This is a pivotal year: the national anti-hunger safety net is under the greatest threat seen in Food Bank For New York City’s 30-year history. Decisions being made in Washington right now will determine whether cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as the Food Stamp Program) — our nation’s first line of defense against hunger — will create new hardship for low-income New Yorkers and plunge New York City off a looming Hunger Cliff. Yet even before cuts were imposed, New York was facing a meal gap that emergency food providers struggle to address.

This document outlines the policy and program options that will enable our State’s leaders to take meaningful steps toward closing the meal gap and ending hunger in New York City.

New York State’s Meal Gap - 465M Meals

More than 3.1 million New York State residents (approximately one in six) rely on SNAP to keep food on the table, with an average monthly household benefit of $273 – or more than $5.5 billion annually.

More than one in six New York State residents struggles with food hardship, and demand for emergency food continues to grow, despite SNAP and other nutrition assistance programs – evidence that a meal gap remains.

The meal gap represents the translation of a food budget shortfall into a number of meals. Analysis by Feeding America finds an annual meal gap in New York State of 465 million meals. Despite the collective efforts of our city’s network of emergency food providers to fill the gap, a shortfall of approximately 270 million meals remains each year. Unfortunately, instead of identifying ways to close the gap, decisions in Washington threaten to make the meal gap even wider.

The Hunger Cliff – More Than 282M Meals Could Be Lost

November 1, 2013: 135 million meals lost
On November 1, sweeping cuts to SNAP benefits took effect, resulting in the estimated loss of 135 million meals for New York State residents. A household of three has lost, on average, $29 per month in SNAP benefits – or more than $30 million per month in New York State alone.

These cuts are the result of a deal struck in December 2010 in order to pay for a $0.06 per meal increase in federal school lunch reimbursements as part of the “Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act.” While the White House promised to work with Congress to restore the funds before the cuts could take effect, the promise was not fulfilled.

The Farm Bill: More than 147 million additional meals lost
The Farm Bill, negotiated by Congress every five years, sets policy and funding for critical components of the safety net, including SNAP and emergency food (through the federal Emergency Food Assistance Program, or TEFAP). Reauthorization negotiations provide an opportunity to strengthen
anti-hunger programs; instead, leaders in both the Senate and the House of Representatives are promoting bills that would cut SNAP and worsen hunger.

The Senate’s bill includes a **$4.1 billion cut** to SNAP, which will result in the loss of $90 per month for 274,000 New York households. In its first year alone, these cuts translate to 110 million fewer meals in New York State, which, in combination with the cuts happening in November will **increase New York State’s meal gap to 710 million meals.**

The House of Representatives narrowly passed even deeper cuts in a separate, SNAP-only bill. The $40 billion in cuts for this bill would result in the estimated loss of more than 147 million meals in New York State, **increasing the meal gap to more than 747 million meals.** This is a conservative estimate, as it does not incorporate the effects of difficult to quantify, unfunded work requirement provisions.

**Who loses in these deals?**

More than half of SNAP recipients in New York State are in households with children. More than one third are elderly or disabled. All saw benefit reductions in November.

The Farm Bill proposals will disproportionately harm New York State. New York State represents approximately 60 percent of the households who will have their SNAP benefits cut by the Senate proposal, which targets SNAP recipients in federally subsidized housing – including NYCHA – who receive assistance from the Home Energy Assistance Program (HEAP). The House bill includes this cut and additionally targets seniors, and working families with children.

Emergency food providers are already struggling to meet unprecedented need: **63 percent of food pantries and soup kitchens in New York City reported food shortages in the past year.**

The economic impact of SNAP cuts goes beyond those who stand to lose food assistance. New York State’s food retailers are facing a loss of more than $30 million per month in SNAP redemptions starting this November – putting the jobs supported by that revenue at risk.

---

**Policy Options for New York State**

No New Yorker should go hungry: access to adequate, nutritious food is a fundamental human right. New York State must develop a plan to realize this core principle. While the ultimate fate of SNAP will be decided in Washington, **there is much New York’s leaders can do to help ensure that struggling New Yorkers can afford to keep food on the table.** The following are a set of policy and programmatic options that can be implemented by State government to improve financial and geographic access to nutritious, affordable food across New York.

**Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)**

While participation in SNAP has increased in recent years, too many eligible state residents still do not access this vital food assistance program. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, 76 percent of eligible New Yorkers were enrolled in the program in FFY 2010, meaning more than 700,000 eligible
New Yorkers were not accessing SNAP.\(^1\)

Given that the number of New Yorkers in poverty has risen more than seven percent between 2007 and 2011,\(^2\) increasing the participation rate for SNAP is a necessary step in reducing this growing need.

**Policy Recommendations**

- Increase New York State’s food stamp participation rate to 90 percent of eligible New Yorkers by the end of 2018 (as shown in Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Point Increase in Participation</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Increase from 2014-2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Restore eligibility for all documented immigrants.
- Simplify application and recertification processes.
  - Create simple systems through which working families and other groups facing hardships can apply for SNAP in ways that do not conflict with jobs, training programs, or job search activities, and that generally minimize potential scheduling conflicts, by: offering late evening and weekend hours at more offices for interviews and the submission of SNAP application materials; opening satellite offices for conducting SNAP interviews; and establishing drop boxes for after-hours access.
  - Accelerate and expand efforts to enable true online application and recertification for SNAP.
  - Coordinate among multiple benefits so that clients can apply for several programs and services simultaneously, such as public health insurance, taxes, childcare subsidies and nutrition programs.
  - Leverage the health insurance exchange platform to enable screening for SNAP and other programs.
- Maximize all federal waivers that expand program access and benefits,\(^3\) including:
  - the Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents (ABAWD) waiver, which extends issuance of SNAP benefits for unemployed childless adults beyond three months during times of high unemployment;
  - simplified applications for seniors;
  - elimination of mandatory verification of childcare expenses, which leads to under-utilization of allowable childcare deductions (especially for low-income households who rely on home-based childcare), in favor of verification only when questionable;
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3. Available SNAP waivers and options may be contingent on policy changes made in the federal Farm Bill currently under negotiation in Congress.
o extension of recertification periods whenever possible, and waiver of recertification interviews for households in which all members are elderly and/or disabled and have no earned income;
o adoption of a standard medical deduction for seniors whose medical expenses exceed $35 per month; and
o inclusion of pregnant women living alone under broad-based categorical eligibility, to raise the gross income limit on applications to 200% of the poverty level and better align SNAP eligibility with the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC).

- Eliminate or minimize work requirements to align the program more closely with other federal benefit programs, so as to improve access for low-income families (including the newly unemployed and part-time workers) and to clarify that SNAP is a nutrition assistance program.
- Ensure that the state is more aggressive in enforcing that all counties and social service districts comply fully with all federal laws and regulations regarding program access.
- Strengthen and coordinate public and private SNAP outreach efforts throughout the state:
  o Take common-sense measures to reach eligible New Yorkers, including but not limited to: the development of targeted outreach to increase the participation of older New Yorkers, children, working families and immigrants; and the incorporation of SNAP outreach into outreach for other programs for low-income New Yorkers, including the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), WIC and the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP).
  o Mandate and provide additional funding for the distribution of SNAP outreach materials at emergency food programs.
  o Expand the distribution of SNAP outreach materials at hospitals, government offices, community food programs (senior centers, daycare centers, kids cafes, rehabilitation centers, shelters, etc.) and other services and providers that reach low-income populations.
  o Include SNAP outreach materials in mailings of checks and other materials to recipients of Unemployment Insurance, the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and disability benefits.
- Improve SNAP administration.
  o Provide annual incentive awards to local social service districts that achieve the largest increases in SNAP participation.
  o Increase funds for SNAP administration, which is essential to fund technology improvements and adequate staffing.
  o Ensure adequate staffing at government offices and application centers.
  o Improve state hotlines that serve both SNAP applicants and recipients trying to access their benefits, particularly by providing services in multiple languages.
- Draft SNAP notices using clear language, avoiding messages that discourage participation or cause confusion.
- Provide transitional benefits to those who have missed their TANF recertification.
- Expand educational programs and job readiness opportunities covered under SNAP Education and Training.
- Strengthen New York State’s Disaster SNAP (D-SNAP) implementation and readiness:
  o Provide review of Disaster SNAP applications and oversight of implementation to ensure on-the-ground resources are managed effectively in a disaster.
  o Develop an outreach and implementation plan with local authorities before a disaster, and provide resources so community organizations can respond to a disaster in a timely and efficient manner.
o Provide all SNAP workers with regular D-SNAP training.

**Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program (HPNAP)**

The Hunger Prevention and Nutrition Assistance Program is a state-sponsored grant that provides emergency food providers with lines of credit at regional food banks and other organizations, including Food Bank For New York City and the United Way. In addition to the credit lines, HPNAP also comprises an Operations Support and Equipment grant, which awards emergency food programs up to $3,000 for operations and equipment expenditures. HPNAP is administered by the New York State Department of Health.

HPNAP received baseline funding of $28 million in the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2013-14 budget, a decrease of 5.6 percent from SFY 2012-13 and 15.9 percent from its peak funding of $33.3 million in SFY 2007-08. (A one-time allocation for food banks of $2 million offset the SFY 2013-14 funding cut and brought total state funding for emergency food to $30 million. This allocation is not expected to recur in future budgets.) As the chart below illustrates, the loss of baseline HPNAP funding since SFY 2007-08 has taken place at a time of rising food costs in New York.

![Baseline HPNAP Funding vs. Food Inflation](chart)

These funding cuts have been imposed not only at a time of rising costs, but also at a time of rising need throughout New York State. Between 2007 and 2011, the number of New Yorkers in poverty increased by 8.4 percent. In 2011, more than 2,600 HPNAP-supported food pantries, soup kitchens and emergency shelters received approximately 30.1 million requests for food assistance. Children accounted for 29 percent of all the persons receiving food from HPNAP-supported food pantries; the elderly accounted for 13 percent.

Emergency food providers address the lack of sufficient food to meet need with a range of tactics, one being to ration supplies to serve the greatest number possible. As a result, it is not uncommon for pantries to provide less than the State standard of nine meals per person in a pantry bag. Food Bank For New York City research found that in 2011-12, food pantries in New York City were providing an
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4 New York State’s fiscal year begins in April and runs through March of the following year. HPNAP’s peak funding in SFY 2007-08 reflects a $31.9 million baseline, as well as mid-year adjustments, including a cost of living adjustment.


6 New York State Department of Health. (August 2012). *Healthy Food for Hungry People: History*
average of 5.8 meals per pantry bag, a number little changed from 2007. Even so, 63 percent of food pantries and soup kitchens reported food shortages at some point in the year.

Policy Recommendations
- Maintain dedicated funding for HPNAP in the State budget.
- Increase HPNAP funding by $18.7 million to a SFY 2014-15 funding of $52.2 million. This 62.2 percent increase comprises: baselining of the $2 million one-time allocation for emergency food in the SFY 2013-14 budget; an inflationary adjustment of 15 percent for changes in food costs over the past five years; an 8.4 percent increase to reflect the rise in New York State poverty from 2007 to 2011; and an additional 36 percent increase to adjust for the chronic inadequacy of the existing food supply to meet need.
- Increase funding for actual administrative and operational support.
- Ensure that HPNAP distribution during federal disaster declarations is submitted to the federal government as part of New York State’s disaster appropriations request.

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)

In FFY 2011, the average monthly participation in WIC was 266,475 for New York. That year the federal government allotted the State $464.5 million in WIC funding. As of September 30, 2012, this annual funding increased to about $466 million, with 524,148 New Yorkers expected to receive WIC benefits over the course of the year.

WIC’s implementation in New York State is administered by the Department of Health. New York State supplements the federal WIC program, although the SFY 2014 budget saw this funding line reduced by 5.6 percent.

As funding levels continue to fall, the need for WIC has increased significantly. The number of New Yorkers in poverty has risen more than seven percent between 2007 and 2011. During that time, the poverty rate for children under 18 rose from 19.6 percent to 21.2 percent. In New York City, nearly half of households with children ages five and under that rely on emergency food programs also receive WIC.

Policy Recommendations
- Ensure access to a WIC site in every low-income neighborhood in New York.
- Reject any cuts to State WIC funds, and any proposals that would require WIC to compete with other low-income nutrition assistance programs for funding.
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Notes:
8 Ibid.
10 United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service. (2012). Funding and Program Data: WIC Program Grant Levels by State Agency
11 United States Department of Agriculture. Food and Nutrition Service. (January 2013). WIC Program: Total Number of Participants Fiscal Year 2011-2012 (Preliminary Data)
• Increase State funding for outreach, breast-feeding promotion and peer counseling.
• Promote referrals of eligible WIC participants to SNAP.
• Expedite the transition from WIC coupons to EBT.
• Promote deeper collaboration between the New York State Department of Health and county/municipal social service agencies to provide SNAP outreach and enrollment opportunities at all WIC sites.

School Breakfast and Lunch

The National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and the School Breakfast Program (SBP) are authorized under the National School Lunch Act. In school year 2010-2011, nearly 1.8 million New York State students participated in the NSLP daily. Of those, almost 1.2 million received meals free or at a reduced price. In New York City, nearly four in five (77.9 percent) of public school students qualified for free or reduced price school lunch.\textsuperscript{15} Of these low-income students, only 70.3 percent participated in the program.\textsuperscript{16} These numbers represent a decrease in participation from 79 percent of students in SY 2008-2009.\textsuperscript{17}

School breakfast participation, even among low-income students, lags far behind lunch participation. In school year 2011-2012, more than 1.2 million New York State students received free or reduced-price school lunch, compared to only 522,351 students participating in free or reduced-price school breakfast. Even though this school breakfast program participation rate represents an increase of six percent from the previous year, it still falls far short of lunch participation.\textsuperscript{18}

While participation rates in school lunch and school breakfast remain far below universal participation, the need for these child nutrition programs has grown significantly. The number of New Yorkers in poverty has risen more than seven percent between 2007 and 2011.\textsuperscript{19} During that time, the poverty rate for children under 18 rose from 19.6 percent to 21.2 percent.\textsuperscript{20}

A wide range of factors prevents full participation in these vital child nutrition programs, including economic, social, psychological, logistical and administrative barriers. Reducing the stigma associated with school meals is one of the foremost necessary steps in the effort to increase program participation. Too often children decline to participate in school lunches and school breakfasts because they fear their classmates' ridicule. Current program structure also invites distinctions between low-income and wealthier students, providing only the former with free and reduced-price meals. The availability of competitive food in vending machines and elsewhere also encourages low-income students to spend their money on less nutritious food, while further increasing the stigma associated with school meals.

In addition to these administrative and psychosocial barriers, logistical and economic challenges further undermine program participation. School overcrowding very often results in excessively staggered lunch schedules, leaving some students with lunch periods shortly after the beginning of the

\textsuperscript{15} The reduced-price category was eliminated in New York City public schools in the 2013-14 School Year, enabling all children in households with income up to 185 percent of the federal poverty level to receive free school lunch.
\textsuperscript{16} NYS Council on Children and Families: Kids’ Well-Being Indicators Clearinghouse. (2013). KWIC Indicator: Children Receiving Free or Reduced-price School Lunch - Public Schools
\textsuperscript{17} NYS Council on Children and Families: Kids’ Well-Being Indicators Clearinghouse. (2013). KWIC Indicator: Children Receiving Free or Reduced-price School Lunch - Public Schools
\textsuperscript{18} Food Research and Action Center. (January 2013). School Breakfast Scorecard: School Year 2011-2012
day and immediately before day’s end. Limited space and a lack of adequate staffing also impede the expansion of school meals. When school breakfast is not incorporated into the school day, parents often find it difficult to arrange for the necessary transportation, particularly low-income families with little flexibility in their work schedules. Further exacerbating each of these difficulties is the lack of awareness regarding school lunch and school breakfast among families with children, and the inability of schools to conduct effective outreach.

Policy Recommendations

- Promote expansion of universal, free school lunch using the available provisions of the NSLP (such as the Community Eligibility Option and Provision 2) to maximize federal reimbursements and minimize cost to state and city governments.
- Create incentives for schools to offer nutritious “grab and go” breakfasts and lunches at cafeteria and hallway kiosks, and incentives for breakfasts and lunches in the classroom.
- Create new funding sources to add more fruit and vegetables to the menu.
- Increase funding for staff coverage during lunch times.
- Provide incentives for schools to increase the number of nutritious meals prepared on-site, which tend to be fresher and more appealing to students and would enable greater flexibility in menu planning, while allowing food service staff to respond more effectively to student preferences.
- Eliminate the sale of competitive food (in snack bars, student stores, vending machines and a la carte lines) during the school day, so as to improve access to school meals and reduce stigma.
- Improve the type and form of USDA commodities that schools receive, particularly by reducing the fat and sodium levels of processed food.
- Ensure that school districts adhere to identification guidelines.
- Encourage schools to schedule lunches as close to midday as possible and to cease scheduling lunches at 10am and 2pm.
- Encourage schools to hold recess before lunch, which allows students to build up an appetite during recess and, consequently, eat more of their lunch.
- Be sensitive to the dietary, cultural and religious preferences and needs of students.

Summer Meals

Although the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) is a federal entitlement program, participation in SFSP is extraordinarily low. In New York State, approximately 259,000 children participated in SFSP in July 2011, only 23.1 percent of the children who receive a free or reduced-price school meal on an average school day.21

Though participation rates in SFSP remain low, the need for this child nutrition program has grown significantly. The number of New Yorkers in poverty has risen more than seven percent between 2007 and 2011.22 During that time, the poverty rate for children under 18 rose from 19.6 percent to 21.2 percent.23

Like school breakfast and lunch, a variety of socioeconomic, logistical and administrative barriers
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circumscribe SFSP participation. Indeed, in New York City, participation in SFSP among households that rely on emergency food differs little from New York’s SFSP participation rate overall. Complicated reimbursement processes that often underestimate program costs deter many providers from opening host sites. Children and parents often have difficulty arranging transportation to SFSP sites, particularly in rural communities and among low-income families with inflexible working schedules. Further exacerbating each of these problems is a lack of awareness regarding SFSP among low-income families with children.

Policy Recommendations

• Provide breakfast and lunch to students enrolled in summer school and create incentives for schools to offer nutritious “grab and go” summer meals in the classroom.
• Create new funding sources to add more fruit and vegetables to the menu.
• Provide incentives for schools to increase the number of nutritious meals prepared on-site, which tend to be fresher and more appealing to students, and would enable greater flexibility in menu planning while allowing food service staff to respond more effectively to student preferences.
• Ensure that the Education Department publicizes the program in a timely fashion by: identifying open school sites early enough to develop accurate lists for early publication, before school recess; reminding parents and students about the availability of summer meals on all school notices; involving principals, teachers and parent coordinators in the promotion of summer meals; and advertising how to access information regarding expanded sites throughout the summer.
• Ensure that flyers and program information are available in a variety of commonly spoken languages, in adherence with state and local language access guidelines.
• Encourage participation by New York State park sites.

Access to Nutritious Food

One method of reducing hunger and improving nutrition in New York State is to address barriers to access. Approximately three million New York City residents lack access to nutritious food. Although this problem affects all communities, low-income neighborhoods experience this lack of availability most acutely. Many local stores in these communities have, if any, a limited selection of fruit and vegetables and maintain inventories of the lowest quality food. Lack of access to fresh food therefore becomes disproportionately severe for those most likely to experience hunger. Not only do these low-income individuals struggle to afford nutritious food, they also face a far more limited supply than individuals living in wealthier communities.

In response to the lack of retail access to nutritious food, New York State created the New York Healthy Food and Healthy Communities Fund, a State-coordinated public-private grant and loan fund to provide needed capital for food retailers in underserved communities.

Policy Recommendations

• Increase grant and loan opportunities available through the New York Healthy Food and Healthy Communities Fund, and develop an outreach strategy to ensure grocers are aware of these opportunities.
• Create a funding source to: encourage food cooperatives in every low-income neighborhood in the state; enhance access to nutrition education in all communities through additional funding and

utilization of existing resources, such as public schools, colleges, senior programs, emergency food programs and community centers; and enable emergency and community food providers to purchase locally grown produce.

- Increase farmers’ markets and Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) projects in low-income communities.
- Adopt transportation policies that would facilitate access to local food and make nutritious local food more affordable.

Financial Policies for Low-Income New Yorkers

Constrained by limited income, it is essential that low-income New Yorkers access existing resources to ensure that they obtain the greatest possible quantity, quality and variety of basic necessities. Financial education and counseling can provide the knowledge and skill set to facilitate these financial decisions. Training programs should emphasize: how to access the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC); lender programs; mortgage lending; predatory credit policies; and other areas of basic financial literacy.

Policy Recommendations

- Offer financial education, counseling and training programs throughout New York State on how to access the EITC; banking services; wages and supplemental income; lender programs; mortgage lending; predatory credit policies; long-term and retirement financial planning; and other areas of personal finance.
- Increase the value of the State EITC.
- Eliminate the use of discriminatory auditing practices for low-income, cash-earning EITC claimants.
- Implement clear and transparent documentation requirements and auditing practices for EITC claimants.
- Develop outreach programs to educate low-income people about EITC, student loan interest deductions and other credits/deductions that might be available to them.
- Change tax forms to allow New Yorkers to apportion deposits of State tax refunds into more than one account (for example, checking and saving).
- Allow New Yorkers to designate all or part of their tax refunds to directly open and fund a 529 college savings account.

Efforts to Reduce Poverty

The anti-hunger community can only eradicate poverty by embracing a holistic approach to the problem and by collaborating with policy advocates in the healthcare, housing and education fields, as well as with all others who combat this multi-faceted socioeconomic problem. With this paradigm in mind, the anti-hunger community lends its support to those seeking: a living wage with benefits; affordable and comprehensive universal health care; career advancement opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed; open and equal access to education and training; the creation and maintenance of affordable housing; affordable, accessible transportation; high quality, affordable child care; a more progressive tax code; and all other forms of socioeconomic uplift. Only this holistic approach is capable of ending poverty, and only by ending poverty will hunger be eliminated.

In addition to supporting each of these aforementioned issues, the anti-hunger community will also engage in long-term anti-poverty efforts that will specifically seek to reduce hunger and improve access
to nutritious food. The goal will be two-fold: to end hunger and, by ending hunger, to help eliminate poverty and all of its manifestations.

**Policy Recommendations**

- Support efforts to increase the minimum wage in New York State.
- Index minimum wage requirements to inflation.
- Promote policies that support a living wage with access to medical benefits and paid time off.
- Adopt policies that make living wage jobs more accessible to low-income people.
- Develop job creation strategies that are geared toward poverty reduction.
- Develop training and education programs that are geared toward poverty reduction.
- Adopt policies that provide adequate training and advancement opportunities for low-wage workers.
- Properly utilize all State funding that is currently allocated to job training programs.
- Continue to invest in economic development that both enhances the nutrition landscape and provides opportunities for employment in low-income communities.

**Pulling New York Back from the Edge of the Hunger Cliff**

Ultimately, pulling New York back from the edge of the Hunger Cliff will take close coordination of federal, state and local government, as well as meaningful partnerships between government and non-profit service providers and advocates. The policy options outlined in this document, however, present a real toolkit for maximizing the resources available to New York to close the meal gap and improve access to nutritious food for vulnerable New Yorkers.
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