NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

CAN POLLUTION CAUSE POVERTY? THE EFFECTS OF POLLUTION ON EDUCATIONAL, HEALTH AND ECONOMIC OUTCOMES

Claudia Persico

Working Paper 30559
http://www.nber.org/papers/w30559

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
October 2022

This research was conducted with restricted access to Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect the views of the BLS. I am grateful to seminar participants at the Brookings Institution's Economic Studies group, Princeton University, San Diego State University, Claremont McKenna University, Deakin University, University of Missouri, School of International Studies at American University, Erasmus University, and the AEFP, APPAM, ASHEcon, University of Wisconsin-Madison's Institute for Research on Poverty Summer Workshop, and DMV Health Economics conferences for feedback. American University provided generous financial support for this project. Any errors or conclusions are my own. Brittany Blizzard, Carley Weted and Sarah Chung provided excellent research assistance. The views expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2022 by Claudia Persico. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Can Pollution Cause Poverty? The Effects of Pollution on Educational, Health and Economic Outcomes

Claudia Persico

NBER Working Paper No. 30559
October 2022
JEL No. I10,I14,Q53

ABSTRACT

Although pollution is widespread, there is little evidence about how it might harm children's long run outcomes. Using the detailed, geocoded data that follows national representative cohorts of children born to the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth respondents over time, I compare siblings who were gestating before versus after a Toxic Release Inventory site opened or closed within one mile of their home. I find that children who were exposed prenatally to industrial pollution have lower wages, are more likely to be in poverty as adults, have fewer years of completed education, and are less likely to graduate high school.

Claudia Persico
American University
School of Public Affairs
4400 Massachusetts Ave NW
Washington, DC 20016
and IZA
and also NBER
cpersico@american.edu

I. Introduction

Billions of pounds of toxic substances are released each year, yet little is known about whether exposure to these pollutants might harm children's long run educational and labor market outcomes. There are currently about 21,800 TRI sites operating across the United States and more than 221.5 million people had a TRI site operating in their zip code in 2016.[1] In addition, there are reasons to believe that the types of pollution emitted by TRI sites might be particularly detrimental to human health and development. For example, TRI sites release known neurotoxins, such as lead and mercury, into the air. While criteria air pollutants (for example, particulate matter) have been regulated for decades, little is known about the effects of most of the chemicals released by TRI facilities. Most of the chemicals emitted have never undergone any kind of toxicity testing (US Department of Health and Human Services 2010) and were essentially unregulated until 2011 when the U.S. introduced the Mercury and Air Toxic Standards (MATS). These regulations have been rolled back and are now being contested.[2]

Nevertheless, a growing literature suggests that airborne toxic pollutants from TRI sites can cause negative academic and behavioral outcomes for children in school (Persico and Venator 2019), cause cancer, harm birth outcomes (Currie, Davis, Greenstone and Walker 2015), and harm the brain and reproductive

[1] I made this calculation based on linking zip code level census counts of the population to TRI data.

[2] The Supreme Court of the United States decided against the MATS rule in 2015 for lack of sufficient cost-benefit analysis and remanded the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals, which temporarily upheld the rule. In 2020, the EPA determined that it was not "appropriate and necessary" (A&N 2020 rule) to regulate hazardous air pollutants (HAPs, also known as airborne toxics) under the MATS rule and stopped some regulation of these airborne toxics. Litigation on the 2020 A&N rule is ongoing, which affects the legal basis of the MATS rule (Congressional Research Service 2020). On January 20, 2021, President Biden directed EPA to revisit the 2020 rule by August 2021, and the EPA has submitted a new proposed rule to regulate HAPs that is not yet in effect (EPA 2022).

systems (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2009).[3] However, contemporaneous measures of pollution might underestimate the total welfare effects of environmental toxicants if these toxicants negatively affect the developing brain, and consequently, long-run outcomes.

I make three main contributions in this paper. First, this paper provides some of the first evidence that prenatal exposure to hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) can cause negative long-run human capital outcomes with important distributional consequences for fence-line communities of children who live within one mile of a TRI site. Second, this analysis is among the first to investigate how pollution might affect income in adulthood through educational, employment, crime, and health channels using very detailed data from surveys of the children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) and their parents for families that live close to toxic sites. Third, this paper contributes to a literature on how neighborhoods affect health, educational attainment and intergenerational mobility, showing that even within a zip code, proximity to sources of pollution can cause inequality.

I use very detailed data from surveys of the children of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 (NLSY79) and their parents that allows the matching of siblings and geographic information on families to examine how TRI pollution affects children's long run outcomes. By leveraging TRI plant openings and closings, I compare siblings within the same family in which one sibling was exposed to TRI pollution during gestation and the other was not exposed because the plant had not opened yet or because it closed before a later child was conceived. I consider two different approaches – comparing siblings who do not move away from close proximity to a TRI site and estimating an intent-to-treat (ITT) model that assigns initial TRI proximity and open/close dates to all siblings

[3] However, most of the evidence we have on the neurotoxic effects of these pollutants is from studies using animal models.

in the same family regardless of whether or not the family moved. By exploiting the short distance over which TRI toxicants can travel through air (i.e., one mile) and using within-family comparisons, I am able to isolate the effects of pollution from other difficult-to-observe and possibly endogenous factors, such as local sorting, avoidance behavior, and time-invariant characteristics of families that happen to be near a TRI site that could affect child outcomes.

The consequences of prenatal exposure to TRI pollution are stark. I find that children who were gestating near an operating TRI site have 59.4% percent lower family income and are 17.2 percentage points more likely to be on a public assistance program as an adult than their sibling, who was not exposed to the TRI pollution. This represents a large increase of 43.6% in public assistance use above the mean. In addition, children who are prenatally exposed to TRI pollution have 1.284 fewer years of education, are 12.4 percentage points less likely to graduate high school and are 9.4 percentage points more likely to have a cognitive disability as an adult than their sibling who was not prenatally exposed to pollution. I also find significant effects of prenatal exposure to TRI pollution, between -0.49 and -0.53 standard deviations, on a summary index of long-term outcomes.

These findings are much larger than Isen et al's (2017) estimates of the effect of pollution on wages (the only other published paper on the topic). This implies two possible explanations. First, prenatal exposure to TRI pollution, which contains known neurotoxins like lead and mercury, might be much worse than exposure to other types of air pollution, such as emissions from traffic. Second, there might be important distributional consequences for exposure to pollution wherein people living very close to TRI sites are much more strongly affected by the pollution, which would be missed by estimates that assume a county-level treatment. Indeed, the county-level results are likely to be driven by people living very close to these sites, which has important implications for policy

and where we locate these sites. Since disadvantaged families are more likely to live closer to TRI sites, exposure to pollution might push families without resources to compensate into poverty. The results are robust to a variety of specifications and suggest that pollution is a major channel through which inequality is reproduced.

II. Background

In 2017, Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) sites alone (which represent only one type of industrial plant) released 3.97 billion pounds of (untreated) toxic chemicals in America into the air, land and water, out of 30.57 billion total pounds of toxic chemicals created in production-related wastes (EPA 2017). The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) estimates that more than 59 million people (about 19 percent of the population) live within one mile of an operating TRI site (EPA 2014). While most toxic chemicals are managed so that they are not released into the environment, some release of these chemicals is the inevitable byproduct of manufacturing. Research on the effects of pollution on children most commonly focuses on the link between exposure and health outcomes, such as birth weight, mortality or the prevalence of respiratory diseases for children in highly polluted areas.[4]

According to the "fetal origins" hypothesis, prenatal health conditions can have large impacts on health and brain development that reverberate into adulthood (Currie and Almond 2011). Such effects are persistent and occur through "fetal programming" that occurs in the womb through brain development or epigenetic mechanisms, which are just beginning to be explored. There is some evidence that environmental toxicants might interact with genetic susceptibilities to alter developmental trajectories and produce cognitive disabilities, such as

[4] For an overview of how in utero and early life exposure to negative environmental factors, such as pollution, can impact later life outcomes, see Almond and Currie (2011).

specific learning disabilities, speech and language impairments, intellectual disability, and autism (Miodovnik, 2011; Jurewicz et al, 2013). While cognitive disabilities may have a substantial underlying genetic component, there is also evidence that the development of cognitive disabilities is strongly influenced by the environment (Miller and McCardle, 2011). Recent research further points to the ways that genes are especially susceptible to environmental context, since genes are always stored, transcribed and translated within an environment that may influence these processes. Randomized control trials of early-life epigenetic changes in rats show that these changes also affect subsequent gene expression in the brain (Kundakovic. 2011; Roth, 2012; Green, 2015). There is also a growing body of evidence that during the prenatal, perinatal and early postnatal periods, as well as in early childhood, the developing human brain is highly vulnerable to toxic chemical exposures (Bearer, 1995; Rice and Barone Jr, 2000). During these sensitive periods, chemicals can cause permanent brain injury at low levels of exposure that would have little or no harmful effects in an adult (Bearer, 1995; Grandjean and Landrigan, 2014). Increasing evidence points towards non-genetic, environmental exposures that are involved in causation of cognitive disabilities, in some cases by interacting with genetically inherited risk factors and epigenetic mechanisms.[5]

Unfortunately, there are no studies to date comparing the effects of different types of toxicants on cognitive outcomes, though there is a literature showing the different types of toxicants can harm cognitive development in children. Aizer and colleagues (2015) found that a 5 micrograms per deciliter increase in children's preschool lead levels reduces elementary school test scores by 43 percent of a standard deviation. Lead reduction policies explained roughly half of the decline in the Black-White test score gap in these cohorts. Because

[5] For a more in-depth discussion of how different types of environmental toxicants affect cognitive development, please see the NBER working paper version of this paper (Persico et al., 2016).

lead easily crosses the blood-brain barrier, exposure to lead can lead to brain damage in the prefrontal cerebral cortex, hippocampus and cerebellum (Finkelstein, Markowitz, and Rosen, 1998).[6]

There is also evidence that other environmental toxicants found in TRI sites (e.g. methylmercury, arsenic, polychlorinated biphenyls, dioxin, volatile organic compounds, etc.) are similarly damaging to the developing brain, though there is far less research on these chemicals than on lead.[7] For example, there are growing epidemiological literatures on how exposure to TRI pollutants, such as Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) (Lovasi et al., 2014; Margolis et al., 2016; Perera et al., 2009), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) (Allen et al., 2015; Grandjean & Landrigan, 2006; Wu, Bhanegaonkar, & Flowers, 2006), and other heavy metals (e.g., Bellinger, 2013; Ciesielski et al., 2012; Counter & Buchanan, 2004), might harm child development. However, epidemiological studies usually employ longitudinal methods that control for a range of variables and use the amount of a toxicant in a child's or mother's blood or hair as a predictor of the effects of early toxic exposures. Often a disaster in which a large number of people were exposed to a large amount of the toxicant is used to detect the effects of the toxicant in humans. In some cases, epidemiologists use a comparison group of unexposed children. However, because of the nature of the research, there can be no random assignment, and there is often no data on the

[6] The EPA (2013) provides a comprehensive review of hundreds of studies investigating the effects of lead from epidemiology, toxicology, economics, public health, neuroscience, and other disciplines. Early-life exposure to lead causes lower IQ, decreased test scores, increased rates of high school dropout, lower adult earnings, attention deficit disorders, impulsiveness, hyperactivity, conduct disorders, and criminal behavior.

[7] For reviews of the recent literature on how toxicants like methylmercury, arsenic, polychlorinated biphenyls, dioxin, volatile organic compounds, and other toxicants found in Superfund sites affect child development and the brain, see Bellinger (2013), Bose et al (2012), Grandjean and Landrigan (2006 and 2014), and Behrman, Butler and Outcomes (2007). Most of these toxicants have been tested in rat studies to show that they are neurotoxic, but the evidence on how they affect developing human brains is relatively small.

same outcomes before the disaster. Thus, it is difficult to control for pre-trends and account for possible biases using these methods.

However, a growing literature links pollution exposure during gestation to negative birth outcomes[8] and cognitive outcomes. For example, Persico, Figlio and Roth (2016) explore the effects of in utero exposure to Superfund pollution on health and cognitive outcomes in school, finding that pollution exposure is associated with worse infant health, 0.11 of a standard deviation lower test scores, and a higher likelihood of behavioral incidents, cognitive disabilities and repeating a grade. Ferrie, Rolf, and Troesken (2012) find that early exposure to lead affects later army intelligence test scores. Almond, Edlund, and Palme (2009) and Black et al (2013) use quasi-experimental designs and Scandinavian data and find effects of exposure to radiation from nuclear fallout during gestation on later test scores. Sanders (2012) finds that a standard deviation decrease in mean pollution level at birth is associated with 1.9 percent of a standard deviation increase in high school test scores in Texas. Bharadwaj, Gibson, Graff Zivin, and Neilson (2014) compare Chilean siblings' differential exposure to air pollution during gestation to show that exposure to carbon monoxide during the third trimester is associated with a 3 to 4 percent of a standard deviation decline in test scores in fourth grade.

Fewer papers, however, investigate the effects of pollution on later earnings. Black et al (2019) find effects on later earnings and educational attainment in Norwegian children exposed to radioactive fallout. Isen and colleagues (2017) compare cohorts of children in nonattainment counties that had to reduce their air pollution after the Clean Air Act to those in attainment

[8] A growing literature has shown that children exposed in utero to pollution have higher infant mortality (Currie and Neidell, 2005), lower birth weight (Currie, Davis, Greenstone, and Walker, 2015), and a higher incidence of congenital anomalies (Currie, Greenstone, and Moretti, 2011). For example, a number of epidemiological studies have also found significant relationships between air pollution and preterm birth (Butler and Behrman, 2007).

counties. They find that cohorts exposed to more air pollution in early life is associated with a 0.7 percent decrease in the number of quarters worked and a one percent decrease in mean annual earnings. In a new working paper, Voorheis (2017) also finds that pollution exposure in early life is associated with modestly lower college attendance and wages. Grönqvist, Nilsson, and Robling (2019) show that children who were exposed to less lead through removing lead from gasoline in Sweden were more likely to graduate high school, were less likely to commit crimes, and had higher wages in adulthood.

Nevertheless, it is unclear what mechanisms might underly the relationship between pollution and long-run human capital outcomes and whether certain types of pollution might have bigger impacts on wages. In addition, this is the first paper to investigate the spatial, racial and socioeconomic distributional consequences of prenatal pollution exposure on long-run outcomes. Finally, most studies to date are unable to account for time-invariant characteristics of families and neighborhoods that could affect child outcomes. This paper lends insight into the ways neighborhoods affect long-run outcomes for children, as well as the true costs of pollution.

III. Empirical Strategies

I evaluate the effects of in-utero exposure to environmental toxicants on children by comparing siblings who lived within 1 mile of a TRI site that opened or closed so that at least one sibling was exposed during gestation, but the other was not. In my analyses, I concentrate on families residing within one mile of a TRI site because, as shown in Panel A of Figure 1, Particulate Matter2.5 (PM25) does not travel much farther than a mile. Panel B also shows that Particulate Matter 10 (PM10) increases following a TRI site opening.[9] Most TRI sites (72%

[9] A similar result was obtained by Persico and Venator (2021) for the distance traveled by PM2.5 and PM2.5 having increased after a TRI site opening. Furthermore, there is evidence from

in 2018) primarily emit air pollution and usually release a variety of pollutants such as PM2.5, PM10, lead, and ozone.

I employ two different identification strategies that both use a family fixed effects design. My first comparison is an intent to treat (ITT) analysis where I account for potentially endogenous mobility by conditioning on the location of the first birth near a TRI site for all siblings in the same family born earlier or later, regardless of whether the family moved. In other words, I compare children conceived within one mile of an operating TRI site to their siblings that are conceived after the same site closed or before it opened, regardless of whether the mother remained in the proximity of the site. These results include the entire population of siblings for which the first-born sibling was conceived within 1 mile of an operating TRI site. Second, I compare siblings whose family does not move between births (though they might have moved before or afterwards) where at least one child was prenatally exposed to TRI pollution because the mother lived within 1 mile of an operating TRI site. The comparison group in the regressions is siblings living in the same neighborhood at birth who are conceived at a time when a TRI site is not operating because it had not yet opened or it closed.

Because pollution exposure is not randomly distributed, it is important to account for the time invariant characteristics of families and neighborhoods that could affect child outcomes in adulthood, which motivates my use of family fixed effects. Thus, my identifying assumption is that the only thing that changed between conceptions of siblings was that the local TRI site closed or opened (regardless of where later children were born). Because the timing of TRI site openings and closings is plausibly unrelated to the timing of conception, comparing siblings who do not move should yield an unbiased estimate of the

environmental modeling that airborne toxics, such as heavy metals, from TRI sites are concentrated at closer distances to a facility (Chakraborty, Maantay and Brender 2011; Dolinoy and Miranda 2004).

effect of exposure to TRI pollution during gestation. Later in the paper I describe a variety of the tests and specification checks that I undertake in order to determine the degree to which my results are internally valid.

My basic family fixed effects estimation is given by:

$$(1) \quad Y_{ijt} = \beta_1 ClosestSiteWithinMileisOpen_{ijt} + X_{ijt} + \theta_j + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

Where Y_{ijt} is some outcome of a child *i* born to family *j* at time *t*. I determine whether prenatal exposure to TRI pollution affects a variety of long-run outcomes, including the log of wages, family income, the likelihood of being on public assistance as an adult,[10] years of education, the likelihood of graduating high school, college attendance, as well as a summary index of adult outcomes. β_1 is the coefficient of interest on $ClosestSiteWithinMileisOpen_{ijt}$, which is a dummy variable for whether a child was conceived while a TRI site was operating within one mile of their mother's residence. θ_j is a family fixed effect that is specific to the mother, γ_t is a birth year fixed effect, and X_{it} is a vector of child-specific control variables (i.e., gender, birth order fixed effects, birth month fixed effects, birth spacing, adult marital status, age in the last survey wave in 2016, maternal marriage status at the time of birth, and total years of childhood poverty). In addition, the models that analyze economic outcomes (such as wages and family income) use all available person-year observations for ages 20-45 and control for age of the economic outcome linearly, a quadratic in age and a cubic in age to avoid confounding life cycle and birth cohort effects. Because many individuals did not respond in some survey waves or were missing some adult outcomes, I weight my regressions by the inverse of the number of times an

[10] I define adulthood in this context as age 23 or older. I define public assistance receipt as the receipt of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, also known as food stamps), Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Women, Infants and Children (WIC), general cash assistance, or Supplemental Security Income (SSI). I do not include veteran's benefits, etc.

individual is observed in the adult survey data. ε_{ijt} is an error term. Standard errors are clustered at the TRI site level.[11]

Since children who live near TRI sites are slightly more disadvantaged, as shown in Table 1, one might be concerned that other neighborhood factors might contribute to disparities in outcomes. My estimates also could be biased if there are unobserved factors affecting the outcomes of children within one mile of a TRI site that are correlated with a TRI site opening or closing. For example, when a TRI site opens, more motivated families might move away from a TRI site to escape the pollution. If there is substantial residential sorting around an opening or closing, another mechanism through which a TRI site opening might affect children is through peer effects. On the other hand, a factory opening might both increase pollution and also stimulate the local economy (Greenstone, Hornbeck and Moretti, 2010), meaning that the positive impacts of better economic conditions may cancel out any negative impacts that could arise from pollution exposure.

To address these concerns, in my preferred specification I compare children in the same family in which I instrument the location of the first birth in the family near a TRI site (and the first TRI site status and location) for all other siblings born later, regardless of whether the family moved. This Intent to Treat (ITT) specification allows me to address residential sorting and avoidance behavior by proxying the location of the first birth and treatment status for all later-born siblings. Thus, one would expect these estimates to be smaller since some untreated siblings might count as treated and some treated siblings might count as untreated if families moved. In an additional specification, I compare children in the same family who do not move between at least 2 births (though they might have moved earlier or later). I also restrict the analysis to children who

[11] The results are also robust to clustering at the zip code level.

only live within a mile of one TRI site (or fewer) at a time to ensure that treatment intensity was consistent across all children in the sample. While in the ITT specification, first-born children are all likely to be exposed to TRI pollution during gestation, in the non-movers specification, there is more heterogeneity in which sibling is exposed prenatally.[12][13] I show that my results are robust to a variety of tests and specification checks in Section V.C. of the paper.

These results could also be biased towards zero if environmental toxicants mothers were exposed to through living near TRI sites affect children who are conceived after the site closes. Some research suggests that once exposed, environmental toxicants remain in a person's body for a long time, contributing to chemical body burden (Thornton et al., 2002; CDC, 2009). If environmental toxicants from local TRI sites stay in a mother's body for a long time, they could affect siblings who are conceived even after a TRI site has closed. My results might also be biased towards zero if there exists measurement error in the recorded timing of openings and closings. I use the earliest time when the company first filed its tax records or first started reporting to the TRI as the opening date and the latest time when the company last filed or stopped reporting as the closing date, but if the site was not emitting pollution at those times, children might not have been meaningfully exposed.

IV. Data Description

In this study, I explore the long-term effects of being exposed to TRI pollution by using a rich, longitudinal survey connecting mothers and children. The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth 1979 Cohort (NLSY79) is a

[12] While I also control for birth order fixed effects in all specifications, there could be concern with the confounding of birth order and treatment status that is alleviated in the non-movers specification.

[13] It is important to note that there are fewer families who have their first child near a TRI site than families who ever have two children near the same TRI site since in the non-movers specification, I am including later births (e.g., siblings 2 and 3 are born near a TRI site, but not sibling 1).

nationally representative sample of adolescents who were 14 to 22 years old when they were first surveyed in 1979. The survey follows 12,686 young men and women, with annual interviews through 1994 and biennial interviews after that. The survey collects rich data about labor market participation, education, health, training, family formation and mobility. The Bureau of Labor Statistics began a separate survey of all children born to NLSY79 female respondents in 1986, the NLSY79 Children and Young Adult Surveys (CNLSY). This survey (the CNLSY) can be matched to the mother's information from the NLSY79 and contains information on each child on health, education, labor market participation, engagement in risky behaviors, and disability through 2016.

The set of adult outcomes I focus on include (1) labor market and economic status outcomes (measured biannually and expressed in 2000 dollars) – wages, family income[14] (20-45) and the incidence of poverty in adulthood (23-45), (2) educational outcomes – years of completed education, whether a person graduated high school, and whether a person attended college, and (3) health outcomes – the likelihood of having any disability[15] and the likelihood of having a cognitive disability.[16] Wages, defined by annual earnings/annual work hours, is my main labor market outcome. I compute wages for only those who have positive earnings in a given year, and valid data exists for 79 percent of the sample of children with siblings living within one mile of a TRI site.[17] The average wage (in 2000 dollars) at age 30 for the whole sample is $15.20.

To reduce measurement error and address concerns about multiple inference, I construct a summary index of outcome measures (Kling, Liebman,

[14] If a person is not married, family income is equal to individual income.
[15] Having any disability is defined as reporting having a cognitive disability, epilepsy, a nervous disorder, a heart problem, cancer, or being handicapped.
[16] Having a cognitive disability is defined as having a learning disability, ADHD/hyperactive, intellectual disability or a speech impairment.
[17] I drop a few implausibly low wages that are lower than $2.75 per hour.

and Katz 2007; Deming 2009). I normalize each outcome to have a mean of zero and standard deviation of one, adjust the signs of outcomes so that a more positive outcome is better (i.e., I flip the sign for being on public assistance or having disabilities), and take the simple average across those outcomes. I then standardize the summary index, which includes family income, likelihood of being on public assistance programs as an adult, years of education, graduating high school, graduating college, having a cognitive disability, and being employed in the last four years. While my primary analytic sample is small, I am identifying off of 239 families and 778 children in my preferred ITT specification.

I gathered data on the annual types of pollution released by TRI sites and the locations of TRI sites from the EPA. Because the toxic emissions measures in the TRI database have been widely criticized for containing substantial measurement errors,[18] I gathered data on the timing of TRI site opening and closings from the state tax filings. Companies that are operating are required to file taxes each year, and I was able to match TRI sites based on business names and address information. I use the time when the company first filed its tax records or started reporting to the TRI as the opening date and the time when the company last filed or stopped reporting as the closing date.[19]

Using geocoded census-tract and zip-code data from the NLSY79 and latitudinal and longitudinal coordinates for TRI sites, I calculate the closest

[18] The data on emissions is self-reported and based on criteria that have varied over time. The EPA does not require plants to measure their emissions precisely, or to report at all under certain circumstances. Facilities are required to report if they manufactured or processed more than 25,000 pounds of a listed chemical or "otherwise used" 10,000 pounds of a listed chemical. For persistent bio-accumulative toxins, the thresholds are lower. These thresholds have changed periodically over the life of the program. The EPA provides guidance about possible estimation methodologies, but plants estimate their emissions themselves. Estimating methodologies may vary between plants and over time (Currie, Davis, Greenstone and Walker, 2015).

[19] However, the first year of the TRI is 1987. If a company reported on the TRI in 1987, they could not be found in the tax records, and there was reason to believe it was operating before 1987, in a few cases I assigned its opening date as 1970. The results are also robust to the assignment of different opening dates.

distance between the population-weighted census tract or zip code centroid and the nearest TRI sites in the year a child was born. The sample in this study includes every child born within one mile of a TRI site. 693 TRI sites opened and 497 sites closed between 1970 and 1998, the latest birth year for which I could observe adult outcomes. I also match these data to additional census tract and zip-code level census data from the 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010 censuses. Table 1 presents the characteristics of children of NLSY79 respondents overall in Column 1, within one mile of a TRI site in Column 2 and within one mile of an open TRI site in Column 3. As shown in Table 1, children living within one mile of TRI site are significantly more disadvantaged than children in the CNLSY79 overall. Their mothers and fathers had fewer years of education at birth, were less likely to be married, and were more likely to report being in poverty than the entire sample of CNLSY79 children. They are also more likely to be Black or Hispanic, and less likely to attend preschool. However, children who were gestating near an open TRI site are similar to all other children who ever live near a TRI site on observable characteristics.

V. Long-run Outcomes of TRI Exposure During Gestation

A. Main Results

Table 2 presents the results that compare siblings with and without TRI pollution exposure during gestation on several long-run outcomes: an outcomes index, the log of wages, log of family income, the likelihood of being on public assistance as an adult, years of education, the likelihood of high school completion, and likelihood of attending college. Panel A presents the results of my preferred ITT specification in which I account for endogenous mobility by instrumenting for birth location with the first time a family lived near a TRI site,

regardless of whether the family moved.[20] In other words, I compare childing conceived within one mile of an operating TRI site to their siblings that are conceived when the same site is not operating, regardless of whether the mother remained in proximity of the site. It is important to note that the models that analyze economic outcomes (such as wages and family income) use all available observations for ages 20-45 and control for a cubic in age to avoid confounding life cycle and birth cohort effects (in addition to all of the other controls outlined in Section III). Standard errors are clustered at the TRI site level.

Being exposed to air pollution prenatally is associated with large negative effects on long-run outcomes: I find that children who were exposed to TRI pollution during gestation have a 0.49 of a standard deviation decline in the long-run outcomes index relative to a sibling who was not prenatally exposed to TRI pollution. Children who are exposed to TRI sites during gestation also have 59.4% lower family income and 1.284 fewer years of education than their unexposed siblings. However, I do not find a statistically significant effect on high school completion, college attendance, wages or public assistance receipt, though the point estimates are negative.

The estimates in Panel B of Table 2 present the results from the specification that compares non-moving siblings. It is important to note that the results in Panel A are slightly smaller on average than those in Panel B since children might not have been prenatally exposed to TRI pollution if their family moved away between births, but they would be assigned as exposed if the site was still open. In Panel B, I find that being prenatally exposed to TRI pollution leads to a 53 percent of a standard deviation decline in the long-run outcomes index compared to their unexposed siblings. I also find that children who are exposed to TRI sites during gestation have 25.5% lower wages and are 17.2 percentage

[20] The regressions are weighed by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the adult survey data.

points more likely to be on public assistance as an adult than their siblings, which represents a 43.6 percent increase above the mean. They also complete 1.263 fewer years of education and are 12.4 percentage points less likely to complete high school than their siblings who were not prenatally exposed to TRI pollution.[21] Although the pattern of results in Panels A and B are similar, I use the more conservative ITT specification of in the rest of the paper.

In order to investigate whether children in a zip code's outcomes were already on a downward trend before relative to after a TRI site opening, I estimate an event study of the outcomes index on time from a TRI site opening in a zip code. I estimate the following regression for children gestating within a mile of a TRI site that opens:

(2) $$Y_{izt} = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=-2}^{2} \beta_j \, \mathbb{1}[\tau_{it} = j]_{st} + X_i + \eta_z + \theta_t + \epsilon_{ist}$$

Y_{izt} is the long run outcomes index value for child *i* born in zip code *z* in year *t*. I include 5 years of leads and 9+ years of lags for the treatment, where τ_{it} denotes the year relative to the opening of a TRI site. For example, a value of τ_{it} = -1 represents children's outcomes index in adulthood if they gestated one year before the year in which the TRI site opens (the reference year). β is the effect of a site opening within one mile of gestating child's location on the long-run outcomes index. η_z is a zip code fixed effect, which captures unobserved time-invariant characteristics of zip codes, and θ_t is a birth year fixed effect. X_i is a vector of controls for gender, birth order fixed effects, birth month fixed effects and age. I estimate this event study for children who did not move between their birth and the birth of a sibling in order to isolate the effect of a TRI site opening on long run outcomes.

[21] Panel A of Table A1 show similar results for non-movers using zip code fixed effects instead of family fixed effects. However, the results are much smaller in magnitude and not statistically significant, indicating that time invariant characteristics of families are important determinants of long-run outcomes. Thus, I control for family fixed effects in the rest of the paper.

Figure 2 shows the results of the event study on the long-run outcomes index. Relative to children who gestated the year before a TRI site opened, children who gestated 1-2 years afterwards experienced about 50% of a standard deviation worse outcomes in adulthood.[22] These effects persist at least 9 years after a TRI site initially opens, indicating that TRI sites worsen outcomes at the neighborhood level years after an initial opening. In addition, the results in year 0 are primarily driven by TRI sites that open before children are born. This implies that during the next year (1), all children would have been exposed to the TRI pollution during gestation, which is why the effect on outcomes might increase in magnitude.

Table 3 presents some additional long run outcomes that could constitute other mechanisms through which TRI pollution affects long run outcomes. I find no statistically significant effects for being employed or on unemployment or being convicted, on probation or in prison. However, in Panel B of Table 3, I find that children exposed to TRI pollution prenatally are also 7.58 percentage points more likely to have any disability and 9.42 percentage points more likely to have a cognitive disability than their siblings.[23] This represents a 144.9% increase in disability rates overall and a massive 342% increase in cognitive disabilities. The point estimates also imply that cognitive disabilities drive the results on disability.

The picture that emerges suggests that pollution exposure during gestation is associated with having a cognitive disability, dropping out of high school, and then being on public assistance. One reason the effects might be so large is that TRI sites are known to emit especially harmful classes of compounds, such as heavy metals, volatile organic compounds and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons.

[22] Due to my small sample size, I binned the years before and after an opening into 2 year bins. Thus, 1-2 represents 1 to 2 full years after a TRI opening, 3-4 represents 3 to 4 years after an opening, etc.

[23] Because there could be differential slippage between these categories over time, I examine cognitive disabilities separately and together.

There is currently little causal research in humans about what these might do to the developing human brain, largely because this topic is difficult to study.

Next, I examine whether TRI site openings might have different effects from TRI site closings. The results are presented in Table 4, where Panel A presents the effects for a TRI site opening on long-run outcomes and Panel B presents the effects for a TRI site closing on outcomes. Both specifications use the sample of non-moving families and compare siblings. The results in Table 4 suggest that for the long-run outcomes index, family income, years of education, and college attendance, the effects of an opening are slightly larger than that of a closing. One might expect TRI site closings to produce larger effects than openings since in the case of closings, only one sibling is exposed to TRI pollution, while in the case of openings, both siblings are exposed to the pollution, but at different ages. However, the pattern of results for openings and closings are fairly similar, which suggests that prenatal exposure to TRI pollution is worse than exposure at other times. In addition, some TRI chemicals might linger in a mother's body, exposing later-born children even if the site is no longer operating.

B. Heterogeneity of Estimated Effects

Table 5 presents estimates of the effects of exposure to TRI pollution by gender and socioeconomic status. Panel A presents the results for boys, while Panel B presents the results for girls. Although most results are not statistically different from each other, the pattern of results suggests that exposure to TRI pollution might have somewhat worse effects for boys than for girls. The outcomes index is -56.5% of a standard deviation lower for boys, compared with 40.4% lower for girls, which is marginally significant at the $p<0.1$ level. Both girls and boys who were prenatally exposed to TRI pollution have fewer years of completed education (1.111 fewer years of education for girls, compared with 0.981 fewer years for boys), relative to their unexposed siblings. However, boys

are 22.1 percentage points more likely to be on public assistance in adulthood and have 118% lower family income if they were prenatally exposed to pollution, relative to their unexposed sibling(s). These differences are both statistically different at the 1% level from the point estimate for girls. Boys are 27 percentage points less likely to attend college. This pattern of results is consistent with prior evidence that boys might be more harmed than girls by early pollution exposure (e.g., Persico, Figlio and Roth 2020).

Panel C of Table 4 presents the results for children whose mothers were not in poverty when they were born, and Panel D presents the results for low-income children whose mothers were in poverty when they were born.[24] While the results are not statistically different from each other across groups, the effects of prenatal exposure to TRI pollution are also somewhat larger in magnitude for low-income children than for higher income children. Low-income children who suffered prenatal pollution exposure have 1.125 fewer years of education, have 87.6% lower family income and are 19.3 percentage points less likely to attend college than their unexposed siblings. In comparison, wealthier children have 0.991 fewer years of education, are 14.2 percentage points less likely to attend college than their siblings (though this is not statistically significant). The outcomes index is -0.434 for non-poor children and -0.575 for low-income children. TRI pollution might be worse for lower income families because low-income children live in closer proximity to the TRI pollution than wealthier children and have less ability to practice avoidance behaviors. However, the pattern of findings also suggest that pollution could harm mobility and might push people at the margins of poverty into poverty.

Panels E and F present the results by race: Panel E shows the results for non-Hispanic White children and Panel F shows the results for Black and

[24] Unfortunately, due to sample size constraints, I am unable to break the sample into smaller bins to estimate effects across the earnings distribution.

Hispanic children.[25] Overall, the long-run outcomes index result suggests that the effects are similar across racial categories and most of the results are statistically different from each other across racial groups, except for high school graduation, which is worse for Black and Hispanic children. However, the effects of prenatal exposure to TRI pollution on public assistance, high school completion and college-going are larger for Black and Hispanic adults. The effects of prenatal exposure on years of education and family income appears to be somewhat larger in magnitude for non-Hispanic White children.

In Table 6, I present the results of an exploratory analysis in which I estimate the effects of pollution on children for TRI sites that report emitting pollution through stacks, compared with TRI sites that have fugitive emissions. Because pollution released through smokestacks is usually treated with scrubbers before being released, one might expect the results to be smaller in magnitude for stack releases than for fugitive releases, which are essentially untreated releases. All specifications maintain the family fixed effects model and only include non-movers. The results presented in Panels A and B of Table 6 show that the pattern for stack releases and fugitive releases is quite similar overall. However, the effects on the outcomes index and the log of family income in adulthood are larger for fugitive releases, but the effect on years of education is larger for stack releases.[26]

[25] Unfortunately, due to sample size constraints, the effects on Black and Hispanic children had to be estimated as one group.

[26] Because the EPA only includes data on stack vs fugitive releases for a subsample of TRI sites, the number of observations are smaller here than for the full sample. Sites with missing data on stack versus fugitive releases are treated as missing, though it is clear they released air pollution. The EPA defines fugitive emissions as unintended emissions from facilities or activities (e.g., construction) that "could not reasonably pass through a stack, chimney, vent, or other functionally equivalent opening" (see title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations, sections 70.2 and 71.2). Thus, it might be the case that only the milder polluters volunteer this information. In addition, many sites release both stack and fugitive releases, making disambiguating the effects difficult.

Another important question for policy is what types of industries drive these effects. In Table A3, I estimate an exploratory analysis in which I regress the long run outcomes index on indicators for different types of TRI industries interacted with an indicator for the TRI site operating during gestation within one mile of the family (using my preferred ITT specification). I find that the results from different industries are not statistically different from each other – all industry types are associated with negative effects on children's long run outcomes indexes.

C. Additional Threats to Internal Validity

My identification strategy relies on the theory that residences closer to TRI sites will have greater exposure to pollutants. However, the air quality monitoring data over this time period is somewhat sparse. Figure 3 presents the results disaggregated by distance from the TRI site, in which we interact an indicator for the site operating with distance bins (for example, site is open x <1 mile, site is open x 1-2 miles, etc.), with the children who are farther than 8 miles from a TRI site as the control group. As expected, the strongest effects are on children who are closest to the TRI site, with children living less than 1 mile from the TRI site having 40% of a standard deviation worse outcomes than children living more than 8 miles away. However, the effects on long run outcomes appear to fade out rapidly over distance.

One alternative explanation for these findings is that family income, a mother's marital status, a mother's or father's education, prenatal care, or parental behavior may have changed between siblings so that children born when TRI sites were not operating experienced married parents or parents with higher education and more resources than siblings born during a TRI site operating. While I do not have data on all factors that might have changed within families, I test for this directly in Table 7 by comparing years of maternal and paternal education and

whether the mother was married, reported at birth, between siblings who were exposed to TRI pollution, relative to siblings who were conceived after a site closed or before it opened. I also compare total years of childhood poverty, the month prenatal care was first obtained, whether the mother smoked or drank during pregnancy, and where a child ever attended preschool between siblings who were exposed to the TRI pollution, compared with their unexposed siblings. The results, presented in Table 7, are small and not statistically significant.

One might also be concerned that the closing of a TRI site might make a neighborhood more attractive to live in – and this neighborhood improvement, not the TRI site closing per se, was the cause of the better long-run outcomes. For example, if a TRI site's closure causes more educated and affluent people to enter a neighborhood, later born children might do better in school than their earlier born siblings because the composition of children in neighborhoods changed, leading to positive peer effects. While I do not have data on the schools children born to NLSY recipients attended, I can compare neighborhood characteristics between births. Using data from the 1980, 1990 and 2000 Censuses, I compare median home values, median income, percent of dwellings that are rented, the percent Black and percent Hispanic[27] at the zip code or census tract level for children prenatally exposed to TRI pollution, relative to their siblings who were not exposed in the same neighborhood. The results, presented in Table 8, show that siblings experienced roughly similar neighborhoods. However, children conceived when a TRI site was operating experienced neighborhoods that had $1,866 higher income and 1.6 percentage points fewer homes that were rented, suggesting that there could be some positive economic effects around TRI site openings. Nevertheless, on average there are few economically meaningful differences in neighborhood characteristics between the neighborhoods siblings

[27] I linearly interpolate these values for missing years of data.

experienced.[28] Similarly, Persico and Venator (2019) find that there is no differential sorting based on observable characteristics into or out of schools after the openings or closings of TRI sites.

One might also be concerned that a few very polluted TRI sites are driving the results. Thus, Table 9 presents results that limit the types of TRI sites used in the analysis in two different ways. The results presented in Panel A are limited to those TRI sites that are emitting pollution below the 80th percentile nationally. In other words, I drop the top 20 percent of polluters from the sample entirely and estimate the results for only the bottom four fifths of the distribution of TRI sites. The results presented in Panel B are from a sample of TRI sites that do not have bad-sounding names, or names associated with pollution.[29] The results in both Panels A and B are very similar to those in Table 2, though the results in Panel A are only marginally significant for the outcomes index. This suggests that it is not negative selection into certain neighborhoods or especially bad TRI polluters that drive the results.

Finally, one might be worried that even though I control for birth spacing, birth order and birth month and year, that the results might be driven by children who are very different in birth order. Thus, in Panel B of Table A1 I limit the sample to just children who are first or second born. The results are again very similar to those in Table 2, suggesting that birth order does not drive the results. In addition, I also estimate the effects of prenatal exposure to TRI sites using a difference in difference strategy in which I compare siblings where one was exposed in utero to TRI pollution within one mile of a TRI site to the same

[28] While Currie et al (2015) find that TRI sites lower housing values by 11%, they examine a much longer time period in 5 states. Since the average gap between siblings is roughly 3 years in my data, not finding much change in housing prices in that time might make sense in this context.
[29] Bad-sounding names were names that included the words "industry", "concrete", "metal", "chemical", "pharmaceutical", "plastic", "manufacturing" or "power plant." I also flagged any names that sounded like something one would avoid living near, like oil refineries, landfills, recyclers or industrial names.

contrast for families living eight to ten miles away from a TRI site.[30] The results, presented in Table A2, are quite similar to the main results in Table 2, suggesting that time trends over this time period and birth order do not substantially affect the results.

VI. Conclusion

This is the first study to examine the long-run effects of living near industrial pollution on wages, family income, adult poverty, years of education, high school completion and the development of cognitive and other disabilities. Children prenatally exposed to TRI pollution have 59.4% lower family income, a 17.2 percentage point increase in the likelihood of being on public assistance as an adult, have 1.284 fewer years of education, and have a 12.4 percentage point increase in dropping out of high school, relative to their siblings who were not exposed during gestation. They also have a 7.6 percentage point increase in disability rates overall, as well as a 9.4 percentage point increase in cognitive disabilities. The results suggest that early life exposure to industrial pollution contributes substantially to long-term cognitive, labor market and developmental outcomes, and that pollution has much higher costs than have previously been estimated. In addition, closing TRI sites substantially benefits children's cognitive development and long-run labor market and health outcomes.

While it is difficult to estimate the total costs of TRI pollution because of potential differences across samples, I attempt a rough back of the envelope calculation to estimate the cost of TRI pollution on the costs of providing public assistance for one year. The federal government spent $877.5 billion on benefits and services for people with low income in 2016 (Falk, Lynch and Tollestrup

[30] This specification has the advantage of estimating birth order effects more cleanly, as well as accounting for time trends.

2018), and there were about 39.7 million low-income people in poverty (Fontenot, Semega and Kollar 2018). This implies a total average benefits cost of $22,103.30 per person on food, housing, medical care, job training and the like. Given that 19 percent of the U.S. population live within one mile of a TRI site (EPA 2014) and there were 3,941,109 children born in 2016 (CDC 2016), this implies an additional cost of about $2.91 billion per birth cohort per year from TRI pollution.[31]

Because exposure to pollution might have distributional effects, pushing people on the margins into poverty and disability, the true costs of pollution might be quite high. In addition, the results suggest that prenatal exposure to TRI pollution, which contains known neurotoxins like lead and mercury, might be much worse than exposure to typical air pollution. Given that geography is an important determinant of human capital formation (Chetty, Hendren, Kline and Saez, 2014), it is important to understand the mechanisms behind the disparities in educational outcomes that could stem from location itself. This study shows that one important mechanism through which neighborhoods affect long run outcomes is through exposure to industrial pollution.

I find strong evidence of worse outcomes even though the comparison set of siblings are likely exposed to some pollution, particularly in the case where there is a TRI opening. In addition, I find large effects even though some parents might practice avoidance behaviors to reduce children's exposure to pollution. However, these findings might also reflect the effects of cumulative exposure to environmental toxicants, since some children may live near a TRI site for a long time before it closes or after it opens.

Nevertheless, my findings point toward the notion that regulating TRI pollution would benefit low-income communities substantially, since children

[31] This calculation uses the estimate in column 2 of Table 2 (0.176) to estimate the additional fraction of people who would need public assistance.

born to mothers living near sources of pollution are negatively affected in terms of their cognitive development and long-run outcomes. In addition, Black, Hispanic, and low-income children are nearly twice as likely to live within one mile of a TRI site as the average for all children in the sample. The fact that low-income, Black, and Hispanic children are more likely to be exposed to environmental toxicants has profound implications for environmental justice and residential segregation. If TRI sites negatively affect housing values (Currie, Davis, Greenstone, & Walker, 2015) and poor children are almost twice as likely to live nearby, exposure to industrial pollution might also partially explain the widening socioeconomic education gap (GAO 2019). Pollution exposure could also be partially responsible for low-income children having a higher incidence of cognitive disabilities than higher income children (Bloom et al, 2013).[32]

Unfortunately, my results do not speak to specific toxicants to which individuals were exposed, since exposure to different compounds and agents released by TRI sites are collinear – TRI pollution is a mixed treatment. Further research is also needed to address how the benefits of TRI regulation may vary across industries and types of pollution, as well as what schools and other programs can do to support children with early toxic exposures.

However, this study is among the first to provide insights into how environmental pollution and policies affect early development and long run human capital outcomes. This is the first paper to examine whether exposure to especially hazardous air pollution affects adult wages, poverty, education and disability. In addition, this work speaks to how residential and socioeconomic contexts contribute to children's unequal life chances. If proximity to some

[32] In families with an income of less than $35,000, the percentage of children with a learning disability (11 percent) is almost twice that of children in families with an income of $100,000 or more (6 percent) (CDC, 2013).

pollution has distributional consequences that push people into poverty, it might be far more costly to families and society than previously supposed.

References

Aizer, Anna, Janet Currie, Peter Simon, and Patrick Vivier. 2018. "Do Low Levels of Blood Lead Reduce Children's Future Test Scores?" *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 10 (1): 307–41.

Almond, Douglas, and Janet Currie. 2011. "Killing Me Softly: The Fetal Origins Hypothesis." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 25 (3): 153–72.

Almond, Douglas, Lena Edlund, and Mårten Palme. 2009. "Chernobyl's Subclinical Legacy: Prenatal Exposure to Radioactive Fallout and School Outcomes in Sweden *." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (4). Oxford University Press: 1729–72.

Behrman, Richard E., Adrienne Stith Butler, and Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Understanding Premature Birth and Assuring Healthy Outcomes. The Role of Environmental Toxicants in Preterm Birth. National Academies Press (US), 2007.

Bellinger, D.C. (2013). Prenatal exposures to environmental chemicals and children's neurodevelopment: an update. Saf Health Work 4(1): 1-11.

Bharadwaj, Prashant, Matthew Gibson, Joshua Graff Zivin, and Christopher Neilson. 2017. "Gray Matters: Fetal Pollution Exposure and Human Capital Formation." *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists* 4 (2). University of Chicago PressChicago, IL: 505–42.

Black, Sandra E., Aline Bütikofer, Paul J. Devereux, and Kjell G. Salvanes. "This Is Only a Test? Long-Run and Intergenerational Impacts of Prenatal Exposure to Radioactive Fallout." The Review of Economics and Statistics 101, no. 3 (July 1, 2019): 531–46.

Bose, R., Onishchenko, N., Edoff, K., Lang, A. M. J., and Ceccatelli, S. (2012). Inherited effects of low-dose exposure to methylmercury in neural stem cells. Toxicological Sciences, kfs257.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2009. *Fourth Report on Human Exposure to Environmental Chemicals.* Atlanta, GA: US Department of Health and Human Services Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Chetty, Raj, Nathaniel Hendren, Patrick Kline, and Emmanuel Saez. "Where Is the Land of Opportunity? The Geography of Intergenerational Mobility in the United States." The *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 129, no. 4 (November 1, 2014): 1553–1623.

Currie, Janet, Lucas Davis, Michael Greenstone, and Reed Walker. 2015. "Environmental Health Risks and Housing Values: Evidence from 1,600 Toxic Plant Openings and Closings." *American Economic Review* 105 (2): 678–709.

Currie, Janet, Michael Greenstone, and Enrico Moretti. 2011. "Superfund Cleanups and Infant Health." *American Economic Review* 101 (3): 435–41.

Falk, Lynch and Tollestrup. 2018. " Federal Spending on Benefits and Services for People with Low Income: In Brief." Congressional Research Service Report #R45097.

Ferrie, Joseph P., Karen Rolf, and Werner Troesken. 2012. "Cognitive Disparities, Lead Plumbing, and Water Chemistry: Prior Exposure to Water-Borne Lead and Intelligence Test Scores among World War Two U.S. Army Enlistees." *Economics & Human Biology* 10 (1). North-Holland: 98–111.

Fontenot, Semega and Kollar. 2018. "Income and Poverty in the United States: 2017: Current Population Reports." Report Number P60-263. U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.

Grandjean, P., and Landrigan, P. J. (2006). Developmental neurotoxicity of industrial chemicals. The Lancet, 368(9553), 2167–2178.

Grandjean, P., and Landrigan, P. J. (2014). Neurobehavioural effects of developmental toxicity. The Lancet Neurology, 13(3), 330–338.

Greenstone, Michael, Richard Hornbeck, and Enrico Moretti. 2010. “Identifying Agglomeration Spillovers: Evidence from Winners and Losers of Large Plant Openings.” *Journal of Political Economy* 118 (3). The University of Chicago Press : 536–98.

Grönqvist, Hans, J. Peter Nilsson, and Per-Olof Robling. "Understanding how low levels of early lead exposure affect children's life-trajectories." *Journal of Political Economy*, forthcoming.

Isen, Adam, Maya Rossin-Slater, and W. Reed Walker. 2017. “Every Breath You Take—Every Dollar You’ll Make: The Long-Term Consequences of the Clean Air Act of 1970.” *Journal of Political Economy* 125 (3). University of Chicago Press Chicago, IL: 848–902.

Persico, Claudia, David Figlio, and Jeffrey Roth. 2019. “The Developmental Consequences of Superfund Sites.” *Journal of Labor Economics*, Advanced online publication.

Persico, C., & Venator, J. (2019). The effects of local industrial pollution on students and schools. *Journal of Human Resources*, Advanced online publication. https://doi.org/10.3368/jhr.56.2.0518-9511R2

Voorheis, John. 2017. "Air Quality, Human Capital Formation and the Long-term Effects of Environmental Inequality at Birth". CARRA Working Paper Series. Working Paper 2017-05. U.S. Census Bureau.

Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of Children Within One Mile of a TRI site

	(1) Characteristics of all Children in the NLSY	(2) Characteristics of Children Within 1 Mile of a TRI Site	(3) Characteristics of Children Within 1 Mile of an Open TRI Site
Maternal Education at Birth	12.87	12.14	12.19
Paternal Education at Birth	12.64	12.20	12.35
Mother was in Poverty in Birth Year	0.168	0.279	0.284
Years of Education in Adulthood	13.69	13.05	13.21
Percent Black	0.157	0.295	0.274
Percent Hispanic	0.080	0.161	0.179
Maternal Marriage Status	0.744	0.569	0.562
Attended Preschool	0.662	0.599	0.587
Observations	11,521	2,138	1,014

Notes: This table depicts the characteristics of children in the sample. Column 1 shows the characteristics of all CNLSY79 individuals using sample weights. Column 2 shows characteristics of all children within one mile of a TRI site. Column 3 shows characteristics for all children within one mile of an operating TRI site.

Table 2: Long-Run Outcomes with Family Fixed Effects for Children Conceived Within One Mile of a TRI site

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Wages	(3) Log Family Income	(4) On Public Assistance	(5) Years of Education	(6) Completed High School	(7) Attended College
	Panel A: Intent to Treat						
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.490**	-0.0750	-0.594*	0.0658	-1.284**	-0.0629	-0.167
	(0.197)	(0.220)	(0.333)	(0.100)	(0.540)	(0.0705)	(0.103)
Observations	988	659	745	903	795	871	860
Mean of outcome	0.139	2.448	9.802	0.370	13.38	0.845	0.633
	Panel B: Restricted to Non-Moving Families						
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.530***	-0.255*	-0.105	0.172**	-1.263***	-0.124**	-0.0720
	(0.167)	(0.150)	(0.241)	(0.0765)	(0.438)	(0.0575)	(0.0655)
Observations	1,399	972	1,079	1,295	1,138	1,235	1,217
Mean of outcome	0.130	2.371	9.784	0.394	13.40	0.849	0.629

Notes: Columns 1-7 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. The estimates in Panel A are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. In Panel B, only children from families living consistently within one mile of a TRI site and not changing census tracts or zip codes between births are included in the analysis. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 3: Mechanisms and Other Long-Run Outcomes

	(1) Employed (in Either of the Last 2 Surveys)	(2) Ever on Unemployment	(3) Ever Convicted, on Probation or in Prison	(4) Has a Disability	(5) Has a Cognitive Disability
	Panel A: Intent to Treat				
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	0.0129	0.0143	0.00958	0.0240	0.0280
	(0.104)	(0.0222)	(0.0655)	(0.0412)	(0.0392)
Observations	1,002	1,073	1,062	1,073	1,073
Mean of outcome	0.540	0.108	0.193	0.0475	0.0196
	Panel B: Restricted to Non-Moving Families				
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	0.0115	0.0153	0.0230	0.0758*	0.0942**
	(0.0887)	(0.0201)	(0.0697)	(0.0407)	(0.0472)
Observations	1,435	1,530	1,514	1,530	1,530
Mean of outcome	0.548	0.115	0.201	0.0523	0.0275

Notes: Columns 1-5 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 4: The Effects of Openings versus Closings on Long-Run Outcomes with Family Fixed Effects for Children Conceived Within One Mile of a TRI site

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(4) On Public Assistance	(5) Years of Education	(6) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
	Panel A: Restricted to Openings					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.609**	-0.803**	0.148	-1.321*	-0.100	-0.254**
	(0.278)	(0.401)	(0.155)	(0.789)	(0.0809)	(0.124)
Observations	913	690	878	736	800	791
Mean of outcome	0.162	9.811	0.353	13.45	0.856	0.649
	Panel B: Restricted to Closings					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.454**	-0.520	0.0419	-1.427***	-0.0949	-0.153
	(0.189)	(0.331)	(0.0983)	(0.525)	(0.0666)	(0.101)
Observations	970	730	940	779	853	842
Mean of outcome	0.130	9.799	0.349	13.36	0.844	0.629

Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. In Panel A, I restrict to TRI site openings and in Panel B I restrict to TRI site closings. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 5: Long-Run Outcomes by Gender, Race and Poverty Status at Birth

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(3) On Public Assistance	(4) Years of Education	(5) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
			Panel A: Boys			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.565** (0.219)	-1.182*** (0.456)	0.221** (0.0896)	-0.981 (0.653)	-0.109 (0.0773)	-0.270** (0.125)
			Panel B: Girls			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.404 (0.255)	0.137 (0.300)	-0.0785 (0.144)	-1.111* (0.666)	-0.00479 (0.0884)	-0.0545 (0.124)
P val boys=girls	0.0804*	0.0032***	0.0076***	0.504	0.194	0.0625*
Mean of outcome	0.139	9.802	0.349	13.38	0.845	0.633
			Panel C: Non-Poor Children			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.434** (0.199)	-0.502 (0.352)	0.114 (0.0999)	-0.991* (0.535)	-0.0270 (0.0649)	-0.142 (0.0977)
			Panel D: Low-Income Children			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.575*** (0.214)	-0.876*** (0.328)	0.0535 (0.0984)	-1.125* (0.573)	-0.112 (0.0731)	-0.193* (0.109)
P val non-poor=low income	0.229	0.776	0.132	0.181	0.514	0.457
Mean of outcome	0.139	9.802	0.349	13.38	0.845	0.633
			Panel E: Non-Hispanic White Children			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.506* (0.286)	-1.809*** (0.686)	-0.130 (0.268)	-1.895** (0.963)	0.0684 (0.104)	-0.0896 (0.152)
			Panel F: Black and Hispanic Children			
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Closed)	-0.486** (0.234)	-0.253 (0.337)	0.126 (0.0970)	-0.869 (0.571)	-0.110 (0.0679)	-0.183* (0.109)
P val white=non-white	0.379	0.127	0.240	0.901	0.051*	0.247
Observations	988	745	956	795	871	860
Mean of outcome	0.139	9.802	0.349	13.38	0.845	0.633

Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. In Panels A and B, I estimate the effects by gender, and Panels C and D show the effects by maternal poverty status in a child's birth year. Panels E and F estimate the effects by race. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are clustered at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 6: Long-Run Outcomes by Treatment Intensity

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(4) On Public Assistance	(5) Years of Education	(6) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
	Panel A: Stack Releases					
Conceived when TRI Site is	-0.372*	-0.470	0.128	-1.374**	-0.0959	-0.171
Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	(0.218)	(0.420)	(0.104)	(0.629)	(0.0876)	(0.118)
Mean of outcome	0.137	9.802	0.352	13.37	0.844	0.633
	Panel B: Fugitive Releases					
Conceived when TRI Site is	-0.506**	-0.673**	0.102	-1.147**	-0.0625	-0.156
Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	(0.198)	(0.323)	(0.0998)	(0.553)	(0.0716)	(0.106)
P val stack=fugitive	0.391	0.455	0.188	0.0472**	0.312	0.254
Observations	980	737	949	788	863	852
Mean of outcome	0.137	9.802	0.352	13.37	0.844	0.633

Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. In Panel A, I restrict to TRI sites reporting stack releases and in Panel B I restrict to TRI sites with fugitive releases. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 7: Average Difference in Family Characteristics between Siblings Living Within 1 Mile of a TRI Site

	(1) Maternal Marriage Status	(2) Years of Maternal Education	(3) Years of Paternal Education	(4) Poverty Status in Birth Year	(5) Total Years of Childhood Poverty	(6) First Month Prenatal Care Was Obtained	(7) Mother Smoked During Pregnancy	(8) Mother Drank During Pregnancy	(9) Ever Attended Preschool
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	0.0674	-0.0458	-0.691	0.0340	0.0663	0.0741	-0.00298	0.117	0.138
	(0.0642)	(0.205)	(0.521)	(0.0969)	(0.434)	(0.339)	(0.0643)	(0.0951)	(0.0945)
Observations	988	811	467	988	988	892	988	988	893
Mean of outcome	0.744	12.29	12.46	0.290	2.18	2.604	0.250	0.415	0.622

Notes: Columns 1-9 present the results for running my main specification where the outcomes are different family characteristics. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 8: Average Difference in in Zip-code level Characteristics between Siblings Living Within 1 Mile of a TRI Site

	(1) Median Home Value	(2) Median Household Income	(3) Percent Black	(4) Percent Hispanic	(5) Percent of Homes Rented
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-13782.2	1866.5**	0.00141	0.00942	-0.0156***
	(8384.6)	(864.8)	(0.0164)	(0.0209)	(0.00536)
Observations	471	592	592	592	592
Mean of outcome	111768.5	35066.7	0.247	0.115	0.405

Notes: Columns 1-9 present the results for running my main specification where the outcomes are different zip code characteristics. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table 9: Long-Run Outcomes with Family Fixed Effects for Children Conceived Within One Mile of a TRI site, Limiting to TRI Sites with Pollution Below the 80th Percentile for TRI Sites Nationally or Without Bad-Sounding Names


	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(4) On Public Assistance	(5) Years of Education	(6) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
	Panel A: Limiting to TRI Sites with Pollution Below the 80th Percentile for TRI Sites Nationally					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.397**	-0.235	0.0605	-0.945***	-0.186***	-0.0503
	(0.170)	(0.186)	(0.116)	(0.331)	(0.0601)	(0.0770)
Observations	912	801	784	852	934	922
Mean of outcome	0.0966	9.839	0.365	13.29	0.835	0.628
	Panel B: Limiting to TRI Sites without Bad-Sounding Names					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.593**	-0.633*	0.0200	-1.571**	-0.0837	-0.111
	(0.239)	(0.323)	(0.134)	(0.691)	(0.0897)	(0.127)
Observations	862	645	833	690	758	749
Mean of outcome	0.114	9.781	0.355	13.28	0.835	0.619

Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. In Panel A, I restrict to TRI sites with pollution emissions that are below the 80th percentile nationally for TRI sites. In Panel B I restrict to TRI sites that do not have bad-sounding names. The estimates are from the Intent to Treat specification in which the location of the first birth near a TRI site is instrumented for all other children in the same family. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.


Figures

Figure 1: Particulate Matter 2.5 levels over Distance Away from a TRI site and Event Study of Particulate Matter after a TRI site Opening

Panel A




Panel B




Notes: Panel A of Figure 1 depicts the level of Fine Particulate Matter (PM 2.5) over distance from the TRI site using data from 1990 to 2012. I show pollution levels by calculating the distance between PM 2.5 EPA monitors and the open TRI sites, regressing a kernel-weighted local polynomial smoothed plot of the average PM2.5 measured at a monitor on distance from a TRI site. Panel B of Figure 1 plots the coefficients from a regression of mean level of PM10 on leads and lags of a TRI site opening within a mile of the pollution monitor using pollution data from 1988 to 2012. T is the year the TRI site opens and all coefficients are normalized such that the coefficient in the year prior to opening (T-1) is zero. Dotted lines represent 0.95 confidence intervals for the coefficients. Standard errors are clustered at the pollution monitor level.

Figure 2: Event study of Outcomes with Zip Code Fixed Effects after a TRI site Opening



Notes: Figure 2 plots the coefficients from a regression of the outcomes index on leads and lags of a TRI site opening within a mile. 0 is the year the TRI site opens and all coefficients are normalized such that the coefficient in the year prior to opening (-1) is zero. In addition to zip code fixed effects, the regression controls for birth year, birth order and birth month fixed effects, gender, and age. Dotted lines represent 0.95 confidence intervals for the coefficients. Standard errors are clustered at the zip code level.

Figure 3: Outcomes with Family Fixed Effects for Gestational Exposure at Different Distances from a TRI site



Notes: Figure 3 plots the effects of in utero exposure to an operating TRI site at different distances away from the site. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level; the vertical lines represent 95 percent confidence intervals.

For Online Publication

Appendix

Table A1: Long-Run Outcomes with Zip Code Fixed Effects or Family Fixed Effects Limited to First or Second Born Children (Limited to Children Conceived Within One Mile of a TRI site)

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(3) On Public Assistance	(4) Years of Education	(5) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
	Panel A: With Zip code Fixed Effects					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.0447	0.118	0.0973	0.175	0.0304	0.112
	(0.163)	(0.194)	(0.0663)	(0.570)	(0.0688)	(0.0911)
Observations	1399	1079	1439	1138	1235	1217
Mean of outcome	0.130	9.849	0.354	13.40	0.849	0.629
	Panel B: ITT Limiting to First and Second born Children					
Conceived when TRI Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)	-0.524*	-0.469	0.195	-1.737**	-0.112	-0.254*
	(0.283)	(0.464)	(0.159)	(0.869)	(0.0957)	(0.143)
Observations	828	631	809	668	717	710
Mean of outcome	0.200	9.802	0.349	13.54	0.865	0.662

Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. In Panel A, only children from families living consistently within one mile of a TRI site and not changing census tracts or zip codes between births are included in the analysis. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to zip code fixed effects, regressions control for maternal marriage status at birth, total years of childhood poverty, birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, adult marital status, and gender. In Panel B, only first and second-born children are included in the analysis in which the location of the first birth is instrumented for other children in the same family. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table A2: Difference in Difference Results with Family Fixed Effects for Children Conceived Within One Mile of a TRI site, Compared to Siblings in Families Living 8 to 10 Miles Away

	(1) Outcomes Index	(2) Log Family Income	(3) On Public Assistance	(4) Years of Education	(5) Completed High School	(6) Attended College
(Conceived when TRI Site is Open Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed within 0-1 mile) – (Conceived when TRI Site is Open Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed in 8-10 miles)	-0.574***	-0.0598	0.177**	-1.148***	-0.129**	-0.0492
	(0.191)	(0.236)	(0.0686)	(0.436)	(0.0532)	(0.0649)
Observations	1246	1115	1418	1170	1276	1257
Mean of outcome	0.131	9.852	0.372	13.41	0.848	0.631


Notes: Columns 1-6 present the results for different long-run outcome variables. Only children from families living consistently within one mile of a TRI site and not changing census tracts or zip codes between births are included in the analysis, which compares siblings in families within 1 mile of an operating TRI site with siblings living 8-10 miles away. Standard errors are adjusted for clustering at the site level. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, age squared, age cubed, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse probability of responding to the survey. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Table A3: The Effects of TRI Pollution by Industry Type

	Outcomes Index			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All other Industries	Metals	Mechanical	Plastic
Conceived when TRI	-0.334	-0.319	-0.970*	-0.176
	(0.247)	(0.302)	(0.557)	(0.257)
Site is Open (Compared to Conceived When TRI was Closed)				
P val compared to all other industries		0.966	0.262	0.633
Observations	980	980	980	980

Notes: This table includes output from a single regression in which the effects of different types of TRI industries were estimated on the long run outcomes index. The location of the first birth is instrumented for other children in the same family. In addition to family fixed effects, regressions control for birth month and year, birth order, birth spacing, age in the last survey wave, maternal marriage status, total years of childhood poverty, adult marital status and gender. All regressions are weighted by the inverse of the number of times an individual is observed in the data. Coefficients labeled as ***, **, and * are statistically significant at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively.

Figure A1: TRI Sites over Population Density



Notes: Figure A1 shows the location of TRI sites (blue dots) nationally (according to the National Institute of Health's Toxmap website, 2019) overlaid on a population density map by county. Darker blue areas are more population dense. TRI sites are disproportionately located in the most population dense areas of the United States. Source: National Institute of Health, U.S. National Library of Medicine, TOXMAP. https://toxmap.nlm.nih.gov/toxmap/app/