years and the Obama years, and of course there were four years between them,

Michael Greenstone: I think I didn't see it coming, and I think it was something of a blind spot in my research, and not just mine in our collective research. It doesn't take a brain surgeon to recognize that a dollar of damages to Jeff Bezos is a lot less meaningful than a dollar of damages to people who are living in relatively low income levels. And somehow we've just kind of been skipping that. I don't quite know why, but we have been. So I think it was a really important reawakening, or I don't know, awakening, to see this as an important area. I think like in all instances... Well, not all, but frequently, when there's new idea, sometimes people get a little carried away with it. So one thing I've seen, I don't know if you've seen this. There's this now heightened focus on these environmental inequalities.

They're very important, but sometimes the level gets missed. So I was recently asked... A *New York Times* reporter called me to ask about the congestion pricing policy that they have for Manhattan. She wanted to write a whole article basically about environmental justice. She didn't quite use that phrase. And she had found buried in the 5,232 page documentation of what the likely impacts would be, that there would be an increase in particulate pollution in one particular neighborhood in New York. So then I was like, "Okay." We flipped through it, and it got to it, and it was like 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter. It was definitely happening in a more impoverished neighborhood, and I'm not saying that's unimportant, but context was missing. In that same neighborhood, I went and looked up the data for her. Air pollution concentrate, PM 2.5 concentrations had declined by maybe eight or nine micrograms for cubic meter in the last 15 years. So those were enormous improvements for exactly those communities, and I just... Sometimes it's important to see the larger picture, too.

Rob Stavins: Yeah, and context is so important. My first interaction actually, that I ever had with the *New York Times*, I think was in 1988, and I had been quoted. But I had made one of these statements on the one hand, on the other hand, typical economist. And they had only taken one of the hands. So I actually contacted the New York Times, fool that I was and said, "You took it out of context." And I got back a letter. This was, I think probably pre-email. I got back a letter, and the letter from the editor said that, "Quoting individuals out of the full context of their statements is not an error. But thank you very much for contacting us," and I never forgot that.

I want to bring this to a close by asking you one other question, one final question about another change that we've seen, and it has to do... I'm thinking of the youth movements of climate activism. I don't know if your children are part of that. I see it among primary school kids. I certainly see it among college students. They're much more exercised over this. And I'm not thinking just of Greta Thunberg, but of broadly youth activism. It was very prominent in Europe and the United States in the pre-Covid year of 2019. It came back quite a bit in Glasgow at the International Climate Negotiations last November. I'm interested to know, what's your reaction to these youth movements of climate activism?

Michael Greenstone: First, I'm just going to note, offense taken. Obviously you don't think of me as part of the youth anymore. So I'll just lick my wounds quietly about that.

These youth movements have been incredibly successful, in my view, in raising political consciousness in ways... And I... It's hurtful to myself, and maybe even hurtful to you, in ways that cold blooded cost benefit analysis somehow don't seem to hit the mark. And I give them a lot of credit for that. Really a lot of credit in getting people's attention focused on it. Politics is a tricky game. I don't claim to understand it with perfection, or anywhere near perfection, and I just give them a lot of credit. A second reaction is, I do not think that the right way to confront climate change is by treating it as a moral issue, or as an issue that is beyond economics. I think it's a really interesting economics question that has all kinds of subtleties, but I do not think that the tools of cost benefit analysis and or economic analysis are inappropriate for climate change. So I don't like that thread that is running through that activism.

Rob Stavins: Well naturally, that certainly warms my heart. I feel similarly. A question in my mind, and I don't have the answer to this, is both in terms of the degree of youth activism and the nature, as you were just saying, of the youth activism, what will happen to these people over time? Is it going to be an age effect, and people become more conservative or they change as they get older? Or is this a cohort effect, and the people that are now outside demonstrating at the climate negotiations will be inside negotiating 10, 15, 20 years from now? I don't have a clue.

Michael Greenstone: To be determined. But I do think a real game changer has been that we can see the fingerprints of climate change now, in ways that we couldn't 10 or 15 years ago.

Rob Stavins: Absolutely correct.

Michael Greenstone: So, I think that it agitates them. It agitates me, and I think that's really important. And I guess one other macro issue that I would say that I think if part of the reason they've been gaining traction, is no matter what they said 15 years ago, 10 years ago, 20 years ago, it was still going to be very, very expensive to deal with climate change. And we got some really good draws in the sense that the delta, the difference between the low carbon energy sources, not all of them, but several of them, and the fossils has started to shrink quite

significantly. So, I think the two things that we can see – the fingerprints and that it's not as economically challenging a bar to jump over – have come together in a way that has in a reinforcing way helped with the youth activism, which is it's not... We don't have only infeasible responses.

Rob Stavins: I think that's absolutely correct. And it's a note of optimism on which I'm going to bring the conversation to a close, by saying thank you very much, Michael, for taking time to join me today in this conversation.

Michael Greenstone: My great pleasure. And I'll just note how kind you were not to raise the Chicago White Sox, which has been a source of great depression for me this summer.

Rob Stavins: Yeah, but I wouldn't dare do that, because of how my own team, the Boston Red Sox are performing this year. Our guest today has been [Michael Greenstone](#), the Milton Friedman Distinguished Service Professor of Economics at the University of Chicago. Please join us again for the next episode of [Environmental Insights: Conversations on Policy and Practice](#) from the [Harvard Environmental Economics Program](#). I'm your host, [Rob Stavins](#). Thanks for listening.

Announcer: [Environmental Insights](#) is a production from the [Harvard Environmental Economics Program](#). For more information on our research, events, and programming, visit our website, [www.heep.hks.harvard.edu](http://www.heep.hks.harvard.edu).