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Background: Evictions in NYC Housing Court

• Evictions are processed through the State civil court system.
  – Most cases do not go to trial and are resolved through a negotiated agreement between tenant and landlord (stipulation). Failure to meet stipulation provisions can lead to eviction.
  – Historically, almost all landlords—and very few tenants—were represented by attorneys in Housing Court cases.

• In 2017, New York City enacted the country’s first Right to Counsel (RTC) law for tenants facing eviction proceedings.
  – Administered by the Office of Civil Justice (OCJ) within the Department of Social Services / Human Resources Administration (DSS/HRA).
  – Implemented in phases, serving over 30,000 households in FY2019 (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic).
Assessing the Quality of Legal Services

• The DSS Office of Evaluation and Research (OER) conducted a literature review that identified four general approaches to defining quality in legal services—legal outcomes, legal competence, resource inputs, and procedural justice—and concluded that the last was most promising for assessing RTC.

• Procedurally just interactions are marked by four related features:
  1. Respect—the extent to which clients are treated with dignity.
  2. Voice—the degree to which clients bring relevant facts to bear.
  3. Understanding—the extent to which clients know what is happening with their case and understand the consequences of court determinations.
  4. Neutrality—whether clients perceive legal proceedings to be carried out without bias.

❖ Lawyers in housing court are positioned to promote procedural justice, with likely downstream housing benefits for tenants. We thus define high quality legal assistance as that which fosters a sense of procedural justice among tenants with eviction cases in housing court.

Evaluation Questions

*Through structured interviews with RTC clients, OER explored the following questions:*

1. What types of legal services did RTC lawyers provide to tenants? How often were different service components provided?
2. What were the court outcomes? How confident were tenants that they would be able to remain in their homes?
3. How satisfied were tenants with their lawyer? How did tenants perceive the quality of their representation?
4. What were the relationships between service receipt, court outcomes, and perceived quality of representation, understood through a procedural justice lens?
Methods

• Telephone surveys conducted over 5 weeks in English and Spanish.
• Placed calls to random sample of 902 tenants who obtained legal representation through RTC program in 4Q CY2018 and for whom phone numbers were available.*
  – Study sample (n=143) relatively similar to overall population of tenants served (details in Appendix).
• Structured and open-ended questions to capture services received, case outcomes, satisfaction, and perceived quality.
  – 4-point Likert Scale responses to prompts associated with respect, voice, and understanding averaged to create Quality Index Score.

*Did not include tenants who were advised but not formally represented by RTC attorneys (brief services) and tenants enrolled through the Anti-Harassment Tenant Protection Program.
## Legal Services and Court Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lawyers <strong>actively engaged with tenants</strong> and provided critical assistance with stipulation negations.</th>
<th>The majority (75%+) of tenants reported that their lawyer spoke with them on the phone, appeared with them in court—usually more than once—and met with the landlord’s lawyer on their behalf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost all tenants who received assistance with stipulations understood the terms and were confident they could meet the terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawyers also helped connect tenants with other services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most tenants were <strong>still living in their home</strong> when surveyed (5-8 months after connecting with a lawyer).</th>
<th>85% of tenants were still in their home; open-ended responses suggest that almost all of those who had moved did so involuntarily.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost half of those still in their home were confident they would be able to stay, and another quarter were somewhat confident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Satisfaction and Perceived Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost all tenants were satisfied with their lawyer.</th>
<th>98% of those surveyed agreed that</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...they would want help from a lawyer for any future cases in housing court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...they were happy with their decision to get a lawyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...would recommend having a lawyer to others with an eviction case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nearly all tenants reported receiving high-quality legal representation.</th>
<th>90% of tenants agreed that they were respected, supported, and kept informed by their lawyer.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responses to 10 prompts related to procedural justice were strongly correlated; average Quality Index Score was 3.3 (80% of tenants had a score above 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-ended responses about the value of an attorney often cited factors aligned with understanding and voice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix for detailed responses to procedural justice items.
Patterns in Perceived Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement in legal services provision</th>
<th>Across service components, tenants whose lawyers more actively engaged generally reported higher overall quality.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, many tenants with limited attorney engagement also reported high quality, likely due to rapid resolution of cases in Housing Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-attorney interaction</td>
<td>Number of tenant-attorney meetings and amount of time spent were both positively and significantly associated with overall quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests that personal interaction between tenants and lawyers promotes perceived procedural justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case outcome</td>
<td>Among tenants still in their home, average quality scores were slightly higher among those more confident in their ability to remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No notable difference in average quality scores comparing residents <em>no longer in their homes</em> to those who remained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“[my lawyer] made sure I am getting a fair try...because they know more about the situation than I can. It is always more helpful to get an attorney.”

“[my lawyer] made things clearer for me. He took his time to make sure I understand everything and all the processes that can happen.”

“[My lawyer] helped me with my case so I could fully understand what was going on. I was not alone so I felt secure. She helped me in the most possible way that she could. Unfortunately, I was evicted because it was a holdover case—the landlord wanted his apartment back. And the conclusion that came was, I had no other alternative. I had to go into a shelter.... [My lawyer] helped me with the steps moving forward so I wouldn't be living on the streets.”
Implications

• Findings are aligned with prior research on procedural justice: perceived fairness is the primary driver of satisfaction with court experiences, *regardless of case outcome*.

• Increased perceptions of fairness may translate into increased housing stability:
  - Research suggests litigants who perceive court processes as fair are more likely to comply with court orders.
  - Tenants who received legal assistance in negotiating stipulations were more likely to understand the terms and may be better able to fulfill terms.

• In addition to legal representation, lawyers can play a role in linking clients to benefits and providing emotional support during a highly vulnerable time.
Study Population and Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Total (n=3,858)</th>
<th>Randomly selected, did not participate (n=857)</th>
<th>Participated (n=143)</th>
<th>Study sample relatively similar to overall population of engaged tenants, with the exception of holdover cases which were purposely oversampled.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronx</td>
<td>1,601 (41.5%)</td>
<td>331 (38.6%)</td>
<td>49 (34.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>1,110 (28.8%)</td>
<td>232 (27.1%)</td>
<td>57 (39.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>467 (12.1%)</td>
<td>101 (11.8%)</td>
<td>15 (10.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>396 (10.3%)</td>
<td>147 (17.2%)</td>
<td>15 (10.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>284 (7.4%)</td>
<td>46 (5.4%)</td>
<td>7 (4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdover</td>
<td>948 (24.6%)</td>
<td>438 (51.1%)</td>
<td>61 (42.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Payment</td>
<td>2,910 (75.4%)</td>
<td>419 (48.9%)</td>
<td>82 (57.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of adults per household</strong></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of children per household</strong></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family income below 2X FPL</td>
<td>3,716 (96.3%)</td>
<td>822 (95.9%)</td>
<td>143 (100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent-regulated housing</td>
<td>2,338 (65.5%)</td>
<td>469 (58.4%)</td>
<td>79 (59.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NYC Department of Social Services

Human Resources Administration
Department of Homeless Services
Sample Demographics

- Large majority (85%) of survey population identified as African-American or Hispanic/Latinx.
- 60% of White/European-American participants were male, the other three groups overwhelmingly identified as female.
- Reported educational attainment higher than anticipated, given that all survey takers had a family income less than twice federal poverty limit.
- Higher than anticipated education level might limit generalizability of findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th># (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female), (n=135)</td>
<td>104 (77.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity (n=133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>63 (47.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx (all races)</td>
<td>50 (37.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>13 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Other</td>
<td>7 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment (n=127)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>15 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>34 (26.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>27 (21.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree or higher</td>
<td>51 (40.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceived Quality: Procedural Justice Items

My lawyer...
- treated me with respect (n=136)
- was trustworthy (n=132)
- represented me to the best of their ability (n=128)
- supported me (n=135)
- was knowledgeable (n=132)
- made me feel more comfortable in housing court (n=128)
- understood my side of the story (n=133)
- explained court rulings in a way that was clear to me (n=134)
- made sure I understood the housing court process (n=133)
- was easy to get in touch with (n=135)
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Supporting Local Planning with Data
## American Community Survey (ACS) Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009-2013 ACS Demographic Profiles</th>
<th>2007-2011 ACS Demographic Profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012 ACS Demographic Profiles</td>
<td>2005-2009 ACS Demographic Profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS Data on American Fact Finder</td>
<td>Maps for 2005-09 ACS Data on New York Times Website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2010 Census Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF1 Demographic Profiles</th>
<th>Capital District PL94 Redistricting Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census Data on American Fact Finder</td>
<td>Maps for 2010 Census PL94 Data on New York Times Website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Data

- December and Year-End 2014 CPI & Producer Price Index
- Capital District Data; Nov/Dec 2014 Issue Now Available Online
Capital District Final Age Cohort & Population Projections

1990: 777,783
2000: 794,293
2010: 837,967
2020: 864,426
2030: 888,073
2040: 896,451
2050: 895,012

Prepared by the Capital District Regional Planning Commission

2012-08-15, WWV Age Cohort Projections - Capital District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Region Inflow</th>
<th>Number of Individual (from NYC)</th>
<th>Capital Region Outflow</th>
<th>Number of Individual (to NYC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYC Counties</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>NYC Counties</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren County, NY</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>Warren County, NY</td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County, NY</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>Washington County, NY</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County, NY</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>Montgomery County, NY</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County, NY</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>Fulton County, NY</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County, NY</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>Schoharie County, NY</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton County, NY</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Columbia County, NY</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County, NY</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Greene County, NY</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester County, NY</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Middlesex County, MA</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster County, NY</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>Maricopa County, AZ</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Sales Tax Revenue by County

Source: New York State Department of Taxation and Finance
Using Data to Inform Action In the Greater Capital Region
## Building Permit Issuance 2008 - 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Albany County</strong></td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Cohoes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Watervliet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Berne</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Bethlehem</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Guilderland</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Knox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of New Scotland</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Rensselaer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Westerlo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town/Village of Green Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Altamont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Colonie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Menands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Ravena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Voorheesville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rensselaer County</strong></td>
<td>City of Rensselaer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Troy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Berlin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Brunswick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of East Greenbush</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town of Grafton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safe Harbor Municipalities

- Municipalities in upstate NY will be required to grow their housing stock by 1% over a three-year period.
- Have enacted by law two of five ‘preferred actions’.
Preferred Actions to Qualify for Safe Harbor Communities

- Allow accessory dwelling units (AUDs) in all areas that allow single-family and multi-family units.
- Allow regulations to allow for lots to be split.
- Amend regulations to remove any exclusionary land use regulations.
- Permit smart growth rezoning.
- Permit adaptive reuse rezoning.
Percent of Municipalities that Reach the 1% Housing Unit Stock (2020 Baseline) Target Using 2019-2021 Building Permit Issuance Data

- Yes 48.72%
- No 51.28%
More information

Capital District Regional Planning Commission
Phone: 518.453.0850
https://Cdrpc.org

Mark A. Castiglione, AICP
Executive Director
Office: (518) 453-0850 ex. 22
Cell: (518) 461-3597
Phone: 518.453.0850

Madison Hrysko
GIS & Data Analyst
Office: (518) 453-0850 ex. 23
Cell: (631) 384-6455
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ERAP & TENANT STABILITY

Nic Rangel, Esq. (she/her), Executive Director at Legal Aid Society of Northeastern New York
The New York State Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP) was established to distribute federal and state funding to provide financial relief to tenants and landlords during the COVID-19 Pandemic. Tenants (up to 120% AMI) could have up to 12 months arrears plus 3 months future rent paid on their behalf to their landlord.

- Total Applications: 404,727
- Number of Applications Paid: 232,401
- Value of Payments Issued to Landlords: $2.89 billion
- Total Assistance Obligated and/or Paid through November 30, 2022: $3.06 billion.
New York State Emergency Rental Assistance Utility Arrears Program through March 15, 2023:

- Number of Utility Payments: 95,551
- Value of Payments Issued: $124 million

This program used a combination of federal and state funds and a tax write off to utility companies that forgave eligible arrears.
LAN DLORD RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LRAP)

• New York State Landlord Rental Assistance Program (LRAP) through March 15, 2023.
  • Number of LRAP Applications: 55,009
  • Number of LRAP Payments: 28,223
  • Value of LRAP Payments Issued: $284 million

• This program used state funds to pay off tenant arrears to landlords when the tenant refused to participate in ERAP or had already moved out.
ERAP DISTRIBUTIONS

- Over 63% of all ERAP assistance went to female head of households
- Over 43% of all ERAP assistance went to Black head of households
- Over 32% of all ERAP assistance went to Hispanic or Latino head of households
- Over 68% of the ERAP assistance went to households at or below 30% Area Median Income (AMI) = $29,850
Eviction moratoria (CEEFPA) and court closures from March 2020- January 2022, except for a few weeks between when orders expired and were later extended.

The Tenant Safe Harbor Act, Chapter 127 of 2020, protected tenants from eviction for failing to pay their rent that came due during the covered period from March 7, 2020 through January 15, 2022, if they suffered a financial hardship due to COVID-19.

Eligible ERAP applicants were granted a 1-year lease extension at the current lease rent rate to prevent holdover evictions.
Eviction Filings in New York State

- During the moratorium, landlords were generally unable to raise rents. We are now seeing large rent increases across the country.
- Nationally listed rents rose by over 15% from a year ago.
- Average asking rent for a market-rate unit in Albany is 12% higher than last year and was already over 9% from 2019.
- Filings are climbing back up to pre-pandemic levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Filings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>262,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>109,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>69,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>193,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2021, the Governor awarded $25M in federal funding to provide free legal assistance and comprehensive housing stability services outside of NYC.

That funding was continued in the 2022 Budget for FY 22 & FY23 and continued to be distributed to LSC legal services organizations.

Likely to continue this level of funding or add more this year.
RIGHT TO COUNSEL - IMPACT

- Statistics show Q3 of 2022 on 1.3% of tenants were represented by an attorney. In comparison, landlord representation rates for the same period were 92% in Albany, New York.

- Outcomes for tenants in eviction cases are improved by as much as 60% when they have legal assistance.

- Court filings in localities with RTC have dropped by 30%, due to the deterrent effect of the law on landlords using evictions to harass tenants.
RTC IS CATCHING ON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>Minneapolis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, KS</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>(2022)</td>
<td>(2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2021)</td>
<td>(2022)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Right to Counsel” legislation is catching on (see last slide) across the country.

- S.2721/A.1493 (2023): Right to Counsel in any landlord/tenant matter, including evictions

“Good Cause” legislative initiatives are also gaining momentum across the country.

- S.305/A.4454 (2023): Right to renew a lease and sets a floor for unconscionable rent hikes.
New York’s Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP)

Comments / Questions

Thank you!

Disclaimer: The information and materials contained on this presentation was prepared by LASNNY for general informational purposes only, and are not intended, and should not be considered, to be legal advice or legal opinion. Transmission, receipt or use of this presentation does not constitute nor create an attorney-client relationship. No recipients of content from this presentation should act, or refrain from acting, based upon any or all of the contents of this presentation. LASNNY does not wish to represent anyone desiring legal representation based on viewing any material on this presentation where such material does not comply with all laws and rules of professional ethics of the state in which such person is located. Neither LASNNY warrants that the information contained on this presentation is accurate or complete, and hereby disclaims any and all liability to any person for any loss or damage caused by errors or omissions, whether such errors or omissions result from negligence, accident or any other cause.
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Pedaling Forward or Pedaling Back?
A Study on the Use of ICTs in Online Discussions on Urban Cycling

Marco Castillo
Associate Professor of Political Science
NYC College of Technology - CUNY
Introduction

- Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) have become an increasingly important vehicle by which citizens can participate in public discussions.
- And over time, ICTs have shown their value as tools for public participation in government.
- The use of these tools has also become more ubiquitous.
The Problem...

- While there are numerous benefits, the adoption of these technologies has also introduced new problems.

- Some note that these communications technologies have a wide set of characteristics that should be considered before their adoption as tools for public participation and/or understanding public sentiment.

- I analyze online social media communications to explore how differences in social media platforms may affect the characteristics of communications occurring on these platforms.

- I utilize sentiment analysis to analyze online discussions regarding cycling in New York City, a public activity that is the subject of some controversy and is affected by governmental policy and administrative action.
Background

- Evolution of ICTs – USDOD ARPANET
- Web 1.0 to 2.0
- Static Communications to Interactivity
- Today’s Social Media
Support for Social Media

- Academics and practitioners generally positive

- Social media tools have been credited as being "important mechanisms for enabling open government" as they "provide more opportunities for citizens to collectively deliberate on public policymaking and the role of citizens in governance" (Ganapati & Reddick, 2014; Liu & Yuan, 2015).

- Foth et al. note that "social media has grown beyond the purely 'social' realm and is now increasingly used to cause real impact, in terms of community activism, civic engagement, cultural citizenship and user-led innovation" (Fredericks & Foth, 2013).

- These tools are seen as contributing towards improvements in a wide range of publicly valued outcomes, including improved public services, improved administration, and improved social value in the outputs and outcomes of government (Twizeyimana & Andersson, 2019).
The Problem

- But the academic literature often refers to social media tools in a generic fashion
- This may prompt us to overlook important differences that can have implications for how public administrators utilize these tools to achieve their objectives.
- In contrast, I posit that there are significant differences among social media tools that need to be recognized for a more complete understanding of the value of these tools for the achievement of public administrative objectives.
Research Questions

- How does the type of social media platform affect the nature of communications occurring on these platforms with respect to an area of human activity subject to governmental policy and/or administrative action?

- What are the implications of observed differences for public administrators seeking to utilize these platforms to understand citizen sentiment regarding public issues and to communicate to the public about these matters?
Hypotheses

\( H_1: \) Citizen communications expressed on a microblogging platform will exhibit more polarity than communications on platforms utilizing a discussion forum interface.

\( H_2: \) Citizen communications expressed on a microblogging platform will exhibit more negative sentiment than communications made on a platform utilizing a discussion forum interface.
Methodology – Gathering Data

- To gather the Twitter "tweets" and the Reddit posts, I utilized Python and two “web scraping” tools
  - Pushshift API to gather r/NYCitybike Reddit posts
  - Snscrape to gather #BikeNYC tweets
Methodology - Analysis

- Utilized the Pandas library to assemble these data sources into a single dataset.
- Utilized sentiment analysis to assess the sentiment of these tweets and Reddit postings.
- Sentiment analysis is the process of using natural language processing and machine learning techniques to analyze and determine the emotional tone or sentiment of text.
- It involves identifying the overall sentiment expressed in a given text, whether it is positive, negative, or neutral.
Utilized the *Textblob* NLP library, to analyze subjectivity and polarity of postings.

- Subjectivity scores range from 0 to 1, with 0 being completely objective and 1 being completely subjective.
- Polarity scores range from -1 to 1, with -1 being very negative, 0 being neutral, and 1 being very positive.
- Also utilized polarity values to create a new binary value indicating whether the tweet or Reddit post exhibited a negative sentiment overall (0 = positive or neutral, 1 = negative).
Methodology - Analysis

- Statsmodels library

- $H_1$ (OLS model):
  - polarity score (ranging from -1 to +1) = intercept + platform dummy ($0 = \text{Twitter}, 1 = \text{Reddit}$) + reply ($0 = \text{not a reply}, 1 = \text{is a reply}$)

- $H_2$ (Logit model):
  - negative text dummy ($0 = \text{not negative}, 1 = \text{negative}$) = intercept + platform dummy ($0 = \text{Twitter}, 1 = \text{Reddit}$) + reply ($0 = \text{not a reply}, 1 = \text{is a reply}$)
## Figure 2: Polarity Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twitter (var=0)</td>
<td>161068</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit (var=1)</td>
<td>218077</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Platforms</td>
<td>379145</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: Histogram of Polarity Scores
Figure 4: Bar Plot

- **positive**: 175,000
- **negative class**: 75,000
- **neutral**: 110,000
Figure 5: OLS Regression Model

|                | coef   | std err | t      | P>|t| |
|----------------|--------|---------|--------|------|
| const          | 0.1146 | 0.001   | 162.258| 0.000|
| platform       | -0.0263| 0.002   | -16.295| 0.00 |
| reply          | -0.0173| 0.002   | -10.551| 0.000|
• Transforming the logit regression coefficients into odds ratios allowed me to interpret the findings in terms of percentages.

• After making these transformations, the data indicated that a Reddit post's odds of being negative is 45.4% higher than a Twitter post.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>coef</th>
<th>std err</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>P &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>const</td>
<td>-1.8698</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-253.920</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>0.3741</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>24.409</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reply</td>
<td>0.3855</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>24.365</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A reply's odds of being negative is 47% higher than an original post!
- For Twitter posts, the odds of a reply being negative is 57% higher than an original post.
- For Reddit posts, the odds of a reply being negative is 23% higher than an original post.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>platform</th>
<th>reply</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>platform</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>0.846082</td>
<td>0.130791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reply</td>
<td>0.846082</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>0.129740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>0.130791</td>
<td>0.129740</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

- Several findings were unexpected
- In contrast to my hypotheses, the regression results indicated that Reddit posts were somewhat more negative in sentiment than Twitter posts and more likely to reflect negative sentiment at a whole.
- The analysis also corroborated my assertion that the reply variable would serve as a useful control variable, as postings that were replies did seem to be fundamentally different (in this case, more negative) than original posts.
- These findings have implications for public administrators
Implications

- No great “toxicity”
- The findings do not seem to indicate that the use of these social media platforms is particularly injurious to the achievement of democratic objectives (fostering effective citizenship, a publicly spirited character in the populace.)
- Comments were slightly positive, in line with what one might expect in mature and civically minded public conversation.
Implications

- But Reddit “discussion forum” posts were more negative than Twitter microblogging posts.
- Public administrators may use social media information for a variety of purposes
- But it seems that utilizing Reddit and the discussion forum interface may be particularly useful for providing citizens a forum to raise concerns, complaints, and "petition the Government for a redress of grievances."
- May aid in establishing legitimacy and democratic responsiveness
Implications

- In contrast to hypotheses, Twitter posts were on average less negative and more objective than the Reddit posts.

- Twitter and similar microblogging platforms may serve as better avenues to garner simpler, clearer, more discreet fact-based information that could help in making more traditional improvements in public services.

- May be particularly useful in more traditional bureaucratic environments without extensive programs of coproduction.
Implications

- But was there “toxicity?”
- Twitter replies were more likely to be categorized as negative than Reddit replies (57% to 27%).
- Public administrators utilizing Twitter and microblogging platforms should remain cognizant of this tendency.
- These insights can likely be used to raise administrative awareness about problematic issues that may arise when engaging in more collaborative and participative administrative processes.
Conclusion and Next Steps

- Findings can shed light on important issues regarding the adoption of social media tools by public administrators as they seek to carry out their democratic and administrative objectives.

- This research shows that the differences social media tools are substantial and may have a significant impact on the nature of communications occurring on these platforms.

- Public administrators should remain aware of these differences.
Conclusion and Next Steps

- A future focus on the link between public administrative objectives and social media utilization
- Remain aware of goals (democratic, administrative) and how environmental conditions affect their accomplishment (resources, organizational culture)
- Finally, insights can be useful for utilization of tools in new combinations and even the development of new platforms.
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From Starting to Sustaining:
What actions are local governments in North Carolina taking to advance DEI?

Maurice Tose II
Kimalee Dickerson
Carl Stenberg
Four Phases of Organizational Change

1. Develop shared commitment and vision
2. Assess and build capacity
3. Establish organizational infrastructure
4. Create and evaluate polices and practices
Initiatives to Advance DEI

1. Develop shared commitment and vision
   - Adopt resolution acknowledging local history of racism
   - Release formal statement of support for DEI efforts
   - Incorporate DEI principles into organization’s strategic plan
   - Incorporate DEI principles into organization’s vision/mission statement
   - Add DEI principles terminology into organization’s website
Initiatives to Advance DEI

2. Assess and build capacity
   • Institute DEI-related training for governing board members
   • Institute DEI-related training for staff
   • Conduct DEI-related surveys of staff
   • Establish formal mentorship opportunities for staff of color
   • Create internship programs targeting people of color
   • Establish affirmative action plans for hiring staff of color
   • Establish membership with GARE or other DEI-related professional organization
3. Establish organizational infrastructure
   • Hire a DEI-related officer to act as a dedicated staff person (Chief Diversity Officer)
   • Assign DEI-related responsibilities to an existing staff person
   • Establish a DEI-related department (Office of Diversity & Inclusion)
   • Establish an internal DEI-related task force made up of staff
   • Establish an external DEI-related advisory committee made up of residents
   • Establish department-specific DEI initiatives
   • Set aside a pool of budgetary resources targeted to DEI initiatives
4. Create and evaluate policies and practices
   - Evaluate Human Resource policies related to DEI
   - Reform procurement and contracting policies to promote MWBE
   - Expand data collection related to DEI performance measures
   - Implement Racial Equity Toolkits (GARE, ICMA) to evaluate policies, practices, and procedures
Methodology

Email survey sent to 543 county and city managers and administrators in July/August 2021

Focus on initiatives currently being implemented or planned for fiscal year 2022-2023

9% response rate to full survey (38 municipalities, 11 counties); diverse geographic and population size

No actions reported by 16 municipalities and 2 counties

Interviews conducted with representatives of 3 municipalities that had implemented more than 50% of the DEI initiatives
Most adopted or planned initiatives were in Phase # 3 – Establishing Organizational Infrastructure

- Establish department-specific DEI initiatives
- Establish internal DEI-related staff task force
- Assign DEI-related responsibilities to existing staff member
- Set aside pool of funds targeted to DEI initiatives
Results

Other Current or Planned Initiatives

– Institute DEI-related training for staff (Phase #2)
– Evaluate Human Resource policies related to DEI (Phase #4)
– Incorporate DEI principles into the strategic plan (Phase #1)
– Institute DEI-related training for governing board members (Phase #2)
– Reform procurement and contracting policies to promote MWBE (Phase #4)
– Conduct DEI-related surveys of staff (Phase #2)
Least Common Current Initiatives

- Establish commission on truth and reconciliation (Phase #3)
- Create formal mentorship opportunities for staff of color (Phase #2)
- Adopt formal resolution acknowledging local history of racism (Phase #1)
Challenges

– Pushback from staff and community stakeholders
– Need for patience and persistence
– Need for clarity on DEI terminology

Supports

– Buy-in from elected officials and senior management
– DEI Training
– Staff “champions”
Conclusions

1. Local governments of various sizes and in different areas are taking steps to advance DEI

2. There is more than one way to start a DEI journey; local governments are implementing DEI in different ways and sequences

3. Local governments are planning to implement a variety of future DEI initiatives including an increased focus on data collection and evaluation
Limitations and Next Steps

• 9% response rate lower than hoped; why was this the case? (Budget-delayed priorities; pandemic response; lack of DEI pressure in small, rural jurisdictions; political sensitivity)

• Focus on 23 actions; what was missed? (Funding for DEI work; authority, resources, and location of DEI staff; how pushback was dealt with; indicators of success; evaluation plans)

• Information collected about what initiatives were being taken or planned, not assessing how they worked or organizational/community impacts

• Second survey planned for fall 2023
Thank You

The School of Government
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
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Talk the Talk and Walk the Walk: What New Yorkers Think and Say about Substance-Use Disorder

Patricia Strach, University at Albany, SUNY
Katie Zuber, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY
Elizabeth Pérez-Chiqués, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE)
As opioid overdose deaths increased in the past two decades, media stories and drug policy have shifted from a criminal-justice framework to a medical one. Rather than thinking of drug use as a criminal-justice problem requiring a law-enforcement solution, as was the case during the previous heroin and crack-cocaine drug waves, drug use during the opioid epidemic has been seen as a medical problem requiring a treatment solution. While researchers have established that attention to the current wave of opioid use is different from drug waves in the past, we know less about how this shift occurs and what the policy implications of this change may be.

(1) How has people’s understanding of substance use changed in response to the opioid epidemic?
(2) How do new understandings shape the policy response?
FROM CRIMINAL JUSTICE TO MEDICAL MODEL

ISSUE UNDERSTANDING = POLICY

RESPONSE

How people think about issues is related to the policies in place to address them
Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Nelson 1984; Stone 2002

Elected officials are limited in the types of policies they can choose based on perceptions about (social constructions of) target populations. Policies for negatively constructed and weak groups—such as drug users—will necessarily be punitive while policies for positively constructed and strong groups—such as older individuals or veterans—will be beneficial (Schneider and Ingram 1993).

PORTRAYALS

Media stories about drug use shifted from criminal justice to medical model
Kim et al 2020; Mendoza, Rivera, Hansen 2018; Netherland and Hansen 2016; Netherland and Hansen 2017; Shachar et al 2020

Policies

Policy on drug use shifted from criminal justice to medical model
Kim et al 2020; Netherland and Hansen 2016; Hansen and Roberts 2012.

WHY THIS SHIFT?

Perceived race, class, geography, and blameworthiness of drug users
Gollust and Miller 2020; Raychauduri, Mendelberg, McDonough 2023; Shachar et al 2020; de Benedictis-Kessner and Hankinson 2023; Kim et al 2020; Wood and Elliott 2019; Hansen and Roberts 2012; McElrath and McEvoy 2001; Haeder, Sylvester, Callaghan 2021; Kelly 2010; Mendoza, Rivera, Hansen 2018; Netherland and Hansen 2016; Netherland and Hansen 2017
Existing literature demonstrates an important link between issue understandings and policy solutions. Yet, the literature often assumes elites drive mass beliefs (e.g., Gollust and Miller 2020). Drawing on E.E. Schattschneider’s conception of politics as a street fight, where winners and losers are determined not by the strength of elites but by the spectators watching the fight, we look at how spectators understand drug use, the policies they support, and of their beliefs on what’s possible in the future.
DATA & METHODS

DATA

Methods to capture people’s understanding of drug use:
• Sample from in-depth interviews (30-120 minutes) with people on the frontlines (e.g., state and local officials, criminal justice personnel, medical and health professionals, service providers, people who use drugs, etc.).
• 27 interviews with 38 individuals

ANALYSIS

Recorded, transcribed, uploaded to Atlas.ti
• Coded all interviews for whether they addressed a specific understanding of drug use, 90 of them included this code from which we drew a purposive sample.
• Unit of analysis = individual
• Focused on inconsistencies (slippage) in how interviewee talked about drug use

CASE

Understandings of drug use by spectators in New York State
• Stratified by geography (rural, urban, suburban)
• 1 state official, 5 local officials, 6 criminal justice personnel, 16 medical/health providers, 2 service providers, 2 community members, 6 PWUD/family
# RESULTS

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR UNDERSTANDING SUBSTANCE USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIMINAL JUSTICE MODEL</th>
<th>MEDICAL MODEL</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL MODEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>people who use drugs</strong> are the problem and a law-enforcement approach is the solution.</td>
<td><strong>people who use drugs</strong> have a disease that needs medical treatment.</td>
<td><strong>people who use drugs</strong> are collateral damage of a system that harms them and the solution is to eliminate inequity and injustice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People who use drugs:</strong> &quot;addicts,&quot; &quot;repeaters,&quot; &quot;shoppers,&quot; &quot;frequent flyers,&quot; &quot;garbage heads,&quot; dealers, &quot;hard core,&quot; urban</td>
<td><strong>People who use drugs:</strong> &quot;substance-use disorder,&quot; &quot;biochemical dependency,&quot; disability, caused by individual trauma, can affect anyone</td>
<td><strong>People who use drugs:</strong> vulnerable, trauma of living in poor communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies to address:</strong> arrest, prosecution, War on Drugs</td>
<td><strong>Policies to address:</strong> prevention (limitations on prescribing), expanded treatment, therapy, reintegration</td>
<td><strong>Policies to address:</strong> end War on Drugs, safer drug supply, invest in communities, universal healthcare, housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the existence of these overarching frameworks, people do not always have systemic and coherent ways of understanding drug use. Instead, they oscillate between frameworks -- for example, describing addiction as a disease while simultaneously calling for a criminal justice response. These inconsistencies, or slippage, are windows into individual beliefs, namely when, how, and for whom individuals change their beliefs and when, how, and for whom beliefs remain “sticky” and unchanged,
Distinguishing between good people who use drugs (Medical) and bad people who use drugs (Criminal Justice)

When he went to jail, they provided no care for him because he was detoxing. He went from right, you know, getting high, doing that in the parking lot, to going to jail. No detox, no medication, no doctor. And, because it wasn't November’s end, they would not provide him with a blanket. He was freezing, cause if you’re… (yes, yes) somebody detoxing [flu-like symptoms, yes). Right. And they would, I’m sorry, they wouldn’t allow him to have long-Marks, because you are not allowed to have long-Marks until November something, a date. And so, you are left to suffer, which… okay, you know, I heard him hurting but he got through that. He goes to [state-run facility] and made it through [state-run facility] through March. In a second-rate facility and that’s all of the facilities that are state-run...He was surrounded by people that are going to just continue to do drugs. They are just there to… most of the people came from the city, most of the folks were just biding their time to not do prison time. And so, it wasn’t a very good climate, and they didn’t do anything for him, he just rotted.
Distinguishing policy response for drug users (Medical) and drug dealers (Criminal Justice)

Local Official 1: *I truly feel that there must be a… multi-faceted approach that includes treatment and includes prosecution. You can treat the addict, but we really need to prosecute the dealer. And as long as there is supply and demand, it’s gonna go on. If there’s an addict and there’s a dealer, sooner or later they’re going to find the same street corner [PS- right], that’s how it is.*

Local Official 2- *and the dealer, if the dealer knows he’s going to be prosecuted and he’s going to be sent away, they’ll think twice, maybe…. Maybe.*
Justifying the criminal justice system as the policy response to drug use for good people (Medical) and bad people (Criminal Justice)

When I have a robbery case, and I have a robbery defendant who goes after an 80-year-old man who’s at the gas station and knocks him down, and bruises him, and hurts him badly. And that robbery defendant says, well, I’d like to get into treatment. You know, kind of my reaction is that’s good and fine on the one hand, but what sort of treatment do we give to people who knock 80-year-old men and beat them up for their wallet. Do we have a treatment facility for that? We don’t. That’s antisocial, violent behavior, that requires someone to be locked up. So, on the one hand, I can see it, but it’s not an excuse for what you’ve done.

We want to get people help, but we want to hold dealers accountable, and I don’t think I have the tools to do that necessarily...[W]hen that parent calls me, and I’ve had the calls. ‘I cannot get my son help, he’s going to die, he’s addicted to heroin, he’s going to be a statistic, can you help him?’ how do I help? And how does she want me to help? By locking him up and forcing him into treatment....[W]hen you are in treatment, even by force, even by threat of going to jail, and someone shares something in a group about the way that they affected their sister, or their mother or their grandmother and it hits somebody, that person then, may see the light. Maybe it’s only one person, maybe it’s a small number of people, but you have to try, I think you can’t give up on people.
Justifying denying treatment for a disease (Medical) by using personal accountability (Criminal Justice)

We get a lot of people come in, ‘I need a refill on my Suboxone.’ ‘we are not going to refill your Suboxone.’ ‘well, then, I’m just going to go out and use.’ ‘okay, that’s your choice, no one’s telling you to use.’ ‘Well, you don’t know what it’s like, I don’t want to feel sick.’ I struggle there too because I wanna. Really, I have to remember I’m on the record. I really want to be just like ‘stop it, get yourself together, stop it. Okay? You need to do this, we can’t like spoon-feed you. look, I get it, you don’t want to get sick, I understand that. but you are in control here. You wanna go out and use? After being clean for how long? That’s on you. We are not making you use. You are going to use, you are going to blame us, but you are accountable for your own actions.’
[W]e have to really be more careful that we are actually treating this like a disease.

It connects to so much because this, you know...this crisis affects everyone. It affects the child, it affects the parents of the individual. It connects to what services are available, how do we provide help for a person? How do we help a person who doesn’t want to be helped? Umm, how do we address root causes before they become what they are? It connects to everything...law enforcement, how do you protect and serve without hurting? Sometimes that doesn't happen that way, sometimes, by thinking you’re protecting and serving, you actually just made a person go down further down that rabbit hole. How can you do better? Umm, it connects to everything....
Causes of drug use (Structural) vs. solutions (Medical & Criminal Justice)

How are they gonna survive on a regular basis, and how are they gonna avoid the temptation of not wanting to be numb, when they can't feed their kids, when they’re living in rat dens that nobody’s inspecting?... They’re just economically desperate. And again, we can close our eyes and say everything’s great, it’s not. [chuckles] You know? Poverty is one of the huge causes of what all these issues are.

I think, you know, the same way you need to pay for your defense, you need to pay to save people. You need to pay to keep people healthy. That means access to medical care, that means access to rehabilitative services, and you gotta say it’s okay that we foot this bill.

Police "know where the drug dealers’ houses are. And they know the people comin’ constantly in and out of ‘em. But, you rarely see the drugs on the table busts like they used to talk about on the Wire happen now."
CONCLUSION: POLICY IMPLICATIONS

SHALLOW TRANSFORMATIONS

- Not the transformation from criminal justice to medical model that the literature suggests
- Slippage reveals incomplete transformation: from papering over existing beliefs to a partial transformation in beliefs

WHAT IS POSSIBLE, FOR WHOM

- What is possible is determined by the spectators to policy debates
- A rising tide doesn't lift all boats: Distinguishing between "good" and "bad" drug users and policies best suited to address them

POSSIBILITY OF CHANGE BACK TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE MODEL

- Kept criminal justice infrastructure and policies but added the medical model on top
- Criminal justice model remains strong and can be activated at any time
We conducted open-ended interviews. Specifically, we were there to listen to how local officials think about the problem and what they’d like to see done to ameliorate it. The questions here are illustrative of the type of information we asked about.

Introduction: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. There has been a lot of national attention to opioids recently, and we are trying to learn more about how the problem looks on the ground in communities like this one.

1. Can you tell me about the opioid epidemic in your community?
2. What has your experience been like? How has the opioid epidemic looked similar to or different from drug epidemics in the past?
3. What kinds of initiatives/policies/programs have worked well?
4. What has not worked so well?
5. What would you like policymakers to know?
6. Is there anything we didn’t cover but should have? Is there anyone else we ought to speak to?
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COMMUNITY POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Civilian Oversight of Police in Albany, NY: Recent Changes in 2021-2022 and Challenges Ahead
AGENDA

ABOUT THE BOARD Who we are & What we do

CHANGES TO OUR WORK Local Law J and its impact on our mandate

PROGRESS UPDATE Where we have been & What we have been doing

AREAS OF FOCUS Building stronger & Moving forward
ABOUT THE CPRB

Our Mission
The CPRB reviews complaints of misconduct committed by officers of the Albany Police Department (APD). The CPRB’s goals are to improve communication between APD and the community and increase police accountability and credibility with the community it serves.

Our Vision
The CPRB is committed to providing the City of Albany with independent and impartial law enforcement oversight. The CPRB accomplishes this goal through investigations, policy recommendations, and community outreach to improve communication between APD and the community and increase police accountability and credibility with the community it serves.

For more information about the Board, visit: https://www.albanycprb.org/
COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

Nairobi Vives, Esq.
Chair

Dr. Veneilya Harden, Ed.D.
Vice Chair

Paul Collins-Hackett
Secretary

Kevin Cannizzaro, Esq.

Reverend Dr. Victor Collier

Antoinette Santos

Matt Ingram, JD, PhD

John Levendosky

Victor Person
RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CPRB

CPRB’s responsibilities include:

- Receiving and reviewing community complaints of police misconduct
- Reviewing any investigation conducted by APD’s Office of Professional Services (OPS)
- Reviewing APD and OPS policy
- Developing a police disciplinary matrix
- Conducting independent investigations into alleged police misconduct

The Government Law Center (GLC) at Albany Law School provides substantial support services to assist the Board in its duties and day-to-day responsibilities.

The Board has nine members, five appointed by the City of Albany Common Council and four appointed by the Mayor.
BOARD MEETINGS: PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

The CPRB holds a working meeting that is open to the public on the second Thursday of every month.

CPRB’s monthly meetings provide a platform for community members to learn more about police accountability and the Board’s scope and priorities. Board members also use the meetings to review complaints, ask questions, and share concerns about police-community relations in Albany neighborhoods. Speaking at Board Meetings is open to all.
CPRB COMPLAINT REVIEW

The Community Police Review Board is a resource to help community members voice concerns or file complaints.

Members of the public may file a complaint against a member of the Albany Police Department (APD) for improper conduct through our website, email and by mail. Criminal complaints against non-APD personnel must be filed with the Albany Police Department.

The complaint form is available in English and Spanish. To access the complaint form, visit our website at www.albanycprb.org.
On June 12, 2020, Governor Andrew Cuomo signed an Executive Order requiring each local government to convene stakeholders for a fact-based dialogue about the public safety needs of their community and adopt a policing reform plan by April 1, 2021, or lose future state funding. In line with the directive from Governor Andrew Cuomo, Mayor Kathy Sheehan formed the City of Albany’s Policing Reform and Reinvention Collaborative on August 13, 2020.

The purpose of the collaboration was to create a partnership with the community, police and stakeholders through shared decision-making, resources and responsibilities to reform policing.

Nairobi Vives, Esq., and Larry Becker, Esq., as members of the CPRB, participated in the Policing Reform and Reinvention Collaborative. The Board actively participated in the Policing Reform and Reinvention Collaborative and the city-wide conversation on police reform and continuously engaged and informed the community.
• Enhanced the complaint intake process to allow for better evidence collection, including the submission of multimedia (text, images, and video) through the CPRB website.

• Increased opportunities for community engagement by introducing a digital avenue for community members to provide public comment via the CPRB website and email.

• Integrated translation services on the CPRB website and complaint forms to accommodate limited or non-English-proficient complainants and witnesses at all stages of the investigative and adjudicative process.

• Fostered public awareness and shared knowledge of Albany’s efforts to support police reform by taking an active role in City-wide initiatives (e.g. City of Albany’s Policing Reform and Reinvention Collaborative, February 2021), tabling at community events, and upgrading the CPRB website.

• The Board partnered with Youth FX to develop educational videos for the general public about the CPRB, its remit, role and responsibilities as well as how to file a complaint and answer general FAQs

• Outreach Committee members attended the Black Expo and participated in a podcast roundtable conversation
This past year (2020 - 2021) marked an unprecedented period of police reform and oversight advocacy for the CPRB, culminating in the passage of Proposition 7 (Prop 7), also known as Local Law J, significantly clarifying and expanding the Board’s authority.

The proposition was supported unanimously by the Common Council and on November 2, 2021 was overwhelmingly voted in by Albany residents, amending the Board’s authority to conduct independent investigations into alleged incidents of police misconduct.
The new legislation, unanimously supported by the Common Council and overwhelmingly approved by voters, affirms the Board’s authority and allows us to:

▪ Issue subpoenas along with increasing access to police audio and video recordings and other relevant evidence
▪ Receive quarterly reports from the Chief of Police on disciplinary investigations and action
▪ Perform audits assessing the investigation and adjudication of civilian complaints
▪ Have full access to information about any officer involved in the events that are the subject of a complaint
▪ Conduct independent investigations with subpoena power
▪ Establish a disciplinary matrix, in conjunction with the Chief
▪ Review and access APD policies, procedures, patterns, practices, and training and make recommendations to APD for improvement
▪ Provide language access for limited or non-English-proficient complainants and witnesses at all stages of the investigative and adjudicative process
CLARIFYING LOCAL LAW J

To fully implement and integrate the spirit of Local Law J, we are recognizing the need for clarification and additional language around staffing and budget, the investigation and complaint review process, CPRB access to information, confidentiality, and the mediation process.

To remedy the shortfalls, the Board is considering:

• Adopting a new structure based on research and review of the efficacy of models in other jurisdictions, eventually developing an infrastructure that serves the community and the police officers that serve them (e.g., BART civilian oversight model (California), which separates staff for investigation and review)

• Requesting a budget untethered from APD (currently 1% of APDs budget) that sufficiently funds the Board’s duties to comprehensively meet our mandate to resolve all complaints by conducting fair, thorough, and independent investigations into police misconduct

• Clarifying and cementing the Board’s access to information, including making CPRB the final decision-maker in disputes over whether the information is confidential

• Empowering the Board’s Chair, rather than the entire Board, to decide whether mediation is appropriate
Developing Discipline Matrix For APD

The Board is tracking and taking part in collaborative discussions to develop clear and consistent systems for accountability.

In the last few years, Albany’s constituents voted to amend Local Law J of 2020 – Proposition 7 to enhance the role and responsibilities of the Albany Community Police Review Board (CPRB). As part of these changes, the Board is tasked with working with the Albany Police Department (APD) Chief of Police to develop and implement a Discipline Matrix that clearly delineates penalty levels with ranges of sanctions and stipulates a consistent accountability structure for law enforcement.

Our goal is to develop clear and consistent expectations of penalties and sanctions based on the gravity of substantiated police misconduct after an investigation. As a result, police officers and community members will have a clear understanding of the consequences of misconduct and trust in the accountability and oversight structures that Albany has in place.

The Board has begun this work and invite public engagement and input into the process.
BENEFITS OF POLICE OVERSIGHT

Why is Oversight Necessary?

• **Protect** human rights
• **Promotes** constitutional policing
• **Increases** public confidence and trust in the police
• **Builds** bridges between law enforcement and the public
• **Supports** greater accountability
• **Enhances** risk management
OTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF NOTE

• **Increased accessibility:** In accordance with Local Law J, the Sign Language Connection of the Center for Disability Rights sponsored sign language interpreters at CPRB meetings.

• **Increased evidentiary intake:** Community members can now submit pictures and videos with their complaint form on our website.

• **Increased engagement:** Community members can now leave public comment using the digital form on our website or provide written comments by email.
“The Board takes pride in what it has accomplished but understands that effective implementation of police oversight is an iterative process that requires continuous evaluation and work. We eagerly embrace the challenge.”

- Nairobi Vives, Chair
Albany Community Police Review Board
c/o Government Law Center, Albany Law School
2000 Building, Room 315
80 New Scotland Avenue
Albany, NY 12208
518-445-2383
cprb@albanylaw.edu
https://www.albanycprb.org

Follow us:  https://www.facebook.com/AlbanyCPRB
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Overview
We examine the relationship between community collaborative design and public safety outcomes in county-level criminal justice system oversight across the state of Oregon.
“We have to come together to rebuild trust between law enforcement and the people they serve.”

- U.S. President Joe Biden

Executive Order on Advancing Effective, Accountable Policing and Criminal Justice Practices to Enhance Public Trust and Public Safety
August 2022

Photo courtesy of Open Democracy
Community-policing relations

Proposed solutions

Reform
- Improve policing through evidence-based policies and practices

Defund
- Redirect police funding to social programs and investments

Abolish
- Dismantle current system to imagine alternative crime interventions

Gallup Poll, 2022; photo courtesy of Oregon Public Broadcasting.
“A collaborative process of problem solving and criminal justice system planning is the only way to meet and overcome the challenges facing our complex and fragmented criminal justice systems.”

—National Institute of Corrections, United States Department of Justice
1. What is the relationship between mandated community collaboration and criminal justice outcomes?

2. How does collaborative composition (who gets a seat at the table) moderate this relationship?
Unpacking public safety collaborative dynamics

Key Concepts

Collaborative governance
Representation
Public participation
Inclusion

How do we collaborate?
An Integrative Framework (Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh, 2012)

Who gets a seat at the collaborative table?
(Pitkin, 1967)

How is public voice considered in the process?
"There is a critical difference between going through the empty ritual of participation and having the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process."
(Arnstein, 1969)

How does process design facilitate or impede substantive representation?

Resistance to inclusion
Opposition to the participation of a particular group or individual at a particular time during any stage of a process (Artsien, 1969)

Limited
Often perpetrated by actors belonging to the dominant social or political group throughout the process

Descriptive representation

Meaningful involvement
Substantive representation

Pervasive
Community outcomes

Public value

A seat at the table
Meaningful contribution
Community outcomes

An Integrative Framework (Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh, 2012)
Who should have a voice in community public safety efforts?

**Theoretical Tension**

**Democratic participation**
Inclusive collaboration facilitates **just and equitable** policy outcomes

(Frederickson, 2008; Nabatchi, 2010)

**Community oversight:**
- Direct citizen participation
- Indirect participation (e.g., nonprofits)

(Butzlaff, 2022)

**Bureaucratic discretion**
Technocratic expertise facilitates **efficient and effective** policy outcomes

(Rosenbloom, 2003; Young & Tanner, 2022)
**Literature review**

*Officer discretion creates police-community meetings that “suffocate community voice.”*
Qualitative examination of NYPD police complaints (Cheng, 2022)

*Police regulatory intermediaries regulate public input rather than police action.*
Review of Chicago PD’s Police Board meeting minutes (Cheng, 2022)

*Public perceptions of policing vary by race/ethnicity.*
Survey analysis of Chicago Neighborhoods Survey (Boehme, Cann, and Isom, 2022)

*Communities with Citizen Review Boards report higher perceptions of procedural justice.*
Examines survey data from 48 major cities across the U.S. (Holliday and Wagstaff, 2022)

*Citizen oversight on policing has adverse effects on organizational performance*
National law enforcement administrative data (Kim, 2022)

*Nonprofits act as societal mediators to activate political participation and engagement.*
South Texas “State of the Nonprofit Sector” survey (Fernandez, 2022)
Oregon’s Approach: Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils (LPSCCs)

Oregon Senate Bill 1145 (1995)

“Because counties are in the best position for the management, oversight and administration of local criminal justice matters and for determining local resource priorities…county commissioners …shall convene a local public safety coordinating council.”
**Mandated LPSCC goals**

1. **Coordinate**
   Guide countywide public safety policy and planning by aligning collaborators

2. **Recommend**
   Make recommendations to county supervisors about resource allocation

3. **Grant**
   Approve Justice Reinvestment Grant program (since 2014)

---

**LPSCC Purpose**

Oregon Senate Bill 1145, 1995
Research design

- Is there a relationship between Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils (LPSCCs) and county-level criminal justice outcomes?
- Does the composition of an LPSCC influence its outcomes?
- Oregon Atlas of Collaboration
- Oregon Uniform Crime Report
- Examine relationship between LPSCC characteristics and public safety outcomes

Evaluating Oregon’s Local Public Safety Coordinating Councils

Research questions

Data sources

Empirical strategy
Data + Empirical Strategy

• Crime rates, by county:
  – 1991-2014
  – Property, violent, behavioral (misdemeanors)
  – Total data: 864 county-year observations

• Difference-in-differences approach
  – Leverage late compliance among counties
  – Compare changes in criminal justice indicators after policy implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of LPSCC</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Nonprofit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For-Profit Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Only</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Participation (no NP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government &amp; Experts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Participation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Participation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- Influence of LPSCCs varies by county size
  - Rural: less than 50,000 – 20 counties
  - Urban: 50,000 or more – 16 counties
- Total crime rate decreased across all counties
- Relative to counties with an LPSCC that included a Non-Profit:
  - Rural control counties saw estimated decrease in 1,618 total crimes*
  - Rural counties with an alternative LPSCC saw an estimated decrease in 999 property crimes
  - Urban control counties saw a estimated decrease in 1,215 total crimes, 263 violent crimes and 874 property crimes
  - Urban counties with an alternative LPSCC saw a estimated decrease in 1,275 total crimes
Discussion

• Including non-profits in Local Public Safety Collaboratives appears to have little influence on crime rates

• Treatment counties had persistently lower rates of crime throughout the observed period, though crime decreased in control counties at a greater rate

• Additional data collection to exploit variation between treatment and control counties
Limitations

• Data allows for analysis of quantity of community representatives rather than quality of representatives

• Complex system context with many potential factors impacting LPSCC performance and criminal justice outcomes

• Small number of late-compliers in comparison group
Potential Contributions

We addresses significant gaps in collaborative governance theory and practice in three ways:

1. Address the gap in scholarship surrounding collaborative governance outcomes by exploring the relationship between community collaboration and crime rates.

2. Explore how variation in community representation relates to public safety indicators, adding nuance to our understanding of how collaborative design influences collaborative outcomes.

3. Weave together theoretical threads from siloed research traditions to consider potential sources of resistance to inclusion in these processes.
Thank You!

Amanda Bankston  
(abanksto@syr.edu)  
Adam Cucchiara  
(ajcucchi@syr.edu)
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## Backup Slides – Model Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Small</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Large</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Crime Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-1802*</td>
<td>321,981</td>
<td>-1,221 (0.063)</td>
<td>-1,134 (0.104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other LPSCC</td>
<td>-1068</td>
<td>-1,087</td>
<td>-957 (0.105)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-691 (0.116)</td>
<td>-103,234</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-362</td>
<td>-328</td>
<td>-80</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-183*</td>
<td>80,417</td>
<td>-86</td>
<td>-339**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-133 (0.075)</td>
<td>-202**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-802*</td>
<td>343,963</td>
<td>-965**</td>
<td>-346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-530 (0.066)</td>
<td>-805</td>
<td>-679*</td>
<td>-106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crime Rate by County-Type: Pre-Trends
Number of Crimes/100,000 Citizens

Rural (Control)

- 95% CI
- Fitted values

Rural (w/ LPSCC)

- 95% CI
- Fitted values

Urban (Control)

- 95% CI
- Fitted values

Urban (w/ LPSCC)

- 95% CI
- Fitted values
Crime Rate by County-Type & LPSCC: Pre-Trends
Number of Crimes/100,000 Citizens
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Leveraging Local Resources for an Effective Sanctuary Response

Kathy Sheehan
Mayor, City of Albany

Kaitlynn Chopra
Pro Bono Scholar
Immigration Law Clinic
The Justice Center at Albany Law School
Sanctuary Welcome Plan
EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 1-17

April 24, 2017

City of Albany Policy Regarding Community Policing and Protection of Immigrants

WHEREAS, the City of Albany is a diverse City where more than one in ten of our residents were born in a country other than the United States; and

WHEREAS, access to city services is essential to all residents and visitors regardless of their immigration status; and

WHEREAS, the City of Albany ensures equity and social justice guide all decisions; and

WHEREAS, the City of Albany is committed to community policing and 21st century policing strategies, and law enforcement is more effective as a result of the partnerships cultivated from continued interaction and trust between all residents, visitors, and the Albany Police Department; and

WHEREAS, the Albany Police Department’s role is to protect all individuals, and individuals should not be afraid to contact the police if they are the victim or witness of a crime because they are concerned the police will inquire as to their immigration status; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government is best suited, and required by law, to enforce federal immigration laws; and

WHEREAS, in furtherance of these policies, the City of Albany will not inquire as to the immigration status of any individual as provided herein;

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Kathy M. Sheehan, Mayor of the City of Albany, by the authority vested in me by the charter and laws of the City of Albany do hereby order:
Immigration &
The City of Albany
Sanctuary Welcome Toolkit

The Sanctuary Welcome Toolkit does not collect identifying personal information.

No information submitted will be shared with the federal government or immigration enforcement, or effect your eligibility for public assistance or immigration benefits.
Benefit Eligibility Screening

The Sanctuary Welcome Toolkit does not store individualized personal data, and will not share any of the information you submit with the federal government or immigration enforcement.

This eligibility assessment is solely for the purpose of helping you figure out what local support resources may be available to you, and should not be used to determine eligibility for any immigration benefits.

Please answer the questions below to determine your benefit eligibility category.

Do you have immigration status?  
- Yes
- No
- I'm not sure

Choose an option:
- No, none of these
- Lawful Permanent Resident (Green Card)
- Refugee/Asylee
- Withholding of Removal
- Approved VAWA I-360
- Parole for More than 1 Year
- Granted Iraq/Afghan SIV
- Granted T Visa
- Valid Nonimmigrant Status (except U, T, & S)
- Granted Visa
Sanctuary Welcome Toolkit

Step 1 - Urgent Needs
Click below to begin working on your toolkit for urgent needs.

- Food
- Shelter
- Clothing
- Medical

Step 2 - Settling In
Click below to begin working on your toolkit to settle into your new home.

- IDs & Drivers License
- Education
- Library
- Community
- Worship
- Work Authorization

- Identify Needs
- Determine Eligibility
- Provide Information
- Refer & Support
Sanctuary Welcome Toolkit

Urgent Needs: Food

Eligibility: PRUCOL

Please answer the following questions to find food resources near you.

- Do you have any dietary restrictions or preferences? 
  - Yes
  - No

Enter address: Please type your address here

Next>

Based on your answers to the previous questions, your benefits eligibility category is likely “PRUCOL.”

You may not be eligible for common food support benefits such as SNAP (food stamps) or TANF (family assistance). However, there are many other food resources in the Albany area, including food pantries, where you can find food.

PRUCOL, or "Persons Residing under Color of Law," is a benefits category for people who have several types of indeterminate immigration status and are known to the federal government.

PRUCOL includes people with nonimmigrant visas, green card applicants with a filed application, people granted Temporary Protected Status (TPS), Parolees for < 1 yr, and applicants for asylum and withholding of removal, Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS), and TPS.

Please see the New York Immigration Coalition's & Empire Justice Center's Benefits Eligibility Chart for further information.
Identity Documents & Drivers Licenses

Common forms of IDs are:

- Passports
- National Identity Documents
- Drivers Licenses
- Work Permits (EADS)
- Green Cards
- Border Crossing Cards
- Consular IDs

Other documents can also be helpful to prove who you are, including:

- Birth Certificates
- Marriage/Divorce Certificates
- Work IDs
- School Diplomas
- Bank Statements

Continue
Identity Documents & Drivers Licenses

Your Right to a Drivers License in New York State

Starting in 2019, New York allows anyone, regardless of immigration status, to apply for a Drivers License and other state IDs.

Even though you may be eligible to apply, you will still need to submit specific documents to the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to prove your identity.

The following page will help you determine if you have the necessary documents to apply for a Drivers License or State ID in New York.
Identity Documents & Drivers Licenses

Which Documents Do You Have?
Please click each document that you either have or can get:

Proof of Date of Birth
- Passport
- Work Permit/EAD
- Border Crossing Card
- Consular ID
- Driver’s License/ID from another US State
- Driver’s License/ID from Foreign Country
- Birth Certificate
- Green Card

Continue

➢ Organize & Centralize
Thank you!

Questions? Want to get involved?
Please contact Lauren DesRosiers at Ldesr@albanylaw.edu
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Institutionalizing Equity: Innovation in ARPA spending

CRP 4120/6120: Urban Public Management
Professor Mildred E. Warner

December 2022
Provided US municipalities with a unique opportunity by directing $130 billion to local governments.

Will these funds be used to promote equity?

National ICMA survey: 84 % for infrastructure  
37 % for equity focused projects

NYSCMA survey: 76 % for infrastructure,  
31 % for equity-focused projects
Projects address underserved communities, disproportionately impacted by COVID

Community engagement ensures community needs are met. Grants and programs target those with greatest need

Reimagine public services – with an “equity in all things” framework
Covering the re-distributional and conceptual components of equity at the federal level, the third component, procedural equity, was left in the hands of local governments.

Focusing on this component shows how each government use ARPA funds to respond to its local conditions in innovative ways:

- Across a diverse sample of case studies, strategic partnerships and multi agency collaboration are often used to fight opposition and guarantee political will and community support.
Most of ARPA funds directed to housing were invested in tackling homelessness (43.6%)

Construction of tiny homes and conversion of hotels are among the most innovative investments, expanding the housing supply in the short and long-term.

Four case studies reveal promising opportunities for success including affordability, collaboration and partnerships, and the leveraging of ARPA funds to maximize impact.

The case studies also reveal challenges, including restrictive federal regulations of how funds are used and the issues of location and community buy-in of new projects for homeless populations.
BROADBAND

- Broadband is not considered a utility, but the pandemic showed the technological divide and how it affects every aspect of communities’ lives.

- With a historic $65 billion in federal ARPA funding, localities are employing innovative approaches to enhance local broadband connectivity.

- The case studies explored focused of understanding how local governments pursue their investments in **innovative ways to overcome state preemption, lack of political will, and lack of up-to-date federal regulation.**

- **Strategic partnerships with new actors**, like NGOs, were an innovative way to overcome these issues across the five case studies.
The importance of water access and affordability was highlighted during COVID-19 pandemic, given the increasing demand and the limited ability of many communities across the United States to pay for water utilities.

The Low Income Household Water Assistance Program (LIHWAP) was modeled after a similar federal program for energy (LIHEAP), and it is the first federally-funded water assistance initiative.

It provides funding for water utilities to address service restoration, rate reduction for low-income households, and prevention of service disconnection.

Even though it is a temporary program to support state and tribal governments, it frames water affordability as a policy priority.
KEY TAKEAWAYS

1. Thanks to ARPA's flexibility, local governments can respond to their specific conditions and implement innovative procedures that promote equity.

2. Even though equity conversations are on the table, political and community support for equity-focused investments must be built. Strategic partnerships and collaboration between different government and community entities are key to successful project development.

3. The explicit equity language used by the federal government is not necessarily used by local governments. Local governments can either lead with their values or lead with their actions to achieve equitable outcomes.

4. Policy innovation and historic investment raise the question of how will these efforts stick beyond ARPA and overcome limitations within the institutional design.
Thank you!

More information:

https://labs.aap.cornell.edu/local-government-restructuring-lab/student-work
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BROADBAND: A CASE STUDY

Jane Bowman Brady
Melody Chen
Edward Guo
Divine Maduakolam
OlaFare Olagbaju
DuxiXi Shen
Why Broadband Matters

Over **42 million** Americans lack reliable broadband access

**Key issues** are Access, Affordability, and Adoption

COVID-19 pandemic furthered our **dependency on the Internet** with school, work, and even governmental affairs now being conducted online. **ARPA** and other federal funding provided local governments with a **unique opportunity** to address broadband issues.
Methodology

- **State preemption** was the starting point for research
  Explored cases mostly in states with preemption: FL, PA, TX, VA

- **Identified municipalities** with **creative approaches** and **real efforts** in improving broadband access

- **Interviewed key stakeholders**
  Public sector workers and private sector partners
CASES: OVERVIEW
Cases: Brownsville, TX

**Context**
Border town, ”Worst Connected Cities” in the U.S.

**Funding**
Used $19.5 mil of ARPA to enter a PPP with Lit Communities, which committed to providing an additional $70 mil

**Project Overview**
100 miles of publicly-owned middle-mile fiber network and 550 miles of private last-mile fiber connections to all homes and businesses within the city
Cases: Palm Beach, FL

Context
School district realized long-planned efforts to serve disconnected students as COVID significantly impacted schooling

Funding and Project

+ 15.7 mil form CARES (ended in 2020) and 40 mil form ARPA for building fiber and Wifi mesh networks

+ Additional $1 mil of DOE and Education Foundation of Palm Beach County funding for wifi extenders; approximately 11,000 wifi extenders have been configured by September, 2022
Cases: York County, PA

Context
Rural town, “Didn’t have any broadband strategy prior to COVID” but COVID showed the importance of broadband

Funding
$20 mil ARPA funding for public middle-mile fiber
$5 mil ARPA funding for private last-mile to city of York and Hanover

Project
144 miles of middle-mile network with affordable FTTP plans through York Fiber
Cases: Shenandoah County, VA

Context
6 towns in rural, agricultural county

Funding
+ Received $12.1 mil in grant from the VATI (Virginia Technology Initiative)
+ $17 mil from Shentel (local ISP)
+ $3.7 mil from ARPA

Project
Deploy fiber optic Internet to 4,090 residences, 42 businesses, 3 community anchors, and 4 non-residential customers with FTTH. Collaborate with Dominion Energy and Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative to integrate middle mile fiber with ISP in underserved areas. Formalize resource sharing agreements with VDOT. Extend FTTP.
Cases: Wrangell County, AK

Context
A series of islands home to a small community of Tlingit and Haida tribes

Funding
$13 mil from ARPA

Project
4G, 100 Mbps symmetrical wireless connectivity to 10,000 Wrangell City residents by…

+ building 120-feet towers that will broadcast Internet directly to homes and businesses
+ using cell on wheels (COWs) to act as a mobile Internet service
Themes: Preemption

Preemption, although present in 4 of 5 of the cases, was not a major roadblock

+ **TX, PA, VA Preemption** = Ban on Municipal broadband provision
  
  Public Private Partnership model as a solution

+ **FL Preemption** = Restrictions on the Use of Funding
  
  Broke the project into smaller projects using different funding sources
  
  CARES & ARPA: middle-mile construction
  Others: last-mile digital inclusion
Themes: Lack of funding

ARPA funding jumpstarted all of these projects. Without substantial funding toward broadband, projects do not get actualized.

+ Shenandoah, VA
  “The availability of state, federal and Shentel funding closed the funding gap.”

+ Wrangell, AK
  Without ARPA, “the Tribal council would not be able to build out the necessary infrastructure required to access their exclusive mid-band broadband spectrum.”

+ Palm Beach, FL
  CARES and ARPA made things that cannot be achieved in the last decade happen
Themes: Private Partnership

In TX, PA, and VA, PPPs helped with:

- Providing additional project funding
- Knowledge in network planning, operation, maintenance and customer service
- Building local workforce and expertise
Themes: Political Will

Political will played an important role in starting and progressing broadband projects. Many did not get off the ground until community leadership decided it was important.

+ COVID-19 played a significant role in communities realizing the importance of broadband

+ **Palm Beach, FL:** The political will from different levels promoted the initiative to move forward continuously from 2006, but real change came when the county and the school system became champions due to COVID

+ **Brownsville, TX:** Mayor Mendez’s election in 2019 was the catalyst taking action, and COVID hastened deployment
Themes: Incumbent Provider Pushback

While this is not a hurdle for all the cases, incumbent providers did strongly resist municipal-led broadband projects in TX and PA.

+ **Brownsville, TX**: incumbents paid for advertising campaigns to boast their services + filed Freedom of Information Act requests demanding the release of Lit’s proprietary business models

  Response: detailed survey data before project planning served as justification for project

+ **York County, PA**: incumbents pushed to promote that the project was unlawful on the basis of county provision

  Response: no standing → the county isn’t providing direct service
Many places took an implicit approach to equity

Broadband was a practical need that leaders wanted addressed in their communities

- **Palm Beach, FL:** Used heat maps to identify low-income areas to provide broadband access to students in need
- **York County, PA:** Brought broadband to rural parts of the county
- **Brownsville, TX:** Entire city needed broadband
- **Wrangell, AK:** Designed their project to address digital equity
Recommendations

**Do It Now**

+ There are many sources of funding right now that can facilitate local broadband efforts

**No need to go alone, partner up**

+ Partnership with willing incumbent provider or outside partners can help bring outside money into broadband and can help save on operation and maintenance

**Preemption and state rules do not have to be a barrier**

+ Partnership and creative solutions exist
Thank you!

This project was conducted under the supervision of Professor Mildred Warner, as required by the course CRP 6120: Urban Public Management, in the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University. Funding support was received from the Mui Ho Center for Cities, the Cornell Agricultural Experiment Station and the USDA NIFA.
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Introduction

COVID-19 & the Housing Crisis

- Increase in demand for space and deficit of 3.8 million housing units shows high demand and low supply in housing that caused median home prices to spike after COVID-19.

- Strategies to limit the spread of COVID-19 caused congregate shelter entry pauses, closures, and limited capacity.

- Homeless population estimated at 552,830 individuals in 2022, a 2% increase from 2021.
Motivation and Reasoning: *Homelessness*

- ARPA enabled states and localities to **develop transformative housing programs** in their communities across multiple categories:
  - Homelessness, Rental Assistance, Affordable Housing, Eviction Prevention, and Other Housing

- **Homelessness** accounted for the majority of spending
Motivation and Reasoning: Tiny Homes & Motels

We decided to focus on both the development of tiny home villages and the conversion of motel/hotels into shelter space and affordable housing

- Tiny homes offer a short-term solution to ending homelessness
- Hotel/motel conversions offer long-term solution offering permanent supportive housing
- Both are replicable and feasible across NY

The following presentation will outline our review of the costs and benefits of these programs as well as four case studies
Case Study Methodology

We chose four tiny home and hotel conversion cases in localities that represented significant increases in rental prices, specialized unhoused populations, or unique political challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison, Wisconsin</td>
<td>Tiny Home</td>
<td>Homelessness increased by 160% since 2021. City is closing an encampment where ~70 persons live</td>
<td>Linette Rhodes, Community Development Grants Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
<td>Tiny Home</td>
<td>A total of 11% of unhoused persons are veterans, 4% higher than the national average</td>
<td>Loretta Hiner, Senior Housing Analyst for the Affordable Housing Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston, Vermont</td>
<td>Hotel Conversion</td>
<td>Around 30% of unhoused persons have one child or more. Vermont also has the highest amount of sheltered persons of any state, with 303 individuals per 100,000</td>
<td>Chris Donnelly, Champlain Housing Trust Director of Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td>Hotel Conversion</td>
<td>Rents increased by 40% from 2021 to 2022, the most of any metro area</td>
<td>James May, Housing and Community Development Officer for the Housing and Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Build Tiny Homes?

**Benefits**

- Tiny homes are **usually built in cluster**; a tiny home village creates a sense of community
- **Provision of social services**, i.e. addiction recovery services and employment training for residents, in tiny home villages
- **Quicker construction with low-skilled personnel** of tiny homes compared to traditional housing units

**Costs**

- **Inefficient use of land** to fulfill housing and homeless housing needs
- Purchasing land could be cost prohibitive
- **Administrative red tape** could be prohibitive
- Political infeasibility in the long run due to **lacking potential of scale-ups** and **local communities’ resistance**
Tiny Homes

**Madison, WI**
- Mid-sized city
- Historically mixed conservative/progressive state
- Republican Governor
- Issue with homeless encampments

**St. Louis, MO:**
- Mid-sized city
- Historically conservative state
- Republican Governor
- High rate of veteran homelessness
Tiny Homes Case Studies

**Madison, Wisconsin**

**Context**
- $890K (includes: property management including trash pick up, electricity, etc.)

**Impact**
- 30 tiny homes (29 today due to a fire) that measure 64 sq. ft. were built and will be supported until mid-2023

**Community Engagement**
- Local political support and cross-departmental collaborations
- Surveying homeless tent residents
- Pushback from upper and middle class residents on location of the development
## Tiny Homes Case Studies (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. Louis, Missouri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10M ($1M from ARPA), and Veterans Community Project confirmed other funds have been secured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 units for homeless veterans (25 for 80% of AMI, 20 for 65% of AMI, 5 for 30% of AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from city legislation and Jason Kander, former MO Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Treasury released a How-To Guide for Affordable Housing for ARPA funds in June 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors resisted the construction of a second tiny home site in the city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Convert Hotels/Motels?

Benefits

- Motels are ideal for conversion to affordable housing and shelter space since they are built for long-term stays (include small kitchens, plumbing, lighting, windows, furnishings, and other amenities)
- Conversion and acquisition projects are more cost-effective and faster to implement than new construction
- Many hotels/motels are easily accessible by transportation infrastructure

Costs

- City government and social service providers often lack the technical know-how or capacity to manage large-scale conversion projects
- The units were not built for permanent housing and are typically too small for families
- Buildings may lack green space or other amenities
Hotel Conversion

**Austin, TX:**
- Large city
- Historically conservative state
- Republican Governor
- Homelessness Crisis

**Williston, VT:**
- Small city
- Historically progressive state
- Republican Governor
- Affordable Housing Crisis
## Hotel Conversion Case Studies

### Williston, VT (Champlain Housing Trust)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>~10 years experience converting hotels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>$338M in state funds directed towards increasing affordable housing in past 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>On-site case management and supportive services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 permanent-use, furnished, affordable apartments (50-60% of AMI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38 units for people coming out of homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>Both local State representatives spoke out in favor of the project, and the town’s Select Board voted to approve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbors were concerned about the lack of parking. CHT applied for and was granted a parking zoning exemption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Hotel Conversion Case Studies (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Austin, TX (City of Austin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Engagement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Austin’s Pecan Gardens complex in a former Candlewood Suites*
Takeaways for Practice: **Challenges**

**Rules and Regulations** could interfere with effective ARPA funding use.
- Guidelines published by the U.S. Dept of Treasury in June 2022 nearly shut down tiny home funding that was 8 months into contract negotiations.
- Zoning changes were necessary to account for lower parking needs.

**Location** is a key challenge.
- Motels and hotels are often not linked to essential services (grocery stores, health care, schools, etc.) through public transport.
- Tiny home projects are often rejected by residential communities, and may end up being located in remote areas.

**Community Buy-in** is crucial.
- Community concerns about crime, population density, parking, etc., can shut down or slow down projects for the unhoused.
- Community education and consultation efforts can alleviate concerns and create working relationships with communities.
Takeaways for Practice: Opportunities

Affordability and low maintenance costs are a benefit for tiny home/hotel conversion projects

- Relatively minor renovations are required to convert hotel/motel rooms to efficiency apartments.
- Tiny homes are inexpensive to build, and can be outfitted with solar power and geothermal heating to reduce operational costs.

Partnerships and collaboration with social services providers and multiple city departments is important.

- Services for job training, mental health, addiction recovery, etc. are provided on-site to address the unhoused population holistically and transition to permanent housing.
- Ensuring municipal, county, and state-level support is critical in enacting and sustaining these projects.

Funding from ARPA was leveraged in combination with other funding.

- Other government funds such as LIHTC and private sources of funds such as those secured by partner organizations, allow local governments to leverage ARPA dollars for larger projects.
- Leveraging ARPA funds with other funding sources required working within the ARPA regulations, which was somewhat challenging.
Questions?
Thank You!

Full report can be found at: https://labs.aap.cornell.edu/sites/aap-labs/files/2022-12/Crispin%20etal_2022_FullReport.pdf

This project was conducted under the direction of Professor Mildred Warner, as a part of CRP 6120 Urban Public Management in the Department of City and Regional Planning at Cornell University. Funding support from the Mui Ho Center for Cities, the Cornell Ag. Expt. Station and USDA NIFA.
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What is LIHWAP?
Purpose:
To assist households with low incomes with the following:

1) **Restoration** of Services
2) **Prevention** of Disconnection
3) **Reduction** of Rates Charged

**Appropriations:**
$1.138 billion (1.5% reserved for administrative costs)

**Eligible Applicants:**
States, territories, and tribes
- Required to negotiate agreements with the water service providers→make payments to providers on behalf of LIHWAP beneficiaries
- Can use up to 15% of the funding towards administrative costs
Shutoff Moratoria
Unemployment rate tops 14.4% during the COVID-19 pandemic
Customers falling behind on bills
34 states put in place shutoff moratoria and most expire by the end of 2020

LIHWAP Funding
$1.1 billion appropriated to LIHWAP through CAA (2020) and ARPA (2021)
First federally-funded affordability program instated

Distribution
States work with vendors to onboard them for the program (required)
Administered through the same state offices that run LIHEAP
Households apply for assistance

Distribution Deadline
Funds must be obligated by September 2023 and expended before the end of 2023
### Comparing LIHWAP to its Blueprint: LIHEAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIHEAP</th>
<th>LIHWAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established in 1981</td>
<td>× Established in 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% (states &amp; territories) for administrative costs</td>
<td>× 15% for grantee administrative costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to restore services and avoid disconnections</td>
<td>× Explicit priority to restore services and avoid disconnections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households do not receive direct payment; payment goes to utility to lower arrearages</td>
<td>✓ Households do not receive direct payment; payment goes to utility to lower arrearages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates through the HHS and OCS at national and state level</td>
<td>✓ Operates through the HHS and OCS at national and state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires signed agreement with utility</td>
<td>✓ Requires signed agreement with utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIHWAP encountered several challenges in its rollout directly related to the LIHEAP model’s poor fit for the water industry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors will opt-in to the program</td>
<td>Vendors not participating in the program in large numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordability program will be equitable</td>
<td>Eligibility requirements can make it challenging for low-income households to access funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utilities have the capacity to distribute as effectively as electric/gas utilities</td>
<td>The water utility landscape is much more fragmented than electricity/natural gas providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors will opt-in to the program</td>
<td>Vendors not participating in the program in large numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordability program will be equitable</td>
<td>Eligibility requirements can make it challenging for low-income households to access funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utilities have the capacity to distribute as effectively as electric/gas utilities</td>
<td>The water utility landscape is much more fragmented than electricity/natural gas providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Water Industry

**Problem:** There are under 3,000 electric utilities in the U.S., but there are almost 50,000 water utility companies.

**Why is it a problem?**
- That's more utilities to get to sign on to the program!
- Some may be reluctant to join because they have few staff and the program is temporary.
- States are seeing varying levels of success at an early checkpoint →

*Source: LIHWAP Data Dashboard, * Q3 finished June 30, 2022*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors will opt-in to the program</td>
<td>Vendors not participating in the program in large numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordability program will be equitable</td>
<td>Eligibility requirements can make it challenging for low-income households to access funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utilities have the capacity to distribute as effectively as electric/gas utilities</td>
<td>The water utility landscape is much more fragmented than electricity/natural gas providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hard-to-reach Populations

**Problem:** The program is limited in access to those who receive water bills. An estimated 71% of renters pay their water bills through their rent—the landlord holds the water account. In contrast, only 10% of electricity bills and 16% of gas bills are paid through rent. New York State’s Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (OTDA) refers renters with water & sewer included in rent to the Emergency Rental Assistance Program (ERAP).

**What is being done?**
- Incentivize landlords to participate in affordability programs (D.C.)
- Provide rentres with a credit directed towards electric bill instead (Seattle, Austin)
- Discounts to non-profits supporting low-income renters (Napa, CA)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expectations</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reality</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vendors will opt-in to the program</td>
<td>Vendors not participating in the program in large numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The affordability program will be equitable</td>
<td>Eligibility requirements can make it challenging for low-income households to access funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water utilities have the capacity to distribute as effectively as electric/gas utilities</td>
<td>The water utility landscape is much more fragmented than electricity/natural gas providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Water Industry

**Problem:** LIHEAP can work effectively because it is a permanent program that serves *high-capacity* electric/natural gas utilities. 90% of water utilities serve less than 10,000 people. 43% of those small utilities have just one or no full time staff. Many small utilities do not have the capacity to implement customers assistance programs.

**What is being done?**
- Water utilities can partner with neighbors to access LIHWAP funding (Ex. Mosier, OR, Population: 468)
- State agencies are utilizing community action agencies and existing partnerships to assist small system operators (Kentucky and Ohio)
Number of Customers Served for a County’s Largest Water System

Source: NYS Department of Health
Percentage of Water Systems Serving Fewer than 2,000 People by County

Source: NYS Department of Health
1: Erie County Water Authority*
$7.9 million in arrears (10/21), $2.75 million added between 2019 and 2021

2: Monroe County Water Authority*
$35,000 overdue by over one year in October 2019 → $358,000 overdue by over one year in October 2021 (910% increase)

3: Mohawk Valley Water Authority*
3,006 residential customers with outstanding balances for water (2021)
$817,000 in arrears (2021)

4: New York City Department of Environmental Protection
Delinquency doubled from start of the pandemic until December 2021 (NYC Water Board Meeting)

5: Suffolk County Water Authority*
$31 million in residential arrears (10/21)
SCWA placed 3,681 liens in 2020

*Source: Western NY Law Center and the National Center for Law and Economic Justice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not yet a permanent program</td>
<td>Establish a permanent water affordability program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIHWAP focuses on restoring services &amp; preventing shutoffs, not overall affordability</td>
<td>Expand support for financing water infrastructure/affordability (ARPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze successes &amp; failures of LIHWAP, apply lessons learnt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors not joining LIHWAP</td>
<td>Utilize LIHWAP partnerships for future water affordability programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters missing out on assistance</td>
<td>Pass water affordability legislation at the state level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small providers lack staffing and technology to assist customers</td>
<td>Providers can outsource or cooperate with nearby utilities to gain economies of scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbundling water bills from garbage, service fees, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Takeaways

- Growing water affordability crisis needs to be addressed
  - LIHWAP is a stopgap solution—most states focus solely on reconnections and preventing shut-offs, not affordability!
- Small water providers reluctant to participate as they do not have the same capacity to manage the program as larger utilities and the program is only temporary
- LIHWAP serves two clients: the customer whose water was shut off or who can’t pay their bill, and the provider who will potentially never receive their payment
- Some challenges LIHWAP has faced include:
  - Vendor participation
  - Hard-to-reach renters
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Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

The Problem(s)

- Cyber criminals are getting more sophisticated and aggressive
- Insurance carriers are losing money
- Risks are difficult to understand and manage
- Counties and local governments are at varying degrees of security
- Premiums have increased by double or triple since 2019
- Localities with insurance are paying more for less coverage, more exclusions
- Some public entities are not qualifying for insurance at all
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

The stakeholders

- Local governments
  - Electeds/IT/Risk Managers
- Government Risk Pools
  - NYMIR, AGRIP, Others
- Brokers
- Insurance carriers/reinsurers
- Center for Technology in Government, University at Albany
Exploring Solutions

**Surveys, Focus Groups, and Interviews**

In the past 12 months, there has been a considerable amount of work done to explore potential solutions to the cyber insurance challenges facing public entities.

1. Survey by the Center for Technology in Government, University at Albany
2. Survey and exploring a pooled purchase program by the New York State Association of Counties
3. Focus group by the Association of Government Risk Insurance Pools
4. Experience from one NYS local government insurance pool
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Survey #1 and Key Findings

22 Responses from NYS Local Government IT Directors Association (counties, cities, towns)

- 2 don’t have insurance – no MFA or too expensive
- 13 different insurance carriers cover 20 entities
- Coverages range from $500K to $10M
- Premiums have doubled and tripled in two years
- Insurance applications are lengthier and far more complex
- Deductibles increased and coverages decreased
- One entity filed a cybersecurity claim (library ransomware attack)
- Respondents want to develop a cooperative cyber insurance procurement
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Survey #2 and Exploration

26 Responses (23 counties, 1 city, 2 towns)

- 5 don’t have insurance
- 13 different insurance carriers cover 18 entities
- Coverages range from $500K to $5M
- Renewal or expiration dates vary by entity

13 entities continued process by submitting application for pooled purchasing program
Goal: achieve more premium rates, improve coverages, standardize requirements

- All had varying levels of controls in place
- Two cyber insurance brokers reviewed and refused
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

- Focus Group of Insurance Pools
- 68 Respondents from various risk insurance pools from across the country
  - 33 self fund coverage, 27 buy reinsurance or excess coverage, 8 do not provide
  - One started in 2012, but most started in 2015 or after
  - Coverages ranged from $100K to $10 million
  - All had various sublimits in coverage: breach, ransomware, business interruption, fraudulent instruction, fines, network interruption
  - Various (18 exclusions) – ransom payments, hardware, fines, wire fraud, loss of data, power failure, etc.
  - Most had increasing number of requirements for coverage
  - Premiums based on population, budget, number of employees, payroll, total insurable value.
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Experience of One NYS Pool

• Offered cyber insurance coverage since 2015
• Started at $50k of coverage for between $200-$300 in premium, little interest
• Expanded coverage in 2018, to $250K, premiums still less than $1000
• 2019, premiums started to double as reinsurers raised rates and high profile municipal claims started (Baltimore, Atlanta, and others)
• 2021 Reinsurance tighten limits and warn of plans to leave the cyber insurance market
• 2022-23 – continue to provide coverage, with new limits and stricter application
• Reinsurer begins to deny applications for increased coverage
• Insurers asking more questions, requiring controls and risk management, increasing premiums and limiting coverage
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Insurers want Controls in Place

Twelve Key Controls Insurers want to see*

1. Multifactor authentication
2. Email filtering and web security
3. Security, encrypted, separated, tested back ups
4. Privileged access management
5. Endpoint Detection and Response
6. Patch and vulnerability management
7. Incidence Response Plans
8. Cybersecurity awareness training and phishing testing
9. Remote desktop protocol mitigation and hardening security configurations
10. Logging and monitoring
11. End of life systems management
12. Digital supply chain management

*Marsh McLennan Insurance Company
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Recommended Ongoing Risk Management Strategies

• Penetration testing
• Network vulnerability scanning
• Website vulnerability scanning
• Assessment of infrastructure and IT controls
• User awareness training
• User simulations and phishing campaign assessments
• Critical incident response planning assistance
• Legal services
Cybersecurity Insurance for Local Governments

Current Marketplace

• Insurance marketplace is softening
• Cybersecurity awareness is on the rise
• Risk management is getting better
• Public entity controls still vary dramatically
• Local governments and schools continue to be targeted
• Criminal elements growing more and more sophisticated
• Ransomware incidents will increase

Next Steps

Public entities will not qualify for insurance unless they meet controls
Insurers going to be more active in partnering with cyber companies
NYS offering EDR to counties and large localities
Working with NYS and NYS DFS to explore standards
Meeting with brokers and reinsurers
Cybersecurity Insurance Challenges for Local Governments

www.nysac.org/cyber
Thank You

Mark F. LaVigne, PhD
NYSAC Deputy Director
mflavigne@nysac.org
Local Government Data in Open Book New York

Sarah Lauser · Rockefeller Institute · 2023-03-24
Topics

• What’s available in Open Book
• NYS geographic hierarchy
• Data dictionary / data decoding
• Upcoming changes to LG data
Open Book New York

“New Yorkers pay among the highest taxes in the country. It’s important to have transparency so citizens are empowered with information they need to hold their elected officials accountable.” – Thomas P. DiNapoli
**State Contracts**
Search 20,000 contracts that State agencies have with businesses, not-for-profit organizations and other government entities in effect April 1, 2012, or later. Includes both contracts approved by the Office of the State Comptroller and those that don’t require approval by the Office.

[Search Contracts](#)

**State Payments**
Search payments made by the state since April 1, 2012, which now includes about 17,000 new payments each day, and contains the agency submitting the payment request, the payment recipient, the payment amount and the date the payment was made.

[Search Payments](#)

Also see Legislative Travel and Per Diem Expenses

**Local Government Data**
View and download detailed revenue, spending, debt, tax limits, balance sheets, and property tax cap information for 3,100 local governments dating back to 2007.

[Search Local Government Data](#)

Also see Fiscal Stress Monitoring System and Local Sales Tax Collections

**State Spending**
Search by major spending categories for State agencies and some authorities. Provides information on budgetary activities such as payments, journal transfers, appropriated transfers, and so on.

[Search Spending](#)

Also see COVID-19 Relief Program Tracker

**Public Authorities Data**
View financial information for more than 500 State and local public authorities dating back to 2007.

[Search Public Authorities Data](#)

Also see State Public Authorities Dashboard
Local Government Data Search

You can search six reports:
- **Property Tax Cap**: Factors used by local governments to calculate their real property tax levy limit.
- **Revenues and Expenditures**: Local government revenue and expenditure data.
- **Tax Limit**: The maximum amount of real property tax cities, counties and villages may levy.
- **Balance Sheet**: Local government asset, liability and equity data.
- **Debt**: Local government summary of debt related activity. Installment purchase contract data is not available for school districts prior to 2003.
- **Multi-year Compare**: 2 to 5 year presentation of local government Balance Sheet, Revenue, Expenditure, Fund Balance/Net Assets and Budget data by fund.

**Report**
- Property Tax Cap
- Revenues and Expenditures
- Tax Limit
- Balance Sheet
- Debt
- Multi-year Compare

**Report Type**
- Trend
- Comparison

Submit

You can also download bulk detailed account-level data of revenues, expenditures and balance sheets. Download the following zipped .csv files:
- Single class of local government for all years,
- All classes of local government for a single year, or
- All classes of local government for all years.

**Download Bulk Data Files**
- Revenue, Expenditure, and Balance Sheet Account Code Level Data
- Debt
- Property Tax Cap

Links to additional Local Government financial information:
- [See Property Tax Rates in Your Community](#)
- [Additional Financial Information about Local Governments](#)

**Date Last Updated**: 3/23/2023
You can search six reports:

- **Property Tax Cap**: Factors used by local governments to calculate their real property tax levy limit.
- **Revenues and Expenditures**: Local government revenue and expenditure data.
- **Tax Limit**: The maximum amount of real property tax cities, counties and villages may levy.
- **Balance Sheet**: Local government asset, liability and equity data.
- **Debt**: Local government summary of debt related activity. Installment purchase contract data is not available for school districts prior to 2003.
- **Multi-year Compare**: 2 to 5 year presentation of local government Balance Sheet, Revenue, Expenditure, Fund Balance/Net Assets and Budget data by fund.

Report

- Property Tax Cap
- Revenues and Expenditures
- Tax Limit
- Balance Sheet
- Debt
- Multi-year Compare

Report Type

- Trend
- Comparison
Revenues and Expenditures Trend

Local Government Data Search - Trend Report: Revenues and Expenditures

Class
Name of Local Government

Fiscal Years - Select up to six years.


Submit  Cancel

Classes
- City
- County
- Fire District
- School District
- Town
- Village
- Library
- Special Purpose Unit
- Joint Activity
## Trend Report for City of Albany

### Revenues and Proceeds of Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>207,103,133</td>
<td>176,422,520</td>
<td>210,377,117</td>
<td>221,168,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-12,791,695</td>
<td>15,683,021</td>
<td>15,977,894</td>
<td>15,632,198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges to Other Governments</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-1,87,742</td>
<td>1,023,214</td>
<td>1,117,376</td>
<td>925,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-20,787,068</td>
<td>3,220,504</td>
<td>4,619,708</td>
<td>4,860,894</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Revenues</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-8,754,320</td>
<td>8,349,320</td>
<td>9,729,020</td>
<td>9,732,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-Property Taxes</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-1,342,635</td>
<td>1,396,906</td>
<td>1,473,408</td>
<td>1,521,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Real Property Tax Items</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-19,421,455</td>
<td>19,710,690</td>
<td>20,984,411</td>
<td>20,417,936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds of Debt</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-3,000,000</td>
<td>2,590,000</td>
<td>26,205,000</td>
<td>37,604,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Property Taxes and Assessments</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-59,178,211</td>
<td>58,608,188</td>
<td>58,312,601</td>
<td>58,252,312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Use Tax</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-42,219,520</td>
<td>35,377,779</td>
<td>37,640,036</td>
<td>36,819,273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Aid</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-36,903,068</td>
<td>28,898,173</td>
<td>30,928,283</td>
<td>31,828,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use and Sale of Property</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-1,977,519</td>
<td>646,125</td>
<td>3,183,380</td>
<td>4,044,161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>219,147,319</td>
<td>217,866,730</td>
<td>203,436,002</td>
<td>194,038,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-2,157</td>
<td>23,732</td>
<td>25,890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Recreation</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-4,229,130</td>
<td>2,623,490</td>
<td>4,359,992</td>
<td>4,610,481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-17,917,315</td>
<td>23,532,257</td>
<td>19,107,000</td>
<td>21,638,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-5,311</td>
<td>713,159</td>
<td>1,711,720</td>
<td>397,944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-59,664,805</td>
<td>55,783,138</td>
<td>54,564,565</td>
<td>51,611,317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-32,031,170</td>
<td>41,585,067</td>
<td>33,307,529</td>
<td>22,893,141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-136,966</td>
<td>157,292</td>
<td>137,202</td>
<td>123,717</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-82,889,580</td>
<td>74,004,964</td>
<td>68,795,351</td>
<td>70,728,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-6,518,848</td>
<td>5,940,786</td>
<td>6,425,219</td>
<td>5,817,412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-1,735,929</td>
<td>1,990,969</td>
<td>1,799,671</td>
<td>1,636,327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>-14,018,265</td>
<td>11,553,451</td>
<td>13,204,021</td>
<td>14,705,959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Trend Report for City of Albany

#### Revenues and Proceeds of Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>207,103,133</td>
<td>176,422,920</td>
<td>210,371,117</td>
<td>221,156,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL AID</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,177,427</td>
<td>1,023,214</td>
<td>1,117,376</td>
<td>925,272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,878,066</td>
<td>3,220,504</td>
<td>4,619,708</td>
<td>4,980,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NON-PROPERTY TAXES</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,574,220</td>
<td>8,349,320</td>
<td>9,729,020</td>
<td>9,732,401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REAL PROPERTY TAX ITEMS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,342,636</td>
<td>1,369,406</td>
<td>1,473,408</td>
<td>1,523,863</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS OF DEBT</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,421,455</td>
<td>19,170,680</td>
<td>20,984,411</td>
<td>20,417,936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,509,000</td>
<td>2,625,050</td>
<td>37,004,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES AND USE TAX</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,197,211</td>
<td>58,368,018</td>
<td>58,312,601</td>
<td>58,252,312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE AID</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,197,520</td>
<td>53,377,779</td>
<td>37,840,036</td>
<td>38,619,273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE AND SALE OF PROPERTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,903,068</td>
<td>28,988,173</td>
<td>30,928,283</td>
<td>31,828,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,977,519</td>
<td>646,125</td>
<td>3,183,380</td>
<td>4,041,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>219,147,319</td>
<td>217,868,730</td>
<td>203,436,002</td>
<td>194,038,903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE AND RECREATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANITATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Account Code & Narrative**

### CHARGES FOR SERVICES

- **Community Services Fees**
  - 2023: 12,701,695
  - 2022: 15,683,021
  - 2021: 15,977,894
  - 2020: 15,632,198

- **A2590 Permits, Other**
  - 2023: 6,926,297
  - 2022: 8,423,558
  - 2021: 6,347,392
  - 2020: 6,070,246

- **A2115 Planning Board Fees**
  - 2023: 4,370,692
  - 2022: 5,112,346
  - 2021: 3,872,249
  - 2020: 4,261,107

- **A1710 Public Works Charges**
  - 2023: 52,920
  - 2022: 48,738
  - 2021: 38,209
  - 2020: 71,655

- **Culture And Recreation Fees**
  - 2023: 1,161,833
  - 2022: 937,813
  - 2021: 1,015,067
  - 2020: 983,309

- **A2089 Other Culture & Recreation Income**
  - 2023: 19,405
  - 2022: 30,564
  - 2021: 82,934
  - 2020: 75,001

- **A2012 Recreational Concessions**
  - 2023: 22,526
  - 2022: 60,186
  - 2021: 61,933
  - 2020: 57,085

- **A2025 Special Recreational Facility Charges**
  - 2023: 1,119,902
  - 2022: 847,063
  - 2021: 871,100
  - 2020: 801,223

**Economic Development Fees**

- 2023: 19,050
- 2022: 10,550
- 2021: 23,110
- 2020: 11,925

**Education Fees**

- 2023: 19,050
- 2022: 10,550
- 2021: 23,110
- 2020: 11,925

**General Government Fees**

- 2023: 634,573
- 2022: 417,452
- 2021: 377,084
- 2020: 429,634

**A1255 Clerk Fees**

- 2023: 20,622
- 2022: 8,514
- 2021: 10,333
- 2020: 186
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>207,103,133</td>
<td>176,422,920</td>
<td>210,371,117</td>
<td>221,156,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>12,701,695</td>
<td>15,683,021</td>
<td>15,977,894</td>
<td>15,632,198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL AID</td>
<td>8,117,742</td>
<td>1,023,214</td>
<td>1,117,367</td>
<td>925,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL REVENUES</td>
<td>20,787,068</td>
<td>3,220,504</td>
<td>4,619,708</td>
<td>4,980,894</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NON-PROPERTY TAXES</td>
<td>8,754,220</td>
<td>8,349,320</td>
<td>9,729,020</td>
<td>9,732,401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REAL PROPERTY TAX ITEMS</td>
<td>1,342,635</td>
<td>1,396,906</td>
<td>1,473,408</td>
<td>1,521,863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS OF DEBT</td>
<td>19,421,455</td>
<td>19,110,690</td>
<td>20,984,411</td>
<td>20,417,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,509,000</td>
<td>26,250,000</td>
<td>37,004,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES AND USE TAX</td>
<td>42,419,250</td>
<td>35,377,779</td>
<td>37,906,099</td>
<td>36,819,273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE AID</td>
<td>36,903,068</td>
<td>29,898,173</td>
<td>30,928,283</td>
<td>31,828,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE AND SALE OF PROPERTY</td>
<td>1,977,519</td>
<td>646,125</td>
<td>3,183,380</td>
<td>4,041,616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY SERVICES</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>219,147,319</td>
<td>217,886,730</td>
<td>203,436,022</td>
<td>194,038,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE AND RECREATION</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4,229,130</td>
<td>2,632,490</td>
<td>4,359,992</td>
<td>4,610,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>17,917,315</td>
<td>23,532,257</td>
<td>19,107,000</td>
<td>21,638,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>5,311</td>
<td>713,159</td>
<td>1,711,720</td>
<td>397,944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>59,664,805</td>
<td>55,783,138</td>
<td>54,564,565</td>
<td>51,461,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEE BENEFITS</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>32,031,170</td>
<td>41,585,067</td>
<td>33,307,529</td>
<td>22,893,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>136,966</td>
<td>157,292</td>
<td>137,202</td>
<td>123,717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>82,899,580</td>
<td>74,004,964</td>
<td>68,795,351</td>
<td>70,278,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>6,518,848</td>
<td>5,940,786</td>
<td>6,425,219</td>
<td>5,817,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANITATION</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1,735,929</td>
<td>1,990,969</td>
<td>1,799,671</td>
<td>1,636,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>14,018,265</td>
<td>11,553,451</td>
<td>13,204,021</td>
<td>14,705,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures of City of Albany for 2021

Total Expenditures: $219,147,319

Diagram showing pie chart.
### Revenues and Expenditures Comparison

#### Comparison Report for Charlotte Valley Central School District, City of Albany, City of Troy, and County of Tioga for 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Charlotte Valley Central School District</th>
<th>City of Albany</th>
<th>City of Troy</th>
<th>County of Tioga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues and Proceeds of Debt</td>
<td>212,546,022</td>
<td>19,403,062</td>
<td>23,324,593</td>
<td>4,708,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES FOR SERVICES</td>
<td>213,644</td>
<td>19,403,062</td>
<td>23,324,593</td>
<td>4,708,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARGES TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td>826,511</td>
<td>278,953</td>
<td>2,065,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL AID</td>
<td>644,928</td>
<td>9,309,746</td>
<td>2,675,147</td>
<td>7,454,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER LOCAL REVENUES</td>
<td>224,265</td>
<td>9,007,397</td>
<td>5,683,811</td>
<td>950,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER NON-PROPERTY TAXES</td>
<td>1,487,567</td>
<td>569,923</td>
<td>150,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REAL PROPERTY TAX ITEMS</td>
<td>402,283</td>
<td>32,644,238</td>
<td>1,884,077</td>
<td>2,741,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEEDS OF DEBT</td>
<td>27,402,127</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL PROPERTY TAXES AND ASSESSMENTS</td>
<td>2,715,533</td>
<td>56,313,118</td>
<td>21,469,896</td>
<td>23,523,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES AND USE TAX</td>
<td>34,436,181</td>
<td>16,295,226</td>
<td>19,549,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE AID</td>
<td>5,911,870</td>
<td>20,367,616</td>
<td>15,068,212</td>
<td>11,273,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE AND SALE OF PROPERTY</td>
<td>117,980</td>
<td>1,366,519</td>
<td>650,700</td>
<td>114,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select available local governments:
- City of Albany
- City of Troy
- County of Tioga
- Charlotte Valley Central School District
- City of Troy
- County of Tioga
- Charlotte Valley Central School District
- City of Troy
- County of Tioga
- Charlotte Valley Central School District
- City of Troy
- County of Tioga

Select fiscal year:
- 2024
- 2023
- 2022
- 2021
- 2020
- 2019
- 2018
- 2017
- 2016
- 2015
- 2014
- 2013
- 2012
- 2011
- 2010
- 2009

Submit or Cancel.
Tax Cap vs. Tax Limit

### Tax Cap

**Property Tax Cap** (Data elements presented below are "as submitted" by the local government, and have not been modified or certified by OSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Cap Limit (Cap) before Adjustments and Exclusions</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Levy Prior Year</td>
<td>60,282,998</td>
<td>59,892,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Reserve Offset</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Base Growth Factor</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILOTS Receivable Prior Year</td>
<td>20,003,760</td>
<td>19,676,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax(Judgment Exclusion Prior Year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowable Levy Growth Factor</td>
<td>1.0116</td>
<td>1.0200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILOTS Receivable Current Year</td>
<td>20,217,273</td>
<td>20,003,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Carryover from Prior Year</td>
<td>940,798</td>
<td>623,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Levy Limit before Adjustments/Exclusions</td>
<td>62,272,912</td>
<td>62,719,890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjustments for Transfer of Local Government Functions

| Costs incurred from Transfer of Functions | 0 | 0 |
| Savings Realized from Transfer of Functions | 0 | 0 |
| Total Adjustments | 0 | 0 |
| Total Levy Limit, Adjusted for Transfer of Local Government Functions | 62,272,912 | 62,719,890 |

### Exclusions

| Tax levy necessary for expenditures resulting from tort orders/judgments over 5% Prior Year Tax Levy | 0 | 0 |
| Tax levy for pension contribution expense | 0 | 0 |
| TRS | 0 | 0 |
| ERS | 0 | 0 |
| PFRRS | 0 | 0 |
| Total Exclusions | 0 | 0 |
| Total Tax Levy Limit, Adjusted for Transfers Plus Exclusions | 62,272,912 | 62,719,890 |

| Reserve Amount Used to Reduce Current Year Levy | 0 | 0 |
| Proposed Levy for Current Year, Net of Reserve | 61,282,998 | 60,292,998 |
| Total Tax Levy Limit Adjusted for Transfers Plus Exclusions compared to the Prior Year Tax Levy | 3.3% | 4.5% |
| Difference between Tax Levy Limit Plus Exclusions and Current Year Proposed Levy | 979,914 | 2,426,862 |
| Planning to Override the Cap | No | No |

### Trend Report for City of Albany, 2020-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Limit</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Tax Levy</td>
<td>61,329,105</td>
<td>60,006,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Exclusions</td>
<td>17,152,531</td>
<td>21,752,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Levy Subject to Tax Limit</td>
<td>44,176,574</td>
<td>38,253,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Tax Limit</td>
<td>90,000,280</td>
<td>96,087,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Tax Limit Exhausted</td>
<td>44.62</td>
<td>39.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Margin</td>
<td>54,623,706</td>
<td>57,813,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Balance Sheet vs. Multi-year Compare

#### Governmental

**Balance Sheet for City of Albany for 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>GENERAL A</th>
<th>CAPITAL PROJECTS H</th>
<th>SPECIAL GRANT CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASH</td>
<td>$5,884,760</td>
<td>19,047,627</td>
<td>462,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH IN TIME DEPOSITS</td>
<td>$12,775,449</td>
<td>6,174,614</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETTY CASH</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH FOR REVENUE ANTICIPATION NOTES</td>
<td>26,674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,636,183</strong></td>
<td>25,221,835</td>
<td><strong>462,199</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITIES AND MORTGAGES</td>
<td>16,016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td>16,016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXES RECEIVABLE, CURRENT</td>
<td>4,870,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxes Receivable (net)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,870,919</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE</td>
<td>7,367,983</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOWANCE FOR RECEIVABLES (CREDIT)</td>
<td>-122,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Receivables (net)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,244,331</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE FROM STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>3,923,905</td>
<td>1,574,729</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State And Federal Aid Receivables</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,523,933</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,574,729</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE FROM OTHER FUNDS</td>
<td>5,153,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Due From Other Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,153,356</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUE FROM OTHER GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td>34,169,524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Due From Other Governments</strong></td>
<td><strong>34,169,524</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPAID EXPENSES</td>
<td>2,756,126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Prepaid Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,756,126</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH SPECIAL RESERVES</td>
<td>483,065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH IN TIME DEPOSITS SPECIAL RESERVES</td>
<td>436,259</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Restricted Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>919,344</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,416,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,736,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,199</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets and Deferred Outflow of Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,416,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,736,834</strong></td>
<td><strong>462,199</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipal Code: 010201000000</th>
<th>County: Albany</th>
<th>Regional Office: Glen Falls Regional Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A200</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$1,791,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A201</td>
<td>Cash in Time Deposits</td>
<td>$5,828,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A210</td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A222</td>
<td>Cash For Revenue Anticipation Notes</td>
<td>$20,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,820,369</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,799,843</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A405</td>
<td>Securities and Mortgages</td>
<td>$16,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,016</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A250</td>
<td>Taxes Receivable, Current</td>
<td>$4,706,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxes Receivable (net)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,706,767</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,911,813</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A360</td>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$6,667,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A360</td>
<td>Allowance For Receivables (credit)</td>
<td>-$251,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Receivables (net)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,416,123</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,223,941</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A410</td>
<td>Due From State and Federal Government</td>
<td>$2,129,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State and Federal Aid Receivables</td>
<td>$2,129,405</td>
<td>$1,712,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A410</td>
<td>Due From Other Funds</td>
<td>$7,530,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Due From Other Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,530,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,093,925</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A440</td>
<td>Due From Other Governments</td>
<td>$20,433,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Due From Other Governments</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,433,727</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35,657,015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A460</td>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>$3,405,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Prepaid Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,405,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,370,674</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A250</td>
<td>Cash Special Reserve</td>
<td>$1,024,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cash Special Reserve</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,024,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7,762,694</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NYS Geographic Hierarchy

General Purpose: Counties, Cities, Towns, Villages
Special Purpose: School Districts, Fire Districts
Other: Library, Special Purpose Unit, Joint Activity

Statewide Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Districts</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Districts</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Count: 57 * + 5 NYC = 62
Standard* Hierarchy of New York Geographic Entities

- State
- County
Standard* Hierarchy of New York Geographic Entities

State

County

City/Town*
**Standard* Hierarchy of New York Geographic Entities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SWIS Code</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% by area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320500</td>
<td>City of Geneva</td>
<td>Ontario 72.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seneca 27.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWIS Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario 72.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seneca 27.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650000</td>
<td>City of New York</td>
<td>Queens 38.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Staten Island)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond 21.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Brooklyn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kings 20.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bronx 12.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Manhattan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New York 7.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Cities that cross county lines:
Standard* Hierarchy of New York Geographic Entities

- State
- County
- City/Town*
- Village**
** Villages that cross town/county lines (SWIS codes in parentheses)**

| crosses 2 towns in 1 county | Albion (342001), Baldwinsville (313601), Ballston Spa (412001), Black River (224001), Briarcliff Manor (553405), Broadalbin (172201), Brockport (265201), Cambridge (532201), Cato (052403), Chatham (102601), Chester (332201), Clifton Springs (323605), Cooperstown (363801), Corfu (184201), Croghan (232001), Dannemora (093401), Dansville (243801), Depew (143003), East Hills (282203), Elmira Heights (073001), Floral Park (282007), Florida (335401), Glen Park (222605), Greenwich (532601), Harriman (334003), Homer (112201), Hunter (193601), Ilion (212801), Lyons Falls (233803), Mamaroneck (553203), Maybrook (333401), Medina (343401), Middleport (292201), Middleville (212401), Mineola (282039), Montour Falls (442403), New Hyde Park (282041), New York Mills (304803), North Syracuse (312201), Norwood (406201), Nyack (392005), Odessa (442001), Old Westbury (282231), Ovid (452801), Perry (562603), Poland (213805), Pomona (392205), Port Leyden (233401), Remsen (305201), Richburg (023803), Roslyn Harbor (282245), Sag Harbor (472403), Sinclairville (062601), Spring Valley (392003), Stamford (123801), Valley Falls (383601), Wappingers Falls (134601), Waterville (304601), Watkins Glen (442401), Williamsville (142201), Wolcott (542201) |
| crosses 3 towns in 1 county | Fort Plain (272205), Hamilton (253203), Massena (405201), Penn Yan (572201), Waterloo (452201) |
| crosses 2 towns in 2 counties | Almond (022601), Attica (182203), Deposit (034201), Dolgeville (173401), Earlville (085601), Gowanda (047201), Rushville (323201) |
| crosses 3 towns in 2 counties | Saranac Lake (154003) |
### Pairs of towns with the same name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>County 1</th>
<th>County 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>Oswego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>Chemung</td>
<td>Greene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Dutchess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>Broome</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Steuben</td>
<td>Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Villages not in their matching towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SWIS Code</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Town List</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>SWIS Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>342001</td>
<td>Albion (Orleans County), Gaines</td>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>Orleans Oswego 352000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>053401</td>
<td>Ledyard</td>
<td>Cayuga</td>
<td>Erie 142400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>293801</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>Broome 032000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>332201</td>
<td>Chester (Orange County), Goshen</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Warren 522400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>304001</td>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Oneida</td>
<td>Clinton 093200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dutchess 132400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dansville</td>
<td>243801</td>
<td>North Dansville, Sparta</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Steuben 464000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>573601</td>
<td>Torrey</td>
<td>Yates</td>
<td>Washington 532400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>335401</td>
<td>Goshen, Warwick</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Montgomery 272600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>123201</td>
<td>Franklin (Delaware County)</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Franklin 164400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenport</td>
<td>473801</td>
<td>Southold</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Columbia 104000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>282023</td>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>St Lawrence 404800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk</td>
<td>212803</td>
<td>German Flatts</td>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>Montgomery 273200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>213805</td>
<td>Newport, Russia</td>
<td>Herkimer</td>
<td>Chautauqua 065600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory</td>
<td>415003</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>Cayuga 056400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>492001</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Tioga</td>
<td>Franklin 165400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Dictionary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Download Bulk Data Files</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○ Revenue, Expenditure, and Balance Sheet Account Code Level Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Debt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Property Tax Cap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Download Data to Comma Separated File</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Download Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ Single Class of Government for All Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ All Classes of Government for a Single Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ All Classes of Government for All Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Download Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all_classes_years.zip ≅ 270 MB  
unzipped ≅ 3.13 GB

one file per year (1995 – present) per class (County, City, Town, Village, School District, Fire District)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Sample Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALENDAR_YEAR</td>
<td>INTEGER</td>
<td>YYYY</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNICIPAL_CODE</td>
<td>CHAR (12)</td>
<td>12 digits, but may start with 0 * contains smart coding</td>
<td>010201000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTITY_NAME</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>display name, not good for joining</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS_DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>ENTITY_TYPE</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>the county with the largest area %</td>
<td>Albany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISCAL_YEAR_END</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>MM/DD</td>
<td>12/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT_CODE</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>1-2 letters followed by 3-5 digits * contains smart coding</td>
<td>A51424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT_CODE_NARRATIVE</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Snow Removal, Contr Expend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL_STATEMENT</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES AND OTHER USES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL_STATEMENT_SEGMENT</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL_1_CATEGORY</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL_2_CATEGORY</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>HIGHWAYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECT_OF_EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contractual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMOUNT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>dollar amount (may contain cents)</td>
<td>1227218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAPSHOT_DATE</td>
<td>CHAR</td>
<td>date last updated as DD-MON-YY</td>
<td>28-FEB-23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCOUNT_CODE smart coding

• The first 1-2 letters represent the fund e.g., A = General
• The number of digits represents the type of account
  • 3 digits = general ledger
  • 4 digits = revenue
  • 5 digits = expenditure
    • The final digit of the expenditure code represents the object of the expenditure
• The account numbers are further divided into categorical ranges

Example:
A51424 is an expense (5 digits) paid out of the general fund (A) for Transportation (range 5000x – 5999x) and represents contractual payment (ends in a 4).
MUNICIPAL_CODE smart coding

• Digits 1-2 represent the county
• Digits 3-4 represent the class of government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Code</th>
<th>Entity Count (2021)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>School District - City Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>School District - Independent Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>School District - Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>School District - Central High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>School District - Union Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>School District - Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>Fire District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Watch out for:

- Similar entity names
- Changing fiscal year-end dates (can cause short or extended years)
- Overlapping real property taxes
  
Upcoming changes

- New AFR/AUD system expected Fall 2023
- Same account codes
- Expected conversion for all 2013+ data
Local Government Data

Download annual financial data spreadsheets by class of local government and year.

Use Open Book New York to see data for an individual local government.

File local government data with the Office of the State Comptroller.

Access Local Government Data Sets

- Fiscal Stress Monitoring System
- Justice Court Fund Data
- Local Government Entities by County and Economic Region
- Local Sales Tax Data, Reports and Resources
- NYS Local Government Interactive Data
- Population Data, Resources and Publications
- Real Property Tax Levies, Taxable Full Value and Full Value Tax Rates

Find Information About Local Government Data

- Annual Financial Report Filing Deadlines
- Data Glossary
- Data Release Dates
- Data Sources
Fiscal Stress Monitoring System
https://www.osc.state.ny.us/local-government/fiscal-monitoring
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Part II — References
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*= especially useful for data analysis
The Chart of Accounts Query presents the account codes that are valid for Annual Financial Report (AFR) reporting by year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Code</th>
<th>Account Description</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A200</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>(A) General</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A201</td>
<td>Cash In Time Deposits</td>
<td>(A) General</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A210</td>
<td>Petty Cash</td>
<td>(A) General</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A215</td>
<td>Departmental Cash</td>
<td>(A) General</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A220</td>
<td>Cash From Obligations</td>
<td>(A) General</td>
<td>Balance Sheet</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schedule:
- (All)
- [ ] Balance Sheet
- [x] Revenue
- [ ] Expenditure
- [ ] Budget Summary

Class:
- (All)
- [x] County
- [ ] City
- [ ] Town
- [ ] Village
- [ ] Fire District

Funds:
- (All)
- [x] (A) General
- [x] (CB) Housing Authority
- [x] (CD) Special Grant
Real Property Tax Levies, Taxable Full Value and Full Value Tax Rates

Local Governments:
The files below contain real property tax levies, taxable full value and full value tax rates for local governments. Read the data description files to learn about how the tables are organized and how they differ from previous versions.


Data Notes:
Data for 2012 and prior are not comparable to later years. Additionally, there are some definitional changes that affect some levy components for counties and towns in 2015 and after.

- Data Description for 2015 and newer tax tables [pdf]
- Data Description for 2013 and 2014 tax tables [pdf]

School Districts:
To activate the excel macro buttons:
1. Select the Security Warning’s ‘Options’ button.
2. Choose to ‘Enable the Content’.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAB
A Forum for New York State Researchers, Practitioners, and Policymakers

March 24, 2023
Fiscal Recovery and Budget Credibility in New York Municipalities

An Examination of Local Government Finances After the Pandemic

Rahul Pathak
Richard P. Nathan Fellow, Rockefeller Institute of Government
Assistant Professor, Baruch College, City University of New York
Background

- The Covid-19 pandemic had a profound impact on the fiscal landscape of municipalities.

- In the early months of the pandemic, municipalities suffered a revenue squeeze and increased spending requirements.

- However, the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) provided much needed federal assistance in 2021.

- The impact of the pandemic on city budgets is less understood since financial reports are just becoming available.
Research Questions

How public finances of cities in New York State fared during and in the immediate aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Do the budget estimates provide credible estimates of revenues for major cities and what was the extent of forecast errors?
Previous Research

- Still limited work on the impact of the pandemic on city finances as the data is just becoming available. A limited number of studies focus on finances of large cities.


- Some research in the context of the Great Recession focused on actual revenue impacts (Ross et al, 2015; Chernick and Reschovsky, 2017), but no work on forecast errors and such.

- Recent work from the Office of the Comptroller (2021) in the context of New York’s mid-Hudson region and California’s Legislative Analyst’s office highlights substantive impact on sales tax and user fee and relatively stable property tax revenue.
Data Challenges

• The ex-ante and ex-post estimates are not readily available for research use – unlike say Census estimates that inform substantive research on financial condition analysis.

• ACFR data is not easily accessible, and the use of these data remains rather limited.

• While the corporate financial statements are mandated to be machine readable by SEC, making them readily available to researchers and stakeholders, no such mandate exists for the financial statements of state and local governments (Joffe & Reck, 2019).

• GASB guidelines to state and local governments allow wide discretion to local governments concerning both what is to be reported and how to make it accessible to users.
We collect data from ACFRs of eleven cities in NYS – FY 2014-2021
(based on population and regional representation)

These cities are somewhat representative of small and medium-sized cities around the country.

- Albany
- Binghamton
- Buffalo
- Hempstead
- Newburgh
- Plattsburgh
- Rochester
- Schenectady
- Syracuse
- Watertown
- Yonkers
## Variation in Fiscal Years and Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>99,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>47,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>July 1-June 30</td>
<td>278,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempstead</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>793,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>28,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburgh</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>19,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>July 1-June 30</td>
<td>211,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>January 1-December 31</td>
<td>67,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>July 1-June 30</td>
<td>148,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown</td>
<td>July 1-June 30</td>
<td>24,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonkers</td>
<td>July 1-June 30</td>
<td>211,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Financial Reports of Governments and Office of the Comptroller*
Data and Methods

• Data from supplementary schedules of the ACFRs on budgets and actuals for general fund revenues and expenditures.
• Some line items are comparable across cities; still there is substantial variation in reporting across cities.
• Original budget, revised or final, and actuals – Rochester does not report original budget estimates in its ACFRs.
• In addition to an examination of linear trends and changes in composition. I calculate forecast evaluation metrics:

\[
\text{Mean Percent Error (MPE)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1}^{n} \frac{(f-a) \times 100}{a}
\]

\[
\text{Mean Absolute Percent Error (MAPE)} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{1}^{n} \frac{|(f-a)| \times 100}{a}
\]
Total Revenues in Sample Cities, Budgeted, Revised, and Actuals
Property taxes have been relatively stable
A glance at public safety expenditures
Temporary changes in revenue composition?

Share of Major Revenue Sources, 2014-2021
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intergovernmental  real property  charges
Temporary changes in revenue composition?

Share of Minor Revenue Sources, 2014-2021
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licensepermits
fines
Larger errors during the pandemic, but some cities did better than others

Original Budget Variance, 2014-2021
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Larger errors during the pandemic, but some cities did better than others

Revised Budget Variance, 2014-2021
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Mean Percent Error and MAPE for Selected Revenue Categories Across Cities, 2017-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean Percent Error</th>
<th>Mean Absolute Percent Error</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Modified Budget</th>
<th>Original Budget</th>
<th>Modified Budget</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-2.79</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>-12.26</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td>-5.83</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key takeaways and next steps

• The pandemic induced revenue squeeze for majority of cities didn’t last too long. Property taxes have been relatively in most cities with some exceptions and intergovernmental aid has increased.

• Increase in expenditures appears to be weaker than increase in revenue…contributing to surplus. How cities use this opportunity and transition to post federal aid environment (“ARPA cliff”) remains to be seen.

• While Covid-19 pandemic was unprecedented and unique in its nature; a closer scrutiny of inter-city variation in revenue forecast errors can reveal why some cities are able to budget better than others.

• Next steps
  • FY 2022 ACFRs
  • Panel analysis
  • Selected expenditures
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Background

• Fair Fares New York City (FFNYC) program funds NYC Transit (NYCT) to provide half-priced transit discounts to low-income NYC residents. Funding is in the NYC Department of Social Services/Human Resources Administration (DSS/HRA) budget to reimburse NYCT for the discount.

• The program began in January 2019 and during its first year focused on targeted groups (e.g., working adults on cash assistance or SNAP, income-eligible City University of New York (CUNY) and veteran students, NYCHA public housing residents).

• In January 2020, Fair Fares expanded to include all adults (18-64 years old) at or under 100% FPL, residing in NYC, and not receiving another reduced-fare benefit.

• As of October 2022, over 275,000 New Yorkers were enrolled in the program.

• Current HRA clients (cash assistance and/or SNAP) who meet eligibility requirements are notified via ACCESS HRA and can enroll through an expedited “Fast Track” process.

• Others complete a short application and upload documents to verify household income, age, residence, and identity* through the ACCESS HRA app or website. Assistance is available at Fair Fares offices, located at a Benefits Access Center (BAC) in each borough.

*In some cases, identity, age, and residence can be verified by LexisNexis and/or IDNYC match without the need for documents.
Key Research Questions

• Among fast track-eligible HRA clients, what proportion enroll in Fair Fares? Which clients are more likely to enroll?

• What are common barriers to client enrollment among fast-tracked individuals?

• Among “late renewers,” what factors contribute to Fair Fares cardholders’ failure to renew during the appropriate window?

• What outreach strategies would help increase awareness of the Fair Fares program among eligible New Yorkers?

• How have Fair Fares participants used mass transit to navigate the city? What changes do they report in their mass transit use? Do they report changes in their stress levels, time spent travelling, and overall quality of life?
The Office of Evaluation and Research used a mixed methods approach, drawing on multiple quantitative and qualitative data sources:

- **Fast-Track Study Cohort** (n=83,137): Analyzed Fair Fares administrative data to explore differences in characteristics of fast track-eligible individuals who did and did not enroll in the program, using chi-square tests of significance and multivariate logistic regression. Included those who became fast-tracked eligible September 2021-April 2022.

- **Fast-Track Non-Enrollees Interviews** (n=145): Conducted telephone interviews with fast track-eligible individuals who did not apply for Fair Fares to assess barriers to enrollment and perspectives on the Fair Fares program. Interviews conducted in English (77.2%), Spanish (16.3%), Chinese, Bengali, and Hausa; May-July 2022.

- **Applicant/Renewer Online Survey** (n=884): Administered on-line surveys with Fair Fares applicants and renewers (including both fast-tracked and non-fast-tracked individuals) to gain further insight into client expectations for and experience with the program. Sample included first-time applicants (43%), individuals submitting an on-time renewal (23%), and individuals re-applying after renewal period lapsed (“late renewers,” 34%); April-July 2022.

- **Key Informant Interviews** (n=6): Conducted in-depth interviews with Fair Fares leadership and staff regarding outreach, customer service, and the enrollment process; July 2022.
FINDINGS
Enrollment Patterns and Barriers

Among those fast-track eligible in the study period (Sep ’21 – Apr ’22), **25% enrolled.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment rates were higher among certain subgroups: (seen in descriptive analysis as well as regression results)</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Assistance (CA) clients (vs. non-CA SNAP clients)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan residents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with English as their preferred language*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults ages 25+ (vs. young adults, ages 18-24) and those without dependents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In a telephone survey of never-enrolled fast track-eligible HRA clients, frequently-cited reasons for not enrolling included:</th>
<th>Lack of awareness of the Fair Fares program: Just one in five non-enrollees reported seeing Fair Fares eligibility information in their ACCESS HRA profile.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confusion about eligibility and the application process, in part stemming from differences with other (federal) DSS-administered benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrequent use of public transportation, including due to health and safety concerns (23% reported no public transit use; 38% reported decreased use due to the pandemic).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that Fair Fares program information is available online in all twelve Local Law languages.*
## Causes of Churn and Promising Outreach Strategies

In an online survey, “late renewers” cited similar reasons for failing to renew on time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority either didn’t know they needed to renew</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or didn’t think they were eligible</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% assumed they were still enrolled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as their Fair Fares MetroCard still worked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% reported difficulties renewing their enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to 22% of on-time renewers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% didn’t recall getting renewal information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(compared to 18% of on-time renewers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Promising outreach strategies and opportunities include:

- 45% of applicants/renewers cited ACCESS HRA as the most important source prompting enrollment. Other common sources: word of mouth and subway media campaigns.
- Reworking existing messaging to ensure that eligibility criteria are clear.
- Staff noted value of in-person connections, both at HRA Centers and community events, and suggested targeted outreach to CUNY students, NYCHA residents, public school parents, etc.
### Perceptions of Fair Fares Participants

#### Renewers reported struggling to pay for transit **prior to Fair Fares.**

- Average public transit usage was high, at 5-6 days/week (*almost double that of never-enrolled fast track-eligible HRA clients, at 3 days/week*).
- 67% reported that they often had to choose between spending money on transportation and paying for other expenses.
- 33% often did not travel by transit because they couldn’t afford it.

#### As a result of Fair Fares, renewers described:

- More use of public transit (67%)
- Decreased transit spending (75%), with savings typically used for basic expenses (84%)
- Reduced financial stress (87%)
- Improved ability to travel through the city for work, social, and recreational activities (86-89%)
- Time savings in travelling (87%)
Fair Fares Renewers Enthusiastically Endorse the Program

“Es una muy buena ayuda para las personas de bajos recursos, y que me ayuda mucho porque con el precio de una semana puedo usarla dos semanas. Me ahorro dinero gracias a este programa.”

“I am entirely grateful to use this program. As a single mom its heartbreaking having to choose between transportation or lunch at work.”

“[Fair Fares] definitely assists financially and addresses my disability and mobility challenges. Thank you for that!”

“It’s made access to the city more affordable. With rent so high, the next biggest expense is transit.”

“Ha sido de mucha ayuda en lo personal. Antes tenia que caminar mucho con mis bolsas de supermercado o al salir de mi trabajo. Ahora puedo descansar el bus o tren en lo que llego a la casa.”

“I appreciate the program. It hasn't saved me thousands of dollars, but it has minimalized the financial burden of every travel mainly for work which I have no other way to get there. I've made it to work every shift.”

Source: Online survey responses to open-ended question from renewers in ACCESS HRA (over 160 renewing respondents—30% of all renewers who completed the survey — submitted free-text comments).
Implications and Next Steps

- Fair Fares has a highly streamlined enrollment process compared to many other public benefit programs, along with extensive outreach. Still, the Fair Fares program struggles with the same issues of less-than-full uptake and churn. Possible explanations include:
  - Fair Fares is a relatively new program that fully launched just before the pandemic, and while program enrollment did not dip significantly during the pandemic, reduced transit use during this period likely contributed to lower-than-expected take-up.
  - Study findings suggest that some may be deterred by pre-conceptions about eligibility and application requirements (e.g., documentation), based on experiences with other (federal) DSS-administered programs.
  - Churn (“late renewal”) is common across social service programs, due in part to competing priorities and stresses in target populations.*

- Findings suggest that outreach should highlight how Fair Fares differs from many other government benefits in terms of eligibility and enrollment, with a focus on communicating through ACCESS HRA, subway ad campaigns, and select community events.

*For example, see USDA Food and Nutrition Service (2014). Understanding the Rates, Causes, and Costs of Churning in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).
## Data Sources

### Fast-Track Cohort (n=83,137)*

- Data pulled for those who became fast-tracked eligible between September 2021 and April 12th, 2022, to capture “post-pandemic” behavior and attitudes towards public transit.
- It covered information on benefits receipt, program enrollment, and key demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, preferred language, residential and mailing address, and existence of dependents.**

### Fast-Track Non-Enrollees Interviewees (n=145)

- Placed calls to random sample of 858 individuals from the fast-tracked study cohort:
  - never enrolled in the program
  - had not attempted to apply
  - had a valid phone number.
- Most in English (77.2%), Spanish (16.3%), and a few in Chinese, Bengali, and Hausa; May-July 2022.
- Comparable to all fast-track non-enrollees in the study cohort but more often female, Hispanic, and residing in Queens or the Bronx.

---

*The fast-tracked study cohort is generally comparable to the full fast-tracked eligible population but was more likely to be under 25 years old and to have dependents.

** For those with a valid CIN (96.3%) most of the data came from the Welfare Management System (pulled form HRA’s EDW); for the rest, OPMDA provided self-reported data from the Fair Fares application.
Data Sources (cont’d)

**Applicant and Renewers Online Survey**  
*(n=884)*

- Complete surveys submitted online, April-July 2022  
  (includes both fast track-eligible and other applicants).
- Sample includes those submitting a renewal (23%) and those submitting an application; through a series of questions about previous enrollment in Fair Fares and skip patterns, we divided the latter into “first-time applicants” (43%) and “late renewers” (34%).
- Survey respondents were mostly female, Hispanic, and residing in Brooklyn or the Bronx. Just over half had been employed or in school in the past year. Almost three quarters filled out the survey in English, and the rest in Spanish.*

**Key Informant Interviews**  
*(n=6)*

- In-depth interviews with key informants holding different roles in Fair Fares, including the Assistant Deputy Commissioner, one eligibility specialist, one unit leader, and three borough office staff.
- Interviews were conducted by video or in-person between July 11th and 19th, 2022.
- Topics covered included types of assistance offered to applicants, client experience at Fair Fares offices, common mistakes seen in applications, outreach and communication strategies implemented, and ideas for future efforts

*Clients had the ability to respond in any of the other local law languages by downloading a PDF of the survey in that language, however none were received as of July 2022.*
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Overview:

- Projects and Common Threads

  1. Impact of NYS Food Policies on the Mitigation of Shocks to the Food Rescue System
     
     (Mariana)

  2. NY Health Foundation study - Municipalities’ efforts to address food security (April)

- Next steps

  - Projects, collaborations
Some common threads of our projects
## Stakeholder Engagement

**1: Impact of NYS Food Policies on the Mitigation of Shocks to the Food Rescue System**
- Organizations of the food assistance supply chain (farmers, gleaners, food pantries, food bank).

**2: NY Health Foundation study - Municipalities’ efforts to address food security**
- Residents, town supervisors, county-level officials, state agencies, nonprofits, federal stakeholders.

## Local Capacity

**Capacity**: Ability of organizations to handle, sort, and redistribute food.
- Depends on resources (e.g., staff, volunteers, transportation, storage).
- Coordination, collaboration, and partnerships support capacity.

**Capacity**: Ability of towns to identify food insecurity and secure project funding.
- Depends on time, funds, volunteers.
- Voluntary associations, engagement with other organizations and programs, outreach, and fund sharing.
Impact of NYS Food Policies on the Mitigation of Shocks to the Food Rescue System

A System Dynamics Model of Fresh Fruits and Vegetables in the Capital Region

Mariana Torres Arroyo
Approach and Information Sources

- System Dynamics Modeling. Community engagement through group-model building.
- Data sources included:
  - Organizations’ data (food aid supply chain organizations);
  - Surveys to food pantries (Feingold et al., *manuscript in preparation*);
  - Databases, e.g., US Census Bureau, Department of Environmental Conservation ReFED Food Waste Monitor;
  - Survey to stakeholder organizations of the food emergency supply chain.
Model Conceptualization

Figure 1. Conceptual Diagram

- **Surplus**
  - Farms
  - Non-farm food businesses (retailers, wholesale, distributors)

- **Food rescue organizations**
  - Food banks, food hubs, distributors to food rescue
  - Food pantries

- **Community (households)**

- **Waste management**
  - Organizations carrying out composting and recycling of food waste
  - Landfills

- **Farm policies (e.g., Nourish NY)**

- **Waste bankers**

- **Policies**
  - Model boundary
  - Inflow/Outflow
**Figure 2. Simplified Model Structure**

- **Key dynamics:** supply chain dynamics, waste-related dynamics (e.g., how food decays).

- **Equations of stocks** have the general form of:

  \[ \text{Stock} = \int_{t_0}^{t_{\text{final}}} \text{Inflow} - \text{Outflow} \]

"Early stage" = food banks, food hubs and main distributors
Survey to organizations of the food emergency supply chain

- Results:
  - An initial drop in fresh produce availability followed by spikes of overabundant produce. Unpredictability of availability and demand.
  - Operational changes at organizations.
  - New partnerships, increased and enhanced cooperation.
  - Nourish NY brought top quality food from farms but did not come from funding for operational costs.
Simulation Scenarios

• ‘What-if’ scenarios based on:
  • **Supply chain disruptions (shock)**
    • Changes in farm and retail supply, reduced human capacity.
  • Policies
    • **Nourish NY** (compensation to local farmers program) and NYS; **Food Donation and Food Scraps Recycling Law** (waste ban).
  • Partnerships and coordination
    • Effect on distribution times.
  • Outcomes
    • Distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables to households; waste rates.
Example of simulation results

Figure 3. Rate of Fresh Fruit and Vegetables Distribution to Households
Results and Conclusion

Main findings:

• Nourish NY implemented at different levels and increased coordination and partnerships across organizations resulted in greater fresh produce distributions after the shock.

• The waste ban improved fresh produce distribution, but increased waste (additional simulations showed the need to improve the quality of donated food).

Conclusion:

• Policies need to focus on increased capacity (e.g., through coordination and partnerships) for policies to be effective in waste reduction.
NY Health Foundation

Municipalities’ efforts to address food security

April Roggio
Project Objectives

• What did we study?
• Why where we interested?
• How did we do it?
What did we learn?

• Food access
• Food production
• Food distribution
• Collaboration
• Capacity
Stakeholders

- Diversity of actors: town supervisors, village mayors, clerks, and council members
- Specifying internal and external collaboration: community volunteers, the county, and the state
- Stakeholder scales
- Range of issue domains
Collaboration efforts

• Internal collaboration: who is volunteering within the community?

• External collaboration:
  • Structural mechanisms to support collaboration: boards of supervisors and councils.
  • Nonprofit partners.
  • Partnerships with county, state, and federal actors.
Capacity: expanding and contracting

• Limitations
  - Rural places are limited by small and dispersed populations
  - Town supervisors (and county agencies!) are often limited by time, pay, and staff support.

• Opportunities
  - Supervisors can successfully build a shared language and culture around particular issues.
  - The most successful ones expand their capacity by inter-municipal cooperation, regional collaboration, and active and ongoing recruitment of co-conspirators!
Conclusion

• Collaboration matters, but it is an ongoing challenge to manage and recruit partners.

• Capacity is extended by collaboration, but to collaborate often requires some initial capacity.
Project collaboration: Next Steps

• Evaluation of the Regional Economic Development Council (REDC) model in NYS

  • Project goals:
    • Identify where funds have been spent – across issue areas, across funding sources and across regions
    • Identify the degree to which funding has targeted rural communities
    • Measure impact on rural entrepreneurship
    • Evaluate whether REDC funding has impacted local food systems

  • Extension of the system dynamic model to include the population sector
Investigators and Collaborators

**Luis Luna-Reyes, Ph.D.**
Associate Professor, Public Administration / Information Science
Faculty Fellow, Center for Technology in Government,
University at Albany, State University of New York

**Jason R. Evans, P.hD.**
Dean, College of Food Innovation & Technology
Johnson & Wales University

**Eliot Rich, Ph.D.**
Department of Information Technology Management
School of Business, University at Albany

**Alexander Buyantuev**
Associate Professor, Department of Geography and Planning
University at Albany, State University of New York

**Mary Arenberg**
Assistant professor, Department of Plant Sciences
State University of New York at Cobleskill

**Beth J. Feingold, Ph.D.**
Associate Professor, Environmental Health Sciences,
UAlbany School of Public Health

**Xiaobo Xue Romeiko, Ph.D.**
Associate Professor, Environmental Health Sciences,
UAlbany School of Public Health

**Roni Neff, Ph.D.**
Associate Professor, Environmental Health and Engineering/ Health Policy and Management
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health

**Akiko Hosler, Ph.D.**
Associate Professor & Graduate Program Director, Epidemiology & Biostatistics
UAlbany School of Public Health

**Natasha Pernicka and Peter Crasto-Donelly**
The Food Pantries for the Capital District

**Stacy Pettigrew and Ben Attwood**
Radix Ecological Sustainability Center

**Amy Klein**
Capital Roots

**Susan Lintner**
Regional Food Bank of Northeastern New York
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The Role of Trauma-Informed Approaches in Fighting Economic Insecurity

Joe Jones | Director of Policy, FPWA
FPWA & Trauma-Informed Approaches

- Trauma-Informed NYC Begins
- Pushed to the Precipice Report
- Caught in the Gaps Report

- 2019: Poverty to Prison Pipeline Report
- 2020: Trauma-Informed NYC Begins
- 2022: Trauma-Informed NYC Concludes
- 2022: Pushed to the Precipice Report
- 2023: Caught in the Gaps Report
Trauma-Informed NYC

Member Orgs
ranging from large city-wide multi-service organizations to smaller community-based organizations, to a small community church

Months
to develop training, implementation, and evaluation of trauma-informed practices.

Phases
including organizational assessment, skill-building and client assessment, and implementing a trauma-informed client model
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Cycle of *poverty*

- Oppressive Systems
- Intergenerational Poverty
- Deepening of Poverty and Possible Trauma
- Inadequate Government Responses
2
Policy Implications
Trauma-Informed *Policy Implications*

**Accurate System**
Championing an effort to create a true "cost of living" threshold in the city, state, and nationally

**Barrier-Free System**
Identifying and eliminating systemic policies and practices that unintentionally and otherwise punish people for seeking help.

**Responsive System**
Identifying and implementing ways in which our public benefit systems can be trauma-informed and people-centered.
Examples from *Cash Assistance Programs*

**Measure Poverty Accurately**

The FPL is a 60-year-old woefully inadequate measure that accounts for very little of what is required to survive to speak nothing of improving one’s economic future.

**Reduce Administrative Requirements**

Just over half of all denials are caused by non-eligibility issues relating to the application or renewal process itself.

**Remove Asset Tests**

Cash assistance programs have arbitrary asset limits that restrict applicants from having even modest savings.

**Reform Work Requirements**

Research indicates that the requirements cycle recipients into low-wage jobs and fail to improve their long-term economic stability, keeping them tethered to the benefit.
Thanks!

Do you have any questions?

Joe Jones | jjones@fpwa.org

Caught in the Gaps Report
FPWA Trauma-Informed Resources

fpwa.org
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