NCDA
WASHINGTON REPORT

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

DATE: November 22, 2002

NCDA Winter Meeting, January 22-25, 2003 - Washington Marriott Hotel

FEATURED ARTICLES

- ***Status of FY 2003 Appropriations***
- ***How the Latest Continuing Resolution (CR) Affects Early Grantees***
- ***New Leadership in 108th Congress***
- ***HOME Formula Changes***
- ***Consolidated Plan Improvement Initiative Moves Forward; Final Report Due Soon***
- ***HUD Briefs Public Interest Groups on IDIS Modernization Plans, New Race/Ethnic Data Collection Policy***
- ***HUD News: HUD Makes 2002 Awards to Historically Black Colleges; HUD Asks Grantees Why They Aren't Spending Lead Paint Testing Funds***
- ***NCDA Notes: CDBG Formula Committee***
- ***Job Announcements/Attachments***

STATUS OF FY 2003 APPROPRIATIONS

The 107th Congress officially comes to a close today as the House adjourns until the start of the next Congress. Members were successful in passing a Homeland Security bill, which will be forwarded quickly to the President for his signature.

On November 19, the Senate passed a fifth continuing resolution (CR) (H J Res 124) that would keep the government operating through January 11, 2003. The House passed the same measure on November 13. The measure would also allow the administration to transfer $640 million in previously appropriated funds for the creation of a Homeland Security Department and would extend some welfare benefits into next year.

Only two appropriations bills were passed this session; Defense and Military Construction. The remaining 11 appropriations bills will have to wait until January, when both the House and Senate are expected to complete the FY 2003 spending measures. The House and Senate recommended increases for both CDBG and HOME. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended $4.6102 billion in formula funding for CDBG, up from $4.341 billion in FY 2002. The Committee recommended $1.909 billion in formula funding for HOME, up from $1.759 billion in FY 2002. The House Appropriations Committee recommended $4.577 billion for CDBG and $1.975 billion for HOME. Since the 108th Congress is an entirely new session of Congress, the remaining 11 appropriations bills will have to be newly introduced; however, the same language and proposed funding levels can be used. Congressional staff is expected to work on all of the remaining appropriations during the recess, so that members can finish the bills quickly when they return on January 11. Speculation has it that the remaining spending measures will be folded into one or two large omnibus measures.

Senator Byrd, Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, tried to include language for four unfinished spending bills [Legislative Branch, District of Columbia, Energy and Water, and Treasury-Postal Service] in the latest continuing resolution but was unsuccessful. GOP leaders want to delay completion of the FY 2003 appropriations bills until the 108th Congress convenes with Republicans in control of both the House and the Senate. Even then, there will be controversy in completing the spending measures. House and Senate appropriations leaders and the White House have not reached agreement on an overall spending cap. The White House is taking a hard line on its original discretionary spending cap of $750 billion, but appropriators would like to see at least a $10 billion increase above that figure in order to increase funding for some of the spending bills.

HOW THE LATEST CONTINUING RESOLUTION (CR) AFFECTS EARLY GRANTEES

Since Congress has adjourned for the year and the 107th Congress has drawn to a close with 11 of the13 appropriations bills left in “congressional limbo,” a city with a January program year might ask; Will I be able to fund my programs this year? The answer is; Yes, but... According to HUD officials the amount of funding an early grantee will receive depends on the length of the continuing resolution (CR). In this case, the CR only lasts until January 11. That means that even early grantees, particularly January grantees; will most likely not see funding until Congress finalizes HUD’s bill or passes another CR. And as previously stated, the amount of funding awarded will depend on the length of the CR. Obviously, the new Congress will be much more optimistic about its ability to get the remaining appropriations bills passed in a “timely” manner.

Before the elections, most of us in Washington expected Congress to pass a long-term CR to keep the government operational through March. Unfortunately, at least from the January grantees' perspective, this was not the case. As you read in the previous article, there is a $10 billion discrepancy between what the President wants to spend and the discretionary spending goal of Congress. However, there is still hope for early grantees. It is speculated that the numbers on the House side will hold as only a few seats changed as a result of the elections, and in the majority's favor. On the Senate side of things there is a two seat majority in favor of the Republicans and there is very little thought or speculation that the number will be all that different from what was proposed in the 107th Congress. It is likely that Congressional staff will be working feverishly to iron out differences in the separate bills so that the 108th Congress can begin its own work, rather than spending a lot of time on the work left over from the 107th Congress. The President will be submitting his 2004 Budget Proposal the first week in February. It is important to Congress that all the work from the last Congress get resolved so that the new legislative cycle can begin. Lets all hope that the new Congress can work better than the last one did.

NEW LEADERS IN THE 108TH CONGRESS

When Congress returns in January, we will see several changes in the leadership of the House and Senate Committees and Subcommittees that oversee HUD's programs and funding. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL) will replace retiring Senator Phil Gramm (R-TX) as Chair of the Senate Banking Committee when the 108th Congress convenes in January. Shelby serves on both the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence and is better known for his support of national security efforts rather than housing and community development programs. He has no leaning whatsoever towards supporting affordable housing and community development. In a November 9 speech to the National Association of Realtors, Shelby pointed out his concerns about combining banking and commercial activities, citing that the combination of these two activities in other countries, notably Japan, has led to major financial crises that threatened the entire global economy. He intends to "bring the same deliberative, reasoned approach to consideration of the policy and oversight activities of the Banking Committee," as he has with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), a staunch supporter of CDBG and HOME, will remain as ranking member of the committee. Senator Sarbanes also introduced legislation this past year (The Predatory Lending Consumer Protection Act of 2002) intended to curb predatory lending practices nationwide, specifically yield-spread premiums--payments made by lenders to mortgage brokers who give borrowers unnecessarily high interest rates.

Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO) will become Chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, replacing Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) who will remain as ranking member of the subcommittee. NCDA has a good working relationship with both Allard's and Reed's staffs. NCDA worked very closely with Senator Allard two years ago in crafting legislation to consolidate HUD's homeless assistance programs into a formula-allocated block grant to States and local governments. Although, the legislation didn't make its way out of subcommittee then, it's not too late to try to have the legislation introduced once again. Senator Allard introduced legislation in the 107th Congress to authorize President Bush's American Dream Downpayment Fund, a $200 million set-aside within the HOME program which would assist first time homebuyers with downpayment and closing costs. NCDA has also worked well with Senator Reed's staff in crafting legislation to streamline HUD's homeless assistance programs and secure additional funding for lead hazard reduction. Senator Reed supports the creation of a National Housing Trust Fund and co-sponsored legislation in the 107th congress, along with Senator John Kerry (D-MA), to create such a fund. Kerry's and Reed's legislation did not allocate any of the funds directly to local governments, a sore point with NCDA and other local government interest groups. With Republicans in control of the Senate, the creation of a National Housing Trust Fund is unlikely. Republicans traditionally like to work within existing programs, so NCDA will continue to push its HOME*Plus* production program, a program that would increase funding for the HOME program to specifically create new affordable housing, preserve and rehabilitate existing housing. The idea received overwhelming support in the House by Republicans last year, and was included in Rep. Roukema's omnibus housing bill.

Senator Christopher "Kit" Bond will once again become Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies, replacing Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), who will remain as the ranking member of the subcommittee. Luckily, Bond and Mikulski work well together, often conferring with one another on appropriations matters. Both are strong supporters of HUD's programs. Bond, in particular, supports rural economic development, and he and Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska were responsible for creating the Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development within HUD. He also is a strong supporter of Section 8 vouchers, but is a strong proponent of redesigning the program to work more efficiently in those areas where Section 8 vouchers are underutilized.

Bond introduced a housing production bill as part of the VA-HUD appropriations bill two years ago and introduced similar legislation this past session. The legislation would redistribute unused Section 8 reserve funds to state housing finance agencies to provide funds to create, preserve, and rehabilitate affordable housing. NCDA is, of course, unhappy with the funds being solely allocated at the state level and will work hard to shift some of the funding to local governments. Senator Bond was governor of Missouri and had a great relationship with the Missouri Housing Finance Agency, thereby, the inclusion of language allocating the funds directly to states. Bond is also a strong supporter of CDBG and HOME, as is Senator Mikulski. Senator Mikulski also strongly supports anti-predatory lending legislation, a problem which has plagued the City of Baltimore and other areas. Another one of her initiatives was to include language in the FY 2003 VA-HUD appropriations bill to create an Urban Lead Hazard Reduction Program, a $75 million formula-allocated block grant targeted to the top 25 cities with the most problems regarding lead-poisoned children and housing stock. Hopefully, this program can be enacted in the upcoming Congress.

We will also see some changes in the House leadership on the housing and community development front. Rep. Michael Oxley (R-OH) will remain as Chair of the House Committee on Financial Services. Rep. Barney Frank (D-MA) will replace Rep. LaFalce (D-NY), who is retiring, as ranking member of the committee. Rep. Frank will also remain as ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, while the candidate for Chair is still up in the air. We have heard rumors that it could be one of three people: Rep. Doug Bereuter (R-NE), Rep. Bob Ney (R-OH), or Rep. Sue Kelly (R-NY). Both Bereuter and Kelly would be good candidates because they support HUD's housing and community development programs. Rep. Ney's position on HUD's programs is unknown. He seems more interested in the concerns of rural areas and veterans issues. Rep. Barney Frank is an ardent supporter of HUD's programs. We are very lucky to have him as ranking member of both the subcommittee and the full committee. He will definitely give the majority party a hard time if they do not support housing and community development. In terms of appropriations, Rep. Walsh (R-NY) will remain as Chair of the House Subcommittee on VA-HUD-IA, while Rep. Mollohan (D-WV) will remain as ranking member. Both members support CDBG and HOME, as demonstrated by increases in both programs this fiscal year.

HOME PROGRAM FORMULA CHANGES

Unlike CDBG, HOME is a relatively new program. Since 1994, the HOME program formula allocations have been based on the1990 census data. The 2000 census marks the first time that the HOME program will see new changes in its data. These changes will take effect with the FY 2003 HOME formula allocations. Congress has yet to pass a FY03 VA-HUD Appropriations bill, so we have no idea what the final budget allocation will be for the HOME program. The House Appropriations Committee recommended $1.975 billion in formula funding for the program, while the Senate Appropriations Committee recommended

$1.896 billion in formula funding. Right now, the federal government is operating under a Continuing Resolution through January 11 that provides federal agencies with the same level of funding as in FY 2002. HOME grantees with a program year that begins in January will be affected the most by the fact that a FY 2003 appropriations bill has not been enacted. HUD will have to execute a grant agreement based on the FY 2002 allocation amount for the January grantees and then a new grant agreement when the appropriations bills are completed. According to HUD, 105 participating jurisdictions have a January program year start date (out of a total of 620 participating jurisdictions).

Based on the inclusion of the 2000 census data into the FY 2002 HOME formula allocation (which is what jurisdictions will receive until an appropriations bill has been enacted), many states and cities in the South and West will receive increases in their HOME formula allocation, while many states and cities in the Northeast and Midwest will see losses.

Again this data is based on the FY 2002 allocation, which is being used until Congress enacts a fiscal 2003 appropriations bill for HUD, which is expected to occur in January 2003. Both the House and Senate recommended increased formula funding for the program.

These sharp increases in HOME formula allocations in some areas are due solely to the new data reflected in the 2000 Census and inserted into the six HOME formula factors. The HOME program has six measurable formula factors.

(1) <u>Low vacancy and poor renters</u>: This formula factor has a weight of 10 percent. The value in the formula is obtained by multiplying the number of rental units occupied by a poor household by a market tightness measure (the ratio of the national vacancy rate for renters divided by the jurisdiction's vacancy rate for renters). According to the 2000 Census, the national vacancy rate is 7%.

(2) <u>Rental housing with one of four problems</u>: Within the formula this factor has a weight of 20 percent. The four problem conditions are overcrowding, incomplete kitchen facilities, incomplete plumbing and high rent to income ratio.

(3) <u>The number of rental units that were built before 1950 and that are occupied by the poor</u>: This factor has a weight of 20 percent in the formula.

(4) <u>RS Means cost index and rental units with one of four problems</u>: This factor has a weight of 20 percent in the formula. This factor is the number of occupied substandard rental units (identified in factor 2) multiplied by a figure that measures the cost of producing housing. The cost figure in the formula is the ratio of the RS Means cost index for an individual jurisdiction divided by the Means cost index for the nation as a whole (i.e., 100). The source for these indices is the "Means Square Foot Costs Annual Edition" which, as the title would indicate, is updated annually with the revised data used for that year's HOME formula computations.

(5) <u>The number of families in poverty</u>: This factor has a weight of 20 percent in the formula.

(6) <u>Low PCI and population</u>: This factor has a weight of 20 percent in the formula. The factor is computed by multiplying the population of a jurisdiction by its net per capita income (PCI) index. This index is the ratio of two factors: (1) the difference between the national PCI and the national PCI of a 3-person family below the poverty line, and (2) the difference between the jurisdiction's PCI and the 3-person poverty figure.

At the writing of this newsletter, HUD is in the process of re-calculating the HOME formula allocations based on the new census data and using the FY 2002 funding levels. HUD had issued one set of allocations to NCDA and other interest groups, but one of the variables was incorrectly calculated, so they are now in the process of re-calculating the numbers. As soon as we have the new figures, we will post them to our web site at http://www.ncdaonline.org. Once they are posted, use these allocations for planning purposes until an appropriations bill has been enacted in January. If your allocation has gone down, it means that your community has improved in regards to the six HOME formula factors, something that should be seen as positive. If your HOME allocation has increased, it means that these factors have increased in your community.

Please feel free to contact Vicki Watson at 202-887-5532 with any questions. The Housing Committee will likely discuss the formula changes at NCDA's Winter Conference in January.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVE MOVES FORWARD; FINAL REPORT DUE SOON

The working group phase of the Consolidated Plan Improvement Initiative (CPII) is drawing to a close. A November 7 conference call was the final scheduled opportunity for CPII steering committee members to discuss potential ConPlan improvements with HUD and its consultants. Steering committee members have received a draft version of a final report entitled "Ideas for Streamlining and Making the Consolidated Planning Process More Useful and Results-Oriented." This document is still under review and HUD has asked steering committee members not to share this report with anyone until the review is completed.

A final report is scheduled to be released within a few weeks. Members of the steering committee have been invited to submit dissenting opinions and/or supplementary comments to be included with the final version of the report as appendices. This process could be somewhat problematic since those wishing to submit comments have only the draft report to go on; they have no way of knowing whether minor changes or additions included in the final report would preemptively address their concerns.

The draft report makes several recommendations that, if enacted, would indeed streamline the planning process. Most of the proposed changes could be accomplished through minor regulatory changes or by working creatively within existing regulatory and statutory constraints. There are no significant recommendations within the draft report that would require statutory changes. Some interest group representatives have expressed concern that the lack of any language strongly endorsing statutory changes belies HUD's original promise that "everything is on the table."

The draft report includes several brief proposals for possible pilots, and it includes language that seems to encourage grantees not only to volunteer for these pilots but to suggest possible pilots of their own. Proposed pilots touch on the following issues, among others:

- enhancing citizen participation;
- developing alternative documents for submission;
- finding alternative means to meet non-housing community development plan requirement;
- developing an abbreviated plan for CDBG-only entitlements;
- improving performance measurement; replicating best practices; and
- developing automated tools for reporting accomplishments and ConPlan submission.

During the most recent conference call, NCDA staff expressed its belief that the draft report does not have enough to say on two issues that are of concern to NCDA members. First, in the section detailing information technology-related recommendations, the report said almost nothing about HUD's plans for modernizing IDIS. This struck us as an important omission, and the HUD representatives on the call agreed that the final report should include additional language on this subject. The report also included some language recommending that CPD provide review guidance to HUD Field Office Staff to address the fact the some field offices have different expectations or requirements for submission of the ConPlan and the CAPER. We suggested that this section of the report should include a more strongly worded recommendation. The disparate treatment of grantees served by different field offices has become a sore spot for many of our members, and CPD needs to ensure that field offices are enforcing a single, universal set of standards.

HUD hopes to issue guidance clarifying current consolidated planning requirements in December. This guidance will come, in part, in the form of a new "Questions and Answers" document currently in development. HUD has also set a deadline of January 2003 for designing pilots and identifying those communities that will participate in these pilots. Pilots will begin go online in March 2003. Proposals for regulatory (and possibly statutory) changes can be expected sometime in 2004.

HUD BRIEFS PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS ON IDIS MODERNIZATION PLANS, NEW RACE/ETHNIC DATA COLLECTION POLICY

Representatives from NCDA and other public interest groups attended a briefing at HUD headquarters on October 30. Those in attendance received the latest news on the IDIS modernization plan, the IDIS "single sign-on" pilot, and HUD's new race category data policy.

Robyne Doten from HUD provided an update on the IDIS migration strategy. At the time of the meeting, HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) was in the process of retaining a think tank to provide a second opinion on the plan. The think tank is also charged with comparing the IDIS proposal with the e-Grants plan in an effort to eliminate redundancies. CPD has requested that the Gardner Group's report be delivered by the end of November. Robyne described this report as perhaps the key deliverable for advancing the IDIS modernization process. Past efforts to develop new tools (DGMS, for example) have been hampered by contractors straying from their original tasks; the Gardner Group report should give the IDIS migration strategy the legitimacy it needs to gain final Departmental approval and to be implemented without any additional major changes.

HUD's Bob Brever provided an update on the implementation of new race categories. **December 13** is the first key date in this process. On that day, the new race categories will go into effect. For activities newly entered into IDIS on or after December 13, grantees will be required to collect data on the 10 new categories as well as Hispanic ethnicity. For activities entered before December 13, IDIS will display the 10 updated race categories as well as two race categories (Hispanic, which becomes a yes/no ethnicity category, and Asian/Pacific Islander, which will be split into Asian and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander) that will become obsolete. For these previously entered activities, grantees will have until March 31, 2004 to switch over to the new categories, although they are encouraged to switch over earlier if possible. The policy is not retroactive; grantees will not be required to revise old data. *See the attached letter from Assistant Secretary Roy Bernardi for more information.*

Bob Brever also briefed the interest group representatives on the status of the delayed "single sign-on" IDIS pilot. After some technology-related delays, the pilot is finally ready to move forward. Pilot participants, who have been in place for months, will be able to download reports to a secure FTP server located within HUD's firewall. Participants will not have to log in separately to the report server, as is currently required. Participants will also be able to preview reports in their entirety without downloading them; they can choose to download the report from within the preview screen. The pilot system uses Windows dialogue boxes during downloads, and users can rename reports and choose a location anywhere on their computer or network for saving the report.

HUD NEWS

HUD ASKS GRANTEES WHY THEY AREN'T SPENDING LEAD PAINT TESTING FUNDS

The office of Community Planning and Development is asking grantees why they are not making more use of the $10 million in lead-based paint testing funding. These are funds that can be used for reimbursement costs for testing units after the lead work has been performed. There are many answers to this question, however the main reason is that it costs too much to get the money. Other reasons include:

- The reimbursements only cover the cost of testing after the project has been completed, those costs do not include having to go back into the unit to do more work;
- The real costs involved in the lead paint issue is at the "evaluation of the hazard stage" which are not covered under the testing phase;
- The paper work involved in getting reimbursed is not worth the chance that the reimbursement will come through;
- The time it takes for reimbursements to come back to the grantees from HUD;
- Why can't the funds be used from certifying contractors, which is a higher cost to both CDBG and HOME programs.

FY 2002 FUNDING AWARDS ANNOUNCED FOR HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HUD has announced FY 2002 award amounts for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program, which is administered by the Office of the Assistant Director for Policy Development and Research.

FY2002 HISTORICALLY BLACK PROGRAM FUNDING COMPETITION AWARDEES

Institution	*Location*	*Grant Amount*
Norfolk State University	Norfolk, VA	$500,000
Hampton University	Hampton, VA	301,505
Delaware State University	Dover, DE	338,766
C.A. Fredd Technical College Campus of Shelton Community College, Branch Campus	Tuscaloosa, AL	549,990
Stillman College	Tuscaloosa, AL	524,790
Benedict College	Columbia, SC	500,000
South Carolina State University	Orangeburg, SC	549,945
LeMoyne-Owen College	Memphis, TN	549,062
Fisk University	Nashville, TN	550,000
Morehouse College	Atlanta, GA	526,414
North Carolina A&T State University	Greensboro, NC	548,000
North Carolina Central University	Durham, NC	549,479
Gadsden State Community College	Gadsden, AL	424,000
Florida A&M University	Tallahassee, FL	542,674
Rust College	Holly Springs, MS	550,000
Alcorn State University	Alcorn State, MS	497,929
Dillard University	New Orleans, LA	550,000
Southern University and A&M College	Baton Rouge, LA	550,000
Southern University at Shreveport	Shreveport, LA	322,211
Jarvis Christian College	Hawkins, TX	338,274
Paul Quinn College	Dallas, TX	550,000
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	Pine Bluff, AR	368,330

NCDA NOTES

NCDA'S CDBG FORMULA COMMITTEES BEGINS ITS WORK

The NCDA Board of Directors has requested that a subcommittee of the Community Development Committee (the CDBG Formula Committee) review the CDBG formula in response to the changes wrought by the 2000 Census. Due to the demographic changes the 2000 Census raised and because of the fact that the population, housing and poverty data factors will be used in the CDBG formula, the Board thought it might be time, again, to revisit the CDBG formula.
HUD also undertakes a study of the CDBG formula after each decennial census, and they have asked the public interest groups to provide comment on the CDBG formula. The following is a portion of a memo on the responsibilities of this committee.

The Committee's Charge and Goals

The overarching goal of this committee should be to review the CDBG formula in light of the 2000 U.S. Census data and the HUD 2002 Formula Study and to make recommendations that ensure that the Community Development Block Grant Program will continue to be a broadly supported program which targets funding to meet the needs of the nation's low- and moderate-income families and individuals. In doing this, the Association will continue to be seen as advocating for, and helping to maintain the good support the CDBG program has garnered during its 27 year history. However, we must be careful not to recommend changes that would pit one community, one region, or one political party against another.

The Committee shall recommend the Association's policy on the validity of the CDBG formula (i.e., given the existing formula factors, are they good or relevant measures of neediness within communities as a means of funding distribution–as Congress intended?)

If the Committee determines that the existing formulas and their factors are not adequate indicators of need **and** that the political/internal process would not be destructive, it should proceed to review the formula factors as follows:

The Committee should determine if minor "tweaking" of the existing formulas would result in a more equitable distribution of funds (e.g., making age of housing pre-1950 occupied by poor, as in the HOME Program). Other possible changes, including direct use of low/moderate income population as a formula factor, would likely result in substantially greater gains and losses. However, using a low/moderate income factor is problematic because HUD would have to generate these numbers and therefore reduce the "standardization" of the factors that the decennial census provides.

Are there better, standardized, quantifiable measures of need? What impact would these measures have on funding allocations? Whatever new data elements the committee chooses, they must be available through the Census Bureau and/or HUD. HUD has indicated they will work with us to test any proposed formula factors.

Should the program continue to use two formulas? If not, what would be a better alternative formula to get at the growth lag and pre-1940 age of housing issues that formula "B" addresses?

We will need to consider the political realities of any proposed change. Will there be more losers than winners? What districts do the cuts occur in? Regardless of what HUD, the Administration, and OMB may want, any change will first have to get through Congress.

If at any time the Committee finds that political turmoil and/or internal NCDA dissension would damage the Program and/or the Association, the Committee should recommend no change to the existing formulas. The first priority must be to "do no harm."

HUD's CDBG Formula Study

In discussions with HUD officials, it has been suggested that HUD will consider all aspects of the CDBG formula, and that targeting (low/mod) will receive close scrutiny. It has also been suggested that public interest group input should address that issue, and that most of the work on the study by HUD will be completed at about the time of the release of the President's 2004 Budget to Congress. It is not clear what this means except that OMB will have a role in the formula deliberations. Consequently, the Association should be ready with its recommendation before the 2004 Budget comes out.

The Committee's recommendations to the Board should be completed before the next Board of Directors Meeting at the Winter Meeting, January 23, 2003.

Schedule

Dec. 10 – Introductory Teleconference
Agenda
- Introductions
- Background
- 1995 HUD Formula Study
- Staff report on discussions with legislators/other interest groups
- HUD Comments on Factors already looked at
- Request that New Formula Factors be Suggested

Jan. 7, 2003 – Teleconference
Agenda
- Staff report on discussions with legislators/other interest groups
- HUD Report on Factors studied and Impacts
- Suggestions for Additional Factors
- Discussion – Preliminary Recommendations

January 22, 2003– Winter Meeting – DC
- Staff report on discussions with legislators/other interest groups
- HUD Report on Factors studied and Impacts

.

Discussion – Preliminary Recommendations

Committee Chairs shall determine the sequence of issues to discuss and a time-frame for conclusion of discussion on each issue. A draft of the recommendations should be completed before the Christmas holidays.

The Committee Chairs shall determine what information is needed to assist the committee in its work. NCDA staff will work with HUD and the Census Bureau secure the information for discussion.

Committee Composition

Formula "B" Communities

Newton, MA
Providence, RI
Union County, NJ
Pittsburgh, PA
Birmingham, AL
Seattle, WA
New Orleans, LA

Formula "A" Communities

Jacksonville, FL
Fulton County, GA
Denton, TX
Austin, TX
Colorado Springs, CO
Sacramento, CA
Los Angeles County, CA

CDBG TRAINING

- NCDA ***IS*** holding a *CDBG Basics: Training for Practitioners* Course in Daytona Beach, FL on December 4-6, 2002. Please contact Emory Counts for more information.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ATTACHMENTS
To access the files below please go to NCDAonline (http://ncdaonline.org)

- **Letter from CPD Assistant Secretary Roy Bernardi on New Race/Ethnic Data Collection Policy**

- **Board of Director's Meeting Minutes**