NCDA WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN PARKER

DATE: June 17, 2005

FEATURED ARTICLES

- ***Appropriations Update: House Subcommittee Marks-up HUD Spending Bill – CDBG Restored; Senate Releases 302(b) Allocations***
- ***US Conference of Mayors Lists Saving CDBG As A Top Priority At Annual Meeting in Chicago***
- ***House Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census Holds Hearing on Faith-Based Organizations***
- ***Update on GSE Legislation***
- ***HUD News: Performance Measures Noticed Published; Focus Groups to Get Grantee Input; HUD Releases FY06 Fair Market Rents; HUD to Ask CDBG Grantees for Subrecipient Data***
- ***NCDA NOTES: NCDA Finalizes CDBG Technical Assistance Agreement Activities***
- ***Job Announcements and Attachments***

APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE: HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE MARKS-UP HUD SPENDING BILL – CDBG RESTORED; SENATE RELEASES 302(B) ALLOCATIONS

House Subcommittee Marks-Up HUD Spending Bill

The House Subcommittee on Transportation-Treasury-HUD marked-up its spending bill on June 15. The Subcommittee had to work within its $66.935 billion allocation to try to meet the demands of all of the agencies that fall under its jurisdiction. The bulk of the allocation went to providing guaranteed levels of discretionary spending for various Highway, Transit and Aviation programs. If the bill did not provide these mandated levels, the rules of the House would prevent consideration of the bill.

The Subcommittee approved $37.5 billion for HUD, an increase of $1.55 billion over FY 2005 and $4.32 billion above the President's request. The Subcommittee restored funding for CDBG within HUD's budget, providing $4.2 billion for the program, with $3.86 billion provided for formula grants. This is a $250 million decrease in formula funding – 6% decrease – from last year. Still, we have come a long way from when the program was zeroed out in the President's budget in February. The Subcommittee rejected the notion of eliminating the program and transferring its funding to the Department of Commerce.

This is a huge win in terms of denouncing the President's "Strengthening America's Communities Initiative" and supporting CDBG.

The House Appropriations Committee will mark-up the Transportation-Treasury-HUD bill on June 21 with the bill going to the floor of the House on June 30. The Senate Subcommittee has not crafted its bill yet nor has set a date for mark-up. This gives us time to try to influence the bill to try to increase the formula funding for CDBG. The CDBG Coalition has been advocating for at least $4.350 billion in formula funding for CDBG in FY06. It is critical that you contact your Senators – and continue to do so – until the Senate marks-up its bill. Phone calls and faxed letters are best. The CDBG Coalition is continuing its meetings with Senate appropriators and and we will continue to keep the pressure on here in Washington, but they need to here from you. We also need you to push for funding of Section 108 and Brownfields.

The CDBG Coalition will meet with Senate democrats on Monday and will meet with Senator Norm Coleman (R-MN) [he has been a pivotal advocate for the program this year] on Tuesday to discuss strategy for the Senate mark-up.

Normally, CDBG and its set-asides are funded as part of an overall Community Development Fund. The Subcommittee has gotten rid of this fund and has moved most of the set-asides into a separate account, leaving CDBG, the EDI set-asides (pork projects) and the Working Capital set-aside (which funds IDIS and other technology improvements within HUD). The House Subcommittee provided $114 million in EDI set-asides for FY06.

The set-asides that are normally funded within CDBG, such as Section 107, Native American Block Grants, Self-Help Homeownership, Youthbuild, community development capacity building and neighborhood initiatives are now funded in a separate account called Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership. Subcommittee staff have told NCDA that the reason for this transfer of set-asides is twofold: (1) these set-asides are not CDBG focused and really should not be funded within the context of Community Development. Therefore, these programs should not be caught up in the whole SACI debate of consolidating CDBG and possibly transferring it's funding to Commerce; and (2) These programs do not help CDBG and, in fact, hurt the program through reduced formula funding. When asked if this was a step to ready CDBG for transfer to the Commerce Department, the subcommittee staffer said no. Like everyone else, including the CDBG Coalition, he feels that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will propose elimination of CDBG in FY07 and will again push for the President's "Strengthening America's Communities Initiatives." He said that CDBG is strongly supported in the House, otherwise it would not have been funded in the subcommittee's bill. Still, OMB advises the President on the budget and CDBG is not very well liked at OMB for two reasons: (1) it's too flexible; and (2) it provides certainty (formula grants). This is the antithesis of what OMB stands for, which is targeted funding that reaches goals, so that future funding is reduced. Because of OMB's outlook on the program, he doubts that it will ever receive a passing score on the PART review, no matter how much we push forward the performance outcome measurement system. This is just his perspective, however. He thinks the performance outcome measurement system is a good idea and one that will embraced by Congress. The CDBG Coalition is in the process of scheduling a meeting with Clay Johnson, Deputy Director of OMB, to discuss CDBG in the FY07 budget. OMB will begin deliberations on the budget in August.

On another note, formula funding for HOME was increased by $60 million and HUD's homeless assistance programs increased by $100 million. The Subcommittee provided $285 million for HOPWA, an increase of $3 million. The President had proposed a cut of $14 million to this program. The Subcommittee funded the Section 202 program at $741 million, $5 million below last year's level. The Subcommittee rejected the President's proposal to cut the Section 811 by half and restored it to its FY05 level of $238 million.

The Subcommittee split Section 8 into two accounts (Tenant-Based Rental Assistance and Project-Based Rental Assistance) in order to provide better accountability and oversight of the massive program. The Subcommittee funded the Section 8 Tenant-Based Rental Assistance at $15.53 billion, $765 million over last year and $314 million below the President's request. In its report language, the Subcommittee noted that "the cost of this program alone is now approaching 50% of HUD's total budget." The Subcommittee funded the Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance Account at $5.10 billion, $210 million below last year and $16 million above the President's request. Public and Indian Housing programs are funded at $6.8 billion, an increase of $1.6 billion from last year and $466 million over the President's request.

The bill calls for elimination of the Section 108 Loan Guarantee program, the Rural Housing and Economic Development Program, Brownfields, and HOPE VI. Like the President, the House has tried to eliminate these programs over the past several years, but the Senate ultimately restores some level of funding to each program.

Senate Releases 302(b) Allocations

On June 9, Senator Thad Cochran (R-MS), Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee announced the amount allocated to each of the 12 appropriations subcommittees for FY06, commonly known as the 302(b) allocations. FY06 spending for Defense was reduced by approximately $7 billion in order to accommodate increases in the other subcommittees. Besides Defense, the Legislative Branch Subcommittee and the State-Foreign Operations Subcommittee received decreases of $124 million and $1 billion respectively.

The Transportation-Treasury-HUD Subcommittee was allocated $65.373 billion, this is $2.23 billion above the President's requested level of $63.140 billion. The House allocation was approximately $6.2 billion over the President's request. The Senate's allocation is very tight given the fact that other program areas, such as highway spending, FAA, and Amtrak are priorities. The House Subcommittee funded Amtrak at $550 million, $657 million below last year's level. The Senate would like to see a higher funding level for Amtrak, and we have heard estimates of between $1.2 billion to $1.5 billion. This would mean that other program areas would be cut to make up for this increase. In addition, program areas that were cut by the House will likely be restored – at some level – in the Senate, such as HOPE VI, Section 108, Brownfields, and Rural Housing and Economic Development. Other program areas will need to be reduced to make-up for these increases. That's why it's so important to keep the pressure on the Senate to provide $4.350 billion in formula funding to CDBG.

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS LISTS SAVING CDBG AS A TOP PRIORITY AT ANNUAL MEETING IN CHICAGO

Amidst a host of issues that were discussed and debated at the United States Conference of Mayors 73rd Annual Meeting, held in Chicago last week, CDBG topped them all. CDBG was listed #1 behind issues such as homeland security, law enforcement, building competitive cities, infrastructure investment, healthy cities, unfunded mandates, and many others. Due to the leadership and staunch advocacy of Conference President Donald Plusquellic, and the Save CDBG Coalition, tremendous effort was made in saving this great program. Mayor Plusquellic, is very passionate about CDBG because he knows the program, knows its impacts on communities and has a very clear image of what America's cities would become without these much needed resources.

It should not be surprising that not less than three resolutions supporting CDBG were discussed in Chicago. According to USCM staff, "everybody (all the mayors) wanted to propose a resolution on CDBG." Lets hope this hard work, passion, and dedication continues throughout the summers appropriation's process. We have saved the program this year and so far, have sustained a formula cut of approximately 6% in the House Subcommittee mark. We should be very proud of the work we have done, but its not over yet. The full Appropriations Committee has to vote on the Subcommittee's numbers, then the full House of Representatives will vote. As was mentioned above, the Senate is just beginning its process and we don't have details of the Subcommittee numbers yet. We must continue to keep the pressure on members of Congress. They must continue to hear from you, your elected officials and your subrecipients. The Senate will be the next challenge. It can be done.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERALISM AND THE CENSUS HOLDS HEARING ON FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS

Rep. Mike Turner (R-OH), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census of the House Government Reform Committee, has had a very busy hearing schedule this year. He has held more than six hearings so far and on June 14 held a hearing on "Revitalizing Communities: Are Faith-Based Organizations Getting the Federal Assistance They Need?" This particular hearing focused on HUD's efforts to assist faith-based organizations. Apparently, several of the subcommittees under the jurisdiction of the House Government Reform Committee will hold hearings on this subject.

Ryan Streeter, Director of HUD's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives testified at the hearing. In his remarks, Streeter told the subcommittee, "A level playing field is the best playing field. And those who suffer in poverty and despair deserve the best of playing fields. HUD understands this and will continue to ensure that all eligible organizations – regardless of their size, religious affiliation, or lack thereof – are able to compete fairly for HUD resources." Streeter told the subcommittee that HUD's internal departmental priorities and program regulations made it difficult for faith-based organizations to participate in HUD programs, but that the most significant changes made at HUD to support faith-based organizations was changing the regulations in some programs to allow easier access by faith-based groups. "Until recently, HUD had regulations governing nearly $7.5 billion in grant funds that treated faith-based organizations in an unequal manner. Two programs (CDBG and HOME, we presume) prohibited primarily religious organizations from receiving funds "for any activity including secular activities as a general rule." Streeter told the subcommittee that HUD finalized rule changes to these programs in 2003 to provide a level playing field to faith-based organizations and HUD also finalized a rule in 2004 that extended equal treatment provisions to all of HUD's remaining programs. Streeter also told the subcommittee that HUD is working with faith-based groups to improve their grantsmanship through free workshops. HUD also provided training to these groups in five cities on effective homeownership education. This year HUD will study effective grassroots housing partnerships in 6 cities and educate mayors nationwide on how to replicate the cities' leading practices in their own communities.

Other witnesses that appeared before the subcommittee included: Terri Hasdorff, Executive Director of Alabama Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives; Tom Knox, Chairman of the Board, We Care America, Lansdowne, VA; Sister Rose Wildenhaus, Vice President and Co-Founder of St. Mary Development Corporation, Dayton, OH; Mark Howard, General Counsel, World Vision; and Reverend Michael Jones, Friendly Temple M.B. Church, St. Louis, MO.

Two primary themes emerged from the public testimony: (1) faith-based organizations need guidance as they navigate the federal grant application process, and (2) they need technical assistance in developing projects. Two of the witnesses, Sister Wildenhaus of the St. Mary Development Corporation, in Dayton, OH and Reverend Michael Jones of the Friendly Temple M.B. Church in St. Louis, MO extolled the virtues of working in partnership with HUD and state and local governments.

Sister Wildenhaus told the subcommittee that she "places a high priority on collaboration with other nonprofit organizations and with city, state, county and federal agencies. We rely on these "partners" for services." She also told the subcommittee that more resources are needed to meet the demand for housing and services for low-income families. The federal grant process is a particular problem, she told the subcommittee, saying "Federal grants to faith-based organizations are essential if they are to continue to carry on their work. Federal grants programs are intimidating and create barriers for small organizations, including a dizzying array of statutory and regulatory requirements and lengthy applications. Immediate reform is required to make the federal grant process welcoming to faith-based organizations."

Reverend Michael Jones told the subcommittee that HUD has been an exemplary partner. His church has established a faith-based, nonprofit organization to revitalize the surrounding community. The organization partnered with HUD to develop two HUD 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly projects, providing nearly 100 apartments to very low income seniors in the area. He told the subcommittee that "We have found them [HUD] to be exemplary of the standards established by the Faith-Based Initiative. The process for applying for funding from HUD was not as difficult as anticipated. We found the local HUD staff to be accommodating and very helpful." He provided the following recommendations to the subcommittee for strengthening the relationship between the Federal government and faith-based organizations: (1) Have an identified point of contact in each government agency to assist faith-based organizations with navigating the application process for funds; and (2) provide TA to these groups in such areas as strategic planning, infrastructure development, and the need for the diversification of resources.

Terri Hasdorff, representing the Alabama Governor's Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, also told the subcommittee that faith-based organizations need guidance as they navigate the federal grant application process. She also said that state offices need more resources to educate faith-based organizations on federal and state programs and laws. She told the sub-committee that, "there is a lack of clear understanding from the state and even some federal agencies regarding what this initiative is – and what it is not – such that it's **not** a new pot of money and its **not** an affirmative action program for faith-based organizations." She told the subcommittee that her office spends a great deal of time "helping both groups understand that the government can fund compassion but it cannot fund conversion."

Mark Howard, General Counsel, World Vision, a Christian relief and development organization operating in nearly 100 countries told the subcommittee that "Although we are welcomed to participate and apply for all programs, in many cases the price of participation – especially in the U.S. – is too high. We are asked to forfeit our religious hiring requirement, which we refuse to do. Therefore, we do not apply for funding in some program areas." Religious staffing is protected by Title VII exemption of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Some programs do not honor this protection, Howard told the subcommittee. He cited the Youthbuild program as one example, which carries with it Workforce Investment Act (WIA) stipulations that prevent organizations from hiring employees based on religion.

Many of the witnesses offered their support of H.R. 1054 – Tools for Community Initiatives Act – a bill introduced by Rep. Mark Green (R-WI) earlier this year that would establish a Federal Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives within the Executive Office of the President. This office would take the lead in developing, leading, and coordinating policies with respect to faith-based and community initiatives. It would work to expand the role of faith-based and community initiatives through legislation and regulation. It would also create a liaison within each Federal agency to coordinate faith-based and community initiatives, including an effort to incorporate faith-based and community initiatives in the programs and initiatives of the department and proposing the development of pilot and demonstration programs to increase the participation of faith-based and community initiatives in Federal, State, and local initiatives. We feel there are no chances for enactment of this bill, since there is not a great deal of support for it and there is too little time for Congress to consider it this year.

UPDATE ON GSE LEGISLATION

As we all know, few affordable housing opportunities exist anymore. However, Congress is trying to move forward Government-Sponsored Enterprise (GSE) Legislation that would create an Affordable Housing Fund. The House Financial Services Committee voted out H.R. 1461 – The Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005 – on May 25th. The Senate Banking Committee is expected to mark-up its bill in late June or early July. The Affordable Housing Fund would be funded annually using

5% of the after-tax profits of the GSEs – Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. It is estimated that the Fund could generate between $400 million and $1 billion annually. The Fund would be used to develop, preserve, and rehabilitate rental housing that is affordable to extremely low-income and very low-income households as well as make homeownership more accessible to these families. The House bill is expected to come to the House floor for a vote after the July 4 recess. Some Republican members in the House are trying to mount a campaign to strip the Affordable Housing Fund from the bill when it reaches the House floor. They say it is nothing more than a slush fund for the GSEs to provide to their favorite organizations and should be used instead to reduce mortgages. Rep. Mike Pence (R-NC) and other members of the conservative Republican Study Commission are circulating a sign-on letter in the House to Majority Leader Rep. Tom DeLay (R-TX) that seeks to prevent the bill from coming to the House floor if it contains the Affordable Housing Fund. The letter says that the Fund would "work against the free market principles that have made our nation's housing market one of the most accessible in the world" and that "the money from this fund could be used to finance third party advocacy groups that have agendas far beyond simply increasing affordable housing for low-income Americans – agendas that are antagonistic to the free market principles that we value." They are asking that the Affordable Housing Fund be removed from the bill before it comes to the floor; otherwise, they plan to vote against the bill.

We urge you to voice your support of this Fund with your congressional members. By all accounts, the GSE legislation has a good chance of being enacted this year. We need to ensure that the Affordable Housing Fund remains a part of the bill.

HUD NEWS

PERFORMANCE MEASURES NOTICE PUBLISHED; FOCUS GROUPS TO GET GRANTEE INPUT

In the May 31st issue of the *NCDA Washington Report,* members were informed that HUD would publish a notice to alert grantees that administer CPD's four formula programs, that HUD would convene five focus group sessions to gather input on the performance measures reporting framework the public interest groups, HUD and OMB agreed upon last November. The notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on June 10, and a copy of that notice is attached to this newsletter. The notice briefly described the process that participants undertook to reach consensus, and the reporting system that HUD will require for CPD's formula grant programs to track program accomplishments.

The focus groups have been scheduled for two reasons: 1) to allow grantees who are not members of the public interest groups that created the system to understand how it will work, and 2) to gain support for this new way of reporting so that Congress, OMB and citizens can clearly see the impact CDBG, HOME, ESG and HOPWA have in their communities. The focus groups are also intended to allay fears, and misconceptions about the new system and press upon grantees that they can, and should continue to operate and implement their programs as they choose. The ultimate goal of the new reporting system is the fact that grantees will be able to tell their stories of how these programs improve and impact their communities in a more comprehensive manner.

We encourage members to attend at least one focus group session. It is important for all of us to get into the habit of "outcome thinking and reporting." Becoming immersed in the terminology, the logical sequencing , and this new thought processes of looking at the end results of funding decisions will enable members to explain how the new reporting system will work. Understanding and being able to explain the reporting framework will be invaluable when practitioners make presentations to subrecipients, staff and elected officials. Getting buy-in and support from these groups will make the implementation process much easier. The Performance Measures Working Group, (PMWG) which was made up state, local, county, and Housing Authority grantees, firmly believes that the ability to show impact and sustained improvement from these programs is the best way of maintaining program integrity and funding. In fact, Senator Bond, Chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that includes HUD programs, raised and waived the Performance Measures framework during a recent hearing on HUD appropriations. The Senator could not understand how the Administration could zero out CDBG when it was clear that HUD and grantees were working very hard to address OMB's concerns on improving reporting and accountability within the program.

The new reporting framework is comprehensive enough to enable any and all program activities– state, local or county– to be captured, so there will be no need to redesign local programs so that they "neatly fit" into the new system. It was a primary objective of the PMWG that any reporting system must guarantee program individuality and flexibility. We are sure that it does. Please review the attached notice and make plans to attend one of the focus group sessions. We believe you will be pleasantly surprised how well the new system will work, with much less effort than it took to convert to IDIS.

NCDA's Executive Committee of its Board of Directors were the entitlement grantee representatives on the Performance Measures Working Group. They did an excellent job for you. Two of these folks will attend some of focus groups. NCDA staff will also participate. We look forward to seeing you there. Below is the schedule for the sessions.

Satellite Broadcast	**June 30, 2005**
San Francisco, CA	**July 18, 2005**
Philadelphia, PA	**July 20, 2005**
Detroit, MI	**July 26, 2005**
Atlanta, GA	**July 28, 2005**
Austin, TX	**August 2, 2005**

HUD RELEASES FY06 FAIR MARKET RENTS

HUD released its FY06 Fair Market Rents (FMRs) in the *Federal Register* on June 2. The proposed FY06 FMRs differ from the final FY05 FMRs in that they were calculated using the revised OMB area definitions that were issued in 2003. These definitions caused a great deal of distress to many areas when HUD proposed to use them for the FY 2005 FMRs. Ultimately, after much public outcry, HUD rescinded the definitions and chose to use the old definitions instead. HUD wants to start using the new definitions this because they can then use the American Community Survey (ACS) data on an annual basis to update the FMRs, instead of relying on older data estimates. ACS data will be available beginning in 2006.

The proposed FY06 FMRs generally use the new OMB metropolitan area definitions, although HUD made numerous changes to boundaries to attempt to better reflect true housing market conditions, with better distinctions between rural, suburban, and urban markets. This has resulted in small gains in FMRs in most areas. Areas that experienced declines in FMRs were areas that either became designated as a non-metropolitan area or switched to another metropolitan area or experienced declines due to HUD's Random Digit Dialing (RDD) surveys. These are random phone surveys that HUD conducts in a number of metropolitan areas each year. HUD conducted 35 random digit dialing surveys in early 2005. HUD attributes the decline in these RDD areas to high rental vacancy rates due to the loss of renters to homeownership.

HUD will accept public comments on the proposed FMRs through August 1, 2005. We encourage you to review the FMRs for your areas and provide any concerns you may have to HUD and to NCDA, so that we can submit a separate letter. Please send your written concerns directly to Vicki Watson at NCDA.

HUD TO ASK GRANTEES TO IDENTIFY TYPES OF SUBRECIPIENTS FUNDED WITH CDBG

NCDA has learned that IDIS will be modified this summer (August) to collect data on CDBG subrecipients. Responding to a request from the White House, HUD as well as other federal agencies that make grants to non-profit entities, must provide data on the type of subrecipients funded. The White House wants to know, who they are and what they do with federal funds, and from HUD's perspective, what types of subrecipients ***CDBG*** is funding. Subrecipients include, other city agencies, for-profit, and non-profit entities. Of the non-profit entities funded, they want to know if they are, affordable housing non-profits, social service entities, CBDO's, or if any of these are also faith-based entities. The White House has put a very short turn around time for the collection of this data, December 2005. It appears that they are specifically interested in information on subrecipients funded under CDBG for FY 2004 only. NCDA will keep you apprised on these new developments as information is made available.

NCDA NOTES

NCDA FINALIZES CDBG TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT ACTIVITIES

NCDA received $166,000 in CDBG technical assistance funding through HUD's FY 2004 Super NOFA. Often with technical assistance agreements HUD assumes a key role in determining the activities that funds should be spent on. NCDA applied for workshops for new entitlement grantees, encouraging the creation of CBDO's and improving CDBG grantee implementation of economic development projects. HUD has decided that NCDA should focus its funding on subrecipient management and peer-to-peer assistance.

NCDA has proposed a minimum of three, two-day courses targeted to practitioners with at least three years of experience to gain detailed subrecipient management skills. HUD has requested that at least one of these courses be conducted in southern California. The folks in the Entitlement Division strongly believes that most of the problems with poor grantee performance stem from lack of effective subrecipient management. Entitlement staff gave NCDA kudos for its work with the CDBG Basics course and is very pleased that we propose to use the same model with this new course. We hope to have the first course in conjunction with one of the regional meetings.

Ideally, HUD would like to see the first course at the Region I meeting being held in Pawtucket, RI during the last week in September. This will happen only if HUD can get the approvals acted on in a timely manner. When all the relevant contracts, and and the Professional, Planning and Development Committees to finalize course agendas and training staff.

The second activity, the peer-to-peer assistance will allow NCDA to conduct three on site program evaluations that would involve a comprehensive analysis of the " peer city's" CDBG program by the peer team. Each peer team would consist of three persons with each member being responsible for key elements of the peer city's CDBG program implementation, (financial, staffing, program design, etc.) whom would make recommendations for improvements in their respective areas. The peer assistance would also include visits with management staff, and program staff as well as a review of city's management systems, i.e. record keeping, scheduling, NOFA review and awards processes, etc.

The peer team will have 3 days on site time and approximately 96 total hours of preparation for each site visit.

A draft report will be forwarded to the peer community within two weeks of the exit interview, with two weeks for concurrence and modifications. The final report will be forwarded to the "city" within 30 days of response from the peer community.

At this time, HUD is not clear on whether each peer assistance activity will be a comprehensive review of the peer city's entire program, or if the peer visits will be conducted on a specific program area. NCDA staff will post a notice to ask for member participation as trainers and as peer consultants for this new technical assistance contract. We have successfully made the case that practitioners conducting the training provides the most successful learning environment. We hope that members will be able to work with staff on this project.

JOB ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ATTACHMENTS

Please go to NCDAonline (http://ncdaonline.org) to view the attachments below.

* HUD's Performance Measures Notice

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