NCDA
WASHINGTON REPORT

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN PARKER

DATE: August 5, 2005

FEATURED ARTICLES

- *Appropriations Update: Senate Restores Funding for CDBG!*
- *Senate Marks-up GSE Bill; Affordable Housing Fund Not Included*
- *McKinney-Vento Reauthorization Bill to be Introduced*
- *HOPE VI Reauthorization Bill Introduced*
- *Senate Banking Committee Approves Legislation to Better Coordinate Senior Housing and Services*
- *NCDA Participates in Performance Measures Feedback Sessions: System Receives High Marks from Grantees*
- *NCDA NOTES: Input Needed on HOME Consortia Guidebook; What are your HOME TA Needs?; NCDA Offers CDBG Basic Training at the Region I Annual Meeting; September 26-28, 2005 in Pawtucket, Rhode Island; NCDA Board of Directors will continue its Strategic Planning Efforts at the Region VI Annual Meeting on October 28-29 in Albuquerque, New Mexico*
- *Job Announcements and Attachments*

APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE: SENATE RESTORES FUNDING FOR CDBG!

We are happy to report that the CDBG program has been restored in the Federal budget for FY06! Despite the Administration's attempts to eliminate the program and transfer its funding to the Department of Commerce for the "Strengthening America's Communities Initiatives," both the House and Senate outright rejected the idea. The CDBG Coalition worked very hard during this session to ensure that CDBG would be restored to the Federal budget and your efforts in contacting your congressional members and keeping the spotlight on the program at the local level during this session were exceptional and made a difference in restoring the program.

The Senate Subcommittee on Transportation-Treasury-HUD (T-T-HUD) marked-up its FY06 spending bill on July 19 with the Senate Appropriations Committee approving the measure on July 21. Like the House, the Senate restored funding for CDBG, but the formula funding was decreased below the House level. The Committee approved $4.323 billion for the Community Development Fund, with $3.767 billion in formula funding for CDBG.

The overall level is $80 million above the House level of $4.243 billion for the Community Development Fund and the formula funding is $110 million below the House approved level of $3.877 billion. This is due to the numerous set-asides that the Committee chose to maintain in the program.

The CDBG Coalition has been advocating for $4.350 billion in formula funding for the program in FY06; however, with the extremely tight budget caps enforced by Congress, it will be virtually impossible to reach this level. Given that the program was zeroed out by the Administration, along with the many other cuts and elimination of other programs, both the House and Senate have done a great job in restoring funding to the program. CDBG and other program areas had to compete with other politically popular programs such as Amtrak, which was also zeroed out by the Administration, and increased funding for highway projects. The Coalition is pushing for at least the House level of $3.877 billion in formula funding when the bill is conferenced [see attached letter]. We are still working to obtain congressional support for an amendment to increase the formula funding to at least $4.1 billion (the FY05 level) when the bill reaches the House and Senate floor. We're not assured that the formula funding will increase further, but the CDBG Coalition is pushing as hard as it can on the issue. We are also seeking at least $1.5 million in CDBG TA in order to provide funds for training of grantees on the Performance Measurement System. We urge you to call, fax letters, or, best of all, meet with your congressional members while they are home for the August recess to urge them to support at least $4.1 billion in formula funding for CDBG and at least $1.5 million in CDBG TA. The T-T-HUD FY06 spending bill will be conferenced in September and then approved by both chambers. The CDBG Coalition will be working to restore more funding to the formula at each juncture. During the August recess, NCDA, NACCED, USCM, NACo, and COSCDA will meet with House and Senate appropriations staff to urge support of at least the House approved level during conference. We will also meet with key congressional members to seek sponsorship of an amendment to the T-T-HUD FY06 spending bill to increase the formula funding for CDBG to at least $4.1 billion, the FY05 level.

After a great deal of effort on the part of the CDBG Coalition and its member agencies, Senator Christopher "Kit" Bond (R-MO), Chairman of the T-T-HUD Subcommittee offered a manager's amendment during full committee approval of the bill on July 21 that included a $125 million increase to the CDBG formula funding. The Committee also maintained strong support for CDBG to remain at HUD, rejecting the Admini-stration's proposal to eliminate the program and fold its funding, along with 17 other programs, into the "Strengthening America's Communities Initiative" at the Department of Commerce. In its Report, the Committee wrote, "The Committee has rejected the entire proposal since it would undermine HUD's mission and essentially strip HUD's scope of activities to almost only housing programs." The Committee expressed its support for CDBG and the work of the national interest groups [NCDA and its members participated in this working group. OMB and HUD also participated in the development of the system] to implement the performance outcome system and chastised OMB for proposing elimination of the CDBG program when such a proposal ran counter to the very system that OMB helped to develop. In its Report, the Committee wrote, "As evidenced by the CDBG's universal support by States and communities throughout the Nation, CDBG is an integral part of HUD's mission and essential to the ability of States and communities to address their local housing and economic community development needs. What is especially troubling is that at the end of 2004, HUD, OMB and related interest groups agreed to a consensus document to address weaknesses in the CDBG program by creating an Outcome Measurement System to establish new benchmarks and better oversight. HUD currently is implementing these new benchmarks. Consequently, the Committee strongly believes that the elimination of CDBG runs counter, not only to HUD's mission, but to the recent reform measures endorsed by OMB."

Unlike the House, the Senate Appropriations Committee maintained most of the CDBG set-asides. The House version of the HUD spending bill eliminates all of the set-asides, except for EDI projects, Youthbuild, BEDI, and the Working Capital Fund. The remaining set-asides are either placed into a new program account called the Self-Help and Assisted Homeownership Opportunity Program or transferred throughout other HUD program areas. The Senate Appropriations Committee chose to maintain most of the set-asides within the Community Development Fund. It did decide,however, to fund Youthbuild and BEDI separately from CDBG. The Committee rejected the transfer of Youthbuild to the Department of Labor, but also voiced concern of HUD's oversight of the program and asked GAO to provide a report on the program by June 30, 2006.

Thanks to strong advocacy efforts, the Committee provided $6 million in funding for Section 108 to guarantee $275 million in loans in FY06. The House is opposed to any funding for Section 108 due to its 100% loan guarantee [most Federal loan guarantee programs only provide a 85% loan guarantee] and its 20 year loan term. Expect a strong fight in the House against Section 108. Like the House, the Committee also provided funding for BEDI, but at a lower level. The Administration had zeroed out both BEDI and Section 108. The Committee recommended $15 million for BEDI in FY06, while the House provided $24 million for the program.

The Senate Appropriations Committee provided an increase of $3 million dollars to the HOME formula funding, from $1.790 billion in FY05 to $1.793 million in FY06. The House provided level funding for the formula. Both chambers provided $50 million for the American Dream Downpayment Initiative, a decrease of $150 million below the Administration's request of $200 million. In its Report on the bill, the Committee noted that it "is concerned that this program [ADDI] may be helping families with excessive credit risk and who may not be the best candidates for homeownership." The Committee requests HUD to report back to Congress by July 31, 2006 on the default rate of the program. The Committee is "also concerned about HUD's ability to obligate these downpayment funds." It directs HUD to report back to Congress by June 30, 2006 on the obligation rate of the program.

The Senate version of the HUD spending bill creates a new account called the Affordable Housing and Economic Development Technical Assistance Board and provides $45 million for this Board in FY06. The Board is funded by set-asides from other HUD program areas, including $10 million from CDBG and $5 million from HOME. Needless to say, we are not happy with this new set-aside, particularly when these funds could be added back to the formula funding of both programs. According to the Committee Report, this new Board "will assist nonprofits in developing uniform and model approaches to housing and economic development." The Board will be composed of national nonprofit organizations, including LISC, the Enterprise Foundation, and the Centre for Management and Technology, whose mission will be to assist local non-profits in the management of programs and activities funded through HUD, including the "development of uniform policies and best practices with regard to these programs and activities." The Board will be assisted by an advisory committee which will consist of the National Alliance to End Homelessness, Housing Assistance Council, Corporation for Supportive Housing, the National Council of La Raza, the National Urban League, the National American Indian Housing Council, the National Association for the Mentally Ill, and the American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging. LISC and Enterprise already receive $30 million in capacity building funds under CDBG. In addition, these groups are eligible to apply for approximately $7 million of the HOME TA funds which are directed solely to non-profits [at the direction of Congress] for CHDO capacity building.

The Committee approved $1.415 billion in homeless assistance funding. This is approximately $75 million above the House approved level of $1.340 billion and $174 million above the FY05 level of $1.241 billion. Of the $1.415 billion, $238 million will be used to fully fund the Shelter Plus Care renewals, $11.6 million is provided to technical assistance, $1 million for the Working Capital Fund, and $5 million for the newly created Affordable Housing and Economic Development Technical Assistance Board.

The budget chart at the end of this newsletter provides you with the proposed FY06 funding for HUD's programs.

SENATE MARKS-UP GSE BILL; AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND NOT INCLUDED

The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs marked-up its version of GSE reform legislation on July 18. S. 190 was approved on a party-line vote of 11-9, with all of the Committee Republicans voting in favor of the bill, while all of the Committee Democrats opposed the measure. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL), Chairman of the Committee, offered a manager's amendment which outlined the context of the bill. The legislation creates a new regulator for safety and soundness, limits the assets of the GSEs, and gives the regulator the authority to manage the GSE's risk to the market.

Unlike the House version, the Senate version does not include an Affordable Housing Fund. Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), Ranking Member of the Committee, offered a substitute amendment to Shelby's manager's amendment. Included in this substitute was an amendment authored by Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) to created an Affordable Housing Fund. Under Reed's amendment, the Fund would be capitalized with a portion of the unpaid principal balance of the GSE's total new business purchases instead of 5% of their profits, as prescribed by the House. The proposal also included language that limited use of the funds strictly to bricks and mortar projects, excluding the use of the funds for lobbying, outreach, and travel, which Republicans on the Committee had voiced their concern about the use of such activities. Senator Shelby acknowledged that the Reed Affordable Housing Fund was an improvement on the House version, but it still allowed the GSEs to control the fund, which he is opposed to.

Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA) offered an amendment to improve access to affordable housing. His amendment would require deeper income targeting as part of the GSE's housing goals. The amendment would also allow the GSEs to receive credit towards their housing goals for first time home purchases and homes purchased in central cities without regard to purchaser income. The Santorum amendment was included with Shelby's manager's amendment and adopted along a party line vote of 11-9.

Senator Shelby said he hoped members could work toward consensus as the legislation moved forward. Senator Christopher Dodd (D-CT) said he hoped compromise language could be developed during the August congressional recess that will enable the bill to gain bipartisan support. We are still optimistic that an Affordable Housing Fund will be included in a final bill adopted by the Senate.

The National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National Association of Counties, Council of State Community Development Agencies, and NCDA have been advocating together on the GSE bill for the inclusion of an Affordable Housing Fund and also to ensure that Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae will be allowed to continue purchasing state and local housing bonds and low-income housing tax credits [see attached letter]. The bill, in its current form, does not include either provision. If the GSEs are not allowed to continue to purchase tax-exempt bonds, the cost to bond issuers will increase substantially and these costs will invariably be passed on to the borrowers. Currently, Fannie Mae's holdings include $22.3 billion in state and local housing bonds; Freddie Mac's holdings include $9.1 billion; and the Federal Home Loan Bank System's holdings include $5.5 billion in such debt.

MCKINNEY-VENTO REAUTHORIZATION BILL TO BE INTRODUCED

Senator Jack Reed (D-RI) is expected to introduce legislation to reauthorize the McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs when Congress returns from recess in September. The Administration is also working on a reauthorization bill, which is also expected to be introduced in September. Reed's staff is sending NCDA a draft of the bill to review and make comments. As far as we know, the bill would consolidate HUD's competitive homeless assistance programs into a single competitive program. NCDA's members have been in favor of consolidation of the programs in order to eliminate differing requirements in each of the programs. There may be some problematic spending requirements included in the bill. We have heard that the bill will require that a certain percentage of funds be used for permanent housing. Although, this is required currently in the Continuum of Care application process, it has become problematic for many areas where there is a need for emergency shelter and transitional housing. NCDA would like to see the new program reflect local flexibility.

We will provide an update on the bill as soon as we have received it from Reed's staff and have had a chance to review it.

HOPE VI REAUTHORIZATION BILL INTRODUCED

Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), along with Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), Senator Jack Reed (D-RI), and Senator Kit Bond (R-MO), introduced the HOPE VI Reauthori-zation bill on July 28. For the past several years, the Administration has proposed the program be eliminated, saying the program was only intended to be a demonstration program, which has met its goals, and also citing a backlog of funding in the program as well as excessive developer and consultant costs associated with the program. Despite its critics, the program has continued to receive funding annually, although the amounts have been sharply decreased due to the tight Federal budget. However, the Senate Appropriations Committee did approve $150 million for the program for FY06, which brings the funding back up to its highest level. At a press conference to announce the bills' introduction, Senator Mikulski said, "Where HOPE VI has been most successful, it has transformed communities and lives. This reauthorization bill takes this program into the new century, reformed, refreshed and reinvigorated, by codifying best practices and correcting weaknesses."

Senator Mikulski introduced the original legislation that created the HOPE VI program in 1992. Since its creation, over $5 billion has been appropriated for the program, and billions more have been leveraged from the private sector, to replace dilapidated public housing with mixed-income developments connected to schools and retail opportunities. This new legislation would reauthorize the program through 2011 at $600 million. The legislation sets forth five goals for the program: (1) End concentration of the poor in distressed neighborhoods; (2) Create healthy, sustainable communities with an emphasis on high performing schools; (3) Create mixed-income communities; (4) Develop communities through public-private partnerships; and (5) Provide adequate supportive resources to help residents achieve self-sufficiency.

Unlike the original legislation, the reauthorization bill would require every HOPE VI grant recipient to establish, in partnership with local schools and the school superintendent, a comprehensive education reform and achievement strategy to turn the school that serves the HOPE VI development into a high-performing school.
The new legislation would also require support of the project at the local government level, including the signature of the locality's chief executive and financial assistance of at least 5% of the HOPE VI grant. We have a call into Mikulski's staff to learn more about this provision. From our understanding, it could include any assistance: local, State, or Federal assistance received by the locality. Furthermore, Public Housing Authorities would be required to set performance benchmarks for each phase of their HOPE VI project, including benchmarks for linkages to schools, relocation of residents and achievement of self-sufficiency. Moreover, HOPE VI applications will be selected, in part, based on the effectiveness of the plan for temporary and permanent relocation of existing resident, making sure that residents are fully aware of their relocation choices and are supported throughout the process with case management and counseling.

The bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

SENATE BANKING COMMITTEE APPROVES LEGISLATION TO BETTER COORDINATE SENIOR HOUSING AND SERVICES

On July 28, the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee approved S. 705, introduced by Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), that would establish a high level executive office to better coordinate housing programs and related services for seniors. The "Interagency Council on Meeting the Housing and Service Needs of Seniors" would be comprised of the Secretaries of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Health and Human Services and members from the Department of Transportation, Agriculture, Treasury, Labor, Veterans Affairs, the Social Security Administration, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services and the Administration on Aging.

Under the legislation, the Council would conduct a thorough review of all federal programs and services designed to assist seniors with their housing needs, identify gaps in services, recommend how to reduce duplication in existing programs, and work to improve the access of housing and services for seniors. "We need to be doing much more to prepare for the needs of our growing elderly population which will number 50 million by the year 2020," said Sarbanes. "It is essential that we make it easier for seniors and their families to access housing and supportive services together, so that when faced with difficult decisions, they do not navigate a confusing maze of programs and services, and navigate through a complex array of bureaucracies and offices in order to find and access the housing and services..."

A companion bill has not been introduced in the House. If the legislation does not move this year, it is likely that it may be enacted next year, since Senator Sarbanes is retiring at the end of 2006, and the Senate would be more inclined to "reward his service" with the enactment of such legislation.

HUD NEWS

NCDA PARTICIPATES IN PERFORMANCE MEASURES FEEDBACK SESSIONS: SYSTEM RECEIVES HIGH MARKS FROM GRANTEES

NCDA, as part of the Performance Measure Working Group (PMWG) that created the Outcome Performance Measurement System, participated in four of the five forums presented by HUD on the System. Nancy Haney, Vice-President of NCDA, participated in the July 18 Forum in San Francisco, CA; Amintha Cinotti, Immediate Past President of NCDA participated in the July 20 Forum in Philadelphia, PA; Chandra Western, NCDA's Executive Director, participated in the July 26 Forum in Detroit, MI; and Vicki Watson, NCDA's Legislative Director, participated in the July 28 Forum in Atlanta, GA. Nancy, Chandra, and Vicki participated directly with HUD in the presentation of the System, providing conference participants with an overview of the system's creation by the PMWG.

Grantees were very supportive of the PMWG's efforts in producing the new reporting system and applauded the coalition building efforts with all the major stakeholders, HUD and OMB. It was also noted that grantees felt that the new system would indeed help grantees tell their stories better. The following are the common issues raised by grantees in the sessions.

(1) Need to provide training materials to grantees to train their subrecipients on the System.

(2) Need more training on IDIS.

(3) How will this effect long-term projects with multiple activities? Grantees will need to close out the project once it has been completed.

(4) Need to count the number of jobs created if your objective is to help a person start a business. Currently, the system only calculates the number of businesses created.

(5) Include direct services, such as homelessness prevention, in Public Services Activities.

(6) The system must include a reporting category for emergency repair and lead paint reduction only activities in rehab projects.

(7) There needs to be a better mechanism for addressing public service activities. Grantees were concerned that the system does not adequately report on activities that support senior services or meals on wheels types of programs.

As promised, our friends within the Community Planning and Development Office at HUD held five day-long sessions designed to get grantee feedback on the performance measures framework that the Performance Measures Working Group (PMWG) hammered out last year. As you may recall, the OMB rated the CDBG program in 2003 as "ineffective,"and gave the program an overall score of 28 out of 100 points. To counter OMB's opinion that the CDBG program is ineffective, the practitioner groups– with support from the elected officials groups– came together to design a system that would show OMB and, especially, Congress that CDBG, and the other programs covered by the Consolidated Plan, are effective.

After 18 months, the PMWG, made up of NCDA, COSCDA, NCSHA, NAHRO, NACCED, NACo, State and local grantees, OMB, and HUD came to consensus on a new framework for reporting accomplishments. This framework is the first step in the process. It will evolve and expand in the most prudent and appropriate manner to reporting of the accomplishments and local results generated by the $8 billion in grant funds that address the housing and community development needs, primarily of our nation's lower income citizens.

Primary Concerns and Questions

After each focus group session, practitioner members of the working group, HUD officials and the ICF training team reviewed the day's activities and discussions so that questions and concerns could be analyzed and discussed.

The main concern grantees raised dealt with the capabilities of IDIS and how the new CPM Tool would work within the new system as well as how the CAPER and PER would function within this new reporting framework.

The HUD answer to these questions, suggested that IDIS is already being modified to collect data in this new format. The ConPlan and the CAPER/PER may have to be modified, however, the level of detail that is currently required should be much less burdensome. Since all three (four including the Annual Action Plan) of documents are inescapably connected, there should be a much smoother interaction since all the data that HUD wants to collect and the additional data that grantees need to collect, will be available and more easily accessible.

Grantees want to collect more data to tell their stories better.

One of the most surprising and significant developments that came out of these feedback sessions is that grantees want to collect more data than HUD is requesting. Grantees feel that it is imperative that "the whole story" and the data to demonstrate the story be collected. More than a few members of the working group were shocked to hear grantees' wish to report more information. The reasoning for this, is that grantees believe that if the reporting system will be easier to use and allow for taylor-made reports, then telling the story better, with better data will help save CDBG and encourage Congress to provide more funding. Some of the ideas presented will be addressed by the folks at HUD.

Grantee advocates impressed upon their members that a continuous dialogue with their Congressional delegations is the best method of ensuring the continuation of the programs covered by the consolidated plan. Good data is also very important, but congressional staff and the members themselves need to know, first hand, how these programs impact their constituents "back home." We emphasized that it was the tremendous effort that grantees, their elected officials, and subrecipients made during the spring that helped saved the CDBG program. If members of Congress had not been inundated with calls, letter, e-mails and visits in support of CDBG, we would not have maintained this program.

The folks at HUD have committed to continue the refit of IDIS, provide training for subrecipients and take grantee suggestions and produce sample IDIS screens so that members can become familiar with the system before training begins. We will continue providing updates on the progress of this new system.

NCDA NOTES

INPUT NEEDED ON HOME CONSORTIA GUIDEBOOK

HUD is planning to develop and publish a guidebook for HOME consortia to help with administrative issues that are specific to them. We need your input on this guidebook. Are there specific administrative issues that you would like HUD to address in this guide? Are there things that you do administratively that you consider a best practice and would like to share with other consortia? Your input is needed by September 1. Please submit your comments to Vicki Watson at vicki@ncdaonline.org This is your opportunity to help craft this guidebook for your benefit. Thanks for your input.

WHAT ARE YOUR HOME TA NEEDS?

NCDA will be submitting a Technical Assistance Delivery Plan (TADP) to HUD in mid-September for HOME TA funds received through last year's SuperNOFA. We need your input on the types of issues within the HOME program that you need technical assistance, so that we can be sure to provide you with the TA that is relevant to your concerns. Please forward your ideas to Vicki Watson at vicki@ncdaonline.org September 2.

NCDA OFFERS CDBG BASICS TRAINING AT THE REGION I MEETING IN PAWTUCKET, RHODE ISLAND

NCDA's CDBG Basics: Training for Practitioners will be held in conjunction with the Region I Annual Meeting being held in Pawtucket, Rhode Island on September 26-28, 2005. Please see the attached registration and course agenda. For information on the Region I meeting and activities, please contact T.J. Martzial in Bangor, Maine. His e-mail address is; **t.j.martzial@bgrme.org**

NCDA BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL CONTINUE ITS STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORTS IN ALBUQUERQUE IN CONJUNCTION AT THE REGION VI ANNUAL MEETING

As an add-on to the Region VI Annual Meeting, NCDA's Board of Directors will put the finishing touches on its strategic planning efforts that began in Austin, Texas at the Association's Annual Conference in May. NCDA member Marti Luick of Albuquerque, New Mexico will host the Annual meeting and include two days– October 28-29, 2005– immediately following the meeting for strategic planning and a meeting of the NCDA Board of Directors. Please contact Marti Luick for more information at; mluick@cabq.gov

Job Announcements and Attachments
Please check NCDAonline (http://ncdaonline.org) to access the files below.

- CDBG Basics Course Agenda and Registration Form
- Letter to Senators Bond and Murray on CDBG Funding
- Letter to Senator Shelby on GSE Legislation

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Program	FY05 Enacted Level	FY06 President's Request	FY06 House Level	F06 Senate Appro. Comm. Level
Community Development Fund	$4.671 billion	$0	$4.243 billion	$4.323 billion
Set-Asides:				
EDI Special Purpose Grants	$262 million	$0	$290 million	$290 million
Youthbuild	$62 million	$0	$50 million	$55 million
Brownfields	($23.8 million)*	$0	$24 million	Funded separately
Working Capital Fund	$3.4 million	$0	$1.6 million	$3 million
Native American CD Grants	$68.4 million	[$58 million]**	[$45 million]**	$69 million
NCDI	$33.5 million	$0	[$28 million]b/	$30 million
Section 107 (University Prog.)	$43.4 million	[$29 million]***	[$8.9 million]***	$32.4 million
Alaska & Hawaiian Institutions	Funded in Section	Funded in Section	[$2.99 million]***	Funded in Sec. 107
Tribal Colleges/Universities	107	107	[$2.5 million]***	Funded in Sec. 107
Comm. Outreach Part. Program	Funded in Section	Funded in Section	[$5.9 million]***	Funded in Sec. 107
Hispanic Serving Insitutions	107	107	[$5.9 million]***	Funded in Sec. 107
CD Work Study Program	Funded in Section	Funded in Section	[$2.5 million]***	Funded in Sec. 107
Housing Assistance Council	107	107	[$3 million]b/	Funded in Sec. 107
Native Am. Indian Council	Funded in Section	Funded in Section	[$1 million]b/	$3 million
NHDC	107	107	$0	$2 million
National Council of La Raza	Funded in Section	Funded in Section 107	$0	$4.2 million
SHOP	107	$0	[$23.8 million]b/	$15 million
Special Olympics	$3.3 million	$0	[$1 million]b/	$0
Neighborhood Initiatives	$2.3 million	$0	$0	$40 million
Afford. Hsg/ED Tech Board	$4.7 million	$0	$0	$10 million d/
Native Hawaiian Hsg Block	$4.7 million	[$30 million]a/	[8.8 million]e/	$8.8 million
Grant	$25 million	$0	*$365.6 million*	*$562.4 million*
Total Set-Asides	$1.8 million	$0	**$3.877 billion**	
Formula Grants	$42 million	$0		**$3.76 billion**
	$0	[8.8 million]e/		
	[8.8 million]e/	*$0*		
	$560.5 million	**$0**		
	$4.105 billion			
Section 108	$5.95 million	$0	$0	$6 million

Program	FY05 Enacted Level	FY06 President's Request	FY06 House Level	F06 Senate Appro. Comm. Level
HOME Program	**$1.900 billion**	**$1.941 billion**	**$1.900 billion**	$1.900 billion
Set-Asides				
ADDI	$49.6 million	$200 million	$50 million	$50 million
Housing Counseling	$41.7 million	[$42 million] c/	$41.7 million	$42 million
HOME/CHDO TA	$17 million	$10 million	$17.3 million	$10 million
Working Capital Fund	$2 million	$1 million	$1 million	$0
Afford Hsg/ED Tech Board	$0	$0	$0	$5 million d/
Total Set-Asides	*$110.3 million*	*$211 million*	*$110 million*	$107 million
Formula Grants	**$1.789.7 billion**	**$1.730 billion**	**$1.790 billion**	**$1.793 billion**
Self-Help/Assisted Homeown. Opport. Program Account				*Funded in Section 107 or in the comm. development fund*
SHOP	[$24.8 million]d/	[$30 million]a/	$23.8 million	
National Comm. Dev. Initiative	[$33.5 million]d/	$0	$28 million	
Housing Assistance Council	[$3.3 million]d/	$0	$3 million	
Housing Partnership Network	$0	$0	$4 million	
Native Am. Indian Hsg. Council	[$2.4 million]d/	$0	$1 million	
Special Olympics	[$1.8 million]d/	$0	$1 million	
Total	**$65.8 million**	**$30 million**	**$60.8 million**	
EZs/ECs	$10 million	$0	$0	$0
Homeless Assistance Grants	$1.24 billion	$1.440 billion	$1.340 billion	$1.415 billion
Elderly Housing (Section 202)	$741 million	$741 million	$741 million	$42 million
Disabled Housing (Section 811)	$238 million	$120 million	$238 million	$240 million
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	$14.766 billion	$15.845 billion	$15.631 billion	$15.636 billion
Project-Based Rental Assistance	$5.298 billion	$5.072 billion	$5.1 billion	$5.072 billion
Public Housing Capital Fund	$2.58 billion	$2.33 billion	$2.6 billion	$2.327 billion
Public Housing Operating Fund	$2.438 billion	$3.407 billion	$3.6 billion	$3.577 billion
HOPE VI	$143 million	$0	$60 million	$150 million
Native Am. Hsg. Block Grant	$621 million	$583 million	$600 million	$622 million

Program	FY05 Enacted Level	FY06 President's Request	FY06 House Level	F06 Senate Appro. Comm. Level
Native Hawaii. Hsg.Block Grant	$8.8 million	$8.8 million	$8.8 million	Funded in CD Fund
Indian Hsg. Loan Guarantee	$4.9 million	$2.6 million	$2.6 million	$5 million
Native Hawaii. Loan Guarantee	$992 thousand	$882 thousand	$882 thousand	$1 million
HOPWA	$282 million	$268 million	$290 million	$287 million
Rural Hsg. & Econ. Dev.	$24 million	$0	$10 million	$24 muillion
Fair Housing	$46 million	$32 million	$46.5 million	$46 million
Lead Hazard Control	$167 million	$119 million	$166.65 million	$167 million
Faith-Based Prisoner Re-Entry	$0	$25 million	$0	$0

*Funded as a separate program in FY05, not as a set-aside within the Community Development Fund

**Funded under the Native American Housing Block Grant

***Funded under Policy Development & Research.

a/The President recommended that SHOP be funded as a separate program in FY05.

b/Funded under Self-Help Assisted Homeownership Program

c/The President proposed to fund Housing Counseling as a separate program in FY06

d/Funded under the Community Development Fund in FY05.