

The Economic Impact of Air Pollution on Labor Productivity and Income Growth in the United States

Andrew Hansong

Horace Mann Upper School, 231 West 246th Street, Bronx, New York 10471, United States
Andrew_Hansong@Horacemann.com

Keywords: Air pollution; Labor productivity; Income growth

Abstract: Air pollution constitutes a systematically underestimated economic burden in the United States. Based on nearly two decades of microeconomic and general equilibrium simulation cross-evidence, each 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in PM2.5 concentration reduces U.S. labor productivity by 0.6% to 1.9%, with welfare losses equivalent to \$950 to \$3,000 per household annually, reaching 50% to 160% the scale of pollution-related mortality impacts. This effect is not only transmitted through clinical disease pathways; subclinical cognitive function suppression, increased risk of occupational injuries, and obstructed career trajectories together form more concealed cost channels. Macro-economic accounting shows that local air pollution damage accounted for 6.4% of GDP in 1999 and still 3.2% in 2008. Long-term tracking of the Clean Air Act confirms policy returns conversely; the reduction of lead exposure alone has brought a 3.5% lifetime income increase to the average worker, equivalent to a total benefit of \$4.23 trillion. The economic impact of air pollution varies with regional industrial structure and population vulnerability, with the South and Midwest bearing disproportionate welfare losses.

In the debate over U.S. environmental policy, air pollution has always been regarded as a public health issue, and its economic impact is often simplified to a single dimension of "compliance costs." Cognitive biases hide a deeper problem: the continuous depletion of workers' physical and cognitive abilities due to pollution, which creates observable and monetizable suppressions in wage formation, occupational mobility, and regional growth potential. Recently, as matching administrative micro-data with high-resolution pollution monitoring has become feasible, economists have been able to separate pollution's productivity effects from confounding factors, then amplify these to the macroeconomic scale with a general equilibrium framework. Existing evidence reveals that air pollution in the U.S. is not a closed historical chapter. Under current regulatory standards, it continues to erode labor input quality profoundly, deeply affecting economic opportunity distribution across groups and regions.

1. Mechanisms by which Air Pollution Affects Labor Productivity

(1) Health Damage Pathways

PM2.5's physical characteristics give its health hazard penetrative properties. Particles less than one-third the diameter of a human hair can deeply enter alveoli and blood circulation, causing

respiratory inflammation, vascular endothelial dysfunction, and autonomic nervous system imbalance. Epidemiological and occupational medicine research reflect these physiological changes as immediate labor input losses: acute respiratory symptoms cause absenteeism, and cardiovascular function decline manifests as attenuated attention and endurance in presenteeism. The former is a visible reduction in labor hours; the latter more covertly reduces output per unit time. Research using occupational injury data supports monetizing the health pathway. Texas workers' compensation records show that PM2.5 increases of $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ raise injury claim rates by about 17%, with direct costs equalling 0.3% of daily income; extrapolated nationwide, annual injury costs reach \$35.6 billion, about 0.5% of average annual income. The key is that air pollution's health costs are realized both through medical systems and by directly embedding into the production function via labor capacity impairment [1].

(2) Industry-Specific Impact Differences

The impact of pollution on labor productivity is not evenly distributed across sectors. Outdoor physical labor is most sensitive to air quality fluctuations. In agriculture and construction, a one standard deviation increase in ozone and PM2.5 correspond to productivity declines of roughly 2% and 1.1%, respectively. However, considering air pollution solely as an "outdoor issue" is a dangerous misinterpretation. In a northern California pear packing plant, PM2.5's independent effect was first identified in an indoor piece-rate wage environment: a $10 \mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase reduced hourly output by \$0.41, about 6% of the average hourly wage, and this effect appeared even below then-federal air quality standards. Indoor manufacturing, warehousing, and logistics are also exposed to infiltrated fine particles; lacking visible cues, their productivity losses are often overlooked by business decisions and policy evaluations. Evidence from service industries indicates another manifestation of pollution effects in cognitive work. Call center performance data show PM2.5 exposure reduces call handling efficiency and customer satisfaction scores through weakened working memory load and emotional regulation. Exposure-response curves vary by industry in threshold and slope; outdoor physical workers see productivity declines at low pollution levels, while indoor cognitive work is more affected at pollution peaks. Heterogeneity implies uniform air quality standards yield different protection effects across sectors, and cost-benefit analyses based on national averages may systematically underestimate true burdens for specific industries and occupations [2].

(3) Cognitive Function Impairment Effects on Cognitive Labor

For cognition-centered occupations, pollution's pathway shifts from physical limitations to the decline in information processing quality. Studies using the U.S. Health and Retirement Survey (HRS) found exposure to WHO recommended daily limits of PM2.5 reduces cognitive test performance by about 2.5%, most pronounced in tasks requiring novel problem-solving. Research using Lumosity brain training game data extends this effect to the working-age population, finding a robust negative relationship between PM2.5 and memory and attention [3]. More direct evidence comes from managerial decision-making: short-term PM2.5 exposure negatively correlates with U.S. corporate managers' earnings forecast accuracy, due to temporary cognitive function suppression induced by pollution. The economic amplification mechanism of cognitive damage lies in its effect on decision quality. In financial markets, fund managers' short-term pollution exposure correlates negatively with portfolio performance; in judiciary, judges' decision consistency declines on high pollution days; in education, student standardized test scores depend on exam-day air quality [4]. These findings imply distributional consequences warranting caution—cognitive impairment's economic amplification is far larger for high-skill, high-responsibility jobs that disproportionately weight GDP accounting. Moreover, since high-skill occupations generally have better indoor work environment control and flexible scheduling, pollution's cognitive effects create a reverse exposure–vulnerability gradient across occupational strata: though higher-income groups have lower average exposure, even moderate pollution causes disproportionately large economic consequences via decision errors [5].

2. Economic Impact of Air Pollution on Income Growth

(1) Direct Pathways of Wage Income Loss

Productivity decline does not remain merely at the enterprise accounting level; in a competitive labor market, it transmits to wages through changes in marginal product values. Simulations in a general equilibrium framework show that each 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ decrease in PM2.5, leading to productivity improvement, provides welfare gains of \$950 to \$3,000 per household annually, accounting for 0.6% to 1.9% of total consumption. The range reflects measurement heterogeneity already obtained, but even the lower bound indicates annual wage losses in the order of tens of billions of dollars given current U.S. PM2.5 levels relative to theoretical low-pollution benchmarks. Injury pathway estimates complement from the labor market participation side: pollution-induced damages reduce not only current income but also, through workers' compensation systems and career interruptions, income trajectories over longer time spans [6].

(2) Increased Medical Expenditures and Reduced Consumption Capacity

The monetary cost of pollution manifests in household budgets as a forced expenditure reallocation. Treatments for respiratory and cardiovascular diseases, prescription drugs, and emergency visits constitute direct medical burdens. In the U.S. employer-insurance–dominant system, these costs also crowd out household disposable income and impose indirect costs on firm labor. Equally important but more indirect are preventive expenses that crowd out consumption: when pollution events are frequent, households must pay for air purification devices, utility losses from increased indoor time, and lost work hours caring for sick members. Economic analyses of wildfire smoke indicate pollution-driven medical bills significantly increase household debt, especially for families lacking buffer savings. Unequal distribution of medical expenses exacerbates pollution's income effects. Low-income groups face higher pollution exposure and pay more out-of-pocket due to incomplete health insurance [7]. When pollution health shocks force trade-offs between medical spending and basic consumption, this pressure becomes a welfare loss itself. Epidemiological evidence shows PM2.5-related hospitalizations occur much more frequently in low-income communities than high-income ones, even after adjusting for baseline health. There is a feedback loop between medical spending and income loss: health shocks reduce earning ability, income decline limits household moves or protective investments to avoid pollution.

(3) Long-Term Career Development and Income Potential Hindrance

Looking beyond current wages to life cycles, air pollution's impact on income growth reveals deeper cumulative effects. Effects of childhood and prenatal exposure are more persistent. Retrospective research on the Clean Air Act's lead reduction finds that from 1975 to 1985, the decline in airborne lead concentrations increased the average American worker's lifetime income by 3.5%, about \$21,400 per person, with total benefits of \$4.23 trillion, benefiting women more. Lead is not an isolated case. Census cohort data studies conclude that every 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ increase in childhood PM2.5 exposure reduces upward economic mobility within census tracts by about 1.15%, with this effect more pronounced in the South and Midwest. Pollution acts as a hidden opportunity tax; it does not emerge as explicit institutional barriers but systematically weakens certain people's sets of possibilities to achieve income growth through cognitive development, education attainment, and health capital [8].

3. Macro-Economic Costs of Air Pollution

(1) GDP Loss Estimation Methods and Results

Adding micro-level productivity and health effects to derive macroeconomic costs requires an accounting system that handles inter-sectoral linkages and factor price changes. Muller et al.'s environmental satellite accounts represent a continuous time series; using damage cost methods, local

air pollution economic costs equaled 6.4% of GDP in 1999, falling to 3.2% by 2008 due to air quality improvements. Longer backcasts show post-WWII early pollution damage accounted for nearly 30% of output, compressed to below 10% by 2016. These figures reflect losses to "environment-adjusted value added," not mere compliance expenses. EPA's computable general equilibrium modeling from the inverse of productivity shocks finds that welfare effects from each 1 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ reduction in PM_{2.5} are about 45% higher when incorporating sector heterogeneity and labor market frictions versus local equilibrium "envelope" estimates, showing ignoring general equilibrium feedback systematically underestimates economic gains from clean air [9].

(2) Labor Market Participation and Employment Quality

Pollution's labor market effects manifest not only in hourly output reductions but also through participation rate and employment quality effects. Wildfire smoke exposure studies reveal a chain of income declines, reduced labor participation, and increased social welfare dependency. Regarding employment quality, high pollution exposure interacts with increased occupational injury risk, causing some jobs' effective risk-adjusted compensation to be lower than nominal wages suggest. Notably, pollution suppresses employment not via mass unemployment but through less visible means like reduced job search intensity, slowed occupational mobility, and increased involuntary part-time work. Traditional labor market evaluations based on unemployment rates poorly reflect pollution's social costs [10].

(3) Aggravation of Regional Economic Development Inequality

Air pollution's economic burden is highly geographically concentrated and mutually reinforces existing economic vulnerabilities. Welfare gains from National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) do not spread evenly across places. Estimates indicate NAAQS yield annual welfare gains of \$40 billion, mainly concentrated in some cities; prioritizing emission pricing adds another \$70 billion, exposing spatial allocation inefficiencies. Childhood PM_{2.5} exposure's suppression of upward mobility is most severe in Southern and Midwestern states, which simultaneously face manufacturing job losses and weak public health infrastructure. Pollution is not only a regional environmental quality disparity but also a spatial mechanism that entrenches economic disadvantages in communities lacking emission reduction capacity and population mobility options.

4. Effects of Policy Interventions

(1) Historical Effectiveness Assessment of the Clean Air Act

The economic history of the Clean Air Act provides a powerful counterexample to the intuition of "environmental regulation harming growth." EPA's retrospective macro simulations show that without the Act, U.S. real GDP would ultimately be about 2.0% lower, real income and consumption about 1% lower, and capital stock about 1.5% lower than actual trajectories. This is not due to low compliance costs but because health and productivity gains from pollution reductions accumulate over time, exceeding initial investment crowd-outs. By the late 1980s, avoided deaths and lost healthy workdays already generated annual net benefits; net cumulative benefits expanded through the mid-1990s. For the 1990 amendments, cost-benefit analysis shows 2020 central benefits exceed costs by more than 30 times. Lifetime income evidence from lead reduction pushes this logic to human capital formation's core: cohort-level analyses indicate this policy continuously generates a "national dividend" through cognitive development improvements at an annual return exceeding 1%.

(2) Differentiated Impacts of State-Level Environmental Policies

State-level implementation differences under the federal framework add variation to recognizing pollution governance's economic effects. States differ in technical choices and enforcement intensity regarding Clean Air Act State Implementation Plans; Republican-governed states have lower-cost and weaker emission reduction technologies in the power sector, with capital expenditure differences

up to 90%. The direct economic implication is that the same federal standard yields markedly different actual health and productivity benefits across jurisdictions, while cost sharing spills over interstate via atmospheric transport and labor reallocation. Quantitative economic geography models show that states setting pollution control levels based on self-interest cause a 31.5% potential loss of Pareto welfare, mainly due to ignoring interstate spillovers. State policy heterogeneity is not only an enforcement issue but also an institutional root of the uneven spatial distribution of U.S. air pollution economic costs.

5. Conclusion

The economic impact of air pollution in the United States far exceeds the realms of environmental aesthetics or public health. Through three interrelated channels—health degradation, cognitive suppression, and hindered human capital formation—it continuously decreases both the quantity and quality of labor input, leaving observable traces in wages, consumption, career trajectories, and regional growth potential. Microeconomic estimates and general equilibrium simulations converge on the conclusion that although pollution’s marginal effect on labor productivity is not large, it becomes an annual economic burden in the hundreds of billions of dollars due to nationwide population exposure and lifecycle accumulation. The Clean Air Act experience shows that public investments to reduce pollution can yield mid- to long-term returns through productivity and income growth, with returns no less than many traditional economic policies. Current U.S. policy debates treating air quality management as a cost trade-off overlook the core fact: air pollution suppresses the very labor capacity that underpins economic growth itself.

References

- [1] Meng Y Y ,Yu Y ,Gonzales G D , et al. Health and economic cost estimates of short-term total and wildfire PM2.5 exposure on work loss: using the consecutive California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) data 2015-2018.[J].*BMJ public health*, 2024,2(1):e000491.
- [2] Spencer H B ,Ruby M B . Impact of in utero airborne lead exposure on long-run adult socio-economic outcomes: A population analysis using U.S. survey and administrative data.[J].*PloS one*,2023,18(11):e0293443-e0293463.
- [3] Zach R ,Andrew M ,M. J W . Political differences in air pollution abatement under the Clean Air Act[J].*Journal of Public Economics*,2022: 104688.
- [4] Adhikari S ,Rattanapan C ,Laosee O , et al. Health and economic costs attributable to ambient air pollution levels in the Kathmandu Valley, Nepal[J].*Discover Public Health*,2026,23(1):729-749.
- [5] Im J ,Jang Y ,Kim S , et al. Pollutant-specific effects of urban air policy: Causal evidence from South Korea's Clean Air Act[J].*Urban Climate*,2026,65102809-65102829.
- [6] Arriagada B N ,Campbell L S ,Goodman N , et al. Assessing the health benefits and economic costs of interventions to reduce exposure to air pollution from biomass combustion in Australia.[J].*Environmental science and pollution research international*,2025,32(47):1-16.
- [7] Hooler S ,Hillman A ,Hart B S , et al. Four decades after the Clean Air Act, legacy metal contaminants in Northeast U.S. surface waters document full recovery for the first time.[J].*Environmental pollution (Barking, Essex : 1987)*, 2025,373126052.
- [8] Kriit K H ,Sommar N J ,Åström S . Socioeconomic per-case costs of stroke, myocardial infarction, and preterm birth attributable to air pollution in Sweden.[J].*PloS one*, 2024,19(1):e0290766-e0290786.
- [9] Janet C ,John V ,Reed W . What Caused Racial Disparities in Particulate Exposure to Fall? New Evidence from the Clean Air Act and Satellite-Based Measures of Air Quality†[J].*American Economic Review*,2023,113(1):71-97.
- [10] Tatyana D ,Garth H ,H N M , et al. The Mortality and Medical Costs of Air Pollution: Evidence from Changes in Wind Direction.[J].*The American economic review*,2019,109(12):4178-4219.