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**Target Population**The target population for this act is the civilian population in the New York. It has been estimated that the amount of people who keep arms, the percentage is one of the highest in New York. They are ranked third after Texas and Oklahoma, and to make sure that these things are taken care off, it is imperative that the cash for guns program must be initiated

**Goal Statement** To make sure that the prevalence of the usage of the guns and arms is controlled in the New York city as well as making sure that the culture of arms is being stopped.

**Objectives** Decreasing the number of arms and ammunitions witnessed in the city vicinity.

**Analysis**

**Goal of the Evaluation/Analysis:**

It has been found out the that to ensure that to control the increased number of arms in the country, the New York state attorney has showed the willingness to buy unwanted arms and guns in the city vicinity. One thing though that must be seen whether such an initiative is going to be beneficial for people in the long run. The bill has been in the working for a long time now and the idea was to make sure that how at least degree of control is supposed to be implemented in terms of the illegal arms and ammunitions in the country. The provision was stated where it was implied that no background check of the people was going to be carried out so that people are encouraged to submit their illegal arms to the authority (Rosenfeld & Decker, 2016).

**Method of Evaluation/Analysis**

To make sure that the usefulness of this program can be realized, in this research it would be seen that how this program tends to work at the actual level and what are some of the salient features of the program (Rosenfeld & Decker, 2016). To analyze the current predicament, it is needed to be looked at that how these programs tend to work out (Ponza et al, 2018). These payback programs are operating that if there is a case that there are fewer guns being operated in the society, it would mean that the crimes and the suicides that would be happening at the point of time are going to be on the lower side. There are going to be fewer cases of deaths due to the arms and ammunitions if the number of arms that are floating among populace are on the lower side. There are many cities now that are offering the payback, but when one talks about such an initiative working in the New York, it must be kept in mind. The empirical evidence or the past prevalence in some of the cities in which these programs have been implemented does not provide a very positive outlook (Rosenfeld & Decker, 2016). In some of the cities such as St Louis and Seattle, even though these programs have been implemented for a very long time, there success has been far from ideal. The crime in these cities have decrease at the greater rates but the buybacks have not been ideal as far as the shape they are needed to be taking. There have been instances when it has been found that the armed robberies have been declined, but other than that, there is not much evidence to prove that these gun control programs are going to be effective in anyway (Ponza et al, 2018). Most U.S. programs are local and scattered, as opposed to national or even statewide. Since guns can easily be transported, isolated efforts amount to bailing the ocean. And bailing with a teaspoon at that. Typical haul per buyback: 1,000 guns. Total guns in the U.S.: 300 million. To put it another way, in 2011 there were 10,000 gun homicides.

**Findings/Results**

There are many empirical reasons for the lack of success of these programs. One of the prime reasons that these programs are not turning out well is that how the gun control policies are being implemented in the United States now. The problem with the United States is that how easily the guns can be transported from one place to the another. What it means is that any isolated effort to make sure that the gun control programs are working at the given point of time, they are not going to be yielding any result to make a substantial difference (Callahan et al, 2016). The other thing that has to be kept in mind is that it is quite unlikely that the criminal who has excess arms at their disposal are going to turn up and claim that they have illegal arms or the arms that they would like to turn up the arms (Wintemute, 2017). So there are some unrealistic expectations on the part of the people if they foresee that just because the number of arms that are witnessed in the community at the given point of time are on the lower side, it is going to have any bearing on the crime rate to say the least. Now, in some parts of the world, where one gets to see certain level of uniformity as far as the laws are being implemented, such an initiative is going to work out well, but in the country and thus it makes the gun control all the more difficult. For any other country, where Federal government has much more say as far as the way legislation is being done, it would imply greater control in terms of how the load management is supposed to be done at the given point of time in terms of how load management is being done (Callahan et al, 2016).

**Policy Options Recommendations**

Now, there is a need among all the stakeholders to realize what are some of the broader policy changes that they need to bring to make sure that the gun control is improved in the United States (Wintemute, 2017). The first thing that must be done though is that the culture must be changed. There are many nations around the world that have pretty much the same gun control laws as the United States but these incidents are not happening there. One of the reasons that such things are not happening over there is since there are structural and cultural changes that are prevent such incidents from happening. The same thing must happen in the United States. Until that gun culture is not changed, no matter what legislation is being brought, the gun control won’t be possible in the United States. With the help of better legislation, more coordination at the level of the Federal government and change in the gun culture, it can be made sure that the better gun control can be achieved. Not only that, there has to be some consistency across the board when it comes to the gun control laws (Callahan et al, 2016). Boston’s sizable gun buyback programs coincided with a decrease in the city’s crime rate, but crime decreased at similar rates in cities without buybacks. A multiyear study of Buffalo’s gun buyback programs found a reduction in armed robbery using guns, but no significant difference in other gun-related crime. And a meta-analysis of gun-related-crime intervention methods found buybacks had the least effect.
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