

## Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap

### Methods and Sources

#### 2025 Policy Impact Calculator

*Last Updated: November 7, 2025*

**The purpose of the Policy Impact Calculator** is to compare the level of resources available to a family of three based on each state's actual policy choices using policies in the [Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap](#). This simulation demonstrates the substantial variation in available resources during the critical prenatal-to-age 3 period, based on state policy choices. A state's policy choices do not operate in isolation from one another. Instead, they interact to create a system of support of varying generosity for parents and children.

We simulate the level of resources available annually to a single parent with an infant and toddler, who works full time at a minimum wage job for 40 weeks, takes 12 weeks of leave provided for by the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) following the birth of her infant on January 1<sup>st</sup> and receives paid family leave where available, and who uses a subsidy for their two children to receive center-based child care (9 months of care for the infant and 12 months of care for the 2-year old toddler). Our calculations begin with calculating earnings as the total annual earnings at the state minimum wage, assuming the mother works 40 hours per week for 40 weeks, plus any paid family leave the mother is eligible to receive during the period of 12 weeks of leave. We subtract the family's out-of-pocket costs for child care (child care that charges the equal access target rate, which is the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the state's market rate survey). The family's out-of-pocket costs include any required copayment, plus additional fees if the state's child care subsidy reimbursement rate is less than the price of care at the equal access target. We then add the resources a family would expect to receive from nutrition benefits (SNAP and WIC) and state and federal earned income, child, and child and dependent care tax credits, taking into account any federal or state tax liabilities. States are ranked by the total resources available to our family of three, including showing total resources adjusted for cost of living.

Documentation for each component measure, including sources, assumptions, and data notes, is below. All data in the models are as of October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2025, unless noted otherwise.

#### Annual Minimum Wage Earnings

**Definition:** Total annual earnings from full-time, full-year work at the state minimum wage. Calculated by taking the current state minimum wage and multiplying it by 1,600 hours (40 hours per week for 40 weeks).

#### Notes:

1. In the graphics and on the Policy Impact Calculator dashboard, earned income is shown as annual minimum wage earnings minus out-of-pocket child care expenses, state and federal income taxes, paid family leave premiums, and FICA (Federal Insurance Contributions Act).

**Source:** For detailed source information, please see our [state minimum wage methods and sources documentation for 2025](#). See the sources for measure 1.

### Paid Family and Medical Leave Benefits

**Definition:** In states with a paid family and medical leave program, the benefit a minimum wage earner would receive is calculated based on their earnings and taking the maximum paid leave available in the state.

**Notes:**

1. Hawaii's paid family and medical leave represents Hawaii's Temporary Disability Insurance (TDI) program, which provides medical leave for birthing parents but not bonding leave. Premiums are the maximum permitted by state law, with 50% of benefits considered taxable income.

**Source:** Prenatal-to-3 Policy Impact Center's Policy Evaluation Tracking System. For detailed information on our legislative tracking, please see our [paid family leave methods and sources documentation for 2025](#). Additional information available upon request.

### Out-of-Pocket Child Care Expenses

**Definition:** Families' out-of-pocket expenses include both copayments and additional fees. The following assumptions are made: the infant is enrolled in care for the 9 months following the mother's leave, the toddler is enrolled in care for all 12 months, the price of care is equal to the price of care at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the most recent market rate survey, and the provider receives the base reimbursement rates available for each child in the state. Component parts of this calculation are defined below.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total Cost of Care} &= \text{Base Reimbursement Rate} + \text{Additional Fees (if allowable)} \\ \text{Base Reimbursement Rate} &= \text{State Contribution} + \text{Family Copayment Fee} \end{aligned}$$

1. *Total Cost of Care:* The price of care for an infant in full-time center-based care at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of market rates (also referred to as the "market rate price") in the most populous geographic area in the state. The total cost of care is comprised of three components: the base subsidy reimbursement rate, which includes both the state contribution plus the family copayment fee, and any difference between the reimbursement rate and the total cost of care at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (either charged as an additional fee to the family or an unreimbursed cost to the provider).
2. *State Contribution:* The component of the base subsidy reimbursement paid by the state to the provider. {Base reimbursement = State contribution + Family copayment fee.}
3. *Family Copayment Fee:* The component of the base subsidy reimbursement paid by the family to the provider. {Base reimbursement = State contribution + Family copayment fee.}
4. *Additional Fees Paid by the Family:* The difference between the base subsidy reimbursement rate and the market rate price of care, assumed to be equal to the full price of care charged by the provider to private pay families. In states that allow providers to charge families this difference, this amount is paid by the family to the provider as an additional fee. If the state does not allow providers to charge additional fees, this cost to the family is assumed to be \$0 and the provider is assumed to experience this as an unreimbursed cost.

**Notes:**

1. The reimbursement and market rates used are for the most populous geographic region in the state, as defined in state 2025-2027 Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) plans.
2. Rates and copayment data are as of June 30 of that year. Several states planned changes to their subsidy rate and copayment policies as of October 2025, these changes will be reflected in subsequent updates of simulation data.
3. Colorado, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Mexico, and Virginia all base reimbursement rates on cost estimation modeling and do not provide a 75<sup>th</sup> percentile market rate.
4. In Colorado, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, and New Mexico, additional fees are not allowed, so the family has no additional out-of-pocket expense beyond copayments. In Virginia, additional fees are allowable, but the state

does not provide cost estimation figures for comparison. In the 2025 Policy Impact Calculator, we have assumed \$0 in additional fees, though this may not be the case for all families.

5. In 2025, North Carolina released new 75<sup>th</sup> percentile market rates, but did not start reimbursing at that level. Accordingly, many families will have high additional fees.
6. On the Policy Impact Calculator dashboard, in the child care view of the state ranks page, the full length of the bar equals the total cost of child care without subsidies. This bar is then divided into three parts: value of the subsidy received, copay, and additional fees owed. However, we do not display the additional fee in states where it is not permitted. As a result, the bar length for these states appears shorter than the actual total cost of care.

**Source:** For detailed source information, please refer to the "Sources for Measures 3-6 and 8-10" section in our [child care subsidies methods and sources documentation](#) for 2025. The same sources as used in the Prenatal-to-3 State Policy Roadmap were used for this simulation, but under the assumption of different family income.

### Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Benefits

**Definition:** The maximum annual SNAP benefit available to the simulated family of three as of Fiscal Year 2026. Estimated SNAP benefits are calculated based on the methodology described by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, calculated as maximum benefits less 30% of net income. Net income is calculated based on a number of deductions, including the standard deduction, earnings deduction, dependent care deduction, and an excess shelter deduction.

#### Notes:

1. In certain states where the family income is above the standard eligibility threshold for SNAP (130% of the federal poverty level), the family is still eligible for SNAP benefits due to [broad-based categorical eligibility](#).
2. The values for maximum monthly allotments, the standard deduction, and the maximum shelter deduction are higher in Alaska and Hawaii compared to the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia. Figures in these two states differ due to higher cost of living.
3. The earnings deduction is defined as 20% of earnings.
4. The dependent care deduction accounts for monthly out-of-pocket child care expenses. These costs are estimated using the methodology described in the out-of-pocket child care expenses section of this documentation.
5. The excess shelter deduction is set at the amount by which the household's housing costs (including utilities) exceed half of its net income after all other deductions up to a set maximum. The household's housing costs for each year are assumed to match the 2-bedroom fair market rent in that Fiscal Year according to HUD (the most recent data available at time of publication). The family is assumed to live in the same locality as the most populous geographic region as defined for child care calculations.
6. Child expense and medical deductions are assumed to be \$0.
7. SNAP shelter deduction and SNAP benefits are bottom coded at \$0, to avoid negative SNAP values.

#### Sources:

1. Food and Nutrition Service, US Department of Agriculture (2025). *SNAP – Fiscal year 2026 cost-of-living adjustments*. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/fy-2026-cola>
2. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (2023). *A quick guide to SNAP eligibility and benefits*. Retrieved August 9, 2023, from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/a-quick-guide-to-snap-eligibility-and-benefits>
3. Office of Policy Development and Research, Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.). *FY 2025 Fair Market Rent Documentation System* [Data set]. <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr.html>

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

**Definition:** The estimated annual benefit based on the average monthly food cost per person for Fiscal Year 2025, the most recent data available at the time of publication. In the Policy Impact Calculator, we assume the parent is a mother who is eligible due to the age of the infant.

**Notes:**

1. We assume that the simulated tax filer, Lina, is categorically eligible for WIC if she is eligible for SNAP or Medicaid. We consider the Medicaid income eligibility threshold to be that for pregnant people in all states except Arkansas and Wisconsin because postpartum coverage extends 12 months after birth. In Arkansas and Wisconsin, we consider the Medicaid income eligibility threshold to be that for parents.

**Sources:**

2. USDA Food and Nutrition Service WIC data tables. Average monthly food cost per person. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/wic-program>

### Federal Income Tax

**Definition:** The federal tax owed (if any, after applying nonrefundable credits), assuming the mother files as head of household and takes the standard deduction. Federal income tax is estimated using PolicyEngine, a microsimulation model of the US tax and benefit system. The family's annual earnings, number of dependents, and annual child care costs are entered into the simulator to compute the federal tax liability.

**Notes:**

1. In 2025, the nonrefundable portions of the Child Tax and Child and Dependent Care Tax Credits bring the federal tax liability of the simulated household to zero in all states.

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>

### Federal Earned Income Tax Credit

**Definition:** The value of the federal earned income tax credit (EITC) for tax year 2025 based on annual minimum wage earnings for the simulated family. Federal EITC is estimated using PolicyEngine.

**Notes:**

1. The family is assumed to meet all qualifications to be eligible for the federal EITC.

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>

### Federal Child Tax Credit

**Definition:** The value of the federal child tax credit (CTC) for tax year 2025, based on annual earnings for the simulated family. The federal CTC is estimated using PolicyEngine.

**Notes:**

1. In 2025, the maximum child tax credit is \$2,200 per child, but only \$1,700 per child is fully refundable.

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>

## State Income Tax

**Definition:** The state income tax owed (if any) after applying nonrefundable credits, assuming the mother files as head of household and takes the standard deduction. This measure is calculated using PolicyEngine, which simulates US federal and state income tax systems. The family's annual earnings, and number and age of dependents are entered into the simulator to compute the state tax liability.

### Notes:

1. Our simulated tax filer in Pennsylvania owes no state income tax due to Pennsylvania's Tax Forgiveness program, which allows eligible tax filers to reduce all or part of their Pennsylvania state income tax liability.

### Sources:

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>
2. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Revenue. (n.d.). *Tax forgiveness*. In *PA personal income tax guide*. PA.gov. <https://www.pa.gov/agencies/revenue/forms-and-publications/pa-personal-income-tax-guide/tax-forgiveness>
3. Use taxes may be included as state income taxes.

## State Earned Income Tax Credit

**Definition:** The value of the state's earned income tax credit (EITC) for tax year 2025 based on annual earnings for the simulated family.

### Notes:

1. Most state tax credits are calculated as a percentage of the federal EITC. Only four states (California, Connecticut, Minnesota, Washington) have an EITC that is not calculated as a percentage of the federal credit.
4. California's EITC (CalEITC) is based on a unique calculation, not a percentage of the federal EITC received by the same taxpayer. CalEITC is available to filers who earn less than \$30,950 per year, regardless of household size. The credits phase in and out at different income levels, determined annually by the state legislature.<sup>1</sup> The value for this scenario in the 2025 simulation was calculated using PolicyEngine.
5. Connecticut's EITC is calculated as 40% of the federal EITC, plus an additional \$250.<sup>2</sup>
6. Minnesota's EITC (Working Family Credit) is calculated as 4% of a family's earned income, up to \$369. The credit then phases out in conjunction with the state CTC. For tax year 2025, the phaseout begins at \$31,950 for single filers and \$37,910 for married filers, with the combined credit decreasing by 12% of income above these thresholds.<sup>3</sup>
7. Washington's tax credit is a flat rate based on the number of children.<sup>4</sup>
8. State earned income tax credits in the Policy Impact Calculator are based on the simulated tax filer's state taxable income. State taxable income differs from the federal taxable income in states that do not tax paid family and medical leave (PFML) benefits, because the federal government taxes PFML benefits.

<sup>1</sup> Franchise Tax Board. (n.d.). *California Earned Income Tax Credit (CalEITC): Eligibility and credit information*. California Franchise Tax Board. <https://www.ftb.ca.gov/about-ftb/newsroom/caleitc/eligibility-and-credit-information.html>

<sup>2</sup> Connecticut General Assembly. (2025). *House Bill 7287: An act concerning the state budget for the biennium ending June 30, 2027, and provisions related to revenue and other items implementing the state budget.* <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2025/TOB/H/PDF/2025HB-07287-ROO-HB.PD>

<sup>3</sup> Williams, S. (2025, February). *Minnesota's Child Credit and Working Family Credit*. Minnesota House Research Department. <https://www.house.mn.gov/hrd/pubs/ss/sschldwfc.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Washington State Department of Revenue. (n.d.). *Eligibility*. Washington State Working Families Tax Credit. <https://workingfamiliescredit.wa.gov/eligibility>

**Source:** For detailed source information, please see our [state earned income tax credit methods and sources documentation for 2025](#). See the sources for the progress assessment methodology and measure 1.

### State Child Tax Credit

**Definition:** The value of the state's child tax credit (CTC) for tax year 2025 based on annual earnings for the simulated family.

#### Notes:

1. Colorado's Child Tax Credit is only available for children 5 and younger.
2. In 2024, Colorado introduced the Family Affordability Tax Credit, which provides \$3,200 for each child aged 0-5, and \$2,400 for each child aged 6-16. Single taxpayers earning less than \$15,000 receive the full credit. For single taxpayers, the act reduces the amount of credit by 6.875% for each \$5,000 by which the taxpayer's income exceeds \$15,000. In visualizations that summarize resources across 51 states, Colorado's Family Affordability Credit is combined with the Child Tax Credit.
3. In Massachusetts, families can use either a child tax credit or a child and dependent care tax credit, whichever is greater. In our simulation, we assume that the family claims the child tax credit, which is greater than their child and dependent care credit.<sup>5 6</sup>
4. Minnesota's Child Tax Credit (CTC) phases out alongside the state's Earned Income Tax Credit (Working Family Credit). The total value of both credits is reduced as a taxpayer's income increases. For tax year 2025, the phaseout begins at \$31,950 for single filers and \$37,910 for married filers, with the combined credit decreasing by 12% of income above these thresholds.<sup>7</sup>
5. New Jersey's Child Tax Credit is only available for children 5 and under.
6. In Oklahoma, filers may claim either 5% of the CTC or 20% of the CDCTC, whichever is greater. The CTC is more generous for this household and is included in the simulation.
7. In visualizations that summarize resources across all 51 states, Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend (APFD) is included as a Child Tax Credit, although every individual in Alaska receives the APFD, regardless of age. Accordingly, we simulate all 3 family members as receiving the APFD.<sup>8</sup>
8. State child tax credits in the Policy Impact Calculator are based on the simulated tax filer's state taxable income. State taxable income differs from the federal taxable income in states that do not tax paid family and medical leave benefits.

**Source:** For detailed source information, please see the child tax credit section of our [state earned income tax credit methods and sources documentation for 2025](#).

### FICA (Federal Insurance Contributions Act)

**Definition:** FICA is a US federal payroll tax that is deducted from each paycheck to fund the Social Security and Medicare programs. For tax year 2025, FICA is estimated using PolicyEngine.

#### Notes:

1. FICA is split between the employer and employee. Only the employee's share is included in the simulations.

<sup>5</sup> Massachusetts Department of Revenue. (2025). *Massachusetts Child and Family Tax Credit*. <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/massachusetts-child-and-family-tax-credit>

<sup>6</sup> McCabe, J. (2022). Child tax credit proposal would strengthen state's pro-family standing. *CommonWealth Beacon*. <https://commonwealthbeacon.org/economy/child-tax-credit-proposal-would-strengthen-states-pro-family-standing/>

<sup>7</sup> Williams, S. (2025, February). *Minnesota's Child Credit and Working Family Credit*. Minnesota House Research Department. <https://www.house.mn.gov/hrd/pubs/ss/sschldwfc.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Alaska Department of Revenue. (n.d.). *Permanent Fund Dividend*. <https://pfd.alaska.gov/>

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>

**Total Resources**

**Definition:** The total sum of resources available to a family is calculated as the sum of annual minimum wage earnings, benefits from PFML, SNAP, WIC, federal and state EITCs, federal and state CTCs, and federal CDCTC minus out-of-pocket child care expenses, FICA, and federal and state income tax owed (if any).

**Cost-of-Living Adjusted Resources**

**Definition:** Cost-of-living adjusted resources are calculated by applying the state's 2023 regional price parities index value (the most recent data available at the time of publication) for all items to the total resources calculated as described above.

**Notes:**

1. Regional Price Parities (RPPs) measure the differences in price levels across states and metropolitan areas for a given year and are expressed as a percentage of the overall national price level. All items RPPs cover all consumption goods and services, including housing rents. Areas with high/low RPPs typically correspond to areas with high/low price levels for rents.
2. Cost-of-living adjustments were calculated following the methodology used by researchers with the Federal Reserve Bank of St.<sup>9</sup>

**Sources:**

1. US Bureau of Economic Analysis, "SARPP Real personal income, real PCE, and regional price parities by state" Retrieved on August 19, 2025, from <https://apps.bea.gov/iTable/?reqid=70&step=1&isuri=1&acrdn=8>

## Additional Policy Simulations

In addition to the baseline simulation – which calculates the level of resources available annually to a single parent with an infant and toddler, who works full time at a minimum wage job – the Policy Impact Calculator models 12 alternative scenarios on the baseline data as of September 2025. The purpose of these simulations is to compare the level of resources available to a family of three under different state policy choices. The simulations include state EITC and CTCs, state minimum wage increases, a paid family and medical leave program, and child care policy changes.

Documentation for each component measure, including sources, assumptions and data notes, is below. All data in the models are as of September 30, 2025, unless noted otherwise.

**Earned Income Tax Credit Simulations**

**Definition:** Three different refundable EITCs – 10%, 25%, and 40% of the federal EITC – are simulated across all 51 states, regardless of a state's current EITC status or value or income tax system. If a state has a nonrefundable EITC, it is replaced

---

1. <sup>9</sup> Gascon, C.S. (October 1, 2014). *District overview: Buying power of minimum wage varies across and within states*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. <https://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/regional-economist/october-2014/buying-power-of-minimum-wage-varies-across-and-within-states#endnotes>

with a simulated refundable EITC (10%, 25%, or 40%). The nonrefundable credit and state income tax estimates used for the calculations in this simulation are generated using PolicyEngine.

**Notes:**

1. Illinois's child tax credit (CTC) is calculated as 40% of the state's EITC (which is 20% of the Federal EITC), so the value of the state's CTC changes with the EITC simulations.
2. Arizona is the only state with a nonrefundable EITC where the simulated family claims the nonrefundable EITC because the family has state income tax liability. In all other states with a nonrefundable EITC, the standard deduction brings the simulated tax filer's state income tax liability to \$0. In Arizona, the simulated tax filer's state income tax liability before nonrefundable credits is \$68, and she is eligible for a \$200 nonrefundable dependent tax credit. Although Arizona has other nonrefundable credits that Lina may be eligible for (e.g. the family tax credit and the charitable contributions credit), we assume that her state income tax is brought to \$0 due to the dependent tax credit.
3. Minnesota's EITC jointly phased out with the state's CTC. Combined EITC and CTC credits are reduced by 12% of income above \$29,500. Therefore, simulating an EITC that is different from the state's current EITC could also change the tax filer's CTC at certain income levels. However, because the simulated family's earned income in Minnesota is below \$29,500 at the minimum wage, the CTC remains unchanged.

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>

### Child Tax Credit Simulations

**Definition:** Two child tax credit (CTC) designs – one with a high maximum eligible income and one with a low maximum eligible income – are modeled across all states that do not have a refundable CTC in 2025. If a state has a nonrefundable CTC, it is replaced with the simulated refundable CTC. Nonrefundable credits and state income tax used for the calculations in this simulation are estimated using PolicyEngine.

**Notes:**

1. The high maximum eligible income CTC simulation replicates New Jersey's 2025 CTC structure. New Jersey's child tax credit offers \$1,000 for each dependent child aged 5 or younger. The credit is reduced by \$200 for each \$10,000 above \$30,000 of taxable income and fully phases out at \$80,000.<sup>10</sup> The high maximum eligible income CTC simulation applies these parameters across all states that do not have a refundable CTC.
2. The low maximum eligible income CTC simulation replicates Oregon's 2025 CTC structure. Oregon's child tax credit provides \$1,000 for each dependent child age 5 or younger. Tax filers with annual gross income up to \$25,000 qualify for the full credit. For incomes above \$25,000, the credit phases out proportionally, calculated by multiplying the credit amount by the portion of income exceeding \$25,000 and dividing by \$5,000.<sup>11</sup> The low maximum eligible income CTC simulation applies these parameters across all states that do not have a refundable CTC.
3. Minnesota's CTC jointly phases out with the state's EITC. Combined EITC and CTC credits are reduced by 12% of income above \$29,500. Therefore, simulating a CTC that is different from the state's current CTC could also change the tax filer's EITC at certain income levels. However, because the simulated family's earned income in Minnesota is below \$29,500 at the minimum wage, the EITC remains unchanged.
4. In 2025, in all states where the simulated tax filer is eligible for a nonrefundable CTC, the standard deduction already reduces state income tax liability to \$0, so the nonrefundable credit is not claimed.

<sup>10</sup> New Jersey Legislature. (2023, June 30). *An act increasing the amount of the child tax credit and amending P.L.2022, c.24* (N.J. Chapter 72; P.L. 2022, c.24). State of New Jersey. Retrieved from [https://pub.njleg.state.nj.us/Bills/2022/PL23/72\\_.PDF](https://pub.njleg.state.nj.us/Bills/2022/PL23/72_.PDF)

<sup>11</sup> Oregon Revised Statutes § 315.273 (Qualifying Child of Taxpayer). Oregon State Legislature. Retrieved from [https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors\\_315.273](https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors_315.273)

**Sources:**

1. PolicyEngine. (n.d.). *policyengine-us*. GitHub. <https://github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us>
2. For detailed source information, please see the child tax credit section of our [state earned income tax credit methods and sources documentation for 2025](#).

**Paid Family and Medical Leave Simulation**

**Definition:** Colorado's 2025 paid family and medical leave (PFML) program is modeled across all states that do not have a PFML program implemented as of 2025. This simulation is not applied to states that have implemented a statewide PFML program.

**Notes:**

1. The simulated paid family and medical leave program (Colorado's 2025 PFML program) provides wage replacement based on a worker's average weekly wage. Workers receive 90% of the worker's average weekly wage for the portion of their wages equal to or less than 50% of the state average weekly wage (SAWW); and then 50% of the portion of their wages above 50% of the SAWW. The maximum weekly benefit is capped at 90% of the SAWW. To fund the program, workers contribute a premium of 0.45% of wages. Premiums are capped at \$792.45 annually. This simulation uses state reported SAWWs as of January 1, 2025.
2. Georgia did not report state average weekly wages as of 2025. To calculate the PFML benefit in Georgia, this simulation uses SAWW data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

**Source:**

1. Prenatal-to-3 Policy Impact Center's Policy Evaluation Tracking System. For detailed information on our legislative tracking, please see our [paid family leave methods and sources documentation for 2025](#). Additional information available upon request.
2. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (2024). *Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS) survey*.

**Limited Child Care Copay Simulation**

**Definition:** This simulation limits child care copays to 7% of the family's annual income. In states where the copay is already under 7% of the family's income, the copay remains unchanged.

**Notes:**

1. In the 2025 baseline model, the family's copay was above 7% in Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, and West Virginia. The limited child care copay simulation only applies to these states.

**Limited Annual Additional Fee Simulation**

**Definition:** This simulation assumes that the child care provider is reimbursed at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market rate price and the family pays no additional fee beyond any required copay.

**Notes:**

1. In the 2025 baseline model, the family already pays no additional fees in 27 states either because additional fees are not allowed in the state, or because the state's base subsidy reimbursement rate is higher than the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile market rate. The states where the family paid no additional fees are Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. The limited annual additional fee simulation does not apply to these states.

### Limited Child Care Copay and Annual Additional Fee Simulation

**Definition:** This simulation limits child care copays to 7% of the family's annual income and assumes that the child care provider is reimbursed at the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of the market rate price and the family pays no additional fee beyond any required copay.

#### Notes:

1. In the 2025 baseline model, the family's copay was above 7% in Maine, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, and West Virginia. The limited child care copay portion of this simulation only applies to these states.
2. In the 2025 baseline model, the family already paid no additional fees in 27 states either because additional fees are not allowed in the state, or because the state's base subsidy reimbursement rate is higher than the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile market rate. The states where the family paid no additional fees are Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia. The limited annual additional fee portion of this simulation does not apply to these states.

### Wage Simulations

**Definition:** Six wage levels are simulated across all states: \$10/hour, \$15/hour, \$20/hour, \$30/hour, each state's average weekly wage, and each state's 10<sup>th</sup> percentile wage. A simulated wage is applied to a state only if it exceeds the state's minimum wage (the PIC's baseline income level). In states where the minimum wage is higher than a given simulated wage, the lower wage simulation is not applied. Table 1 (next page) shows the state average weekly wage and the hourly 10<sup>th</sup> percentile wage for each state.

#### Notes:

1. The \$10/hour simulation only applies to 20 states: Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. All other states have an hourly minimum wage that exceeds \$10/hour.
2. The 10<sup>th</sup> percentile wage simulation applies to all states except Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Missouri, and Rhode Island. These states have a minimum wage that is above the 10<sup>th</sup> percentile wage of all earners in the state.
3. The \$15/hour simulation applies to all states except California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, and Washington. These states have a minimum wage at or above \$15/hour.
4. The \$20/hour and \$30/hour and the state average weekly wage simulation applies to all 51 states.

**Table 1 : State Average Weekly Wage and Hourly 10th Percentile Wage by State**

| State                | State Average Weekly Wage | Hourly 10th Percentile Wage |
|----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Alabama              | \$1,130                   | \$11.31                     |
| Alaska               | \$1,297                   | \$16.37                     |
| Arizona              | \$1,363                   | \$15.66                     |
| Arkansas             | \$1,062                   | \$12.79                     |
| California           | \$1,704                   | \$16.95                     |
| Colorado             | \$1,471                   | \$16.14                     |
| Connecticut          | \$1,654                   | \$16.47                     |
| Delaware             | \$1,328                   | \$14.40                     |
| District of Columbia | \$1,809                   | \$18.50                     |
| Florida              | \$1,295                   | \$13.84                     |
| Georgia              | \$1,235                   | \$12.96                     |
| Hawaii               | \$1,192                   | \$14.85                     |
| Idaho                | \$1,073                   | \$13.60                     |
| Illinois             | \$1,431                   | \$14.92                     |
| Indiana              | \$1,241                   | \$13.69                     |
| Iowa                 | \$1,137                   | \$13.64                     |
| Kansas               | \$1,113                   | \$13.12                     |
| Kentucky             | \$1,119                   | \$12.86                     |
| Louisiana            | \$1,127                   | \$10.59                     |
| Maine                | \$1,145                   | \$16.44                     |
| Maryland             | \$1,493                   | \$15.67                     |
| Massachusetts        | \$1,829                   | \$17.21                     |
| Michigan             | \$1,292                   | \$14.22                     |
| Minnesota            | \$1,372                   | \$15.21                     |
| Mississippi          | \$946                     | \$10.63                     |
| Missouri             | \$1,170                   | \$13.73                     |
| Montana              | \$1,084                   | \$13.69                     |
| Nebraska             | \$1,130                   | \$14.04                     |
| Nevada               | \$1,300                   | \$13.25                     |
| New Hampshire        | \$1,426                   | \$15.00                     |
| New Jersey           | \$1,546                   | \$15.87                     |
| New Mexico           | \$1,094                   | \$13.51                     |
| New York             | \$1,757                   | \$16.86                     |
| North Carolina       | \$1,254                   | \$13.27                     |
| North Dakota         | \$1,211                   | \$14.54                     |

| State          | State Average Weekly Wage | Hourly 10th Percentile Wage |
|----------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ohio           | \$1,231                   | \$13.72                     |
| Oklahoma       | \$1,083                   | \$11.49                     |
| Oregon         | \$1,331                   | \$16.60                     |
| Pennsylvania   | \$1,347                   | \$13.59                     |
| Rhode Island   | \$1,257                   | \$14.94                     |
| South Carolina | \$1,134                   | \$11.78                     |
| South Dakota   | \$1,066                   | \$13.88                     |
| Tennessee      | \$1,237                   | \$13.37                     |
| Texas          | \$1,219                   | \$12.52                     |
| Utah           | \$1,284                   | \$14.06                     |
| Vermont        | \$1,175                   | \$16.58                     |
| Virginia       | \$1,463                   | \$14.25                     |
| Washington     | \$1,714                   | \$18.03                     |
| West Virginia  | \$1,067                   | \$11.54                     |
| Wisconsin      | \$1,205                   | \$14.00                     |
| Wyoming        | \$1,177                   | \$13.59                     |