NCDA
WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN PARKER

DATE: April 22, 2005

NCDA Annual Conference; May 16-21, 2005 at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Austin, Texas
CDBG Basics Training for Practitioners: May 16-18, 2005, Hyatt Regency Hotel in Austin, Texas

FEATURED ARTICLES

- *Senator Bond Holds Hearings on HUD Appropriations; Secretary Jackson, and OMB Director Josh Bolton Testify*
- *Senator Allard Holds Hearing on HUD Appropriations: Secretary Jackson Testifies*
- *Strengthening America's Communities Committee Holds First Meeting in Fresno, CA*
- *NCDA President Amintha Cinotti Participates in Briefing for House Staff*
- *NCDA Notes: NCDA Bids Farewell to Sarah Wallace of Brookline, MA*
- *Attachments: Final Annual Conference Agenda; 2005/2006 Slate of Officers, Myths on SACI Proposal; Strategic Planning Materials*
- *Job Announcements*

SENATOR BOND HOLDS HEARINGS ON HUD APPROPRIATIONS; SECRETARY JACKSON, AND OMB DIRECTOR JOSH BOLTON TESTIFY

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittees finally shifted into gear to begin the FY 2006 appropriations process to determine the funding levels for each agency of the Federal government. In HUD's case, the funding level proposed by the President was $28.5 billion, $4.5 billion less than what Congress enacted last fall.

On April 14, Senator Christopher "Kit" Bond, Chairman of the TTHUD Appropriations Subcommittee held his first hearing on FY 2006 Appropriations with HUD being the focus. The only witness to testify was HUD Secretary, Alphonso Jackson. Of the nineteen members on the subcommittee, only four were in attendance, Chairman Christopher Bond (R-MO) , Senator Patty Murray (D-WA), Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT) and Senator Ted Stevens (R-AK). Attending on behalf of HUD was Secretary Jackson, Deputy Secretary Roy Bernardi, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, Steve Nesmith, Assistant Secretary Michael Liu from Public and Indian Housing, and Nelson Bregón, General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Grant programs.

The hearing began with Chairman Bond spending 15 minutes reading his opening statement. An opening statement of this length is highly unusual for a hearing of this nature, particularly when the Chair is not supportive of the President initiatives. Normally, majority members and ranking members are allotted 10 minuets for opening statements and questions. Obviously, given the strength of his convictions, the Chairman took the time he wanted, and said what he felt needed to be said. Needless to say, the interest group community was more than a little shocked, but very pleased, by his out-and-out impassioned support of the CDBG program and of his bewilderment at the administration's proposal to eliminate the program. What was also surprising was the Chairman's use of the word "eliminate" instead of "transfer" of CDBG, as has been the practice on the House side. Even his colleagues used the word "eliminate" in their comments on CDBG in the President's budget. His support was so strong, many of us forgot that he is a representative of the Republican party. Mr. Bond's opening statement was punctuated with many notable quotes, "this budget is tragic...troublesome..." and that "...the President was given some bad advise from OMB...in this assault on housing and community development programs."

The Chairman raised and waived the Performance Measurement System document that the Performance Measures Working Group (PMWG) (NCDA, COSCDA, NACCED, NAHRO) had worked on over the past year, admonishing the Administration for their disingenuousness in sitting at the table, hammering out the new reporting system, then to propose the elimination of the largest program covered by the new system. Senator Bond said ***"Mr. Secretary, I will do everything in my power to oppose the President's proposal to eliminate the CDBG program."***

Senator Bond was not too pleased that the President had proposed to eliminate HOPE VI, "...a program that I helped create." Nor was he pleased about the rescission of FY 2005 HOPE VI funding that "the Congress just appropriated last fall."

Secretary Jackson kept to his script. He supported the idea of consolidation of duplicative programs, housed in one agency, but he reiterated that he had argued for the programs to be housed at HUD. He told the Senators that "...the decision was made to move them to Commerce." He supports the President's goals of cutting the deficit by curtailing spending, however he did say that CDBG is a great program and that for the most part it works. Still, he made it clear that there is room for improvement. At this point in his remarks, he briefly addressed the formula study, which only those in the know, knew what he was speaking to. He never actually spoke the words "CDBG formula study." Instead, he said, that HUD and submitted four alternatives [to the CDBG formula allocations] to OMB and to Congress. Nothing more.

When asked about steps to improve CDBG, Mr. Jackson informed the Senators that he had "convened a panel of industry professionals to design a system that would better show where the CDBG dollars were being spent."

Arriving after the opening statements, Senator Patrick Leahy, sat in his seat with an expression of disbelief on his face as he opened his remarks by speaking of the continued assault on HUD and its programs since President Bush was elected. He detailed the Administration's priority of housing and homeownership, but saw a disproportionate amount of funding going to support these priorities. He listed off the programs that had come under fire in successive years of the Bush Presidency: public housing, Section 8, Hope VI and now CDBG. "You would have to be very naive if you can't see that these actions are an attempt to dismantle the agency," the Senator said as he concluded his statement.

Senator Patty Murray (D), Ranking Member from Washington State, suggested that HUD's budget reflects a larger cut that the 12% reduction that the administration is purporting. She indicated that there was language in the budget documents that allows the Secretary of HUD the discretion to cut another $2.65 billion from anywhere he chooses. Secretary Jackson could not respond and appeared surprised by the question. Ms. Murray was also concerned that if Congress was to act on HUD's budget, she needed to get answers to her question about the discretionary nature of the Secretary's ability to cut programs "...on a whim." After hearing Senator Murray's comments on the discretionary language in HUD's budget, Senator Bond leaned over to ask her about her figures.

Ms. Murray was also gravely concerned about migratory farm housing. This is a big issue in the State of Washington. Secretary Jackson informed her that HUD did not administer farm worker housing, and that this type of housing is administered by USDA. She asked if he would work with her and the other agencies that work with farm housing to come to some kind of interagency agreement on how to handle this issue. Of course he said he would.

Senator Ted Stevens from Alaska was most concerned about the HUD field office that covers his state. He complained vigorously about "...those folks down in California trying to administer programs in Alaska that have never been there..." He was concerned about a housing program that was having difficulties, and requested that the Secretary come to Alaska so that he could show him the problems. Mr. Jackson said he would

Chairman Bond, made the point, and said that "...if I were you Mr. Jackson, I would go to Alaska." Senator Bond informed the group that the Subcommittee would hold another hearing on HUD appropriations on April 21, and invite OMB Director, Josh Bolton to testify.

OMB DIRECTOR JOSH BOLTON TESTIFIES BEFORE TTHUD SUBCOMMITTEE

As promised, on April 21, Senator Bond held a second hearing on HUD's budget with OMB Director Josh Bolton as the only witness. After making a congenial opening message, Senator Bond introduced the witness and the OMB Director read his oral statement. At this point, Senator Bond defers to Ranking Member Senator Patty Murray who provides some very disturbing mental pictures for the Director. Mrs. Murray describes HUD's budget "...as a trip to the dentist." She waxes eloquently about the Administration's subterfuge as " elevator muzak playing *Don't worry, be happy,* and is setting us up for a train wreck."

Senator Murray again addresses the issue of the $2.65 billion in discretionary funding that the Secretary is free to rescind from any program he chooses so that he keeps spending at the caps set by the President. Mrs Murray is very concerned that the Appropriators need to be as clear as possible on how and where these funds would come from in order to make rational decisions on funding.

Senator Murray also points out that there is a $5-6 billion shortfall for the TTHUD Subcommittee overall and that "the math just doesn't add up. "I am worried about making some tough choices," she said.

Bolton follows the Administration's message by committing to cut the deficit in half by 2009, without raising taxes, or restricting the expansion of the current tax cuts. He says that this will entail a cut, or elimination of 150 programs in the amount of $20 billion.

Senator Bond asks why CDBG was eliminated. Bolton replies that the program is being consolidated and applying the money where it can be most effectively used. Senator Bond tries to explain that community development is very different from economic development, and that economic development is but one piece of the bigger puzzle. Bond tells Bolton that "it appears that OMB does not want to have a HUD." Bolton did not respond.

When asked about staffing issues and program activities, Bolton implies that the core staff at HUD would move to the Department of Commerce, where there is not currently expertise to administer the existing program. Bond is concerned about the plans for transferring staff and remarks that they will need to know exactly how that will happen as the mark-up for this Subcommittee is expected to take place in July.

Senator Bennett (D-UT) asks about rural programs being consolidated and transferred to Commerce. "Does the Department of Commerce have the capacity to administer these programs or will once they get there, will they be cut out entirely?" Bolton goes into "message mode" and speaks of inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of housing "like" programs in one agency. Bond injects that he has asked that same question and it has yet to be answered.

Bolton says that CDBG has become Revenue Sharing. "It sprinkles funds around" without any concentrated effort on the goals of what the funds are trying to achieve.

Senator Bennett, says that he "...supports consolidating for efficiency and effectiveness, but is anxious about where the CDBG funds will go and how Commerce will treat these [poor] people."

Senator Ted Stevens of Alaska is concerned about the Essential Air Service, EDA services in rural/remote areas and AR CAP, a reduction in Indian Health services. Stevens speaks eloquently of the similarities between Hawaii and Alaska in that both of these states are remote areas and that in fact Hawaii is bigger in area, "if you add in all the water between the islands." He is concerned that the OMB has lost sight of how the federal government addresses issues and programs in areas, for populations that they have no expertise in dealing with.

Senator Bond questions Director Bolton on OMB's PART review, and described, in detail, how poorly OMB fared under the scrutiny of GAO. Many of the same ineffective ratings were received by OMB as were received by CDBG. Bolton responded that they had taken steps to improve their efficiency rating. There being more further questions, the hearing was adjourned.

SENATOR ALLARD HOLDS HEARING ON HUD APPROPRIATIONS

Yesterday, April 21, Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation of the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee held a hearing on HUD appropriations. The only witness to testify was HUD Secretary Alphonso Jackson. Mr. Jackson was once again put in the unenviable position of defending the $4.5 billion cut to HUD's budget, which includes the elimination of the CDBG and HOPE VI programs, an additional $226 million recision of FY 2005 funding for HOPE VI, a cut to the Public Housing Operating fund and the $2.65 billion discretionary recision authority that the President proposes to provide the Secretary, in order to maintain spending caps and cut the deficit in half by 2009.

Senator Allard called the hearing to order by foregoing his opening statement, which was later added to the record, and asking his colleagues to strictly keep to the 5 minute questioning period because a call for votes was imminent. Secretary Jackson read a very brief opening statement which included a request of $28.5 billion, fully funds the Section 8 account and referred to his budget as "... a steward of the tax payers money." Mr. Jackson again, justified the cuts to HUD's budget on the Section 8 program, saying that its costs were "eating up" the HUD budget. Jackson went on to say that in FY 2005 the Section 8 program consumed 57% of HUD's budget. Immediately following Jackson's opening statement, Senator Allard called on ranking member Jack Reed of RI. Senator Reed, opened his remarks on the proposal to "dismantle and replace" the CDBG and 17 other economic development programs by 34%. He said that the only reason he could see the Administration pushing this proposal was a "desire to cut domestic spending." Then Senator Reed went down the list of programs slated for cuts or elimination within HUD's budget. He cited the cut to Public Housing modernization at $253 million, the 30% reduction in the Lead Paint demonstration program, then provided the Secretary with statistics on how the State of Rhode Island uses these dollars and how many children were impacted by lead poisoning. Senator Reed asked the Secretary if he thought housing was important, and if it is, why cut HUD's budget?

Secretary Jackson responded by saying that Section 8 is expanding and since HUD is unwilling to put people out on the street, other programs will have to be cut. Jackson also said that he felt that there were enough resources in HUD's budget to address the housing crises in this country.

When asked about CDBG and the cut and elimination of these funds and the program, Mr. Jackson said he did not cut CDBG, he said "...I was asked to cut $4.5 billion out of the HUD budget and that's what I did..." Jackson said "...that CDBG is good program, it works and is flexible and is a model block grant program, however Section 8 is eroding the budget."

Senator Sarbanes asked the Secretary ..."what happened to the HUD budget on the way to the Congress? One might think that it got waylaid somewhere..." He implied that it lost $4.5 billion along the way. Then the Senator went down his list of the cuts and asked why HUD was proposing to rescind FY 05 funds from HOPE IV? To this Jackson replied, "...we're not going to do that any longer..." When asked why, Jackson replied "Senator Bond told us we shouldn't."

Senator Martinez (R-FL) tows the party line, is very congratulatory of Jackson and his leadership at HUD, makes references of being in a better position from where he was sitting as opposed to where Jackson was sitting. He agreed with Jackson's assessment of HUD budget, except for the elimination of CDBG, which he too said that it was being consolidated and moved to the Department of Commerce. Martinez, uttered the classic line "...if it ain't broke, don't fix it," comment.

The hearing began to deteriorate as Schumer, Sarbanes, and Reed refused to accept the scripted answers that Jackson continued to provide. One comment from Senator Schumer made a reference to "the perfect storm" implying that high cost markets, lower paying jobs, lack of affordable housing, and a cut in federal spending for housing has created the current situation in the Section 8 program, and only more money would fix it.

Senator Allard informed the body of his intent to reform the public housing programs, insisting that he had heard from housing authorities in Colorado and said that "...maybe it is hard to believe, but all wisdom does not emanate from Washington."

Senator Reed told Secretary Jackson that " this budget is a disaster."

Senator Sarbanes asked Secretary Jackson if he thought the Federal government was putting enough resources into housing. Mr. Jackson replied that it was and that the reason for a lack of affordable housing is do to regulatory barriers at the state and local levels. Then Jackson said that Congress should enact the Single Family Housing Tax Credit Act, to provide approximately $2.5 billion dollars as an incentive for developers to build affordable housing. Senator Sarbanes reminded the Secretary that he had just told the Subcommittee that HUD's budget already had enough resources for housing.

After a heated discussion on whether Secretary Jackson had eliminated CDBG, resulted in another failed attempt from Senator Sarbanes to get any definitive answers from the Secretary, the promised call to votes arrived allowing Senator Allard to call the hearing to a close.

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE (SACI) COMMITTEE HOLDS FIRST MEETING IN FRESNO, CA

The Strengthening America's Communities Initiative (SACI) held its first meeting on Friday April 15, in Fresno, CA. The Committee will hold several meetings around the nation to brief citizens and seek input on the proposal. The Anti-SACI Coalition, which includes most members of the CDBG Coalition, prepared a press release for the various news agencies to offer a counter opinion on the President's proposal. We understand that the Committee was provided a draft of the proposed legislation to review and that at the insistence of Congress, the SACI legislation will be forwarded to the Hill by April 30. The SACI Coalition is planning an event of its own in Kansas City, MO on May12-13, at the same time and location of the second SACI Committee Meeting. NCDA will be represented at that meeting, by Jim Vaughn. Jim is a former member of the Association and works with Representative Cleaver (D-MO) on housing and community development issues. Jim will be at the Annual Conference to provide an overview of the discussion.

The following are notes provided by NCDA member Steve Young who attended the first SACI Committee meeting in Fresno last week. NCDA Staff greatly appreciates Steve for attending this meeting and providing his impressions of the make-up, the overall tone of the Committee and what the SACI Committee is really trying to accomplish.

MEETING OF STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S COMMUNITY INITIATIVE ADVISORY (SACI) COMMITTEE (Notes from Steve Young, Sacramento, CA)

On April 15, 2005, I attended the first public meeting of the SACI Advisory Committee in Fresno, California.

[Fifteen] of the 17 appointees attended, along with a number of Commerce Department staff. No public comments were allowed, and the committee eventually broke into three subcommittees and went into closed sessions to discuss details of the program.

The makeup of the Committee was instructive. There were no representatives of large urban communities. The representative of the biggest city was the Mayor of Fresno. Other mayors were from smaller cities - Augusta (Georgia), Spokane (Washington), and Cedar Rapids (Iowa). There was one Community Development Professional [committee member] from Casa Grande, Arizona.

Mayor Autry of Fresno was enthusiastic to be part of the committee, arguing that CDBG was in need of reform, primarily due to the inequities in funding levels. Fresno, with a population of 480,000 and "demographics worse than Appalachia" receives $8.3 million under the existing CDBG dual formula. Is there any City of 480,000 which receives less? He believes that a program focusing on distressed communities only, as will likely be proposed by the SACI, will result in more money for Fresno.

By contrast, there seemed to be a disproportionate representation from state, regional and rural organizations (States of North Dakota, Minnesota, Alaska, Hawaii, and Texas), Center for Rural Development (Kentucky), Center for the Study of Rural America, South and Eastern Tribes (Tennessee), as well as one non-profit (Initiative for a Competitive Inner City) and two think tanks (Maryland Technology Development Corporation, and Council on Competitiveness), and one corporation (Time Warner).

The overview was provided by Dr. David Sampson, Asst. Secretary of Commerce. [who has just been nominated to become Deputy Secretary of Commerce] He explained the thinking behind SACI, and the belief that there was a "consensus" that CDBG and the other 17 programs being proposed for consolidation were "overlapping, duplicative, and ineffective". He said that the "tremendous economic prosperity America enjoys has not reached all corners of the country." He said the record of these programs over the last 40 years was "mixed, at best." As evidence, he said that poverty rates since the beginning of the program have increased, not declined. He also spoke to the lack of adequate performance indicators. He said that these views of the shortfalls of the programs were not the Administration's alone, pointing to support for the consolidation of these economic and community development programs by the Council on Competitiveness and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Not coincidentally, the Chair of the Committee (Mark Drabenstott) and the Vice Chair of the Committee (Deborah Wince-Smith) have ties to these two organizations.

[The] overriding theme from Sampson and others was that funding should go only to communities facing the biggest challenges, with the purpose of transitioning those communities to the 21st century global economy. Throughout the day, references were made to the fact that grant funds went to areas well above the national poverty line. **Clearly, a focus of the new program will be the elimination of eligibility for up to 40% of the current grantees-probably those which do not exceed the national poverty rate. In exchange, the poorest communities would see an increase in aid.**

There is also clearly a move to switch the focus of the programs from community to economic development. The goals of all the programs should be "economic growth, more and better jobs, and livable communities, thereby reducing a community's reliance on perpetual federal assistance." Rather than relying on government and philanthropic resources, communities should have "an opportunity to engage the much larger resources of the private sector to change economic opportunities for our most distressed communities".

The committee is supposed to have a written report completed by the end of May. Meanwhile, legislation for SACI is being written at Commerce. Lest the Committee [members] question the relevance of their work, "placeholders" will be put into the legislation to speak to some of their broad policy recommendations. The draft legislation is to be released before the end of May.
At the end of Sampson's speech, there were no questions from the Committee.

Overview of Issues and Questions for the Committee- Ben Erulkar, Chief Counsel, EDA

On the issues, full consensus was expected of the Committee!

The three areas for subcommittee work included:

1. Threshold eligibility criteria
2. Funding formula
3. Measurable performance measures and accountability standards

Eligibility issues- Need to effectively target to areas of greatest distressNeed to equitably target between urban and rural, large and small. (Recent studies have shown a movement of grant funds from more needy to less needy areas)

What are the key indicators for strong vs. weak communities?

What are the drivers and barriers to economic development?

What should be the threshold level of poverty to qualify?

How to quantify differences in poverty between rural and urban areas?

Formula allocations

What are the quantifiable economic indicators?

As an area's economy improves, its need for federal assistance should decline

Should there be a different formula for urban vs. rural or small vs. large?

Should there be different rules for eligible projects for different areas?

Performance Measures and Accountability Standards

What are the building blocks of the 21st century economy?

What type of assistance most helps economic development?

How should " impact areas" be defined? How big should they be?

What if they overlap other areas?

Don't do stop-gap measures; don't just address symptoms. What is the long-term strategy?

Criteria should include job creation, home ownership, new business development and expansion of the tax base.

How will cities "graduate" from the program?

What is the "time horizon" for the program?

What kind of penalties will be used for non-performance?

This is a long list of issues to be addressed by the subcommittees in less than 45 days, and two more meetings. A written report is expected by May 31. And consensus is expected.

After the overview of all these issues and questions by Mr. Erulkar, there were no questions from the Committee.

Summary of Statement from Mark Drabenstott, Committee Chair. (Representative of Federal Reserve Bank and former head of Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development)

What drives regional economic growth?

The globalization of the economy forces companies to slash costs. Public money should go to assist the new types of jobs to compete in the global economy. Public investment needs to align with private investment.

Where should the money go?
Regions, not cities and counties, are the new unit of the economy. Question is the capacity of regions to respond to challenges of global economy. City and County boundaries are increasingly irrelevant to this response. Rural counties may be better able to respond. Public policy should be focused on these new regional economies.

What are the implications for public policy?

Public investment should move from hard infrastructure to soft infrastructure. Stop looking for manufacturing companies-they have moved offshore. Look instead to entrepreneurs.

His conclusions? Regional competitiveness is good. Regions have become the central players and federal government needs to recognize that. My conclusions from listening to the speeches? While they insist this is "not a stacked deck", there is a clear direction they are heading.

- Limit any new program to "areas of impact"-severely distressed areas that meet or exceed a national poverty index. Eliminate all cities and counties not meeting that index
- Require a long term plan with a time when "graduation" is expected and funding would decline or cease
- Shift in funds from urban to rural areas and
- Shift from community development to economic development activities

NCDA PRESIDENT AMINTHA CINOTTI BRIEFS HOUSE STAFF ON CDBG

One of the activities of the Save CDBG Coalition is to educate members of Congress on exactly how the CDBG program works. It became very clear during the first hearing held on the Strengthening America's Communities Initiative, that members of Congress did not know, or clearly understand how the CDBG program works. And, if the members don't know how the program works, their staffs definitely will not know. Just how much they didn't know about the program became painfully obvious when members asked questions or raised issues on CDBG administration that were, lets just say, out in left field. Still, it is not entirely fair to blame the members of Congress for their ignorance. Just as local community development staff turn over, so do members of Congress and their staffs.

NCDA and our partners often coordinate to hold briefings jointly. It is cost effective and ensures a greater turnout. This year, more than ever, Coalition members will hold joint events, so that our message is the same across all spectrums. Briefings for Congressional staff that include real people, not advocates or lobbyists are the ideal. These events, particularly when we provide lunch, helps them become advocates for the program. For staffers to understand how the program impacts people, a projects or activities they identify with, makes them better advisors for their bosses.

The Coalition has an unwritten rule that any agreed upon activity must have representation from all the groups. We must have a locally elected official; mayor, city councilor, or a county executive. We also want to have someone from the business community and a member of the non-profit community. Lastly, we hope that we can bring in a practitioner to pull everything together and demonstrate how the specifics are pulled together to make the whole. This most recent panel consisted of:

- James Hunt, Councilman, Clarksburg, West Virginia, NLC
- Mayor John White - Ames, Texas, Conference of Black Mayors
- Donna Harris, Executive Director, Kentucky Mountain Housing Development Corporation
- Doug Woodruff, Senior Vice President, Community Development, Bank of America
- Amintha K. Cinotti, Deputy Director of Planning and Development, Providence, RI

Designing the make-up and order of presentation of the panel is crucial in keeping folks in the audience. We also had to ensure that the date of the briefing did not fall on a critical date for Congressional Staff. The original date was April 8, which coincided with the deadline for Congressional members to get in their Subcommittee Appropriations requests. If we had selected this date, we would not have had such a great turn out. It was standing room only. Everyone did an excellent job and most of the 55 staff persons remained for the duration. As we could have the room for approximately 1-1/2 hours, therefore each speaker was allowed between 5 and 8 minutes to provide their perspective on the program. NCDA's President Amintha Cinotti was selected to speak last, an to illustrate how the City of Providence used CDBG funding with the business and nonprofit communities, how the community development staff work with the locally elected officials, and the overall process of addressing the housing and community development needs of a large, older city that is experiencing great changes in its demographics. Amintha was the "glue"that pulled all the pieces together to show how the CDBG program works in t he City of Providence, how CDBG funds are distributed, and most importantly how all of the entities, represented on the panel must work together to provide critical services to lower income persons. She did a great job

NCDA NOTES

NCDA BIDS ADIEU TO SARA WALLACE OF BROOKLINE

(This article was contributed by Tom McCloskey, former CD Director of Fall River, MA and long time member and friend of NCDA)

Sara Wallace, the dedicated, inspiring, and enthusiastic lady from Brookline, Massachusetts, died March 22 of pneumonia in Newton Health Care Center. Sara was 95 years old.

Regarded by those fortunate and privileged to have worked and associated with her, Sara was always considered a true friend and role model, someone quite special in the Community Development family of New England, the *Grande Dame of Region One*, according to Amintha Cinotti of Providence, R.I., President of the National Community Development Association. An untiring participant in development of communities at the local, regional, and national levels, Sara in 1998 was selected as the first recipient of the Paul Poulos Achievement Award, the New England Region's recognition for dedicated commitment and outstanding contributions to the CDBG Program and the citizens it serves.

When one embraces the axiom that it's not the size of the participant in the fight, but rather the size of the fight in the participant, there can be few who could epitomize that phrase. Sara comes to mind right off. Barely 61 inches in height and weighing but 100 pounds, Sara was both effective and efficient and could be a dominant force. "Sara was tiny, but she made very large people move," was one observation.

And move she did. Sara was a mover and shaker long before those attributes became fashionable. "There were very few town initiatives in Brookline that Sara was not involved in," said one town official. "There's almost nothing she didn't touch."
A past president of the Brookline League of Women Voters and a bank director, she served on the Brookline Redevelopment Authority and was a volunteer/consultant for the town for more than 40 years.

In the 70s, she organized the first community council to address the issue of unemployed youth and she also was honored by the Brookline Conservation Commission for her untiring environmental protection efforts.

As Special Counsel to the town, her grant writing abilities secured more than $50 million (folks quit counting at 50) of federal and state grants for such diverse activities as parks, streets, and infrastructure improvements. Sara took considerable pride in securing funding for residential property rehabilitation and homeownership opportunities for the low and moderate income.

Affordable housing was of principal importance to Sara. In recognition, the Brookline Improvement Council dedicated the Sara K. Wallace Home, a refurbished facility for low-income residents.

Sara was actively serving the town in 2004. Born in Warsaw, Poland, she came to the United States at the age of three, the family settling in Winthrop, Massachusetts. She earned her law degree in 1930 and distinguished herself in the state bar exam before taking a rightful place in a profession that not only was dominated by males but was not overly receptive of females. The spirited Sara that we all came to know was undaunted by this challenge.

Also in 1930, Sara Klier married Dr. Jacob Wallace, a pediatric cardiologist at Children's Hospital in Boston. As no surprise to anyone, Sara assumed a very active role in that distinguished institution and served as a trustee for more than 50 years before becoming a lifetime member of its Board of Directors. Dr. Wallace died in 1980.

Ned Handy, a retired and respected CDBG/HOME warrior from Cambridge and a Region One dean, was a close associate of Sara's. "In the depths of my daily thinking about how to do my best on all fronts, Sara was like a fresh, bubbling brook in springtime. She was the brilliant sunshine that broke through on days of heavy clouds," offered Ned. Brookline lost a great lady; Region One an inspirational colleague, teacher, and friend; and NCDA a pillar of strength in the battle to achieve an improved quality of life for the less fortunate among us.

To meet Sara was always a pleasure. To work with her was an inspiration and privilege. To have known her was a true blessing.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ATTACHMENTS

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

- NCDA 2005 Annual Conference Final Agenda
- Myths of the Strengthening America's Communities Initiative
- NCDA Strategic Planning Materials
- Slate of Officers for FY 2005/2006

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Program	FY04 Enacted	FY05 President's Request	FY 05 Enacted
Community Development Fund	$4.921 billion	$4.618 billion	$4.671 billion
Set-Asides:			
Native American CD Grants	$72 million	$72 million	$68.427 million
NCDI	$35 million	$30 million	$33.5 million
Section 107	$52 million	$35 million	$43.337 million
Housing Assistance Council	$3.3 million	$3 million	$3.272 million
Native Am. Indian Council	$2.5 million	$2 million	$2.380 million
NHDC	$5 million	$0	$4.760 million
National Council of La Raza	$5 million	$0	$4.760 million
SHOP	$27 million	$65 million	$24.792 million
Youthbuild	$65 million	$65 million	$61.485 million
Special Olympics	$0	$0	$1.834 million
EDI Special Purpose Grants	$278 million	$0	$262 million
Neighborhood Initiatives	$21 million	$0	$41.99 million
Working Capital Fund	$4.9 million	$1 million	$3.436 million
Development Challenge Grants	$0	$10 million	$0
Faith Based Pilot	$0	$5 million	$0
Total Set-Asides	***$570.7 million***	***$288 million***	*$560 million**
Formula Grants	$4.350 billion	$4.330 billion	$4.111 billion
HOME	$2.006 billion	$2.084 billion	$1.8495 billion
Set-Asides:			
ADDI	$87.5 million	$200 million	$49.6 million
Housing Counseling	$40 million	$0	$41.65 million
Technical Assistance	$18 million	$18 million	$17 million
Working Capital Fund	$2.1 million	$2 million	$1.983 million
Total Set-Asides	***$147.6 million***	***$220 million***	***$110.233 million***
Formula Grants	$1.858 billion	$1.864 billion	$1.747200 billion
HOPWA	$295 million	$295 million	$281.6illion
Rural Housing & Econ.Dev.	$25 million	$0	$23.980 million
Round II EZ/ECs	$14.9 million	$0	$9.917 million
Section 108	$7.282 million	$0	$5.95 million
Brownfields	$24.8 million	$0	$23.4 million
HOPE VI	$149 million	$0	$1482.804 million
Public Housing Operating Fund	$3.579 billion	$3.573 billion	$2.439 billion
Public Housing Capital Fund	$2.696 billion	$2.674 billion	$2.5878billion
Indian Housing Block Grant	$650 million	$647 million	$62.179 million
Section 202	$774 million	$773 million	$740.7million

Section 811	$249 million	$249 million	$238 million
Homeless Programs	$1.260 billion	$1.282 billion	$1.23 billion
Fair Housing	$47.7 million	$47.7 million	$19.834 million
Lead Hazard Control	$174 million	$139 million	$166.660 million
Housing Certificate Fund	$19.257 billion	$18.466 billion	$20 billion
Samaritan Initiative	$0	$50 million	$0