



































































Pro ected Effects Vary Across the U.S. but Are Estimated at 1.2% of GDP per 1C Increase



Fig. 2. Spatial distributions of projected damages. County-level median values for average 2080 to 2099 RCP8.5 impacts. Impacts are changes relative to counterfactual "no additional climate change" trajectories. Color indicates magnitude of impact in median projection; outline color indicates level of agreement across projections (thin white outline, inner 66% of projections disagree in sign; no outline, ≥83% of projections agree in sign; black outline, ≥95% agree in sign; thick white outline, state borders; maps without outlines shown in fig. S2). Negative damages indicate economic gains. (A) Percent change in yields, area-weighted average for maize, wheat, soybeans, and cotton. (B) Change in all-cause mortality rates, across all age groups. (C) Change in electricity demand. (D) Change in labor supply of full-time-equivalent workers for low-risk jobs where workers are minimally exposed to outdoor temperature. (E) Same as (D), except for high-risk jobs where workers are heavily exposed to outdoor temperatures. (F) Change in damages from coastal storms. (G) Change in property-crime rates. (H) Change in violent-crime rates. (I) Median total direct economic damage across all sectors [(A) to (H)].



























China 13.9%					Inc 3.2	lia		Ukraine 1.8	Inter trans 2.5	national sport
								Serb. South Africa 1.3	ypt 0.4	Mexico 1.2
Iran 1.1	Saudi Ar 0.9	rabia	Turkey 0.6	Malaysia	Pakistan	N. Korea	U.A.E.	Algeria		
	Indones 0.9	sia	Taiwan 0.5	Iraq 0.3				Brazil 1.0	Venez. 0.5	ombia lle
1.1	rea Kazakhs 0.8	stan	Thailand 0.4 Uzbekistan	Viet.				Argentina	Peru Cuba	ව ප













ti	Fuel efficient light duty vehicles Electric light duty vehicles Shift to public transportation Shift to bikes and e-bikes				
Transp	Fuel efficient heavy duty vehicles Electric heavy duty vehicles, incl. buses Shipping – efficiency and optimization Aviation – energy efficiency				
	Energy efficiency Material efficiency		Net li	fetime cost of options: Costs are lower than the reference 0-20 (USD tCO ₂ -eq ⁻¹) 20-50 (USD tCO ₂ -eq ⁻¹)	
Industry	Enhanced recycling Fuel switching (electr, nat. gas, bio-energy, H ₂) Feedstock decarbonisation, process change Carbon capture with utilisation (CCU) and CCS		_	50–100 (USD tCO ₂ -eq ⁻¹) 100–200 (USD tCO ₂ -eq ⁻¹) Cost not allocated due to high variability or lack of data	
	Cementitious material substitution Reduction of non-CO ₂ emissions Reduce emission of fluorinated gas	■ #+ ■+		 Uncertainty range applies to the total potential contribution to emission reduction. The 	
Other	Reduce CH ₄ emissions from solid waste Reduce CH ₄ emissions from wastewater	1		associated with uncertainty	

































Carbon Tax	and Cap & 1	Frade: the Differences	
	Carbon Tax	Cap & Trade	
MATIONAL ECONOMIC EDUCATION DELEGATION			

	Carbon Tax	Cap & Trade
Carbon Price	Certain	Uncertain
Emissions	Uncertain	Certain
Ease of Implementation	May be easier to implement	
Additional concerns	 Always generates revenue May require legislation to change Predictability 	 1) Susceptible to lobbying. 2) Only generates revenue if government sells permits. 3) Cap can be changed by regulator. 4) Less certainty over future. 5) Regulations reduce efficacy of Cap & Trade

































































