NCDA
WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN MEANS
JEFF FALCUSAN
TAMARA JACKSON

DATE: August 6, 2002

**NCDA 2002 Executive Symposium: September 25-28, 2002**
**Phoenix, AZ, at the Point Hilton Squaw Peak Resort**
***Request for Art Submissions for National CD Week; April 21-27, 2003***

***FEATURED ARTICLES***



## SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE APPROVES FY 2003 VA-HUD-IA BILL; CDBG AND HOME RECEIVE INCREASES!

Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV), Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, made good on his promise to have all of the appropriations bills approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee before the August recess. The VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill was approved quickly by subcommittee on July 23 and approved by the full committee on July 25.

Overall, HUD received $32.1 billion for FY 2003. This amounts to $634 million over the President's request. Both CDBG and HOME fared well, given the tight budget climate. CDBG received $5.0 billion, including $4.61 billion in formula grants, an increase of $269 million from last year. HOME was funded at $1.950 billion, an increase from $1.846 billion in FY 2002. The President had requested $2.084 billion, including $200 million for his American Dream Downpayment Fund. The committee rejected this proposal, citing concerns the program would place on localities. However, the House has indicated that it will fund the American Dream Downpayment Fund in its FY 2003 VA-HUD-IA Appropriations bill. The two sides will have to work out their differences in conference committee.

The committee provided $201 million for lead-based paint hazard reduction and abatement. This is $75 million more than the President's request and $91,242,000 million more than FY 2002. The committee approved $75 million for a new lead hazard reduction demonstration program focused on major urban areas where children are disproportionately at risk for lead poisoning. This is great news for larger cities that face a disproportionate share of units with lead-based paint. Qualified applicants are the 25 major urban areas identified by HUD as having: (1) the highest number of pre-1940 units of rental housing; (2) significant deterioration of paint and; (3) a disproportionately high number of documented cases of lead-poisoned children. At least 80 percent of the funds must be used for abatement and interim control of lead-based paint hazards. We have heard that the House will include language to create a similar program in its appropriations bill, but funded at a lower level. We will keep you posted on the creation of this new program. We encourage you to contact your congressional representatives in the House to ensure that this program is included in their FY 2003 VA-HUD-IA Appropriations bill. The at the end of this newsletter provides a comparison of the last two years of HUD appropriations.

The Committee approved $1.215 billion for HUD's Homeless Assistance Grants, $85 million above the President's request and $92.5 million above last year's level. Of the funds appropriated, $193 million would cover Shelter Plus Care renewals. The Committee also include authorizing language to continue to require that at least 30% of HUD's Homeless Assistance Grants fund permanent housing.

The Committee recommended $17.4 billion for HUD's Housing Certificate Fund, which would cover all renewals of expiring contracts. This amount also includes funding for 15,000 new incremental vouchers; however, the President had recommended that 34,000 new vouchers be funded. Of the $90 million provided for the new vouchers, $20 million would be reserved for new welfare-to-work vouchers (3,400) and $40 million would be made available for vouchers for disabled families (approximately 8,000), with the remainder used for fair share vouchers.

**NCDA STAFF MEETS WITH MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE**

NCDA staff, Vicki Watson and Jeff Falcusan, met with members of the House Appropriations Committee today , as part of the Campaign for Housing and Community Development Funding annual visits to push for higher funding for HUD. Rep. Mollohan (D-WV), ranking member of the House Subcommittee on VA-HUD-IA, Rep. Meek (D-FL), and Rep. Kaptur (D-OH) were visited.

All three members said there is no money available at this point to increase funding for the VA-HUD-IA bill. According to congressional staff, the bill is short approximately $2 billion, to make it work. However, Gavin Clingham, staff to Rep. Mollohan, said that at some point the Republicans will back-off on the spending caps, allowing funding to become available for the VA-HUD-IA bills and others. If the caps are released, however, don't expect the VA-HUD bill to increase any higher than what has been approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This would mean $5.0 billion for CDBG and $1.95 billion for HOME. Given his own devices, Rep. Walsh would do the right thing, according to staff. Right now, he is hampered by the spending caps.

In terms of timing, we were told that the VA-HUD bill will be one of the very last, if not the last, bill to move out of the House. Staffers told us that the House will likely adjourn by Columbus Day weekend and return after the elections to finish all of the remaining appropriations bills (including VA-HUD). Members will also have to focus on completing the Department of Homeland Security, finalizing the Bankruptcy bill, and completing the Prescription Drug bill. Needless to say, they have their work cut out for them.

**STATUS OF FY 2003 APPROPRIATIONS BILLS**

A collective sign of relief could be heard all over the Washington area when the Senate followed their colleagues in House and left town Thursday night. The members of the House of Representatives concluded as much of its business as possible and left town on Friday, July 26. So, what did the Congress accomplish before the recess? The answer to this question is, not much. Outside of holding hearings on Enron and Arthur Anderson, passing HR 3763 the Corporate Fraud legislation, and the 2002 Supplemental Emergency Spending bill, not much else has been accomplished. But, a lot of work has begun, particularly on appropriations. Both houses have released their 302b's which set the discretionary spending limits for the 13 appropriations bills. The good news is that all but the Labor/HHS bill has numbered. This is right on target, as Labor/HHS is usually the last bill to be finished each year. It is massive, with a lot of controversial issues. The only bills that have passed both the House and the Senate are Defense, Military Construction, and Legislative. The Agriculture, Interior and Treasury/Postal bills have been passed out of full committees and in a couple of instances, passed by the full House or Senate. Commerce/State/ Justice, District of Columbia, Energy and Water, Foreign Ops, Transportation, and HUD/VA have had only Senate action. As mentioned above, the Labor/HHS bill is unnumbered but has passed out of the Senate appropriations committee.

What does all this mean? One thing is means is that when Congress reconvenes after Labor Day, a lot of work has to be done before all the appropriations bills are completed. There is also the election to consider. If all the work is not completed by the targeted adjournment date of October 4 or Columbus Day, then Congress will have to pass continuing resolutions on all remaining bills and come back to Washington after the election, in a lame duck session" and finish the work. Given that the Senate is farther ahead than the House, this may buy the legislators some time. Also, there has been rumors that the HUD/VA bill will be the last bill to be conferenced which could mean that NCDA members will not know that FY 2003 allocations until some time in November or December. For HUD's CPD staff this situation could save or delay a lot headaches concerning the ramifications of the new census data on the CDBG program and other HUD programs that use demographic data to determine funding. This year could prove to be the most exciting appropriations season in a very long time.

**SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDS HEARING ON HUD MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES**

On July 24 the Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs held a hearing on "HUD's Management Challenges." The hearing coincided with the release of General Accounting Office (GAO) report entitled "HUD Human Capital Management: Comprehensive Strategic Workforce Planning Needed." Witnesses included Alphonso Jackson, Deputy Secretary of HUD; Stan Czerwinski, Physical Infrastructure Director for GAO; and Carolyn Federoff, President of the American Federation of Government Employees, Council 222. Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) chairs the subcommittee, and the subcommittee's Ranking Member, Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO), was also present.

The GAO's report on HUD's human capital report is the first in a series of three reports prepared in response to Congressional concerns over the future of HUD. The other two reports, which will follow in the months to come, will focus on improving HUD's acquisitions management and on improving HUD's inadequate, antiquated information technology systems. Senator Reed began the hearing by stating that HUD has a number of programs on GAO's "high risk list," including single-family mortgage insurance and rental housing assistance. Senator Reed also stated that half of HUD's career workforce will be eligible for retirement one year from now. With programs in need of reform and a potential shortage of employees looming, Senator Reed was interested in HUD's future plans.

In his prepared statement, HUD Deputy Secretary Alphonso Jackson indicated that HUD is working to enhance staff capacity through realignment and "other measures." Jackson stated that he and Secretary Mel Martinez have been careful not to neglect field staff as they look for ways to improve the Department's human capital management. The main emphasis of Jackson's testimony seemed to be that the current HUD leadership has spent much of its time thus far formulating new management strategies that are only now ready to be put in motion. Jackson mentioned that in 2001 HUD completed the implementation of a new Resource Estimation and Allocation Process (REAP) which identified critical staff shortages and included recommendations for redeploying staff to meet needs in the field. The President's FY 2003 budget submission, however, did not request the full staffing levels supported by the REAP.

Mr. Czerwinski provided a brief history of HUD's reputation as a department with serious management and oversight weaknesses, then announced what Senator Reed had already hinted at: two of HUD's key programs named to the high risk list in 2001 would still be on that list today. These programs, single-family mortgage insurance and rental housing assistance comprise two thirds of HUD's budget. The Department's problems are compounded by an aging workforce, which creates the potential for serious staff shortages in the years ahead. According to Czerwinski, "HUD does not have the right people with the right skills in the right places to do the right thing."

Ms. Federoff's testimony provided the subcommittee with the perspective of HUD's unionized employees. Federoff stressed that HUD needs to step up its recruiting efforts, while at the same time ensuring that current employees stay on board. Federoff underscored the importance of retaining employees by pointing out the results of a recent survey revealing "a HUD workforce whose morale is generally below that of their private sector counterparts." Federoff laid out several recommendations for addressing HUD's human capital needs. She suggested that HUD should end its practice of arbitrarily contracting out jobs because of a lack of staff, and should instead contract out only when it is cost effective and will provide equal or better service. According to Federoff, HUD also needs to restore much of the Human Resource capacity in the field it eliminated in 1995. Federoff indicated that HUD is relying heavily on interns to meet hiring needs. In order to avoid losing these interns to the private sector when their two-year appointments expire, the agency should extend permanent positions to interns after one year, which is the standard probationary time period for new employees.

After the witnesses finished the prepared testimony, Senators Reed and Allard peppered them with questions. Senator Reed wanted to know whether the President's FY 2003 budget reflected HUD's needs in terms of human capital management. Jackson more or less evaded the question, and Senator Reed again asked if the budget included additional dollars for hiring. Jackson responded by saying that better management, and not necessarily more money, is the answer. Czerwinski was asked what he thought about this, and he responded by saying that HUD will probably need more money in the future, but the need for a credible plan is more pressing. Reed asked Jackson when Congress might see such a plan. "Very soon," was Jackson's response.

Senator Allard expressed concern over the fact that so many of HUD's computer systems are incompatible with each other. Jackson indicated that HUD was creating a plan to deal with this problem. Senator Allard asked when the plan would appear. "Very soon," was again Jackson's response.

This led to a lengthy discussion on whether HUD could use certain un-obligated dollars to make improvements. Jackson did not seem to know what happens to these funds if they are not used for other purposes. Czerwinski stated that some amounts just sit until and unless Congress acts through the authorization and appropriations process. After discussing this topic for a few minutes, Senator Reed suggested that HUD make a re-programming request if it planned on using any un-obligated funds for human capital management initiatives.

The hearing seemed to do little to resolve the question of how successful HUD can hope to be at meeting the management challenges it faces. Jackson said more than once that "our agency is in trouble," but he pointed to his experience in the private sector as evidence that he could right the ship by running HUD like a business. At times it seemed as if the hearing was turning into a job interview; speculation is still running rampant that Jackson may soon replace Martinez.

You can view a PDF copy of the GAO report on HUD human capital management at http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d02839.pdf.

**NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND OR MATCHING GRANT PROGRAM FOR STATE AND LOCAL HOUSING TRUST FUNDS?**

**House Committee on Financial Services Battles Back and Forth on this Issue**

In the June 25 and July 19 issues of the *Washington Report*, we reported on the mark-up of H.R. 3995 – The Housing Affordability for America Act of 2002 – by the House Committee on Financial Services. As reported, during the June 20 mark-up of the bill, the HOME*Plus* provision of the bill [section 101 of the bill], which NCDA, NACCED, and NACo took the lead in creating, was stripped and replaced with an amendment offered by Rep. Bernie Sanders (I-VT) to create a National Housing Trust Fund. The Sanders' amendment was approved along a party-line vote of 33-28 (Rep. Christopher Shays (R-CT) was the only Republican member to vote for the amendment), with several Republicans not present for the vote. As reported, the Sanders amendment that passed was different from his original bill – H.R. 2349 – to create a National Housing Trust Fund. The original bill would have directed all of the resources of the Fund directly to States, leaving local governments empty-handed. The amendment that passed during the mark-up allocated 60% of the funds directly to local governments and 40% to States (the same allocation that exists under the HOME program). This change was made due to a letter sent to Sanders from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which requested that local governments receive at least 60% of the funds. Although, we are now pleased that a reasonable portion of the trust funds are allocated to local governments, we are perplexed as to why Sanders had to strip section 101 – the HOME*Plus* program – from the bill. He could have simply added his amendment to the bill without replacing this section.

As we have reported in previous editions of the Washington Report, NCDA, NACCED, and NACo, have jointly supported the creation of a HOME*Plus* program, funded at $2 billion, and separate from the HOME program, to boost rental housing production, rehabilitation, and preservation. The program would utilize the same program rules as the existing HOME program, so that grantees would not have to learn a whole new set of regulations.

NCDA, NACCED, and NACo came out in support of the HOME*Plus* proposal two years ago, in reaction to Senator Kerry's (D-MA) National Housing Trust Fund proposal, along with Senator Bond's (R-MO) National Housing Trust Fund proposal, which allocated the monies of the Fund directly to States, with no direct allocation for units of general local government. Even though we tried very hard to ensure that local governments received a direct allocation (60% of the funds–the same allocation under the HOME program) under both of these proposals, neither Kerry nor Bond would budge. Why? Senator Bond is the former governor of Missouri–a state which has an excellent state housing finance agency. His proposal was based on his experience at the state level. Kerry, on the other hand, developed his proposal as a political maneuver, hoping that Republicans would sign-on to his bill and ensure its easy passage. This theory was based on the fact that the National Governors' Association (the majority of governors at the time were Republicans) supported a policy (and still do) that all monies of a National Housing Trust Fund should be directed solely to States.

Fortunately, Kerry's strategy didn't work and few Republicans signed-on to his bill.

***National Housing Trust Fund or Matching Grant Program?***

During the continued mark-up of H.R. 3995 on July 10, the Sanders Amendment was stripped from the bill and replaced with an amendment by Rep. Sue Kelly (R-NY) that would create a one-for-one matching grant program for State and local housing trust funds. The funds could be used for the production, preservation, and rehabilitation of affordable housing (the same activities proposed in our HOME*Plus* proposal). This amendment was really offered as a way of defeating the National Housing Trust Fund. Oddly enough, Kelly's amendment mirrors an amendment that was developed by Rep. Sanders and would have been offered by Sanders if the National Housing Trust Fund amendment had been defeated by the Committee on June 20. Republican staff reportedly prepared the amendment at the last minute as a means to ensure the National Housing Trust Fund was defeated. It is widely known that Rep. Marge Roukema (R-NJ), Chairperson of the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, is opposed to trust funds of any sort and many other republicans on the committee either oppose a National Housing Trust Fund outright or oppose the use of the "so called" FHA surpluses to fund such a trust fund. NCDA and many other groups find the Kelly Amendment to be very inflexible. Again, remember that the Kelly Amendment is based on language from an amendment drafted by Rep. Sanders, but never offered. First, not every State or jurisdiction has a housing trust fund in place. In fact, there are only 42 city housing trust funds in twenty-two states, and an additional 142 in the state of New Jersey. In addition, there are 38 state housing trust funds, and 37 county housing trust funds (40 located in the state of Pennsylvania). Although, the Kelly Amendment does not prohibit jurisdictions from creating trust funds, some jurisdictions may not be able to do so, given the politics surrounding affordable housing, or the lack of resources available to create a housing trust fund. This unfairly prohibits those areas from receiving resources for affordable housing. A second concern with the Kelly Amendment is that it requires States and local housing trust funds to develop an annual allocation plan in order to receive matching grant funds. The allocation plan requires the grantee to outline the selection and preference criteria used in selecting applicants; the extent to which the applicant has worked to address issues of siting and exclusionary zoning or other policies that are barriers to affordable housing; the extent of employment and other economic opportunities for low-income families in the area in which the housing will be located; and other burdensome requirements. Instead of the submission of this lengthy allocation plan we would like to see the Consolidated Plan used as the application for the federal matching funds.

Another concern with the Kelly Amendment is the targeting. The amendment would target 75% of the funds to extremely low-income families (families earning no more than 30% of area median income). Of this percentage, 30% of the funds must be provided to families receiving no more than the higher of the Federal or State minimum wage. This is very deep targeting. In most cases, it represents families that earn no more than 15% of area median income. High cost areas across the country are already hamstrung in assisting these families because of a lack of adequate resources to develop workable projects. Given the high cost of construction in these areas, it will take a lot of resources to make projects for families at this income level work. In order to provide more flexibility, we would rather see that targeting remain at 75% of the funds to extremely low-income families with no further requirement for targeting, or possibly make the deep targeting an overall national standard, and not a requirement for every jurisdiction.

***What Next?***

NCDA, NACCED, and NACo are working with the Committee staff on our concerns with the Kelly Amendment and hopefully, get them to design the program more closely with that of the HOME program. The House is expected to vote on H.R. 3995 as soon as it returns from recess in early September. Rep. Sanders is expected to offer an amendment on the House floor to replace the Kelly Amendment with his National Housing Trust Fund (with 60% of the funds allocated to local governments). There is a great deal of grassroots support for the National Housing Trust Fund, primarily spearheaded by the National Low-Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC), therefore, Sanders' Amendment could pass. The bottom line is that both proposals would provide more funding to support the production, preservation, and rehabilitation of affordable housing; something that is desperately needed. The Kelly amendment is a bit more inflexible because it is targeted only to State and local housing trust funds and the Sanders Amendment includes most of the same inflexible requirements as the Kelly amendment. Either way, both proposals will have to be re-worked to make them more flexible.

**An Overview of Existing City Housing Trust Funds**

The Housing Trust Fund Project of the Center for Community Change released its *Housing Trust Fund Progress Report of 2002* in June of this year. The report provides an overview of State, county, city and other housing trust funds across the country. Given the possibility of the creation of a matching grant program for state and local housing trust funds, we thought you might be interested in the following statistics concerning city housing trust funds.

- There are 184 city housing trust funds nationwide. New Jersey has 142 city housing trust funds and there are 42 additional city housing trusts in 22 states.

- Most city housing trust funds (thirty-five) are administered by a housing and community development department. Most city housing trust funds have three or less staff.

- Fourteen city housing trust funds use housing trust fund revenues to pay for administrative costs; another fourteen use other government budgeted funds; and eleven use other sources of revenue to pay for administrative costs, such as CDBG, HOME, and general funds. Only seven city housing trust funds mandate a cap on administrative expenses.

- Thirty-six city housing trust funds have a board that is appointed to provide oversight responsibilities for the trust fund.

- Five city housing trust funds restrict their funds to providing only loans. Another five city housing trust funds provide only grants. The remaining city housing trust funds make awards as either grants or loans.

- Fourteen city housing trust funds use a request for proposals process to allocate revenue; another twenty have an open application process.

- Thirteen city housing trust funds coordinate housing trust fund dollars with other housing funds in some fashion. In some cases, this coordination refers to administering an application process that provides access to numerous sources of funds, including HOME and CDBG, among others. However, in some cities, the housing trust fund is administered within an overall housing policy framework, coordinating housing trust fund revenue with other available local dollars to address housing policies as they emerge. In these cases, dollars are directed to specific needs and/or programs and may shift from year to year, as the planning process dictates.

- Virtually all city housing trust funds identify nonprofit development organizations as eligible recipients for their funds. Most include for-profit developers, as well. Many list housing authorities as eligible recipients. Only eleven listed governmental entities as eligible.

- Only six city housing trust funds require a match from the applicant.

- More than half of the city housing trust funds require that the funds serve those households earning 80% or less of the area median income; 11 city housing trust funds allow some or all of their funds to serve households earning up to 120% of area median income; three city housing trust funds require that some or all of their funds serve households at or below 60% of area median income; another four require that some or all of their funds serve households earning 50% of area median income or below; and another three require that some or all of their funds serve households earning 30% of area median income or below.

- At least 26 city housing trust funds require some kind of long-term affordability requirements for either all or some of the units funded. At least 12 city housing trust funds require forty years or more of affordability, while two (Boulder, CO and Burlington, VT) require that affordability be maintained in perpetuity.

- City housing trust funds receive revenues from at least two dozen sources generating more than $182 million each year to help address critical housing needs. Revenue sources include: hotel/motel tax, business license tax, property tax, sales tax, real estate transfer tax, use tax, housing excise tax, redevelopment tax increment, sale of city owned land, city-owned parking revenues, UDAG repayments, CDBG loan repayments, and bond revenues.

- Five city housing trust funds receive more than $10 million annually; four receive between $5 million and $10 million annually; seven receive between $1 million and $5 million annually; and 21 city housing trust funds receive less than $1 million annually.

## HUD NEWS

### HUD TO PUBLISH "GRANTEE USE OF FUNDS" REPORT

According to HUD officials, the long awaited *Grantee Use of Funds Report* will be placed on its website very shortly. This report details each grantee's useof funds under the four formula programs covered by the consolidated plan for the most recently reported grant year. So, for all of you who have wondered what HUD is doing with the data and information contained in the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), this is it. It is presumed, although not entirely clear, that this information will alert Congress and the general public to where and how cities are spending their CDBG, HOME, ESG and Homeless, and HOPWA funds.

## NCDA NOTES

### CONGRESS GOES HOME FOR THE AUGUST RECESS

On Friday, August 2, the full Congress officially began its August recess, which means they will spend a lot of time in their home districts. Given that this is an election year, it is safe to assume that a lot of campaigning will be going on. To that end, we have included a sample letter as an attachment to this issue of *The Washington Report* that members can use to get the word out on the importance of their continued support of HUD's housing and community development programs and the need to really understand what these programs mean for their districts. We also encourage you to pass this sample letter (with any modifications) along to your subrecipients so that they can assist with this education process.

**NCDA'S 2002 EXECUTIVE SYMPOSIUM**

NCDA's 2002 Executive Symposium will be held at the fun and relaxing Pointe Hilton Squaw Peak Resort in Phoenix, Arizona. The Symposium is scheduled for September 25 - 28, 2002.

The resort makes a good location for a meeting and family get-away. Located at the base of Camelback Mountain, the resort offers an 18-hole championship golf course, a spa and fitness center, opportunities for hiking and horseback riding, combined with beautiful desert sunsets and a myriad of additional activities. Bringing your kids? Make sure to sign them up for Coyote Camp. Coyote Camp provides action-packed days of activities for children ages 4 to 12 and is designed to give your children "a howlin' good time!"

***CDBG TRAINING***

- NCDA will hold a *CDBG Basics: Training for Practitioners* in Phoenix, Arizona on September 23-25 at the Pointe Hilton Squaw Peak Resort. Registration is required. Please contact Chandra Western for more information at 202-887-5521.

- NCDA will hold a *CDBG Basics: Training for Practitioners* in Hyannis, Massachusetts on October 7-9, 2002 at the Sheraton Hyannis in Hyannis, Massachusetts. Registration is required. Please contact Chandra Western for more information at 202-887-5521.

***HOME TRAINING***

- NCDA will hold a one day *HOME Refresher Course* training at the Region IV Conference in Charleston, South Carolina at the Westin Francis Marion Hotel on August 12, from 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. No registration is required. The training is free. Please contact Vicki Watson at 202-887-5532 for more information.

## NCDA REGIONAL MEETINGS

**Region IV**
August 10-13, 2002
Francis Marion Westin Hotel
Charleston, SC

**Region I**
October 10-13, 2002
Sheraton Hyannis
Hyannis, MA

**Region VI**
November 14-16, 2002
La Fonda Hotel on the Plaza
Sante Fe, NM

## ATTACHMENTS

*Please go to NCDAonline (http://ncdaonline.org) to access the files below.*

- Sample Congressional Letter
- Community Development Committee Meeting Minutes
- Housing Committee Meeting Minutes
- Region I Annual Conference Agenda and Registration Forms
- Results of NCDA's HOME Survey
- 2003 CD Week Memo

## FY 2003 HUD/VA SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MARK

| **Programs** | **FY 2001 Enacted** | **FY 2002 enacted** | **President's FY 03 Request** | **S. 2797** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CDBG | $5.058 billion | $5.0 billion | $4.732 billion | $5.050 billion |
| *Set-Asides:* | | | | |
| Comm. Tech Centers | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| ADA Access Initiative | $0 | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Indian Community Block Grant | $71 million | $70 million | $72.5 million | $72.5 million |
| Capacity Building | $28.45 million | $29 million | $29.5 million | $35.5 million |
| Spec. Purpose Grants | $45.5 million | $42.5 million | $39 million | $45.5 million |
| National Council of La Raza | $0 | $5 million | $0 | $0 |
| Housing Asst. Council | $3 million | $3.3 million | $3 million | $3.3 million |
| Natl. Amer. Indian Hsg. Council | $2.6 million | $2.6 million | $2.2 million | $2.6 million |
| Neighborhood Initiatives | $30 million | $42 million | $42 million | $40 million |
| ROSS. | $55 million | $55 million | $0 | $55 million |
| Self-Help Housing | $20 million | $22 million | $65 million | $22 million |
| Youthbuild | $60 million | $65 million | $65 million | $65 million |
| Working Cap. Fund | $15 million | $13.8 million | $3 million | $3.4 million |
| Nat. Hsg. Dev. Corp. | $10 million | $5 million | $0 | $0 |
| Tribal College Facilities | $3 million | [$3 million] | $3 million | $3 million |
| Winter Olympic Hsg. | $2 million | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Alaskan & Haw. Instit. | $0 | [$4 million] | $2.4 million | $4 million |
| Hawaiian Homeland | $0 | $9.6 million | $9.6 million | $10 million |
| EDI | $292 million | $294.2 million | $0 | $140 million |
| Colonias Gateway Initiative | $0 | $0 | $16 | $0 |
| *[Total Set-Asides*] | *[$637.55 million]* | *[$659 million]* | *$303 million* | *$439.8 million* |
| Formula Amount | $4.46 billion | $4.341 billion | $4.429 billion | $4.6102 billion |
| Sec. 108 Loan Guarantees: | | | | |
| - Credit Subsidy and Admin. Costs | $30 million | $14 million | $7 million | $14 million |
| - Loan Guarantee Limitation | $1.258 billion | $608.6 million | $275 million | 608.7 million |
| Brownfields Program | $25 million | $25 million | $25 million | $25 million |
| EZs/ECs | $90 million | $45 million | $0 | $30 million |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| HOME<br>*Set-Asides:*<br>Downpayment Fund<br>Working Cap. Fund<br>Housing Counseling<br><br>*[Total Set-Asides]*<br><br>Formula Amount | $1.796 billion<br><br>$0<br>$17 million<br>$20 million<br><br>*[$37 million]*<br><br>$1.759 billion | $1.846 billion<br><br>**$50 million<br>$17 million<br>$20 million<br><br>*[$87 million]*<br><br>$1.759 billion | $2.084 billion<br><br>$200 million<br>$1 million<br>Proposed as separate program<br>*[$201 million]*<br><br>$1.883 billion | $1.95 billion<br><br>$0<br>$1.1 million<br>$40 million<br><br>*[$41 million]*<br><br>$1.909 billion |
| Housing Counseling | | | $35 million | |
| Homeless Assistance Grants | $1.025 billion | ***$1.123 billion | $1.13 billion | $1.215 billion |
| Shelter Plus Care Renewals | $100 million | Included in the funding amount for the Homeless Assistance Grants. | Included in the funding amount for the Homeless Assistance Grants. | Included in the funding amount for the Homeless Assistance Grants. |
| HOPWA | $258 million | $277 million | $292 million | $292 million |
| Rural Housing & ED | $25 million | $25 million | $0 | $25 million |
| Housing Certificate Fund | $12.9 billion | $16.3 billion | $17.5 billion | $17.4 billion |
| Lead Paint Assistance | $100 million | $110 million | $126 million | $201 million |
| Pub. Housing Capital Fund | $3 billion | $2.843 billion | $2.843 billion | $2.783 billion |
| Pub. Housing Operating Fund | $3.24 billion | $3.5 billion | $3.5 billion | $3.53 billion |
| HOPE VI | $574 million | $574 million | $574 million | $574 million |
| Drug Elimination Grants | $310 million | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| Section 202 Elderly Housing | $779 million | $783 million | $783 million | $783 million |
| Section 811 | $217 million | $241million | $251 million | $250.5 million |