NCDA
WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN MEANS
ROMULUS JOHNSON
TAMIKA MCRAE

DATE: July 18, 2000

NCDA Executive Symposium, October 12-15, 2000, Tucson, AZ

FEATURE ARTICLES

APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE

Time is ticking down to the final hours of negotiation on the 13 appropriations bills. In eight short days, Congress will be out of session for their annual summer recess. When they return on September 5, only four weeks will remain in this congressional session to get the bills to the President in time for the scheduled October 6 adjournment. Congress is making little progress on passing the 13 spending measures, although the appropriations chairs are screaming to have all of the spending bills to the President by the August recess. Says Rep. C.W. "Bill" Young, Chair of the House Appropriations Committee, "...We're getting to the end. We're at the point now where it's time to figure out exactly what it takes to get the bills passed and signed."

That hint of desperation signals that at least some Republicans leaders may be ready to negotiate with fellow Democrats, and with the President to get the bills passed.

Something that may get the process moving is a bigger budget surplus. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released its latest budget estimates on Tuesday, July 18. CBO's projections show non-Social Security surpluses of nearly $102 billion in FY 2001, up from $15 billion estimated by CBO in January, and nearly $2.2 trillion over the next 10 years. Fiscal conservatives want to devote the surplus strictly to tax cuts and reducing the national debt. In fact, the House voted on a measure (HR 4866) this week to apportion $25 billion of the FY 2001 budget surplus for debt reduction. Congressional Democrats are also supportive of reducing the national debt, but also want discretionary spending increased. President Clinton has asked Congress to increase FY 2001 discretionary spending from the $600 billion allowed by the FY 2001 budget resolution's spending caps to $614 billion.

The House of Representatives is on schedule to pass all of its 13 spending measures by the August recess. All but two bills – the Treasury-Postal and District of Columbia bills – have already been passed, and these remaining two bills will likely be passed this week. The Senate is far behind the House in passing its 13 spending measures, with only four bills having been passed – Labor-HHS-Education, Military Construction, Defense, and Transportation. The Senate hopes to complete all but the Treasury-Postal bill, the VA-HUD bill, and the District of Columbia bill by the August recess.

President Clinton signed the FY 2001 Military Construction appropriations bill (H.R. 4425) last week. Included as part of the supplemental appropriations language in this measure is a provision which provides $6.2 million to fund those "Continuum of Care" homeless assistance projects that were not funded by HUD in FY 1999.

TAX CUT AGENDA ADVANCES AS SURPLUS ESTIMATES RISE

Buoyed by new estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, which double the non-social security federal budget surplus to a whopping $2.174 trillion over the next ten years and projected the FY 2000 discretionary surplus at $82 billion, yesterday, in the Senate, Republican leaders shepherded toward passage a GOP sponsored marriage-tax cut proposal. The vote was 61-38; 8 Democrats broke ranks to support the measure.

Dubbed "The Marriage Tax Relief and Reconciliation Act of 2000," the bill proposes to cut taxes for all married couples by adjusting their tax brackets and increasing their eligible deductions to twice that of single tax payers. There are also provisions in the bill to expand eligibility for the earned income tax credit among lower-income married couples. The measure is expected to cost $248 billion over ten years. In February, the U.S. House of Representatives passed its own version of marriage penalty tax relief scored at $182 billion over ten years.

According to estimates from the U.S. Treasury Department, 48 percent of joint filers currently pay a so-called marriage penalty, the average of which is $1,141 yearly. Not surprisingly, eliminating the marriage penalty is proving to be a popular objective with both parties. Despite their reservations over the size of the tax cuts proposed by congressional Republicans, as well as their on-going criticism that its benefits were too skewed toward well-to-do couples (most of whom pay little or no penalty at all), during the House vote 65 Democrats crossed party lines to support the measure. The final vote in the House was 268-158, a veto proof majority. Such a majority did not emerge in yesterday's Senate vote.

Previously, in late June, President Clinton floated the idea of an even trade with Republican leaders. In exchange for signing into law a $250 billion dollar marriage penalty proposal, they would approve his plan to add a prescription drug plan to medicare. Thus far, congressional Republicans have not expressed any interest in pursuing negotiations with the Administration along those lines. The White House has stated over and over again that unless Congress accepts Mr. Clinton's prescription drug plan, he will veto any tax bill that crosses his desk.

In related news, earlier this week the Senate also passed a bill to phase out the federal estate tax on a vote of 59-39. Nine democratic senators lent their support to the measure–still seven votes short of the number of votes needed to override a threatened presidential veto. The bill phases out the estate tax over a ten year period. The government would lose $105 billion dollars in revenue over the first ten years of the phase out, but each year after that the cost of the repealing the tax would balloon to $50 billion or more. An estate tax repeal already cleared the House in exactly the same form on June 9, 2000, when once again a surprisingly high number of Democratic legislators crossed the aisle to help push it through.

The Treasury Department asserts that 98 percent of estates already avoid taxes altogether because the first $675,000 of an estate is exempt from any federal tax whatsoever, and under current law this exemption is due to rise to $1 million by 2006. Moreover, with even rudimentary planning, most estates can be shielded from any tax up to a value of $1.38 million.

Citing this statistic and the fact that the cost of the tax cut could explode to more than $750 billion after ten years, as well as the fact that the fully half of the benefits of the tax cut would accrue to the 2,998 wealthiest families in America, President Clinton issued a strong veto threat from his retreat at Camp David, Maryland. He stated in no uncertain terms that he felt that all of the various tax plans being floated by Congressional Republicans were "reckless" and "irresponsible."

It is no accident that Republicans are attempting to push through a spate of new tax cut proposals just now. It is all part of a deliberate strategy to break-up last year's ill-fated $800 billion dollar omnibus tax cut bill into smaller chunks that are more palatable to moderate House and Senate Democrats facing tough races in November, and, even more important, the American public, which has cast a weary eye on seemingly out-sized tax bills. Congressional Republicans also think that the image of President Clinton vetoing such popular items as a "marriage penalty" tax cut and a "death tax" cut– their term for inheritance and estate taxes– will only further highlight the differences between the two parties, thereby giving them a boost before their national convention in Philadelphia.

SENATOR ALLARD RELEASES DRAFT HOUSING BILL

Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO), Chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, informally released a draft of the "Local Housing Opportunities Act," a housing bill he and his staffers have been working on for months. In a public statement, Senator Allard said, "This legislation is the product of over a dozen congressional hearings conducted in Washington and around the country over the last year and half. [*NCDA testified before Senator Allard's Committee in April.]* I believe many of the solutions to our housing problems are not found in Washington, D.C., but rather in our local communities. What works in New York City is different than what works in Denver, Colorado or Seattle, Washington. The one size fits all approach that HUD currently uses no longer works." Senate Allard is seeking comments on the draft measure which NCDA and other parties have provided comments. Senator Allard is expected to introduce the bill before the August recess.

The bill recommends several changes to program areas within HUD. First, it eliminates over 40 programs within HUD that were authorized by Congress at one time – or created within HUD without congressional approval – but never provided funding. Second, it makes a major recommendation to block grant some program areas within HUD, such as the homeless assistance programs and the public and assisted housing programs. Third, it reauthorizes several existing programs and proposes some new changes, or "fixes," to some of HUD's existing programs. Finally, it contains a "Sense of the Congress" statement in support of increasing the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and State private activity bond cap, and includes language prohibiting lobbying by HUD.

Besides eliminating several programs within HUD that were never provided funding by Congress, Allard's draft measure proposes the creation of a "HUD Consolidation Task Force" whose purpose is to reduce the number of existing programs administered by HUD through consolidation, elimination, or transfer to other Federal departments or State and local governments. Members of the task force would include the Secretary of HUD, the Comptroller General of the United States, and HUD's Inspector General.

In terms of re-authorizations and program changes, Allard's draft bill reauthorizes the CDBG program at $4.850 billion for FY 2001 and prohibits any set-asides within the program. The draft bill also would require HUD to immediately notify a local government of an opt-out of an owner from the Section 8 program as soon as it receives notice. This will remedy the problem many local governments have faced in trying to save these properties with little notice to do so. The bill would also require HUD to sell properties within its portfolio that haven't sold within six months to local governments and community development corporations who are interested in purchasing these the properties and using them for affordable housing. The bill would also permanently authorize the Moving to Work Program, which is currently a demonstration program.

At the urging of NCDA and the other local government interest groups, the draft bill would consolidate HUD's homeless assistance programs into a McKinney Homeless Assistance Performance Fund, a block grant that would be formula allocated, based on the CDBG formula, to state and local governments. Local governments would receive 70% of the block grant and States would receive 30%. The draft bill requires each recipient to pass on at least 50 percent of its allocation to nonprofit organizations. The Secretary may waive this requirement if there are not enough, or any, qualified nonprofit organizations in the jurisdiction. The bill directs HUD to work with the national interest groups to develop a permanent formula that would replace the CDBG formula within a year, including an evaluation and recommendation on changing the formula share to 75/25, with local units of government possibly receiving 75% of the allocation.

In order to protect those applicants that have received allocations annually through HUD's "Continuum of Care" process, the draft bill institutes a graduated minimum allocation process. Under this process, grantees that have received funding through the "Continuum of Care" process would receive not less than 90% of the average amount of funding received during FY 96-99 in the first fiscal year after enactment of this bill; not less than 85% in the second year; not less than 80% in the third and fourth years; and not less than 75% in the fifth year. These average amounts do not include allocations for Shelter Plus Care and Section 8 Moderate Rehab for SROs. NCDA would like to see these two programs included in the allocation scheme.

The draft measure would codify HUD's "Continuum of Care" process, which NCDA and other interest groups view as a successful system for identifying and addressing homeless needs on a community level. As under the existing "Continuum of Care" system, the assistance can be administered by the local government, a public agency or a nonprofit organization. The draft measure leaves this decision to the grantee (State or local government) to decide which entity will take the lead in administering the assistance. The draft measure requires the State or local government to appoint a homeless assistance board to develop the "Continuum of Care" application. The board would also be responsible for overseeing the activities carried out with the assistance and preparing the annual performance report to HUD concerning the use of the funds. The application would be submitted as part of the State or local government's Consolidated Plan. The annual performance report submitted to HUD would contain an assessment of the grantee's performance as measured against any specific local performance measures, the national performance measures and benchmarks established by HUD, and such other information as HUD requires. The performance measures will focus on the number of homeless individuals who transition to self-sufficiency, and a measure of the number of homeless individuals who have ended a chemical dependency or drug addiction. NCDA would like to work with its members in establishing a set of national performance measures.

The draft bill authorizes $1.050 billion for the McKinney Homeless Assistance Performance Fund in FY 2001, $1.070 billion in FY 2002, and $1.090 billion in FY 2003. NCDA views these levels as too low. NCDA supports an initial allocation level of $1.2 billion in FY 2001, and greatly increasing the level in future years in order to truly make an effort at combating homelessness.

All of the existing eligible activities under HUD's homeless assistance programs would be eligible under this block grant. The draft measure proposes a 10 percent administrative fee to grantees. Two percent of a grantee's allocation can be used for capacity-building activities for non-profit organizations. Grantees must provide a match. For every $3 received under the allocation, grantee's must provide a $1 match. Match resources can include: (1) any funds other than assistance provided through the block grant, or any homeless assistance currently provided by a State or local government; (2) the value of any lease on a building; and (3) any salary paid to staff or any volunteer labor contributed to carry out the program.

The national interest groups representing the homeless advocates are staunchly opposed to this draft measure, as well as H.R. 1073, a somewhat similar bill introduced by Rep. Rick Lazio (R-NY) last year. These advocates are opposed to block granting the funds to State and local governments, viewing such a move as taking away nonprofit control and input into designing and implementing homeless assistance systems at the local level.

Title V of the draft measure requires HUD to solicit comments and recommendations regarding changing the section 8 program to promote increased participation by private rental housing owners. Allard and other congressional members are worried about the slow utilization rate of the 110,000 incremental section 8 vouchers appropriated by Congress in the last two fiscal years and want HUD to more quickly get the vouchers on the streets. Title VI of the measure requires HUD to coordinate public housing assistance with State welfare reform work programs. This portion of the draft bill also allows a public housing agency, in lieu of providing monthly section 8 rental assistance to a tenant, to provide the Section 8 assistance in the form of a single grant to be used as a contribution toward a downpayment for a home.

Senator Allard proposes major reforms of HUD's public and assisted housing programs in Title VII of the draft bill by block granting these programs and allowing State governments the option to administer these funds directly. States interested in administering these funds directly would be required to enter into a 5-year performance agreement with HUD and would be required to meet certain performance goals over this time period. States would receive the assistance in the form of a formula allocated block grant. A participating State would receive the highest level of funding for the three years prior to the first year of the performance agreement. This level will be increased each year by the annual cost-of-living adjustment.

Since this congressional session is almost at an end, don't expect this bill to be enacted this year. Allard's staff have confirmed as much. However, provisions of the bill could be tacked on to the FY 2001 VA-HUD appropriations measure, or some other measure, and enacted. We'll keep you posted.

SENATE HOLDS HEARING ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING LEGISLATION FOR SENIORS

Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO), Chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, and Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA), held a hearing on S. 2733 – The Affordable Housing for Seniors and Families Act – which was introduced by Sen. Santorum on June 15, 2000. The bill makes several recommendations regarding the preservation of assisted housing for low-income seniors, disabled persons, and other families. A major portion of the bill provides matching grants to State and local governments to preserve affordable housing at the local level. A mark-up of this bill has not been scheduled yet; however, Washington pundits think that some portions of the bill may be added to the FY 2001 VA-HUD appropriations bill with or without a mark-up. Stay tuned.

SECRET DEAL THREATENS BROWNFIELDS REFORM; CO-

SPONSORS NEEDED

Members of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee received a rude awakening on the morning of Saturday, July 1, when a headline on the front-page of *The Washington Post* revealed that Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) had worked out a secret deal with Idaho Senator Michael D. Crapo (R) to block any legislation dealing with brownfields reform or any other Superfund related environmental clean-up issues.

The proverbial smoking gun was the copy of a leaked letter from Majority Leader Lott to Senator Crapo in which Lott writes:"*In exchange, I have agreed to use the privileges of my position as majority leader to ensure the following: no Brownfields proposal or Superfund liability exemption or limitation proposal . . . will be allowed to be considered or acted upon by this Congress, either as a stand-alone bill or as part of any other legislation."*

What did Senator Crapo do for Senator Lott "in exchange" for the commitment to stall brownfields reform? Earlier in the year, Michael D. Crapo acquiesced to the passage of a environmental provision exempting the scrap metal industry from having to comply with the Superfund hazardous waste site law. Under the Senate's rules, at the time Senator Crapo could have ruled Senator Lott's scrap metal exemption amendment out of order, effectively killing it. But since he declined to do so, Senator Lott agreed to reward him by guaranteeing that no other forms of stand-alone environmental clean-up liability relief would be taken up in the Senate this year. According to estimates from the Congress-ional Budget Office, this exemption could be worth as much $700 million to scrap metal dealers nationwide.

At the heart of the Lott-Crapo deal is a broader struggle in the Congress over reforming the much maligned Superfund law, which in its present from requires the government to recover the cost of cleaning-up hazardous waste sites from the entities or land-owners that presumably polluted them in the first place. The liability provisions of the Superfund law have proven to be a real burden to, among others, numerous large mining interests in Idaho. It is widely understood that Senators Crapo and Lott are determined to hold comprehensive Superfund reform hostage until a majority of Senators and the White House agree to provide broad liability and regulatory relief to the range of large industry groups that are responsible for creating some of the nation's most dangerous clean-up sites. This is something congressional Democrats and President Clinton are determined to oppose. In contrast, there is wide bi-partisan agreement on what can and should be done to rehabilitate urban and rural brownfields, which are smaller and decidedly less contaminated hazardous waste sites. One environmental lobbyist characterized the strategy being pursued by Senator Crapo as refusing to help the relatively innocent in order to benefit the most guilty.

Apart from the obvious unsavory appearance of the agreement between Lott and Crapo, their compact remains a direct threat to the bi-partisan effort that is being propelled by virtually every member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee to win passage of S.2700, 'The Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act. Briefly, S. 2700 resolves a lot of the knotty liability issues that have dissuade private developers, commercial banks, and others from investing in the reclamation and reuse of brownfields in inner-city and economically distressed rural areas all over America. The bill also provides up to $150 million annually in federal grant funds to help local communities assess and clean-up their contaminated brownfields sites. One thing S.2700 does not do, though, is address the liability needs of owners of larger, more toxic National Priorities List Superfund sites that are being championed by Senator Crapo and Senator Lott. (To learn more about the specific provisions of S. 2700, please see the June 30 edition of *The Washington Report*).

At present, fifty-two Senators (21 Republicans and 31 Democrats) are signed on as co-sponsors of S. 2700. Veteran Hill observers believe that at least sixty-one co-sponsors will be needed to force Majority Leader Lott to break the hold he has put on the bill. In conjunction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National league of Cities, NCDA urges all of its members to contact their U.S. Senate delegations and urge their Senators to sign on as co-sponsors to S.2700. Attached to this issue of *The Washington Report* is a list of the U.S. Senators who have already signed on as co-sponsors of the bill. If you don't see both of your U.S. Senators on this list, please contact that missing senator's office and let them know your community needs and wants them to support. S. 2700.

COMMUNITY RENEWAL DEAL STALLS/APICS NOT AUTHORIZED

In late May, the White House and House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert announced that the Administration and key congressional leaders had struck a deal on the outlines of a comprehensive New Markets-Community Renewal Act to promote private sector investment in America's economically distressed and underserved communities. The bill is supposed to include everything from a hike in the low-income housing tax credit, and a new round of empowerment zones, to tax credits geared at the financial services industry and regulatory relief for small businesses. Hopes were high that the compromise legislation could be drafted and on the President's desk within a month. Apparently, someone forgot to share these aspirations with House Ways & Means Committee Chairman Bill Archer (R-TX). Chairman Archer's committee must mark-up and approve the compromises broad array of tax incentives before any final bill can go to the House floor. Thus far, he has been unwilling to schedule a final mark-up of the bill.

Ironically, the main sticking point that has held up progress on the New Markets-Community Renewal bill is the low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC), which is generally thought to be the most innocuous and widely supported feature of the entire package. At various times throughout the 106th Congress, bills to increase the low-income housing tax credit have attracted as many as 300 hundred co-sponsors in the House and over 75 co-sponsors in the Senate.

At the heart of the dispute is a disagreement not over whether to increase the LIHTC but by how much and how quickly. In his FY 2001 budget request, President Clinton proposed an immediate increase in the LIHTC cap to $1.75 per capita, with indexation to the rate of inflation. The Administration maintains that this is what was agreed to in the compromised they achieved with Speaker Hastert. But citing budget concerns, Chairman Archer and other Republican leaders would like to increase the cap at the rate outlined in H.R. 3081, the Republican sponsored minimum wage bill which passed in the House late last year. H.R. 3081 authorizes a phased increase in the LIHTC cap from $1.25 to $1.65, starting in 2001 and lasting through 2004, and subsequent indexation for inflation in nickel increments.

As an alternative to both the Republican plan and the White House plan, the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative Charles B. Rangel (D-NY) is pushing his own cap increase plan. Rangel would increase the LIHTC cap to $1.65 in 2001 and $1.75 in 2002, followed by adjustments for future inflation. It's safe to say, that with so many competing plans floating around, negotiations are bound to continue.

The New Markets-Community Renewal compromise also includes an increase in the private activity bond cap from the greater part of $50 per capita or $150 million to the greater of $70 million or $210 million between 2001 and 2004, with the cap rising to $5 or $220 million in 2007. Fortunately, there is no dispute about this aspect of the deal.

Apart from the millions of low-income Americans sorely in need of affordable housing, the only other obvious casualty of the fight over the LIHTC, is the President's America's Private Investment Companies (APICS) initiative. In the FY 2000 VA-HUD spending bill, congressional appropriators granted APICS $20 million in provisional funding on the condition that program get fully authorized by the Congress before June 30, 2000. That deadline has come and gone, and since authorization for APICS was tied up with completing work on the broader new markets-community renewal bill the funding was lost. The FY 2000 VA-HUD bill stated that if APICS was not authorized by June 30, the $20 million in budget authority would automatically go to the Treasury Department's Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI) program.

LEAD-BASED PAINT UPDATE

NCDA, along with the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, the National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, the National Association of Counties, the National Association for County Community Economic Development, the Council of State Community Development Agencies, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have been meeting over the past couple of weeks regarding HUD's Lead-Based Paint regulation. Other national interest groups, including the National Council of State Housing Agencies, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Realtors, the National Housing Conference, the Local Initiatives Support Corporation, and the National Apartment Association, have joined us in these meetings to support reform of the regulation.

On July 11, the groups met with Don Ryan, Executive Director of the Alliance to End Childhood Lead Poisoning, the primary interest group responsible for pushing the regulation forward, to discuss our concerns with the regulation, and to try to gain support from Don on some of our issues. The concerns of NCDA and the other State and local government interest groups continue to be the following: (1) The regulation is too costly to implement. We support a phase-in of the implementation of the regulation whereby the regulation would initially only apply to units assisted with CDBG and HOME where children six years of age and under reside. This phase-in would continue until the national interest groups have completed a cost study of the regulation and sufficient appropriations have been provided by Congress to fully implement the regulation, based on the findings of this completed cost study. (2) There are not enough certified contractors nationwide to implement the regulation. HUD must provide waivers to those jurisdictions that do not have certified contractors. HUD must also provide funding to "certify" more contractors in order to build the capacity in this area, and HUD must continuing to provide training to grantees on the regulation. (3) HUD must provide compliance assistance to grantees for a period of at least one year to assist grantees in becoming fully acclimated with the regulation. We also reminded Don Ryan that we are supportive of protecting children from lead poisoning and supportive of implementing the regulation, but not in its present state, especially with the expected cost burden to grantees.

The interest groups representing apartment owners commented that they also would like to see a phase-in of the regulation, and would like for HUD to initially apply the regulation to pre-1960 units for Section 8 units.

Don Ryan wants to see the regulation go forward in its present state, and basically agreed to assist the national interest groups on only two fronts: (1) work with the groups to gain more appropriations for CDBG and HOME this year; and (2) use the next year to build the number of certified contractors available nationwide. Don recognized the lack of contractors as in issue. Beyond that, he showed no sign of support for our other concerns. We welcome his support for increased appropriations for CDBG and HOME, and for increasing the number of certified contractors nationwide.

NCDA and the above interest groups will meet with Bill Apgar, Assistant Secretary for Housing, and other HUD officials on Friday, July 21st to continue our discussions on changes to the rule before it becomes implemented on September 15. Besides the issues discussed above, we will also ask HUD to change the regulation to increase the threshold for emergency repairs from $5,000 to $10,000.

We appreciate all of the efforts of members who have sent letters, or telephoned their congressional members regarding the adverse affect of the regulation on local governments. Until we reach agreement with HUD on our concerns, we are asking *all* of our members to continue this effort. We have enclosed a sample letter for you to send to your congressional members. We strongly encourage you to speak to your congressional members while they are in their home districts for the August recess.

HUD NEWS

HUD DELAYS ROLL-OUT DATE FOR DGMS–INDEFINITELY

The Office of the Deputy Secretary released an official announcement on Tuesday, July 11, 2000 stating that, for the time being, the roll out date for implementation of Phase I of the DGMS conversion is being delayed. No new roll-out date was given. The reasons cited are the Department's concerns that the current contractor is failing to address "software defects" and a sense that the contractor's overall "software development approach would neither provide a high level of grant program functionality nor meet the need of [HUD's] business partners on a consistent basis."

By all appearances, development for the entire DGMS process is being sent out for rebidding. The Deputy Secretary's announcement proclaims: "To ensure that delivery schedules are met and IT complies with functional specifications, the DGMS effort is be re-competed through a performance-based fixed-price contract. The bids will address possible new development options, with the the completion schedule determined by the bidder's approach and capability to bid again."

For those of you who may have been worried that a vexing DGMS conversion was right around the corner, it's probably safe to assume that you may breathe easier for a little while longer. As it stands right now, the conversion to DGMS is at least 45 days behind schedule. The original roll-out deadline for completing Phase I entitlement grantee conversion was June 30, 2000.

CDBG TIMELINESS CONFERENCES RESCHEDULED

Due to scheduling conflicts with HUD staff and other conferences, the two remaining timeliness conferences are scheduled as follows:

September17-18	Chicago, IL Regions 5-8
September 28-29	San Francisco, CA Regions 9-10

REGISTER NOW FOR HUD'S HOME 2000 CONFERENCES

HUD is sponsoring three HOME regional conferences this year. These conferences will examine PJ performance issues and provide information to improve local program operations. At each conference, participants will be able to choose among three concurrent tracks of workshops: Construction Management, Preserving Your Investment in Affordable Housing, and Building CHDO Capacity.

Up to three senior staff members from each PJ may attend the conference in their region. The registration fee for each conference is $95.00 per person. The Eastern region conference will be held in Washington, D.C. on July 11-12; the Central region conference will be held in San Antonio, TX on September 19-20; and the Western region conference will be held in Berkeley, CA on November 14-15. Register today! The conferences are filling up quickly. You can register online for the conferences at http://www.hud.gov/cpd/home/homeweb

NCDA NOTES

HARD COPY VS. ELECTRONIC COPY

At the 200 NCDA Annual Conference in New Orleans, the Board of Directors authorized substantial changes in the membership fee for receiving *The Washington Report*. To learn more about these important changes, please see the attached memo on **Electronic vs. Hard Copy Distribution of** *The Washington Report* from NCDA Executive Director, Chandra Western.

WE NEED YOUR HELP

Since the last Winter Meeting in January, NCDA staff have been making a concerted effort to attract advertising from community development and affordable housing technical assistance providers, as well as other kinds of professional service vendors related to housing and community development, onto the *NCDAonline* Yellow Pages. Unfortunately, we have not had much success thus far. Regardless, we are committed to making a success of this project. Therefore, in July, Romulus Johnson will be making another big push to communicate the benefits of advertising in the *NCDAonline* Yellow Pages to CD/affordable housing TA and professional services providers across the nation.

It would be a great help to us if members could contact Romulus Johnson via e-mail (romulus@ncdaonline.org), or telephone [(202)

887-5526], with any contact information about local or regional TA providers they have had positive experiences with. Who knows, if the service contractors did good work for you, chances are your colleagues can also benefit rom their assistance. This really is a win, win situation for everyone: TA providers and vendors get great exposure and your fellow members get access to the kind of technical expertise that can help them run better programs and provide better service to the community. We strongly encourage and eagerly await your help with this important endeavor.

NCDA EXECUTIVE SYMPOSIUM: OCTOBER 12-15, 2000 TUCSON, AZ

The 2000 NCDA Executive Symposium will be held in Tucson, AZ at the Westward Look Resort. ***We have recently learned that this same weekend is parent's weekend at the University of Arizona. Hotel rooms will become scarce as the summer progresses. Get your reservations in as soon as you can.*** For more information, members can contact Jan Shapin at CDTI in Newport (401-849-7053) for Karen Means at NCDA (202-293-7587.

FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES

July 10, 2000. RIN: 2577-AB88. This proposed rule is the first stage in HUD's rule-making process to implement an interim Operating Fund Formula for determining the payment of operating subsidies to public housing agencies (PHAs). The policies and procedures described in this proposed rule would govern the determination of funding distributions to PHAs under the Operating Fund until a final rule, reflecting the results of a congressionally requested public housing cost study, is developed and published.

July 12, 2000. Direct Funding of Public Housing Resident Management Corporations. On October 21, 1999, HUD published a proposed rule to revise its regulations regarding resident participation and resident opportunities in public housing. The rule proposed that a resident management corporation (RMC) may receive capital and operating funds from HUD if the RMC has primary management responsibility for the public housing project and HUD determines that the RMC has the capacity to effectively discharge such responsibility. This rule makes final the policies and procedures contained in the October 21, 1999 proposed rule.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES/ATTACHMENTS

To access the attachments below, please go to NCDAonline (http://ncdaonline.org).

- Sample Lead-Based Paint Letter; List of Congressional Contacts
- Memo from Chandra Western on Electronic vs. Hard Copy Distribution of *The Washington Report*
- S. 2700 -- Brownfields Bill Senate Co-Sponsors List