



WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN MEANS
ROMULUS JOHNSON
CARLA R. SAULS

DATE: August 17, 1999

FEATURE ARTICLES

- ✓ *HUD/VA Bill to be Conferenced After August Recess*
- ✓ *The Real Message Behind the Cuts to HUD's Bill*
- ✓ *HUD Secretary Andrew Cuomo Proposes to Change the CDBG Formula*
- ✓ *Tax Plan Threatens Community Development and Housing Programs for the Poor*
- ✓ *Senate Appropriators Plan to Break Budget Caps*
- ✓ *President Clinton Signs New Executive Order on Federalism*
- ✓ *New GSE Goals Required of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac*
- ✓ *Housing Trust Fund Workbook Available*
- ✓ *HUD News: Issues Guidance on PHA Plan Preparation*
- ✓ *NCDA Notes: NCDA Mourns the Passing of Haron Battle*
- ✓ *Federal Register Notices*
- ✓ *Job Opportunities/Attachments*

HUD/VA BILL TO BE CONFERENCED AFTER AUGUST RECESS

The full House of Representatives was scheduled to consider the FY 2000 HUD/VA appropriations bill on August 4. Due to a death in the family of a member, the vote has been rescheduled until after the August recess. No specific date in September has been set. It is believed that a floor vote could come as soon as September 8, the first day back from recess.

The Senate Appropriation Subcommittee on VA/HUD is scheduled to begin its mark-up on FY 2000 appropriations early in September also.

HUD SECRETARY ANDREW CUOMO PROPOSES TO CHANGE THE CDBG FORMULA

In a meeting held on August 10, at HUD, Secretary Andrew Cuomo said that he would be proposing to change the threshold size of entitlement communities from 50,000 to 25,000 and for entitlement urban counties from 200,000 to 100,000. This change would add 263 cities and 159 counties to the group of entitlements. The amount of funds for these new entitlements would be approximately \$316,000,000, assuming FY 1999 funding levels. Also, this amount would come out of the state portion (30%) of the total CDBG allocation.

HUD would create a new category of CDBG formula funded communities called “**Optional Entitlement Communities**”. This new category will not reduce funds allocated to current urban county and metropolitan city entitlement communities but will allow more communities to receive annual formula funding rather than compete for funds and increase eligibility for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee program.

In general, population thresholds set in 1975 would be adjusted so that communities with the following population size would become eligible:

- cities with a population between 25,000 and 50,000; and
- counties with a population between 100,000 and 200,000

A More Complete Explanation

Certain cities and counties that now apply to their State for CDBG funds will be eligible for recognition as Optional Entitlement Communities and will be able to receive a formula allocation of CDBG funds directly from the Department. The creation of the Optional Entitlement Communities marks the first change and adjustment to the CDBG allocation formula since 1975. This is also significant as it provides for more participation at the local government level in the formula allocations and makes them eligible for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program.

Cities meeting the statistical qualification test for recognition as Optional Entitlement Cities are those with a population of 25,000 or more that are not Metropolitan Cities and are not small city participants in an Urban County. Towns and townships otherwise eligible will be recognized if they have general municipal powers and have cooperation agreements with all villages and other places located in whole or in part within the town/township. Cities that meet the population requirement but are participating in an Urban County will be eligible to become Optional Entitlement Cities if they choose to end their participation in the county at the time the Urban County is up for re-qualification.

Counties not recognized as Urban Counties will be deemed to meet the Optional Entitlement Counties population test if they have at least 100,000 population after excluding the population of any Metropolitan Cities and Optional Entitlement Cities within the county.

The allocation amount for each Optional Entitlement Community will be calculated as a sub-allocation of the 30% State allocation component of the CDBG program. Metropolitan Cities and Urban Counties would continue to share 70% of the CDBG formula funds. The remaining 30%, which has been allocated among the States for use outside Metropolitan Cities and Urban Counties, now will be distributed among the States and the largest cities and counties in the States not participating in the Metropolitan City and Urban County program. HUD would make the grant awards directly to these communities and would administer them under simplified rules that included a simplified Consolidated Plan and with a Technical Assistance program targeted to the special needs of these communities regarding performance monitoring and accomplishment reporting.

About 422 communities would meet the criteria for recognition as Optional Entitlement Cities and Counties based on 1996 population estimates from the Bureau of the Census. These are identified in the attached reports which calculates what the community would have received in FY 1999 if the Optional Entitlement Communities had been part of the CDBG program.

Optional Entitlement Communities have complete discretion about what they may do. The options are to apply to HUD for the amount allocated to them under the CDBG formula. Cities may enter into joint grant agreements with their county (if that county is receiving a formula allocation) if they decide that is the best way to administer the CDBG formula funds being made available. Communities also have the option of not applying for the formula funds and competing in the State program. Amounts allocated to a city or county that does not apply for a grant from HUD will be reallocated to the state in which the city or county is located. Communities that apply for their formula amount will prepare abbreviated Consolidated Plans rather than the full plan submitted by Metropolitan City and Urban County grantees.

If this proposal had been in effect in FY 1999 and all of the potentially eligible communities decided to take their grants, the amount available to the States would have been reduced from \$1.268 billion to \$956 million. The third list summarizes the amount that would have been transferred from each state to optional entitlement cities and counties in the state.

The overall effect of this proposal on the distribution of the CDBG formula program is as follows:

	Before	After
Metropolitan Cities and Urban Counties	70%	70%
Optional Entitlement Cities and Counties	0%	8%
States	30%	22%

For a listing of the affected communities please consult the latest NCDA alert at NCDAonline.org. An asterisk (*) on the county report indicates counties that must include Optional Entitlement Cities to qualify. An asterisk (*) on the city report denotes those cities whose participation will affect county eligibility.

THE REAL MESSAGE BEHIND THE CUTS TO HUD'S BILL

On the face of it, the FY 2000 HUD-VA-IA spending bill marked-up by the House Appropriations Committee on July 30, 1999, authorizes an additional \$2 billion for HUD funding above the department's overall FY 1999 allocation. According to the committee report, in FY 1999 HUD received slightly over \$24 billion in funding; moreover, the House Appropriations Committee recommends that the agency receive increased funding up to \$26 billion in FY2000. A careful analysis of the competing minority (Democratic) response to the spending bill and official report passed by the committee reveals that a number of the creative accounting techniques and other budget "gimmicks" used to keep the bill under the spending caps imposed by the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement has the overall effect of masking some \$900 million in cuts to a broad array of HUD's housing and community development programs.

Basically, to arrive at the purported \$2 billion increase in HUD funding, majority House appropriators assumed HUD's FY 1999 baseline funding to be \$24.079 billion, and then proceeded to add an additional \$214 million dollars in real budget authority to the Housing Certificate Fund. The rest of the "increase" is financed with old "budget authority" recaptured from the phasing out of a one-time rescission and off-sets from last year's budget. In other words, the FY 1999 HUD budget was held artificially low on paper by a number of one time spending off-sets and set-asides found in other areas of the total federal budget. So even though HUD only formally received \$24 billion in spending authority in FY 1999, the agency was given wiggle room to spend nearly 27 billion *real* dollars for its housing and community development programs. To assume a \$24 billion dollar starting point, and then give HUD only \$26 billion in spending authority for FY 2000 is to effectively cut the agency's budget by nearly \$1 billion.

Even though the language of the House Appropriation Committee's majority report doesn't make this plain to see, the \$900 million worth of cuts the Committed voted for virtually every major HUD program does. In addition to a \$250 million across the board cut in CDBG, House Appropriators marked-up a bill that authorizes a \$20 million cut to the HOME program, a \$515 million cut in public housing funds, and, with respect to the Housing Certificate Fund, fails to fund the creation of any new Section 8 and welfare-to-work housing vouchers requested by the Clinton administration. Indeed what amounts to a mere \$900 million cut in HUD program funding relative to FY 1999 allocations surges to \$2.25 billion in cuts if one takes the President's FY 2000 budget request as a funding baseline. As one observer succinctly put it, "in FY 2000 the HUD bill's price tag goes up by \$2 billion but it doesn't provide any money to help even one additional person."

Presently, low-income housing and community development interest groups inside Washington and throughout the nation are debating how to respond to the FY 2000 HUD-VA-IA spending bill, since it clearly fails to fulfill their desire to see full funding for all of HUD's housing and community development initiatives. On Capitol Hill, Representative Janice Schakowsky (D-IL) is actively urging interest groups to join in a movement to pressure her colleagues to vote "NO" on the spending measure, thereby insuring its defeat when it comes to the floor in September.

A number of Congressional Democrats have come to believe that the shape of the FY 2000 HUD-VA-IA spending bill is being "over-determined" by the the Republicans' \$792 million tax cut plan. Reasoning that all the cuts and accounting budget tricks used to keep the bill under the spending caps are being taken to establish a precedent for using substantial domestic spending cuts to finance the tax package, a number of House Democrats feel that the best way to preserve full funding for HUD programs is to kill this bill and force Appropriators to begin anew. Their fear is that if the grassroots low income housing and community development interest constituency does not make its voice heard now, then when any final bill goes to conference housing concerns will be put on the back burner in favor of more vocal concerns.

Along with the U. S. Conference of Mayors and 119 other low-income housing and community development interest groups that make-up the Campaign for Housing and Community Development, NCDA urges all of its members to work with their Mayors and sub-grantees to communicate to their elected federal Representatives the importance of **voting no on H.R 2684**, the FY 2000 HUD-VA-IA Appropriations bill. For information on how to get in touch with your House members during the August 7-September 7 recess, contact NCDA in Washington.

TAX PLAN THREATENS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING PROGRAMS FOR THE POOR

The bulk of the cost of the \$792 billion, ten year tax cut scheme passed by Congress last week results from a proposed 1% across the board tax cut in all marginal income tax rates, the elimination of the so-called marriage tax penalty, reductions in personal and corporate capital gains tax rates, and a host of other miscellaneous provisions dealing with tax cuts for specific business and industry groups, IRAs, employer pension plan contribution exemptions, and new health and elder care deductions. Still, the plan does contain at least two provisions that would prove directly beneficial to developers of affordable housing for low-to moderate-income Americans.

If signed into law, H.R. 2488, dubbed "The Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act of 1999," would raise the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) per capita cap from \$1.25 to \$1.75 over five years, basically at a rate of increase of \$0.10 per year from 2000 through 2004. Thereafter, the LIHTC would be indexed for inflation. H.R. 2488 would also make effective a \$2 million LIHTC small state minimum allocation in FY 2000. A number of related tax credit allocation reform

proposals introduced by Rep. Nancy Johnson (R-CT) are also included in the bill (For more information on these reforms, please see the July 16 *Washington Report*).

Along with the increase in the LIHTC, the tax cut bill authorizes an acceleration of the five-year phased increase in the Private Activity Bond Cap that was passed last year. The private activity bond cap would be the greater of \$55 per capita or \$165 million per state in 2000, increasing in equal increments over the next four years until it reaches the greater of \$75 per capita or \$225 million per state in 2004. The bond cap increase is not indexed to inflation.

Housing is not the only area of assistance to "distressed communities" included in the legislation. On the community/economic development front, the Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act proposes the creation 20 new "renewal communities." Similar in structure to the existing Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community programs, businesses that opt to settle in and employ workers from a designated renewal community would be eligible for an array of tax breaks, including a 100% capital gains exemption for business conducted in a renewal community. The first ten renewal community slots are reserved for existing Empowerment Zone and/or Enterprise Communities. Four of the designated renewal communities must also qualify as economically distressed rural areas. The tax incentives offered under this provision would be effective for a seven year period, from 2001 through 2007.

If one is deeply concerned over the relatively small amount of "additional" provisions for affordable housing and community development programs included in H.R. 2488, these pale in comparison to the damage passage of this tax cutting plan would do to funding for existing affordable housing and community development programs. Like just about every other tax cut plan floated in Congress over the past several weeks, this tax bill is predicated on the maintenance of the federal spending caps imposed in the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. It is these same caps that have already forced allocations to appropriations sub-committees to be \$30 billion less in FY 2000 than in FY 99, effectively compelling House and Senate appropriators to consider making anything from an 8% to a 30% across the board cut in the HUD-VA-IA budget for FY 2000.

But even without a tax deal, the cuts to domestic discretionary spending mandated by the Balanced Budget Act's spending caps only get deeper in FY 2001 and FY 2002. According to the Congressional Budget Office, President Clinton's proposed FY 2000 budget, which stays within the 1997 budget caps, requires a 13% or \$200 billion reduction in non-defense discretionary spending over the next ten years. When you add the Republicans' near trillion dollar tax proposal to the mix, the required cuts to non-defense discretionary spending in the next ten years balloons to over \$775 billion. In other words, under the Republican tax plan, what is now a merely dire situation would become perfectly catastrophic. In theory, at least, all of these very deep cuts would take place while the nation is enjoying its first federal budget surpluses in over thirty years.

Perhaps the most perplexing thing about the current debate raging over what to do with the projected trillion dollar budget surplus is that the surplus projections themselves are based on assumptions which are so rosy as to make them utterly improbable, even absurd. In order to realize the surplus projections being bandied about in Washington, the nation would have to continue its current rate of phenomenal economic growth for the next ten years without any hint of a recession, natural disasters, military emergencies, and, probably the most disconcerting of all, growth in any non-entitlement federal domestic spending, not even for inflation. All of this is to say, H.R. 2488 proposes a massive tax cut with an amount of federal revenue that has not yet and probably never will materialize. So when it comes time pay the bill for Congress's largesse, it will be current federal spending priorities that foot the costs.

SENATE APPROPRIATORS PLAN TO BREAK BUDGET CAPS

Capitol Hill sources report that during an August 4 meeting of key Senate appropriators, Budget Committee Chairman Pete Domenici (R-NM) agreed to a plan to have the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Sub-committee pass out a bill that contains funding levels well above the spending caps imposed by the 1997 Balanced Budget Act. Under the scenario being backed by Domenici, Appropriations Committee Chairman Sen. Ted Stevens (R-AK), and Labor-HHS Appropriations Sub-Committee Chairman Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA), the last section of the spending bill is to contain an across-the board-cut of all the money in the bill that was marked-up over the caps. This cut will be large enough to bring the bill back under the caps. Once the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, however, someone will make a motion to strike this across the board cut from the bill. It is believed that once the bill gets to the floor of the Senate, a motion to strike the cuts and effectively break the caps will be able to attract the 60 votes needed under Senate Budget rules, even if a majority of Republicans elect not to support the proposal.

The underlying rationale behind this complicated maneuver is that it will allow Senate leaders to keep a tight control of the cap breaking process, thereby preventing the flood of new pork-barrel spending amendments that might be introduced if the caps are broken by some other means.

While this particular plan would have no direct bearing on the work of the Senate HUD-VA-IA Appropriations Sub-Committee, it is widely believed that once the caps are broken in one appropriations bill it will be that much harder to maintain them in all others, including HUD-VA-IA. Moreover, if the Senate has already broken the caps on its own, when the two chambers of Congress come together in conference to reconcile their competing versions of the FY 2000 HUD-VA-IA spending bill, a legislative proposal with provisions endorsing higher funding levels is likely to be the one that makes it out of conference and onto President Clinton's desk.

PRESIDENT CLINTON SIGNS NEW EXECUTIVE ORDER ON FEDERALISM

On August 4, 1999, President Clinton signed executive Order 13132, which replaced Executive Order 13083 issued on May 14, 1998. This latest Executive Order on Federalism substantially strengthens the governing partnership between the Administration and state and local governments. The new Executive Order ensures comprehensive consultations and enhanced sensitivity to the concerns of states and local government by establishing requirements that the Federal government must follow as it develops and carries out policy actions that affect State and local governments.

In a letter to the President signed by leaders of the seven major intergovernmental organizations, the Big Seven— a bi-partisan group of state and local officials states, “The executive order constructively responds to the concerns we raised during these consultations and provides to federal agencies strengthened guidance on the importance of federalism and state and local authority.” The official also expressed appreciation to the President for “consulting extensively” with them prior to issuing the new Federalism executive order.

The order directs executive agencies to: (a) closely examine statutory authority supporting any action that would limit the policy making discretion of state and local governments and carefully assess the necessity for such action; (b) construe Federal statutes to preempt state law only where the exercise of State authority directly conflicts with the exercise of Federal authority under the Federal statutes or there is other clear evidence to conclude that Congress intended the agency to have the authority to preempt state law; (c) not submit legislation that would directly regulate the states in ways that would interfere with functions essential to the States’ separate existence; and (d) not attach to Federal grants conditions that are not reasonably related to the purpose of the grant. At the same time, the Order makes clear that federal action is appropriate in the presence of a problem of national scope or significance.

The order also requires each Federal agency to establish an accountable process to ensure meaningful and timely input by State and local officials in the development of regulatory policies that have Federalism implications and, within 90 days of the order, to designate an official in each agency with principal responsibility for the agency’s implementation of the order.

Further, the order requires that, when agencies transmit to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) legislation or draft final regulations with Federalism implications, they certify that the requirements of the order have been met in a meaningful and timely manner.

This order shall supplement but not supersede the requirements contained in Executive Orders: (12372 “Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs”), (12866 " Regulatory Planning and Review”), (12988 “Civil Justice Reform”), and OMB Circular a-19. This order will revoke Executive Orders: (12612 “Federalism”), (12875 “Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership”), (13083 “Federalism”), and (13095 “ Suspension of Executive Order 13038”). For

a complete copy of Executive Order 13132, please contact Carla Sauls at 202-293-7587 or see the attachments to this issue of the *Washington Report* at www.NCDAonline.org .

NEW GSE GOALS REQUIRED OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC

On July 29, HUD announced new increased affordable housing participation goals for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are the two largest sources for financing for home mortgages in the United States. This new policy would require Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to devote 48% of their mortgage purchases next year to loans to low and moderate income people, or to multifamily properties with low and moderate income tenants.

Under the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, the housing goal for Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac was set at 30 percent. The goal rose to 40% in 1996 and increased to 42% in 1997. HUD has now increased the goal to 50%. The percentage will first increase to 48 percent in 2000, and then to 50 percent in 2001. The nation's two largest housing finance companies will now be required to buy \$2.4 trillion in mortgages over the next 10 years to expand affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income families. This new policy is expected to assist approximately 28.1 million families over the next ten years.

In addition to raising this goal, two other Congressionally mandated goals will also be increased, including a special affordable housing goal for families with very low incomes and low incomes (those with less than 60% and 80% of the area median) which jumps from the current 14% to 20% (a 43 percent increase) and a geographically targeted goal for underserved areas (central cities, rural areas, and underserved communities based on income and minority concentration) which increases from 24% to 31% (a 29 percent increase). The revised goals are subject to the rule making process and public comment

HOUSING TRUST FUND WORKBOOK AVAILABLE

The Housing Trust Fund Project of the Center for Community Change has developed a workbook to assist governments and advocates in creating housing trust funds. The Housing Trust Fund Project is a special project of the Center for Community Change. The Project acts as a clearinghouse of information on housing trust funds throughout the United States and assists organizations and agencies working to create, implement or expand these funds. The workbook focuses on experiences from existing housing trust funds and provides guidance to those entities interested in taking the first steps to create a housing trust fund. The workbook covers such topics as developing housing trust fund revenue sources, designing a housing trust fund, and administering the fund once it is created. Housing trust funds have been used across the country to provide a dedicated revenue source for affordable housing. There are nearly 150 housing trust funds in cities, counties and states. The cost of the workbook is \$10 and can be ordered from the Publications Department of the Center for Community Change, 1000 Wisconsin Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20007. Their web site address is www.communitychange.org

HUD NEWS

HUD ISSUES GUIDANCE ON PHA PLAN PREPARATION

Last October, Congress enacted the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998. This legislation made major changes to the framework of the existing public and assisted housing programs. Section 511 of the Act requires public housing authorities for the first time to develop a five-year public housing agency plan, along with subsequent annual plan updates. The five year plan describes the mission of the PHA and the agency's long range goals for achieving its mission over the ensuing five year period. The annual plan provides more up-to-date information on the agency's operations and its plans for addressing the public and assisted housing needs of the community in the coming year. HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing has prepared instructions for public housing agencies to follow in drafting their plans, including a template of the plans to be submitted. The template is available at www.hud.gov/pih/pihnew.html

Many PHAs have already started preparing their first five-year plans. PHA plans are due to HUD 75 days prior to the start of the PHA's fiscal year. HUD has extended the due date for submission of PHA Plans for PHAs with fiscal years beginning on January 1, 2000 from October 18, 1999 to December 1, 1999. As reported previously in NCDA's *Washington Report* newsletter, the Act requires State and local government written certification that the PHA plan is consistent with the jurisdiction's consolidated plan. The certification consists of a signed acknowledgment that the PHA plan is consistent with the consolidated plan (see attached certification). If the PHA is located in more than one jurisdiction, it must include a certification from each appropriate official that the PHA plan is consistent with that particular jurisdiction's consolidated plan. PIH Notice 99-33 (pages 18-20), issued on July 30, 1999 by HUD, describes in more detail the required consistency and collaboration between the PHA Plans and the Consolidated Plan. This notice can be accessed at www.hud.gov/pih/publications/notices/pih99-33.pdf

NCDA NOTES

NCDA MOURNS PASSING OF HARON BATTLE

NCDA is sad to report the passing of Haron Battle, a long time legislative advocate for housing and community development interests. Haron lost his fight with lymphoma on August 1. Haron was an Associate Legislative Affairs Director for the National Association of Counties, where he worked on housing and community development issues, including CDBG and HOME, since the early 1980s. He was a long time friend and partner of NCDA, as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National League of Cities, the Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, and the National Association for County Community Economic Development in supporting increased funding for CDBG and HOME and ensuring these two vital programs remained intact.

Besides his devotion to his work, Haron served on the Board of FLOC (For the Love Children), a nonprofit organization dedicated to the interests of children. He was also a founding member of the Thurgood Marshall Center in Washington, D.C., and served as assistant pastor at his church in Washington, D.C. Haron was also known widely for his annual Martin Luther King, Jr. birthday celebration each January, which attracted hundreds of people to his home to celebrate the legacy of Dr. King. In May, Haron was honored with the Community Development Achievement Award from NaCO, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, NCDA, and HUD for his dedication to community development. In July, Haron received the Roy D. Hoover award from the National Association of County Community Economic Development, their highest honor. Haron was a kind and humble individual that preferred not to talk about his "good works." We will remember him for his great sense of humor, his volunteerism, and most of all, for his ardent passion to the field of housing and community development.

The National Association of Counties is planning a memorial for Haron in mid-September in Washington, D.C. For further information, contact 202-393-6226.

CDBG 25th ANNIVERSARY/NATIONAL CD WEEK PRODUCTS INFORMATION

CDBG 25th Anniversary products are still available to assist communities with their celebrations. Please note that **25TH ANNIVERSARY LOGO STICKERS ARE STILL AVAILABLE** for purchase at \$100 per roll of 1,000 stickers. NCDA has depleted its supply of CDBG postcards and posters. T-shirts, hats, mugs, sweat-shirts, tote-bags and puzzles are still available. It will take approximately 30 days to receive products.

MARK YOUR CALENDARS FOR A 25TH ANNIVERSARY EVENT IN CHICAGO: SEPTEMBER 17

NCDA, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, and the City of Chicago is sponsoring a CDBG 25th Anniversary Event in Chicago on September 17, in conjunction with the annual meeting of the State of Illinois Municipal League. Please come join us in celebrating the most successful block grant program of our time. See the attached letter from U.S. Conference of Mayors Executive Director, Tom Cochran, and hotel information and registration form.

Lest we forget: This week, August 22, 1999 marks the 25th anniversary of President Gerald R. Ford's signing of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, which created the most successful community development program of our time, the CDBG Program!!!!

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

August 11, 1999. Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs: Change in Effective Date. This document advises the public that the interim rule published on May 14, 1999, which provides for the complete merger of HUD's Section 8 tenant-based Certificate and Voucher programs into a new Housing Choice Voucher Program, will take effect on October 1, 1999.

August 10, 1999. Notice of Funding Availability: Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Program. The purpose of ROSS is to link services to public and Indian housing residents by providing grants for supportive services, resident empowerment activities and activities to assist residents in becoming economically self-sufficient. Approximately \$66.6 million is being made available for the ROSS Program under this NOFA. Completed applications are due to HUD on or before September 9, 1999 for Service Coordinators; October 12, 1999 for Resident Management and Business Development, and for Capacity Building and/or Conflict Resolution; and November 8, 1999 for Resident Service Delivery Models. Eligible applicants include public and Indian housing agencies, resident management corporations, resident councils, and non-profit organizations that administer programs benefitting public and assisted resident organizations.

August 6, 1999. FY 1999 Super Notice of Funding Availability; List of High Performing Empowerment Zones and Empowerment Communities. This notice provides a list of high performing empowerment zones and enterprise communities. The list includes the following Ezs/ECs:

August 6, 1999. Public Housing Rent Policies; Guidance Pending Publication of Final Rule on Admissions and Occupancy Requirements. This notice provides guidance on certain admissions and occupancy requirements for those public housing agencies that must implement changes in the United States Housing Act of 1937 regarding rents that are effective October 1, 1999.

August 6, 1999. Notice of Distribution of Funds to Address Unmet Needs Resulting From Presidentially-Declared Disasters. FEMA announces the allocation of Fiscal Year 1999 funds for grants to States to address disaster-related needs not met by Federal disaster relief programs. The amount of \$230 million is available to certain States for use in communities that have experienced Presidentially declared major disasters in FY 1998 and/or FY 1999. The funds will be allocated to States for distribution in communities affected by disasters.

August 6, 1999. Lead; Requirements for Lead-Based Paint Activities in Target Housing and Child-Occupied Facilities; Certification Requirements and Work Practice Standards for Individuals and Firms; Amendment. EPA is amending the procedural requirements for training and certification of workers involved in lead-based paint activities in target housing and child-occupied facilities by extending the effective dates for certification of individuals and firms and

use of work practice standards that are contained in the final regulations promulgated under section 402 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). The extension applies only in those States and Indian Tribes where EPA is operating the Federal lead-based paint program. EPA is extending these effective dates in order to provide additional time for individuals to become trained and certified to conduct lead-based paint activities safely, reliably, and effectively. EPA believes that the extension of the effective dates will result in successful implementation of the Federal program and ensure the availability of a well-qualified workforce to perform risk assessments, abatements, and other lead-based paint activities.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES/ATTACHMENTS

- **Certification by State or Local Official of PHA Plans Consistency with the Consolidated Plan**
- **Executive Order 13132**
- **Call for Membership Information Updates**
- **Request for Proposals: Anaheim Housing Authority**
- **USCM/NCDA/NACo Invitation to a CDBG 25th Anniversary Event in Chicago**