



**Child Poverty Reduction
Advisory Council**

Child Poverty Reduction Advisory Council (CPRAC)

Meeting 09 – June 6, 2024

Reminders – Administrative Items

- Meetings are being recorded and live streamed
- Facilities
- Breaks

Table of Contents

- I. **Welcome** – Meeting Goals
- II. **Recap** – CPRAC Work To Date
- III. **Committees** – Report on Policy Priorities
- IV. **Discussion** – Developing Policy Packages
- V. **Looking Ahead** – Next Steps

Welcome

Welcome

- **Assistant Secretary to the Governor
for Human Services and Mental Hygiene Alyson Tarek –
*CPRAC Co-Chair***
- **Commissioner Barbara Guinn (OTDA) –
*CPRAC Co-Chair***

Goals for Meeting 9

- **Recap** – CPRAC work to date
- **Review** – summary of modeling data from Urban Institute
- **Report** – Committee co-chairs to report out on Committee progress and priority proposals
- **Discuss** – develop combinations of proposals (“policy packages”) for further analysis
- **Schedule** – Meeting 10

Recap

CPRAC to Date

CPRAC – Charge

- CPRAC is charged with:
 - studying child poverty and anti-poverty policy in New York
 - developing recommendations to reduce child poverty by 50%
 - measuring and reporting on progress reducing child poverty
- In so doing, CPRAC must consider:
 - Effects of specific reforms (EITC, ESCC, housing subsidies)
 - Effects of identified proposals individually and combined
 - Effects of poverty and proposals/reforms by race/ethnicity

CPRAC – Work to Date

- **To study poverty**, CPRAC has reviewed key research and is also obtaining data from the Urban Institute
- **To develop recommendations**, CPRAC conducted initial orientations on key policy areas and created committees, which are having focused discussion identifying specific proposals that could reduce poverty
- **To measure and report on New York State's progress** in reducing poverty, the Urban Institute has estimated the effects of recently-enacted policies and programs

CPRAC – Data-Based Analysis

- Researchers at Urban Institute are conducting comprehensive analysis of poverty in NYS to support CPRAC's work
- **Developed a baseline** ("before") against which NY's progress and CPRAC's proposed policies will be compared
- **Estimated the effects of policies in recent budgets**, which we plan to update to account for latest budget
- **Estimating the potential effects of different proposals** on child poverty in New York (individually and in combination)

CPRAC – Measuring NYS Progress

- Urban Institute estimates that policies from recent budgets (SFY22-23 and 23-24) are estimated to reduce child poverty by up to 7.6%, compared to baseline
- **CPRAC's proposed recommendations must reduce child poverty in New York by approximately 50%**

CPRAC – Work to Date

- Formed committees for key topic, with advisory experts
- Completed subject matter orientations for all key topics
- Discussed key research with each committee
- Developed proposals for modeling based on research/discussion
- Obtained initial data from Urban Institute on effects of proposals, starting with Tax Policy, Public Benefits, and Housing
- Tax Policy, Public Benefits, and Housing Committees identified priorities among proposals based on child poverty-reduction data

Next Steps – 2024

Target Month	Goal*
March, April, May	✓ Tax Policy Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Public Benefits Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Housing Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Formal public hearing in NYC, on accessibility and availability of public benefits
June	• Committees report data-based priorities/rankings back to statutory members • Statutory members develop initial policy packages for modeling • Request rough cost estimate from State Agencies of proposals included in packages
July	• UI assesses cumulative effects of policy packages • State Agency partners prepare rough cost estimates of selected proposals
August	• Statutory members review data on policy packages and cost estimates, identify initial recommendations
September	• Finalize initial recommendations and draft summary report
October	• Review and issue report with recommendations
November	• Draft progress report
December	• Vote to issue progress report

Discussion Recap – Recurring Themes

- Many New Yorkers may not know about available programs
- Current eligibility may exclude New Yorkers who need assistance
- Application processes for programs are often cumbersome
- Existing benefits and credits are often described as insufficient
- Poverty disparities by race/ethnicity related to program access

Discussion Recap – Potential Solutions

- Increase benefit levels
- Improve take-up by raising awareness, reducing burdens
- Adjust eligibility to reach as many New Yorkers as possible
- Address demographic disparities in poverty
- Use program access data to identify areas for improvement
- Explore auto-enrollment capabilities and/or use of technology
- More use of trusted messengers/CBOs to help NYers navigate

Modeling Overview – Contents

- **Urban Institute's modeling data includes:**
 - Poverty reduction data for initial proposals identified to date
 - Effects on individuals by poverty level, age, location, race
 - Effects on families by poverty level, composition, location
 - Estimated change in household resources
 - Estimated effect on utilization and cost of existing programs
 - Estimated overall cost of proposed credit or benefit

Modeling Overview – Workbooks

- Workbooks provided by Urban Institute each include several different tables where data is broken down along these lines:

0. Policies Overview: comparative view of all proposed policies and key metrics

1. SPM Summary: highlights of proposed policies poverty reduction effects

2. Poverty_Individuals...: poverty reduction effects by individuals by income level, age, and location

3. Individuals_Race: poverty reduction effects by individuals by income level, age, and race

4. Poverty_Families...: poverty reduction effects by families by income level, family composition, and location

5. Household Resources: number of households that experience resource changes, including average net resource change

7. Program Summary: includes estimated effect of proposed policies on costs of existing programs

8. Costs: summary of estimated cost

Modeling Overview – Context

- Microsimulation model is based on multiple sources of data, including administrative data provided by the State and publicly-available statistical and survey data
- Cost estimates reflect how much would be spent on the benefit if implemented – administrative costs not included
- Different take-up assumptions by policy area, proposal type
- Data does not yet include “employment effects” – will be assessed once proposals are selected for packages
- All numbers are estimates and must remain rounded

Committees

Proposals and Priorities

CPRAC Committees – Goals

- Develop specific proposals for reform or new policies that would help achieve reduce child poverty in New York
 - Discuss policy ideas and identify specific proposals
 - Obtain data on the relative child poverty-reduction effects
 - Use data to prioritize proposals for potential recommendation
 - Relay committee's priorities to CPRAC statutory members, who will consider priorities in the development of policy packages that combine different proposals together

CPRAC Committees – Progress

- Develop specific proposals for reform or new policies that would help achieve reduce child poverty in New York
 - ✓ Discuss policy ideas and identify specific proposals
 - ✓ Obtain data on the relative child poverty-reduction effects
 - ✓ Use data to prioritize proposals for potential recommendation
 - Relay committee's priorities to CPRAC statutory members, who will consider priorities in the development of policy packages that combine different proposals together

CPRAC Committees – Recap

- Discussions have focused on different aspects of government programs and policies, including opportunities for improvement:
 - value of credits/benefits/supports (how much)
 - eligibility for credits/benefits/supports (who receives)
 - accessibility of credits/benefits/supports (how clients access)
 - administration of programs (how govt implements)
- Committees identified proposals for analysis by Urban Institute related to value and eligibility, which we will focus on today

Proposals Modeled – Tax Policy

- **EITC proposals:**
 - Increase percentage applied to the federal EITC for households with children to determine the state EITC from the 30% to 50% and 100%
 - Reduce minimum age of persons eligible to receive the federal EITC for households without children to 21
 - Expand state EITC to cover persons using an Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)

Proposals Modeled – Tax Policy

- **CTC proposals:**
 - Decouple Empire State Child Credit from federal credit
 - Eliminate the wage phase-in (make fully refundable)
 - Assess effects of max credit of \$500, \$1500, and \$3000
 - Assess enhanced \$500 additional credit for younger children
 - Assess effects of *only* enhancing credit for younger children
 - Same phaseout as the pre-2017 federal Child Tax Credit

Proposals Modeled – Data Snapshot

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) - ages 0-17
CTC 1	CTC fully refundable for max amount per child	-2.3%
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%
CTC 3	Max CTC amount increased to \$500 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-6.0%
CTC 4	Max CTC amount \$500 for children 6+, \$1000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-9.7%
CTC 5	Max CTC amount \$1500 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-23.2%
CTC 6	Max CTC amount \$1500 for children 6+, \$2000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-25.5%
CTC 7	Max CTC amount increased to \$3000 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-43.9%
CTC 8	Max CTC amount \$330 for children 6+, \$500 for children 6-, fully refundable	-2.9%
CTC 9	Max CTC amount \$330 for children 6+, \$1000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-6.5%
EITC 1	Increasing the State EITC to 50 Percent of the Federal Share	-4.2%
EITC 2	Increasing the State EITC to 50 Percent of the Federal Share, plus ITIN	-6.0%
EITC 3	Increasing the State EITC to 100 Percent of the Federal Share	-12.5%
EITC 4	Increasing the State EITC to 100 Percent of the Federal Share, plus ITIN	-16.4%
EITC 5	Reducing the Current State Childless EITC Minimum Age to 21	0.0%
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%

Priorities Identified – Tax Policy

- Based on the data and following deliberation, the Committee prioritized the proposals as follows:
 1. Fully refundable CTC, \$3000 for children 0-17
 2. Fully refundable CTC, \$1500 for children 6-17, \$2000 for 0-6
 3. Fully refundable CTC, \$1500 for children 0-17
 4. Fully refundable CTC, \$500 for children 6-17, \$1000 for 0-6
 5. Fully refundable CTC, \$500 for children 0-17

For full data on the proposals modeled and priorities identified from among them, see related Tax Policy workbooks

Proposals Modeled – Public Benefits

- **Public Assistance proposals:**
 - Eliminate asset tests
 - Eliminate durational sanctions
 - Apply current recipient income disregard policy to applicants
 - Increase basic allowance by 50% and 100%
 - Increase shelter allowance by 100% and 200%, as well as to 75% of FMR and 108% of FMR
 - Index income eligibility and max benefit levels to different percentages of Federal Poverty guidelines

Proposals Modeled – Public Benefits

- **SSI/SSP proposals:**
 - Increase the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) State Supplement (SSP) amount by 50% and 100%

Proposals Modeled – Public Benefits

- **Food benefit proposals:**
 - Provide food benefit to households with children currently ineligible for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) due to their citizenship status, equal to the allotment for similarly situated SNAP-eligible households
 - Provide food benefit to current SNAP cases with children where the household includes persons that would be included in the SNAP case except for their citizenship status, equal to difference between the household's SNAP allotment and the amount they would receive if those persons were included

Proposals Modeled – Data Snapshot

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17
SSI 1	Increasing SSI State Supplements by 50 Percent	-0.2%
SSI 2	Increasing SSI State Supplements by 100 Percent	-0.3%
SFB 1	Creating a State Food Benefit for Families With Children, With Full Eligibility for Legal Immigrants	-0.6%
SFB 2	Creating a State Food Benefit for Families With Children, With Full Eligibility for All Noncitizens	-1.6%
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%
PA 4	Increasing the Basic Allowances for FA-SNA by 50%	-8.1%
PA 5	Increasing the Basic Allowances for FA-SNA by 100%	-18.1%
PA 6	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA by 100%	-11.6%
PA 7	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA by 200%	-27.3%
PA 8	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA to 75% of the FMR	-35.3%
PA 9	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA to 108% of the FMR	-43.0%
PA 10	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 50% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 100% FPG, Maximum Benefits 50% FPG for FA-SNA	-4.0%
PA 11	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 75% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 150% FPG, Maximum Benefits 75% FPG for FA-SNA	-23.1%
PA 12	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 100% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 150% FPG, Maximum Benefits 100% FPG for FA-SNA	-41.1%
PA 13	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 100% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 200% FPG, Maximum Benefits 100% FPG for FA-SNA	-47.1%
PA 14	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 150% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 150% FPG, Maximum Benefits 150% FPG for FA-SNA	-68.7%

Priorities Identified – Public Benefits

- Based on the data and following deliberation, the Committee prioritized the proposals as follows:
 1. Option 1: increase shelter allowance to 108% FMR
 2. Option 2: replace PA allowances with single larger grant
 3. Increase basic allowance by 100%
 4. Remove asset tests and durational sanctions for FA-SNA
 5. Apply Earned Income Disregards to FA-SNA applicants

For full data on the proposals modeled and priorities identified from among them, see related Public Benefits workbooks

Proposals Modeled – Housing

- **Housing assistance (voucher) proposals:**
 - Create a State-level housing voucher program based on the Federal Housing Choice Voucher Program, with the value of assistance set to same level as HCVP (108% FMR)
 - Model option following HUD rules for who can apply as well as more inclusive option allowing application regardless of immigration status
 - Program would be implemented as an “entitlement,” but would assume 64% utilization (based on research)

Proposals Modeled – Housing

- **Rent burden relief credit proposals:**
 - Fully refundable tax credit to unsubsidized rent-burdened renter households equal to 50% and 100% of rent burden (difference between rent and 30% of household income)
 - Max allowable rent of 108% FMR to be eligible
 - Compute credit using rent paid and 108% FMR, modeling with caps on credit amount as well as no caps
 - Model option following Federal rules for who can apply, as well as allowing application regardless of immigration status

Proposals Modeled – Data Snapshot

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17
HV 1	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), Current Noncitizen Policies	-13.8%
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%
RC 1	Renters Credit Covering 50 Percent of Rent Burden (Using 108% FMR), With No Cap	-32.7%
RC 2	Renters Credit Covering 100 Percent of Rent Burden (Using 108% FMR), With No Cap	-51.1%
RC 3	Renters Credit Covering 50 Percent of Rent Burden (Using 108% FMR), Capped at 15 Percent of FMR	-13.7%
RC 4	Renters Credit Covering 100 Percent of Rent Burden (Using 108% FMR), Capped at 30 Percent of FMR	-25.2%
RC 5	Renters Credit Covering 50 Percent of Rent Burden (Using Rent Paid), With No Cap	-18.3%
RC 6	Renters Credit Covering 50 Percent of Rent Burden (Using Rent Paid), With No Cap, No SSN Requirement	-19.0%

Priorities Identified – Housing

- Based on the data and following deliberation, the Committee prioritized the proposals as follows:
 1. State HCVP-type voucher, regardless of immigration status
 2. Credit covering 100% of rent burden (using 108% FMR), capped at 30% FMR
 3. Credit covering 50% of rent burden (using rent paid), with no cap, no SSN

For full data on the proposals modeled and priorities identified from among them, see related Housing workbooks

Discussion

Combining Proposals

Goal – Develop Combinations/Packages of Proposals

- Create 4 different potential combinations of proposals that could achieve ~50% child poverty reduction based on:
 - Poverty reduction effect by age, race, geography
 - Change in household resources, overall estimated cost
 - Priority rankings of proposals identified by Committees
- Urban Institute will model combinations to account for interactions between proposals and provide unified data

Examples – Tax-Focused Packages

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
CTC 7	Max CTC amount increased to \$3000 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-43.9%	\$7,769
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%	\$79
Total		-47.8%	\$8,165

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
CTC 5	Max CTC amount \$1500 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-23.2%	\$3,228
EITC 2	Increasing the State EITC to 50 Percent of the Federal Share, plus ITIN	-6.0%	\$560
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$3,272
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
Total		-47.8%	\$7,377

Examples – Public Benefits-Focused Packages

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
PA 9	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA to 108% of the FMR	-43.0%	\$14,408
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
CTC 1	CTC fully refundable for max amount per child	-2.3%	\$107
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%	\$79
Total		-49.2%	\$14,917

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
PA 11	Max Income Eligibility (Applicants) 75% FPG, Eligibility (Recipients) 150% FPG, Maximum Benefits 75% FPG for FA-SNA	-23.1%	\$3,592
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$ 3,272
CTC 4	Max CTC amount \$500 for children 6+, \$1000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-9.7%	\$937
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%	\$79
Total		-49.3%	\$7,895

Examples – Housing-Focused Packages

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
RC 4	Renters Credit Covering 100 Percent of Rent Burden (Using 108% FMR), Capped at 30 Percent of FMR	-25.2%	\$7,789
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$3,272
CTC 3	Max CTC amount increased to \$500 for children 0-17, fully refundable	-6.0%	\$487
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
Total		-49.9%	\$11,872

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
RC 6	Renters Credit Covering 50 Percent of Rent Burden (Using Rent Paid), With No Cap, No SSN Requirement	-19.0%	\$6,596
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$3,272
PA 6	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA by 100%	-11.6%	\$2,330
CTC 1	CTC fully refundable for max amount per child	-2.3%	\$107
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
Total		-51.4%	\$12,629

Examples – Balanced Packages

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
CTC 4	Max CTC amount \$500 for children 6+, \$1000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-9.7%	\$937
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$3,272
PA 6	Increasing the Shelter Allowances for FA-SNA by 100%	-11.6%	\$2,330
PA 4	Increasing the Basic Allowances for FA-SNA by 50%	-8.1%	\$1,123
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%	\$78.54
Total		-48.9%	\$8,064

Policy #	Proposed Policy	Child Poverty Reduction Effect (%) ages 0-17	Additional Annual Cost (\$millions)
CTC 4	Max CTC amount \$500 for children 6+, \$1000 for children 6-, fully refundable	-9.7%	\$937
HV 2	HCVP-Type Voucher for Unsubsidized Income-Eligible Households (<50% AMI), No Noncitizen Restrictions	-15.7%	\$3,272
PA 5	Increasing the Basic Allowances for FA-SNA by 100%	-18.1%	\$2,085
PA 1	Removing the Assets Test for Family Assistance (FA) and Safety Net Assistance (SNA)	0.0%	\$6
PA 2	Removing FA-SNA Durational Sanctions in Areas Using That Policy	0.0%	\$3
PA 3	Applying the Same Earned Income Disregards for FA-SNA Applicants as for Recipients	-2.9%	\$309
CTC 2	Children with ITIN fully eligible	0.0%	\$7
EITC 6	Expanding the Current State EITC to Filers with Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	-0.9%	\$79
Total		-47.3%	\$6,697

Goal – Develop Combinations/Packages of Proposals

- Create 4 different potential combinations of proposals that could achieve ~50% child poverty reduction based on:
 - Poverty reduction effect by age, race, geography
 - Change in household resources, overall estimated cost
 - Priority rankings of proposals identified by Committees
- Urban Institute will model combinations to account for interactions between proposals and provide unified data

Looking Ahead

Next Steps

Next Steps – 2024

- Urban Institute will model cumulative poverty reduction effect of proposed policy packages, accounting for proposal interactions
- August: Statutory members reconvene to review package data
 - Consider lessons learned from public input on benefit accessibility and administrative burdens
 - Develop initial recommendations to reduce child poverty by 50% through different combinations of proposals
 - August 7 or August 30? Pending data delivery
- Goal for the fall: summarize and issue initial recommendations

Next Steps – 2024

- Additional notes:
 - Will request cost estimates (administrative, implementation) from State Agency partners for proposals identified to be included in packages
 - Will also be obtaining estimate data on the potential poverty reduction effects of proposals in recent SFY2024-25 budget, as part of CPRAC's charge to monitor State progress
 - Will aim to issue another progress report this year, recapping this year's CPRAC process and outcomes

Next Steps – 2024

Target Month	Goal*
March, April, May	✓ Tax Policy Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Public Benefits Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Housing Committee reconvenes to review data, develop priorities/rankings based on data ✓ Formal public hearing in NYC, on accessibility and availability of public benefits
June	✓ Committees report data-based priorities/rankings back to statutory members ✓ Statutory members develop initial policy packages for modeling • Request rough cost estimate from State Agencies of proposals included in packages
July	• UI assesses cumulative effects of policy packages • State Agency partners prepare rough cost estimates of selected proposals
August	• Statutory members review data on policy packages and cost estimates, identify initial recommendations
September	• Finalize initial recommendations and draft summary report
October	• Review and issue report with recommendations
November	• Draft progress report
December	• Vote to issue progress report

Closing

Closing

- **Assistant Secretary to the Governor
for Human Services and Mental Hygiene Alyson Tarek –
*CPRAC Co-Chair***
- **Commissioner Barbara Guinn (OTDA) –
*CPRAC Co-Chair***

Thank you!