Enhancing the CPS with Administrative Tax Data

Machine Learning Meets Microsimulation

Nikhil Woodruff & Max Ghenis

PolicyEngine

Society of Government Economists
April 4, 2025

POLICY ENGINE

Current Microsimulation Data: A Trade-off

POLICY ENGINE

- Current Population Survey March Supplement (CPS)
  - Rich demographics and program participation
  - Underreports income, especially at top
  - Limited tax information

Current Microsimulation Data: A Trade-off

POLICY ENGINE

- Current Population Survey March Supplement (CPS)
  - Rich demographics and program participation
  - Underreports income, especially at top
  - Limited tax information
- IRS Public Use File (PUF)
  - Accurate administrative tax data
  - No demographics or state ID
  - Restricted access

Data Quality: Why Accuracy and Access Matter

POLICY ENGINE

- More Accurate Policy Analysis
  - Taxes and benefits jointly affect household incentives
  - Need accurate data on both to model behavior
  - Many researchers lack access to key datasets

Data Quality: Why Accuracy and Access Matter

POLICY ENGINE

- More Accurate Policy Analysis
  - Taxes and benefits jointly affect household incentives
  - Need accurate data on both to model behavior
  - Many researchers lack access to key datasets
- Better Understanding of Economic Reality
  - CPS misses top incomes
  - PUF can't show demographic patterns
  - Both limit inequality measurement

Our Solution: An Open Enhanced CPS

POLICY ENGINE

- Machine learning to combine strengths of CPS and PUF:
  - Learn tax patterns from PUF
  - Preserve CPS demographics and program data
  - Optimize weights to match 570 administrative targets

Our Solution: An Open Enhanced CPS

POLICY ENGINE

- Machine learning to combine strengths of CPS and PUF:
  - Learn tax patterns from PUF
  - Preserve CPS demographics and program data
  - Optimize weights to match 570 administrative targets
- Result: First open dataset with:
  - Administrative-quality tax data
  - Rich demographics and program participation
  - Transparent, reproducible methodology

Two-Stage Approach: ML Imputation + Weight Optimization



Figure: Overview of dataset enhancement process

Quantile Regression Forests: Beyond Statistical Matching

- Standard approach: statistical matching or regression
- We use Quantile Regression Forests (QRF) for:
  - Imputing tax variables from PUF
  - Predicting housing costs from ACS
  - Estimating prior year earnings
- Benefits of QRF approach:
  - Captures full conditional distributions
  - Handles non-linear relationships
  - Preserves correlations between variables

QRF Outperforms Traditional Imputation Methods



Figure: Average quantile loss by method, predicting net worth from covariates in SCF

Calibration: 570 Simultaneous Targets

POLICY ENGINE

- Standard approach: constrained optimization
- We use dropout-regularized gradient descent
- Optimizes against 570 targets:
  - IRS Statistics of Income by income bins
  - Tax expenditure reports
  - Program participation totals
  - Single-year age population counts
- Mathematics:

$$L(w) = \text{mean}\left(\left(\frac{w^T M + 1}{t + 1} - 1\right)^2\right)$$

where w are weights, M is characteristics, t are targets

Validation I: Selected Target Comparisons

POLICY ENGINE

	Admin	CPS	PUF	ECPS
Qual Div	$314b	$103b (-67%)	$263b (-16%)	$322b (+3%)
Infants	3.6m	2.8m (-23%)	17.0m (+367%)	4.0m (+11%)
AGI 100-200k	24.2m	29.5m (+22%)	24.3m (+0%)	28.3m (+17%)

- ECPS is best on qualified dividends and infant population
- PUF better on returns AGI 100-200k
- 567 other targets!

Validation II: ECPS Outperforms Both Source Datasets



Figure: Error change from ECPS to better of CPS and PUF

- ECPS outperforms CPS on 63% of targets
- ECPS outperforms PUF on 71% of targets

Validation III: Matching PUF Income Distribution

POLICY ENGINE

Table: Key tax unit-level distributional metrics

Metric	CPS	Enhanced CPS	PUF
Gini coefficient	0.495	0.572	0.570
Top 10% share	0.361	0.425	0.410
Top 1% share	0.085	0.154	0.150

- CPS inequality measures 12-45% lower than PUF
- ECPS inequality within 4% of PUF
- Unlike PUF, ECPS includes nonfilers
- Inequality measured as income after taxes and transfers

Application: Top Tax Rate Reform Analysis

POLICY ENGINE

- Example: Biden's proposed top rate increase
- Would raise rate from 37% to 39.6% above $400k

Table: Projected revenue from top rate increase, 2025

Source	Revenue (billions)
Treasury	$75.4
Enhanced CPS	$75.7
Baseline CPS	$28.7

- Can analyze by demographics, geography, income
- Interactive results at policyengine.org

Unique Capability: Direct Demographic Analysis

POLICY ENGINE

- Direct race/ethnicity analysis without imputation
- Other models use complex methods:
  - CBO: Statistical matching with Census data
  - Tax Policy Center: Multiple copies with reweighting
  - ITEP: Probability assignment based on characteristics
- Our approach:
  - Uses observed demographics from CPS
  - Individual-level rather than tax unit only
  - Enables analysis of intersectional effects
  - Extends to disability, education, etc.

Local Area Matrix Optimization

POLICY ENGINE

- Standard approach: Optimize single weight per household
- For UK local analysis, we optimize a matrix of weights:
  - One weight per household per constituency
  - Allows different households to have different importance in different areas
  - Includes constituency-level targets in gradient descent

$$W = \begin{pmatrix} w_{1,1} & w_{1,2} & \cdots & w_{1,C} \\ w_{2,1} & w_{2,2} & \cdots & w_{2,C} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w_{H,1} & w_{H,2} & \cdots & w_{H,C} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $w_{h,c}$ is the weight of household h in constituency c

US State-Based Matrix Optimization

POLICY ENGINE

- Unlike UK local model, US requires different policy rules by state
- Our approach:
  - Perform calibration separately for each of 51 states (including DC)
  - Propagate national targets to individual states
  - Apply L0 penalty to prune household-state rows for computational efficiency
  - Results in 51 separate weight matrices rather than a single large matrix
  - Reassemble into a single matrix for analysis

$$W_s = \begin{pmatrix} w_{1,1} & w_{1,2} & \cdots & w_{1,D_s} \\ w_{2,1} & w_{2,2} & \cdots & w_{2,D_s} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w_{H,1} & w_{H,2} & \cdots & w_{H,D_s} \end{pmatrix}$$

where $w_{h,d}$ is the weight of household h in district d for state s

PolicyEngine: Interactive Policy Analysis



Figure: PolicyEngine's policy editor interface

PolicyEngine: Interactive Policy Analysis



Figure: PolicyEngine's policy impact interface

PolicyEngine: UK Parliamentary Constituency Choropleth



Figure: PolicyEngine UK showing impact by parliamentary constituency

PolicyEngine: UK Local Area Dashboard



Figure: PolicyEngine UK local area validation dashboard

Implementation: Open Code and Growing Usage

POLICY ENGINE

- Full codebase on GitHub
- Automatic validation dashboard
- Python package for programmatic access
- Web interface at policyengine.org
- Growing research applications:
  - Academic studies
  - Think tank analysis
  - Government agency use
  - Community contributions

Future Work: Geographic Detail and Validation

POLICY ENGINE

- Geographic and data extensions:
  - Calibrate to states and Congressional districts
  - Integrate SCF and CE
- Making contributions more modular:
  - Creating a `microimpute` package (using quantile regression forests)
  - Developing a `microreweight` package (using gradient descent)
  - These packages can be used across different microdata files
  - Planning separate papers benchmarking these new methods against traditional approaches
- Prediction-oriented validation:
  - Backtest
  - Benchmark ML architectures

Thank You

POLICY ENGINE

- Paper: github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us-data/paper
- Code: github.com/PolicyEngine/policyengine-us-data
- Web app: policyengine.org
- Contact: max@policyengine.org