**APPENDIX A**

Tables 1A and 1B collect the recommendations and budgetary comments from agencies and interest groups in New York.

Table 1A. Government bodies’ recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Recommendation** | **Budget implications** |
| Department of Social Services | Support | “To the extent that this bill results in increased availability of housing and employment, State expenditures would decrease under State supplementation of the Federal Supplemental Security Income program, and under the State's program of services to aged, blind and disabled persons.” |
| Board of Social Welfare | No objection | Not mentioned |
| Executive Department, Division of Human Rights | Approve | Not mentioned |
| Attorney General | No legal objection | Not mentioned |
| Law Review Commission | Adequately drafted | Not mentioned |
| Industrial Commissioner | Disapproval | “The workload of the State Division of Human Rights will be increased.”  “Enactment of this bill may result in a significant increase of litigation before the board on the issues referred to below [workers’ compensation].” |
| Banking Department | Qualified No Objection | Not mentioned |
| State Department of Civil Service |  | Not mentioned |
| Department of Commerce | No position | “None.” |
| Department of Mental Hygiene | No objection | “The Human Rights Division will undoubtedly require a larger staff to enforce the provisions of this law.” |
| Department of Motor Vehicles | No objection | Not mentioned |
| Insurance Department | No objection | Not mentioned |
| State University of New York | No comment | No comment |
| Executive Chamber, Office of Employee Relations | Oppose | Not mentioned |
| State Consumer Protection Board | Approve | Not mentioned |
| Parks and Recreation | No recommendation | Not mentioned |
| Department of Health | No recommendation | Not mentioned |
| Division of the budget | Approve | $75,000 in estimated additional program cost from the Division of Human Rights; possible savings from the state’s Employment Service, which otherwise accepted job orders for handicapped people and sometimes offered job fairs for them. |
| Department of Human Rights | Approve | Estimated over $35,000 in additional costs for the human rights division and noted that this might be an underestimate. No mention of savings from social welfare programs. |
| Division of Housing and Community Renewal | Approve | “None.” |
| Governor (signing statement) | Approve | Not mentioned |

Table 1B. Input from interest groups

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Recommendation** | **Budget implications** |
| State Council on Architecture | Revisions suggested | No comment |
| State Council of Retail Merchants | In support, with some reservations about the definition of disability. | Not mentioned |
| Hospital Association of New York State | In support | Not mentioned |
| State Association for Retarded Children | In support | Not mentioned |
| New York Chamber of Commerce and Industry | Opposed | Not mentioned |
| Empire State Chamber of Commerce | Opposed | Not mentioned |
| Nassau County Executive | In support | Not mentioned |
| Community Service Society | In support | Not mentioned |
| New York Association for the Blind | In support | Not mentioned |
| Voice for the Handicapped / Health Advocates | In support | “Millions of dollars in public welfare and private support payments to the jobless, disabled or handicapped will be saved by giving them new hope and opportunities for employment, which they desperately seek.” |
| National Federation of the Blind | Approve | Not mentioned |
| Federation of Parents Organizations for the New York State Mental Institutions | In support | Not mentioned |
| New York State Chapter, International Association of Rehabilitation Facilities | In support | “This bill will quickly show cost effectiveness in human and economic terms by slowing down the ‘revolving door’ of readmissions into our State Mental Institutions and help our fellow handicapped citizens to remain in their communities as productive tax-paying members of society.” |
| Community Council of Greater New York | Approve | Not mentioned |
| Niagara Frontier Vocational Rehabilitation Center | In support | Not mentioned: “This is not a money bill but the atmosphere it will provide is extremely important for the well-being and progress of all the disabled in New York State.” |
| County of Rockland Commission on Human Rights | In support | Not mentioned |
| Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association | In support | Not mentioned |
| Bar Association | No view | Not mentioned |
| Council of the City of Rochester | In support | Not mentioned |

**APPENDIX B**

In Appendix B, we show the results of the models in Tables 4–7 in the main text but without the control variables. The presence of controls does not change the substantive estimates.

Table B4. Antidiscrimination enactments (no controls)

**Dependent variable: any disability discrimination enactment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue per capita (thousands of dollars) | 0.085 (0.11) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion unemployed |  | 1.83 (1.59) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending per capita (thousands of dollars) |  |  | 3.19\*\* (1.10) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending as proportion of tax revenue |  |  |  | 3.22\*\*\* (0.91) |
| *N* | 833 | 1124 | 1131 | 833 |

*Notes:*

\* *p* < 0.05; \*\* *p* < 0.01; \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include state and year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered by state.

Models 1 and 4 have fewer observations given limited revenue data.

Table B5. Accommodation enactments (no controls)

**Dependent variable: accommodation enactments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue per capita (thousands of dollars) | 0.10\*\*\* (0.026) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 if previous antidiscrimination enactment, 0 otherwise | – 0.0041 (0.0028) | – 0.00083 (0.0027) | – 0.0014 (0.0028) | – 0.0018 (0.0028) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion unemployed |  | – 0.95 (0.71) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending per capita (thousands of dollars) |  |  | – 0.031 (0.23) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending as proportion of tax revenue |  |  |  | 0.021 (0.28) |
| *N* | 796 | 1,087 | 1,094 | 796 |

*Notes:*

\* *p* < 0.05; \*\* *p* < 0.01; \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include state and year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered by state.

Models 1 and 4 have fewer observations given limited revenue data.

Table B6. Index of enactments (no controls)

**Dependent variable: index of enactments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue per capita (thousands of dollars) | – 0.0051  (0.016) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion unemployed |  | – 1.15  (1.06) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending per capita (thousands of dollars) |  |  | – 0.38  (0.24) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending as proportion of tax revenue |  |  |  | – 0.62  (0.36) |
| *N* | 1,345 | 1,636 | 1,643 | 1,345 |

*Notes:*

\* *p* < 0.05; \*\* *p* < 0.01; \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include state and year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered by state.

Models 1 and 4 have fewer observations given limited revenue data.

Table B7. Litigation incentives (no controls)

**Dependent variable: index of incentive enactments (count of number of incentives in given year)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Revenue per capita (thousands of dollars) | – 0.028\*\*\*  (0.0075) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion unemployed |  | 2.03  (3.42) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending per capita (thousands of dollars) |  |  | 0.13  (0.62) |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Welfare spending as proportion of tax revenue |  |  |  | 0.61  (0.95) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pre-existing accommondation mandate | – 0.076  (0.072) | – 0.081  (0.070) | – 0.076  (0.073) | – 0.078  (0.071) |
| *N* | 653 | 653 | 653 | 653 |

*Notes:*

\* *p* < 0.05; \*\* *p* < 0.01; \*\*\* *p* < 0.001.

Standard errors in parentheses.

Models include state and year fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered by state.