NCDA WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: **CHANDRA WESTERN**
VICKI WATSON
KAREN PARKER
JEFF FALCUSAN
TAMARA JACKSON

DATE: **July 28, 2004**

NCDA 2005 Winter Legislative and Policy Meeting; January 18-20, 2005 at the Wyndham Hotel
NCDA Annual Conference; May 16-21, 2005 at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Austin, Texas

FEATURED ARTICLES

- ***FY 2005 Appropriations Update: House Cuts Most of HUD's Programs Including CDBG and HOME***
- ***Subcommittee Hearing on Low-income Housing Adds to Appropriations Intrigue***
- ***NCDA and NCSHA Successful in Getting House Leaders to Send Letter to HUD on the Home Repayment Issue***
- ***HUD News: HUD Set to Celebrate 30 Years of CDBG; HUD Issues Proposed Rule on Slum Blight Designation***
- ***NCDA Notes: NCDA 2005 Winter Legislative and Policy Meeting; January 18-20, 2005, at the Wyndham Hotel; NCDA Annual Conference***
- ***Attachments: Winter Legislative and Policy Meeting Agenda; Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting; HUD CDBG 30th Anniversary Celebration Conference Agenda; Letter from House Authorizers to Secretary Jackson on HOME Repayment Issue***
- ***Attachments and Job Announcements***

FY 2005 APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE: HOUSE CUTS MOST OF HUD'S PROGRAMS INCLUDING CDBG AND HOME

House appropriators kept their promise to mark-up all 13 spending bills before leaving town for their scheduled summer recess, which began on July 23 and ends September 7. The chart below provides you with an update of all 13 spending measures. On June 9, the House Appropriations Committee approved its FY 2005 spending allocations for its 13 appropriations subcommittees. Although the VA-HUD-IA subcommittee received $2.13 billion more than the FY2004 enacted funding level and $801 million above the Administration's FY 2005 budget request, it was not enough to meet the spiraling cost of medical care for veterans nor to fully fund the Section 8 voucher program [which the President's budget underfunded by approximately $1.5 billion].

Status of FY05 Appropriations

Agency	House Action	Senate Action	Signed by the President
Agriculture	Passed the House on 7/13	None	No
Commerce, Justice, State	Passed the House on 7/8	None	No
Defense	Adopted on 7/22	Adopted on 7/22	Yes
District of Columbia	Passed the House on 7/20	None	No
Energy & Water	Passed the House on 6/25	None	No
Foreign Operations	Passed the House on 7/15	None	No
Homeland Security	Passed the House on 6/18	Full committee mark-up completed on 6/17	No
Interior	Passed the House on 6/17	Subcommittee mark-up completed on 6/23	No
Labor-HHS-Education	Full committee mark-up completed on 7/14	None	No
Legislative Branch	Passed the House on 7/12	Full committee mark-up completed on 7/15	No
Military Construction	Passed the House on 7/22	Full committee mark-up completed on 7/15	No
Transportation-Treasury	Full committee mark-up completed on 7/22	None	No
VA-HUD-IA	Full committee mark-up completed on 7/22	None	No

The bill's discretionary spending totals $92.9 billion, an increase of about 2.4 percent from the 2004 figure. Many committee members complained that the allocation – imposed by the House-passed fiscal year budget resolution [S Con Res 95 – H Rept 108-498]– was far too low. "We cannot keep supporting budget resolutions that are unrealistic," said Rep. Alan B. Mollohan of West Virginia, the ranking member of the VA-HUD subcommittee. "It's fantasy. It's delusional. We are abdicating power and responsibility to the Budget Committee." The House Appropriations Committee completed its FY 2005 VA-HUD-IA spending bill on July 22. Unfortunately, CDBG and HOME, and other HUD programs suffered across the board cuts. As we reported in the last issue of the Washington Report, House appropriators were faced with stark shortfalls in veterans medical care and Section 8 funding, their two top spending priorities. As a result, the committee agreed to a 4% across the board spending cut in all other programs under its jurisdiction in order to fully fund medical care for veterans and section 8 vouchers. CDBG suffered a slightly higher cut of 4.5%

HUD's Programs

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is funded at $37.7 billion, $108 million below last year's level and $1 billion above the President's request. Total funding for HUD has increased by $4.7 billion or 14% over the last four years. Despite this growth, funding for most HUD programs has remained flat or been reduced due to the rapid growth in the Section 8 program, which now consumes more than half of HUD's budget, up from 41% four years ago. Most of the growth has occurred in Section 8 voucher renewals, which has increased by almost 30 percent since FY01, including a $14.5% increase in FY04 alone. Section 8 funding now consumers over 53 percent of HUD's budget. The House appropriators pointed out in their committee report that ***"...such growth is not sustainable and reform is imperative to ensure that the nation's housing and community development needs are served. The Committee strongly urges the authorization committees to take the actions necessary to reform the program. The Committee is concerned that absent such reform, the viability of all HUD programs, including the Section 8 programs, will be compromised."*** Absent these authorization changes and faced with a tight allocation the subcommittee had to decrease most HUD programs by 4% in order to fund the continued rapid growth in the Section 8 program.

The committee did not include any authorizing language for the Administration's proposal to provide public housing authorities greater flexibility in administering their programs by eliminating mandatory income targeting, mandatory tenant rent caps, and other requirements. The committee again directs HUD to continue to renew annual contributions contracts in the Section 8 voucher program on a budget-basis, not on a unit basis. In its report, the committee notes, "...Public housing authorities are required to manage their programs within the budget provided in their annual contributions contract renewal. No funding is provided to allow amendments to such contracts." The report goes on to say that, "...Language is continued, carried in previous years, prohibiting public housing authorities from over-leasing. The committee is very concerned that, despite the specific statutory prohibitions in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 appropriations Acts, some public housing authorities continued to engage in this prohibited practice. The committee directs the Department to provide a report to the committee not later than November 15, 2004 of all public housing authorities that violated the statutory prohibitions, the sources of funds used to support such over-leasing, and the sanctions levied against such authorities by the Department."

The chart at the back of this newsletter provides the committee's recommendation for funding of HUD's programs. As mentioned earlier, due to the continuing increase in the Section 8 program, the committee cut all of HUD's programs by 4 percent. Because of this action, the formula allocation for CDBG is decreased from $4.350 billion in FY04 to the committee's recommended level of $4.305 billion. The committee funded approximately $137 million in EDI special purpose grants. This number may increase as the appropriations process continues. The FY04 funding level for EDI grants was $278 million. The committee provided no funds for the President's proposed Development Challenge Pilot or the Faith Based Pilot, stating budget restraints. No funding was provided for the proposed Samaritan Housing Initiative either, a program targeted at the chronically homeless. Furthermore, the formula allocation for HOME is decreased from $1.858 billion in FY04 to $1.776 billion, based on the committee's recommendation.

The committee expresses its concern over the recent changes in the MSA boundaries and the effect on higher income areas. In its committee report, the committee notes, "the recent changes to MSA boundaries may significantly lower area median incomes in some communities with high housing costs, making ineligible many families and individuals who are currently eligible for housing subsidized through the Community Development Block Grant program and the HOME program, which have adjusted media income (AMI) eligibility requirements. The Committee encourages HUD to explore ways to help such MSAs transition to the new AMIs, other than through any adjustment of funding formulas, to reduce the impact of MSA boundary changes on affordable housing and homeownership opportunities."

Once again, the committee has include authorizing language in HUD's homeless assistance programs that requires recipients to provide a 25% match on social services activities, requires HUD to provide at least 30% of the funds available for homeless programs (excluding Shelter Plus Care renewals) to permanent housing, and requires HUD to renew all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts.

In terms of lead hazard control, the committee recommends $138.3 million for HUD's lead-based paint hazard control grant program, but no funding for the Urban Lead Reduction Grant, which is targeted to the top 25 cities with lead hazards. This is a priority program of Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Senator Jack Reed (D-RI), so we expect to see this program funded later in the appropriations process.

What Happens Next?

The Senate still has to pass most of its 13 spending measures. So far, the Senate has passed only two of its 13 spending bills: Defense and Homeland Security. Congress will only have a limited number of working days to focus on these spending measures when it returns from its six week summer recess on September 7 as they plan to officially adjourn for the session in early October to focus on the November elections. This clearly will not allow sufficient time for the Senate to pass all of its 11 remaining spending measures. Congress will likely have to enact a Continuing Resolution to keep those federal agencies without a FY 2005 approved spending measure operating at their FY 2004 spending levels until Congress returns to complete work on the remaining spending bills. We will likely see the same scenario that has played out in the last two years with Congress approving one large omnibus spending bill in January or February of next year for those FY 2005 spending bills not already enacted.

What Can You Do?

GET IN TOUCH WITH YOUR CONGRESSIONAL MEMBERS NOW! Let them know that the cuts to CDBG and HOME are unacceptable, despite the growing cost of Section 8. NCDA is working in partnership with other national associations to work to restore the cuts to the programs, *but without your* *participation in this process, the cuts will not be restored*. Please act today by sending a letter (see the draft letter posted to NCDA's website at www.ncdaonline.org) by mail, fax, and e-mail. We also need you to meet with your Congressional members while they are on recess to ask them to restore the cuts to CDBG and HOME. Have your subrecipients also contact them. Without direct participation on your part, the programs will be targeted for cuts, now and in the future.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON LOW-INCOME HOUSING ADDS TO APPROPRIATIONS INTRIGUE

A July 19 hearing added a new dimension of uncertainty to an already muddled FY 2005 appropriations process. As the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee met across the street in the Capitol Building, the House Financial Service's Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity met to review a recent Government Accounting Office (GAO) report on preserving multifamily housing for low-income tenants. Although the hearing was intended to shed light on a specific policy challenge, the subcommittee's Democratic members were aggressive in their efforts to change the subject to difficulties facing the Section 8 program and the resulting consequences for other HUD programs.

The hearing's principal witness was David G. Wood, Director of Financial Markets and Community Investment for the GAO. His statement focused on the hearing's nominal purpose, which was to review a January 2004 report on HUD-subsidized rental properties scheduled to reach mortgage maturity in the next ten years. This GAO report explored the potential impact on tenants when these mortgages reach maturity due to the expiration of affordability requirements. The report also examined tools and incentives that HUD, the states, and localities can offer owners to keep HUD properties affordable when mortgages mature. During their opening statements, and during the question and answer periods, subcommittee members quickly shifted gears from a discussion of the expiring mortgage issue to a policy problem with more immediacy: shortfalls in Section 8 and the impact on the HUD budget.

Although Congress provided the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) with sufficient funds this year to continue supporting all vouchers now in use, HUD recently adopted a new method of distributing voucher funds to housing agencies that is leaving millions of dollars in appropriated funds unspent — and many agencies without the funds they need to maintain their programs.

Traditionally, HUD has provided state and local housing agencies with sufficient funds to cover the actual cost of the vouchers they distribute. In April, however, HUD announced that it was adopting a new funding system for fiscal year 2004 in which each agency's voucher funding is based on its voucher costs during the spring and summer of 2003,
adjusted for a regional inflation factor computed by HUD.

As a result of this change, many agencies are receiving insufficient funds to pay landlords for all vouchers now in use. One reason for the shortfalls is that actual rents in many communities have risen faster than the rent inflation formula that HUD has adopted. Another is that HUD's new funding system does not take into account the fact that stagnant or falling incomes drive up voucher costs just as rising rents do.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) recently released a report examining 190 state and local housing agencies in 35 states that are being forced to reduce the amount of rental assistance they provide and/or the number of people they help. Together, the 190 housing agencies assist roughly 30 percent of all families helped by the program nationally. According to CBPP, over half of the 190 agencies are cutting costs by reducing the size of the subsidies they provide to families in the program, even families with little or no income. Almost half of the 190 agencies are cutting costs by reducing the number of families in the program. Some agencies have been forced to cut off program assistance for families that have been depending on it to help pay the rent. More agencies may have to take this extreme step over the next few months.

Agencies that experience funding shortfalls will almost certainly have to scale back their voucher programs. While HUD has said it will allow some agencies to ask for additional funds, it plans to provide such funds only under limited circumstances. CBPP says it appears likely that HUD will not notify agencies of any funding adjustments until around the end of August. Many agencies will have no choice but to assume the worst and make cuts in advance of that notification.

The new funding system is just one component of what looks like an increasingly bleak future for the Section 8 program. Under the Administration's FY 2005 budget proposal, Section 8 funding for 2005 would be set about $1.6 billion below the level needed to continue today's level of services. This presents appropriators with a serious policy-making dilemma. On the one hand, the Congress has not shown a willingness to let Section 8 funding fall below what is needed to renew all existing vouchers. On the other hand, the Section 8 program each year consumes a larger portion of HUD's overall budget.

On July 19, two House subcommittees were attacking the Section 8 problems from different angles. Democratic members of the Financial Services subcommittee indicated a willingness to pursue some sort of legislative fix to HUD's new funding system, while keeping an eye on the appropriations process to see if appropriators will attempt to roll a similar provision into their funding bill. The subcommittee's Ranking Member Maxine Waters (D-CA) in particular demonstrated her willingness to play a leading role in such an effort.

Meanwhile, across the street in the Capitol building, appropriators decided to cut nearly every HUD program by 4%, as well as several EPA and NASA initiatives, in order to fully fund the Section 8 program and certain veterans' health care programs for FY 2005. The subcommittee's mark survived the full House Appropriations Committee's mark-up a few days later (see related article for more details). However, because of the proposed NASA cuts, the bill may be dead on arrival due to opposition from House Majority Leader Tom Delay (R-TX) whose constituency includes large numbers of employees of the Johnson Space Center. If the appropriations process is not the best vehicle for addressing concerns over the funding system, it may be left to the authorizing committee to deal with the problem.

No matter what comes of the Financial Services and Appropriations Committees' respective efforts to address the laundry list of Section 8 problems, the elephant in the room remains. Unless overall HUD appropriations begin growing at a substantially greater rate, and absent serious programmatic reforms, fully funding Section 8 year after year will necessitate the erosion of funding for nearly every other HUD program designed to improve the lives of low- and moderate-income Americans, including CDBG.

NCDA AND NCSHA SUCCESSFUL IN GETTING HOUSE LEADERS TO SEND LETTER TO HUD ON THE HOME REPAYMENT ISSUE

After months of work, NCDA and NCSHA have been successful in encouraging leaders of both the House Financial Services Committee and the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity to send a letter to Secretary Jackson voicing their concerns with the policy change detailed by HUD in its June 2003 issue of *HOMEFires*. This policy told participating jurisdictions that they were required to repay HOME funds invested in properties that went into foreclosure during the HOME affordability period. Participating jurisdictions had always operated under the premise that they did not have to repay these funds. If you are in the process of reworking your program documents to accommodate HUD's new policy, suspend those efforts. The letter directs HUD to provide a clarification to the House committee on their policy and to meet with House staff on the issue. A copy of the letter is attached. Please contact Vicki Watson at NCDA at 202-887-5532 with any questions.

HUD NEWS

HUD FINALIZES PLANS FOR CDBG 30TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

Its official! HUD has completed its plans to celebrate 30 years of the Community Development Block Grant program. For some, it appeared that it would take another 30 years to finalize the logistics for such an auspicious occasion. However, on September 13-14, hundreds of grantees, practitioners, mayors, city, state and federal officials will converge on the nation's capital (at the Mayflower Renaissance Hotel) to celebrate the program and recognize the grantees for a job well done. From discussions with HUD, this two-day event will not only be a celebration of 30 years of the granddaddy of all block grants, but also an occassion to acknowledge the tremendous work of the community development practitioners, without whom the CDBG program never would have survived.

As might be expected, the agenda will have a "training component" with an eye toward what works within the program as well as how we can improve on what has become a reliable source of funding for programs and activities that primarily benefit lower income persons. Good program administration, quality projects, and effective reporting will be key components of the sessions during this conference. And like any event held in Washington, this one will most assuredly include the presentation of awards.

HUD has contracted with the Mayflower Hotel as the conference site. As we understand it, 400 rooms have been blocked for the event, so if you want to ensure a room and one at the group rate, you must register early. It is not clear if there will be overflow hotels, so register early and book your room soon. NCDA will most likely hold a Board of Directors Meeting on Sunday afternoon or early evening directly preceding HUD's CDBG celebration.

NCDA staff will be on site for the duration of the event. Please look for the NCDA booth in the exhibit hall. We plan to formally extend a special welcome to the new entitlement communities attending the event. We hope to see all of you there and know we can count on you to impress upon these new entitlements the benefits of NCDA membership.

HUD PUBLISHES PROPOSED RULE THAT EXPANDS ACTIVITIES UNDER THE SLUM AND BLIGHT NATIONAL OBJECTIVE IN THE CDBG PROGRAM

On July 9th HUD published in the *Federal Register* a proposed rule that would expand the "slums or blight" national objective criteria to include known and suspected environmental contamination, as well as economic disinvestment, as blighting influences. The proposed rule would require grantees to establish definitions of blighting influences and to retain records. In addition, an area slums and blight definition would be required to be redetermined every five years for continued qualification under this national objective.

The proposed rule would include the abatement of asbestos hazards and lead-based paint hazard evaluation and reduction as eligible rehabilitation activities. And lastly, the proposed rule would require that acquisition or relocation must be a precursor to other activities which eliminate specific conditions of blight or physical decay when addressing slums and blight on a spot basis.

Why the proposed changes?

Over the last ten years, there has been some confusion on the eligibility of remediation, development or redevelopment of environmentally contaminated sites under CDBG and what national objective the funding of these types of activities would fall. Most practitioners are aware of this, however the language in the regulations was deemed to unclear on HUD's intent. Therefore HUD determined a need to publish a proposed rule.

Specifics: Eligible Activities

Under this proposed rule assessment and remediation of sites with known or suspected environmental contamination would be listed as eligible activities under 570.201(d), which addresses clearance. Development or redevelopment of properties with known or suspected contamination would be specifically identified as eligible under 570.203, special economic development activities and at 570.204, special economic development activities carried out by community-based development organizations. The rule would allow for some site assessment costs to be eligible as planning costs, while others may be actual project delivery costs. For example, preliminary studies to determine if a site is contaminated, the cause of contamination, and the extent of contamination would generally be planning costs. Studies to determine what type or level of remediation must be undertaken to develop a specific property for a specific use would qualify under other eligibility categories as project implementation costs.

HUD also proposes to revise 580.202(a), to make clear that for a private, for profit businesses, abatement of asbestos hazard and lead-based paint hazard evaluation and reduction are eligible. This is proposed because the elimination of these hazards is a health and public safety benefit to the public. Abatement of these conditions through demolition is also eligible, provided that there is compliance with environmental requirements. HUD also proposes to amend section 570.202(b)(2) to include "improvements" to the list of items eligible for rehabilitation and preservation activities. "Improvements" would be added to maintain greater consistency with the introductory language at 570.202.

Other sections of the CDBG regulations would also be amended to ensure consistency with the proposed intent to expand the definition of what constitutes a blighted area and what activities are eligible under that national objective designation. Specifically, they reference the Section 108 Guaranteed Loan Program at 570.703 and the public benefit standards for economic development projects at 570.203 and 570.204.

These three sections follow in line with the changes proposed in the other sections mentioned above, which increases grantee flexibility in funding brownfields remediation and other environmentally hazardous materials under the slum and blight designation.

National Objective Standards for Addressing Slums or Blight on an Area Basis.

The current rules contains the four criteria for addressing slums or blight on an area basis:

1. *The areas must meet a state or local definition of a slum or blighted, deteriorated or deteriorating area;*

2. *The area must contain a substantial number of deteriorated or deteriorating buildings or the public improvements must be in a general state of deterioration;*

3. *The assisted activity must address one or more of the conditions that contributed to the deterioration of the areas;*

4. *The recipient must keep records sufficient to document its findings that a project meets the national objective of prevention or elimination of slums or blight.*

HUD proposes to significantly expand the second criteria that would include, in addition to deteriorated or deteriorating buildings, physical deterioration of improvements on private property. The inclusion of physical property is because HUD recognizes that lack of improvements on private property can have a blighting influence. Examples of this include: retaining wall that are in disrepair; abandoned industrial equipment on land; or a deteriorated pedestrian bridge. HUD also proposes to include other factors that recognize economic disinvestment and environmental contamination as blighting influences. These are:

1. Abandonment of properties;

2. Chronic high turnover rates or chronic high vacancy rates in occupancy of commercial or industrial buildings;

3. Significant decline in property values or abnormally low property values relative to other areas in the community; and

4. Known or suspected environmental contamination of properties.

The purpose of the new criteria is to allow grantees the ability to mix and match the activities based on their circumstances. It would be up to grantees to determine how they would use these new criteria. There is, however, a distinction in the proposed rule. If deteriorated public improvements in the area is cited as one of the reasons for the "blighted" determination, grantees must show that these conditions exist throughout the entire area of designation. Grantees would also have to keep records informing HUD of the definitions they used to justify "deteriorated and deteriorating properties," as well as all other cited documentation of blighting conditions. And lastly, HUD will require that any activities undertaken in these areas with CDBG funds will have to address the blighting influences and must be re-designated every five years.

Analysis

This proposed rule accomplishes two things: it allows grantees more flexibility in qualifying areas as blighted based on expanded definitions that allow for more activities to be classified as blighting influences, and it virtually requires grantees to undertake more comprehensive planning, and therefore funding in a slum or blight designated area.

This rule appears to be an attempt by the administration to reinforce its philosophy of targeting by spurring more directed funding and revitalization efforts that it feels should be part of grantees' efforts in improving the quality of life in communities. This would explain why there is a proposed reclassification of the area every five years. It seems that HUD expects that within this five year designation grantees would be allocating a portion of their CDBG funds to significantly improve the slum and blighted area.

The other issue for grantees to consider is the urban renewal areas which have been in place for decades. Presently, a previously qualified urban renewal area already qualifies as a slum and blighted area. Will grantees have to re-qualify these areas, and will they have to "finish" the work in these areas within a five year period in order to continue to make improvements under the slum a blight national objective?

NCDA encourages members to send in their comments on this proposed rule to HUD by

September 7th and copy NCDA.. NCDA will also submit comments on behalf of all of our members.

NCDA NOTES

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

NCDA will hold a Board of Directors Meeting on September 12, 2004 in Washington, DC. Since we will not hold an Executive Symposium this year, the idea is to piggyback the board meeting with HUD's 30th Anniversary Celebration of the CDBG program. The time and location has yet to be determined, but we wanted Board members to make their travel plans for HUD's event to coincide with the Board meeting. We will send out Board agendas within two weeks.

ATTACHMENTS AND JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

- Board of Directors Minutes
- Winter Legislative and Policy Meeting Agenda
- 2005 National Community Development Week Art Competition
- HUD's CDBG 30th Anniversary Conference Agenda
- Letter from House Authorizers to Secretary Jackson on HOME Repayment Issue

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Program	FY04 Enacted	FY05 President's Request	FY05 House Appropriations Cmte.
Community Development Fund	$4.921 billion	$4.618 billion	$4.711 billion
Set-Asides:			
Native American CD Grants	$72 million	$72 million	$69 million
NCDI	$35 million	$30 million	$33.5 million
Section 107	$52 million	$35 million	$36.7 million
Housing Assistance Council	$3.3 million	$3 million	$3.2 million
Native Am. Indian Council	$2.5 million	$2 million	$2.4 million
NHDC	$5 million	$0	$4.8 million
National Council of La Raza	$5 million	$0	$4.8 million
SHOP	$27 million	$65 million	$26 million
Youthbuild	$65 million	$65 million	$62 million
Special Olympics	$0	$0	$2 million
EDI Special Purpose Grants	$278 million	$0	$136.5 million
Neighborhood Initiatives	$21 million	$0	$20.5 million
Working Capital Fund	$4.9 million	$1 million	$4.7 million
Development Challenge	$0	$10 million	$0
Grants	$0	$5 million	$0
Faith Based Pilot	$570.7 million	$288 million	$406.1 million
Total Set-Asides			
	$4.350 billion	$4.330 billion	$4.305 billion
Formula Grants			
HOME	$2.006 billion	$2.084 billion	$1.920 billion
Set-Asides:			
ADDI	$87.5 million	$200 million	$85 million
Housing Counseling	$40 million	$0	$38 million
Technical Assistance	$18 million	$18 million	$17.4 million
Working Capital Fund	$2.1 million	$2 million	$2 million
Total Set-Asides	$147.6 million	$220 million	$142.4 million
Formula Grants	$1.858 billion	$1.864 billion	$1.776 billion
HOPWA	$295 million	$295 million	$282 million
Rural Housing & Econ.Dev.	$25 million	$0	$24 million
Round II EZ/ECs	$14.9 million	$0	$14.250 million
Section 108	$7.282 million	$0	$7 million
Brownfields	$24.8 million	$0	$24 million
HOPE VI	$149 million	$0	$148 million
Public Housing Operating Fund	$3.579 billion	$3.573 billion	$3.425 billion
Public Housing Capital Fund	$2.696 billion	$2.674 billion	$2.580 billion

Native American Housing Block Grant	$650 million	$647 million	$622 million
Section 202	$774 million	$773 million	$741million
Section 811	$249 million	$249 million	$238 million
Homeless Programs	$1.260 billion	$1.282 billion	$1.206 billion
Fair Housing	$47.7 million	$47.7 million	$46 million
Lead Hazard Control	$174 million	$139 million	$167 million
Housing Certificate Fund	$19.257 billion	$18.466 billion	$20 billion
Samaritan Initiative	$0	$50 million	$0