Insights:

* **Job losses related to human health and social work**. Any time a policy affects household spending, for example by forcing consumer to buy more expensive equipment, there is likely going to be a significant amount of job loss in the human health and social work category, (ISIC 86T88), which represents, primarily, health care spending. This is because health care spending is a shockingly large share of US household spending, and changes in household income result in changes to spending on health care (everything is reduced proportionally). Education is similarly affected, because it is a large proportion of household spend.
* **Job losses can be smoothed with subsidies**. To the extent a policy forces consumers to purchase more expensive equipment, the impact on income and subsequent job losses can be mitigated somewhat by subsidies that bring the new tech in line with the prices of the tech it’s replacing. Nice to see our subsidy policies now have an impact on an important set of metrics when they may not do much on emissions.

Policies:

* **ZEV Mandate**: Causes a large decrease in jobs due in part to the higher upfront price of EVs causing a decrease in household spending on other things and also due in large part to the loss of vehicle maintenance jobs. Can be somewhat offset with a subsidy for EVs
* **Building Electrification**: Large increase in jobs due to construction and actually finding net savings on fuel spend due to higher efficiency of electrified equipment and rising gas costs over time.
* **Building EE**: Large increase in jobs due to construction and fuel savings causing increased domestic saving elsewhere
* **CCS:** Large increase in jobs because although industries are harmed by installing and running CCS, lots of labor required to do so, resulting in a large increase in household income and spending.
* **Carbon tax**: Currently a large job creator because of massive respending by the government. Still exploring alternatives here.
* **Cement clinker substitution**: Increase in jobs because the increased spend in industry is partially redirected to labor, which in turn offsets losses to industry by employing more people. This raises the question of whether ***we should assign process emissions costs to certain entities, i.e. should we make assumptions about the share of industrial process emissions spending that goes to labor vs materials when we have the data to do so?***
* **CHP:** Job losses because increased cost to industry means job losses to households, means less money to respend, even though the fuel savings more than offset the capital costs. We may want to look into this a bit more; this result surprised me.
* **Contractor training and education:** Net job increases, which makes sense. Discontinuity in a single year because of an avoided power plant from lower electricity demand. This is non-trivially affecting electricity prices, which is why this shows up. However, hard to trace the underlying cause here. Might be worth exploring to see if there is a bug.
* **Demand response:** Creates jobs. Some discontinuities, likely from changes in power sector.