NATIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

FROM: CHANDRA WESTERN
VICKI WATSON
KAREN PARKER

DATE: September 23, 2005

FEATURED ARTICLES

- ***Appropriations Update: NCDA Continues to Push for Additional Funding for CDBG***
- ***House Holds Hearing on Housing Relief Efforts in Wake of Hurricane Katrina: NCDA Asked to Testify***
- ***Oxley and Baker Propose Restructuring of Affordable Housing Fund for Disaster Victims***
- ***Commerce of Department Holds Symposium; SACI Has Key Role***
- ***Congress Aims to Counter Supreme Court Ruling on Eminent Domain***
- ***NCDA NOTES: NCDA Board of Directors to Continue its Strategic Planning Efforts at the Region VI Annual Meeting on October 28-29 in Albuquerque, New Mexico; NCDA Member Survey; National CD Week Poster Art Competition***
- ***Attachments***

APPROPRIATIONS UPDATE: NCDA CONTINUES TO PUSH FOR ADDITIONAL FORMULA FUNDING FOR CDBG

The one issue in Washington, D.C. which can never be predicted annually is when the appropriation bills will be completed. This year appears no different. We are hopeful that the Transportation-Treasury-HUD (T-T-HUD) bill would be completed by October 1 – the official adjournment of Congress – but it appears that once again, it won't happen. All attention is turned to Hurricane Katrina, and rightly so. The House was able to complete all of its appropriation bills prior to the August recess, but the Senate still has many appropriation measures – including T-T-HUD – to finish. We have heard differing time-lines from Senate staff as to when the bill will be completed. One staffer said the bill could be completed as early as the next two weeks, while another has said the end of October.

NCDA is still working to increase the funding level for CDBG. NCDA and other members of the CDBG Coalition continued to meet with congressional staff during the August recess and has been in constant contact with them since Congress returned on September 7.

Staff from Senator Norm Coleman's (R-MN) office, along with staff from the Northeast-Midwest Coalition, and staff from other congressional members are working with the Coalition to find an offset in order to increase the funding level for CDBG. They are mum as to the offsets they are currently considering, but assure us that they are working to find an offset that will be acceptable to both Republicans and Democrats. The delay in the HUD appropriation bill provides them more time to nail down an acceptable offset. The House approved $3.877 in formula funding for CDBG, $228 million below the FY05 level of $4.105 billion. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved $3.767 in formula funding for the program, $338 million below the FY05 level.

We are still pressing for $4.1 billion in formula funding for FY06, the level will likely be lower, due to the overwhelming budget constraints facing Congress. One Senate staffer told NCDA that they are trying to increase the formula for CDBG by an additional $200 million. This would bring the Senate level for the formula to $3.967 billion. We feel confident that the House would agree to this level when the bill is conferenced. Rep. Knollenberg (R-MI), Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Transportation-Treasury-and HUD publicly stated his support for increasing the funding for CDBG further during the debate of the T-T-HUD bill on the House floor. In a colloquy between Rep. Mike Turner (R-OH) and Rep. Knollenberg during the general debate of the bill on the House floor on June 29, Turner urged Knollenberg – and Knollenberg agreed – to find more funding for CDBG during the conferencing of the bill. Turner asked Knollenberg, "As the appropriations process continues and the bill moves to conference, will [you] continue to work to find additional funds to offset the reduction in CDBG for FY06? Knollenberg replied, "Funding for CDBG remains one of our highest priorities and I will do everything to return the program as close to the 2005 enacted level as possible."

We urge you to continue to contact your congressional members to ask them to increase the CDBG formula as close to the FY05 level as possible.

HOUSE HOLDS HEARING ON HOUSING RELIEF EFFORTS IN WAKE OF HURRICANE KATRINA; NCDA ASKED TO TESTIFY

On Thursday, September 15, the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing on the critical housing needs in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. At the start of the hearing, Subcommittee Chairman Rep. Bob Ney (R-OH) said, "In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, federal, state and local governments now face the task of coordinating the relocation of thousands of individuals and families whose lives have been uprooted and homes have been lost. While the recovery effort continues, we must begin to examine the range of short- and long-term housing issues that will need to be addressed in the weeks and months ahead."

The hearing was held in response to a roundtable discussion on September 8 presided over by Rep. Ney and Rep. Maxine Waters (D-CA), and attended by many members of the Subcommittee, to garner feedback from the national interest groups on the housing needs of the Katrina victims. Vicki Watson, Legislative Director, represented NCDA at the roundtable discussion and told Subcommittee members that

Congress must consider waivers to the CDBG and HOME programs in order to provide regulatory and statutory relief to communities providing immediate and long-term housing, infrastructure, and service assistance to the areas affected by the hurricane, including those areas assisting in the placement of the evacuees.

The Subcommittee plans to take a three-pronged approach to the disaster recovery efforts: immediate or emergency housing responses, semi-permanent housing solutions, and long-term reconstruction. The hearing focused on the emergency housing needs of the hurricane victims. The Subcommittee asked NCDA to testify at the hearing by providing a member directly involved in the relief efforts to speak to the Subcommittee on the immediate and long-term housing needs of the victims, including actions the Subcommittee could take to make the process of assisting the victims more efficient and effective. Due to busy schedules with the relief effort, NCDA was unable to provide a witness for the hearing. The Association did provide joint written testimony with NACCED, NALHFA, COSCDA, NACo, and USCM to the Subcommittee [copy attached].

NCDA told the Subcommittee that CDBG and HOME are two critical resources for providing housing and services to the areas damaged by the hurricane as well as to those areas that have accepted the evacuees – both for the short-term and long-term recovery efforts. CDBG, in particular, has a history of providing assistance to disaster victims over the years and Congress has provided supplemental funds for CDBG to do this. In its testimony, NCDA explained to the Subcommittee that additional funding for CDBG and HOME is needed to assist the victims with housing, infrastructure, and service needs – particularly in the long-term. HUD has recommended to OMB a supplemental appropriation of $25 billion for CDBG and $50 million for HOME. The HOME funds would be focused on tenant-based rental assistance, while the CDBG funds would cover a broad spectrum of eligible activities. NCDA urged the Subcommittee to support this request.

In the written testimony, NCDA further informed the Subcommittee that waivers to the statutory and regulatory requirements of CDBG and HOME are needed now and must be approved quickly by HUD. So far, HUD has only waived two requirements in the CDBG program: (1) waived the public comment period for amending the consolidated plan from 30 days to 3 days; and (2) waived the 15% public services cap. In our written testimony, we asked for several waivers to the CDBG program for those areas affected by the disaster, including those communities assisting evacuees, including:

(1) waive the statutory requirement that new housing construction be permitted only through a nonprofit entity;

(2) waive the 20% cap on the use of CDBG funds for administrative costs;

(3) waive the requirement that 70% of the funds provided to a grantee must be provided to activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons, particularly for infrastructure and services;

(4) waive the restrictions on the repair or reconstruction of buildings used for the general conduct of government;

(5) Allow the states affected by the disaster to use its CDBG funds in entitlement areas.

Currently, states can only distribute their CDBG funds in non-entitlement areas.

Several other waivers are outlined in the attached testimony.

The Office of Affordable Housing Programs has approved several waivers to the HOME program that are very helpful to easing the burdensome restrictions on the program during this critical time of providing housing relief, including:

(1) allow, for a one-year period, victims to self-certify that they meet the income requirements of the program;

(2) waiving the tenant selection criteria and property standards (HQS), other than state or local health and safety requirements;

(3) waiving the 10% cap on the use of HOME funds for administrative costs and allowing participating jurisdictions to use up to 20% of their HOME funds for administration;

(4) waiving the maximum per unit subsidy requirement;

(5) eliminating the matching requirement in disaster areas;

(6) waiving the homeownership maximum value/sales price limitation;

(7) waiving the set-aside for CHDOs;

(8) waiving the one-for-one replacement requirement; and

(9) waiving the first-time homebuyer and amount of assistance ceiling (the greater of 6% of purchase price or $10,000) for ADDI funds.

HUD has waived some of these same requirements for the HOPWA program too. In addition to these waivers, the President issued a proclamation on September 8 suspending the Davis-Bacon Act in Louisiana, Mississippi, and certain areas of Alabama and Florida hit by the hurricane. For a complete list of the HUD waivers, go to http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd

What Additional Waivers Are Needed?

For those areas affected by the disaster, including those communities that have accepted evacuees, we need to hear from you as to what additional program waivers are needed to allow you to assist the victims efficiently and effectively. Both the House and Senate will push through legislation to incorporate additional waivers. We need to hear from you in order to provide them with an additional list of waiver requests. Please send your requests to Vicki Watson at vicki@ncdaonline.org

OXLEY AND BAKER PROPOSE RESTRUCTURING OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUND FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

Rep. Michael Oxley (R-OH), Chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, and Rep. Richard Baker (R-LA) plan to restructure the Affordable Housing Fund within H.R. 1461 – The Federal Housing Finance Reform Act of 2005 – to direct new construction of affordable housing to victims of Katrina. H.R. 1461 was introduced by Rep. Baker, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government-Sponsored Enterprises (GSEs), to create an independent regulator to oversee the safety and soundness of the GSEs – Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks. Included within the bill was the creation of an Affordable Housing Fund derived from profits of the GSEs. The establishment of the Fund was key to the Democrats supporting the bill. Initially, Rep. Baker opposed the Fund, saying it would seize "excessive" amounts from the GSEs. He also said the bill did not provide an appropriate process to disburse the monies from the Fund, saying the monies would become a slush fund for the GSEs to curry favor with national organizations. With the devastating effects of Hurricane Katrina, Baker has changed his opinion of the need for the Fund and is working diligently with Rep. Oxley to have the House pass the bill this year.

The purpose of the Affordable Housing Fund is to increase homeownership and rental housing for low-income families. The Fund would be used to produce, preserve and rehabilitate rental and homeownership housing across the country. "In my congressional district and in communities across the country, FEMA is constructing temporary mobile housing to meet the immediate short-term needs of many thousands of displaced Katrina survivors, but in the long-term that's no real solution, not only for the displaced but for the communities that are hosting them," Baker said. "One of the biggest challenges we face today is coordinating a plan that provides the most opportunities for people to find decent, permanent places of their choosing to call home, and a plan that includes greater prospects for homeownership and the renewed hope, independence, and peace of mind that homeownership offers," Baker said. Chairman Oxley went on to say, "After their temporary needs are met, the best thing we can do for Katrina survivors is to create decent and affordable homes. Through the affordable housing fund, we can contribute to this goal with private money that will help to meet this critical need." The Fund would be payed for through a 3.5% - 5% charge to the annual after-tax profits of the GSEs. The Fund would be governed by a board of directors appointed by the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the proposed regulator of the GSEs.

H.R. 1461 passed the House Financial Services Committee by a vote of 65-5 on May 25 [See May 31, 2005 *Washington Report*] and is currently pending House floor action. Oxley and Baker have called for a floor vote of the bill. The ultra conservative Republic Study Commission (RSC) is holding up a vote on the bill because it strongly opposes the Fund; contending the monies could be diverted to "liberal advocacy groups"and have urged House leaders not to schedule a vote on the bill. Rep. Tom DeLay (R-TX) once served as Chairman of the RSC. As the majority leader of the House, his responsibilities include setting the legislative schedule by selecting which bills will be considered by the House for a floor vote. Ironic, isn't it? Besides outright opposing the Fund, DeLay and other RSC members are worried that the bill will be approved if brought to the floor because there is enough support from Democrats and other Republicans to do so.

The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs marked-up S. 190 – its version of GSE reform legislation – on July 18 [See August 5, 2005 *Washington Report*]. The Senate version does not include an Affordable Housing Fund. NCDA and several other national organizations forwarded a letter to Senator Shelby (R-AL), Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, on July 26 voicing our opposition to the deletion of the Fund from the bill. We have been pushing for inclusion of the Fund in the final Senate bill and the disaster certainly gives credence to the need for immediate and long-term affordable housing for the disaster victims and other low-income persons across the country.

The Senate Banking Committee is split along party lines on S. 190. It appears the bill may be delayed until next year. The two major issues which are holding up the Senate bill is (1) what limits to place on the GSE's investment portfolios; and (2) whether to use a percentage of their profits to create an affordable housing fund. Democrats and some Republicans do not want to place a limit on the size of the investment portfolios, but most Republicans, including Shelby, say the combined $1.5 trillion investment portfolio of the GSEs poses a risk to the economy, if any defaults should occur. Like the House, some Republican members of the Senate are also concerned with the GSEs directly distributing any affordable housing fund monies to outside interest groups. NCDA plans to continue its meetings with Senate staff to push for inclusion of the Fund.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE HOLDS SYMPOSIUM: SACI HAS KEY ROLE

Yesterday, at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Crystal City, Virginia, Officials from the Department of Commerce held a day-long symposium to discuss strategies for fostering economic development. Chief among the initiatives was the Administration's Strengthening America's Communities Initiative (SACI). Not much has changed since the SACI Commission report was released in July, except for the huge media campaign the Commerce Department has undertaken to push forward the initiative.

The ideology is still the same, which basically states that the era of the "entitlement" program is over, and that annual, guaranteed, flexible federal funding to states and localities is not the wave of the future. The better alternative is to take a regional approach to economic development because job markets and commuting patterns are not necessarily tied to political boundaries.

Annual funding, without results is no longer feasible. Federal assistance should "enable" entities, not necessarily political entities, to help themselves create opportunities for business development. The SACI would be such a program that awards funds on a three- year funding cycle with performance requirements included. The entire point of the program would be to ensure that there is no guaranteed continuity of federal assistance. The federal assistance is there to enable opportunity for economic development and it would be up to awardees to ensure success.

The philosophy behind SACI is that funding is based on a competition, not a guarantee. There would be no mechanism to allow entities to use federal resources to plan for the social, education, infrastructure impacts of "enabling business expansion." And, the Department of Commerce still proposes to use funds from the CDBG account and other accounts from economic and community development programs to fund SACI.

Currently, the program does not include funding for housing or public service-types of activities, and its focus appears to be more on rural areas where regional efforts are more widely used. It is clearly not a program targeted to large urban areas. NCDA will keep members alerted to any new developments on SACI.

Lastly, there is little doubt that once again, the President will propose to create SACI with funding from the CDBG account, and propose to eliminate the CDBG program

CONGRESS AIMS TO COUNTER SUPREME COURT RULING ON EMINENT DOMAIN; SEEKS TO UNDERMINE LOCAL DECISION MAKING

This week, both chambers of Congress held hearings on the June 23rd Supreme Court ruling in *Kelo v. City of New London*. And, members of both houses have prepared legislation to restrict the use of federal funds to support a local government's decision to invoke eminent domain to take private property for a public use. Briefly, the City of New London was allowed, by state, federal and ultimately the Supreme Court, to exercise its power of eminent domain to require several homeowners to vacate their properties in order to make room for a commercial development project. The Supreme Court upheld the lower court's decision that the city had correctly exercised its power of eminent domain in the *Kelo* case. In the 5-4 decision, the Court said taking of these private properties for economic development, the creation of jobs, and the expansion of the local tax base constituted a public use. Justice O'Connor, in a dissenting opinion, noted that states needed to define what constitutes a "public use," and in her mind, economic development is not a public use. She, as did three other dissenters felt that the "taking" was, in fact, a transfer of private property of one set of individuals to another that would, in turn, redevelop the land to generate higher taxes for the city. Therefore, any community could take any piece of privately held real property, if local leaders felt they could get a high tax value for it.

The Supreme Court's decision was based on procedures, processes, and a lack of a clear definition of a public use, by the states. The Court also suggested that this situation has afforded local governments great largess in taking private property for redevelopment purposes, which were determined to be for a public purpose – the overall economic growth and prosperity of the community.

Since the *Kelo* decision, there have been not less than 10 separate pieces of legislation introduced in Congress, and an unknown number introduced at the state level to address and curtail the use of eminent domain by local governments, specifically in the taking of private property for economic development purposes.

The *Kelo* decision has generated so much media attention that many in Congress are absolutely certain that local governments arbitrarily and capriciously invoke eminent domain on a daily basis, just to take someone's home to provide for the expansion of the local tax base. The media has conspicuously left out the fact that any taking action that involves federal funds is covered by the *Uniform Real Property Acquisition and Relocation Act*, better known to many as the dreaded "Uniform Act." As community development practitioners, you know how arduous a taking can be, especially if relocation is involved. It is not a pleasant process in any case. And, most locally elected officials are loathe to use eminent domain in any case, and particularly with federal funds, because of URA and also because it is highly political and can seriously undermine re-election efforts.

The media hype has generated so much frenzy that Congress has responded not only by introducing legislation barring the use of federal funds in eminent domain actions that directly result in economic development, but also holding hearings on the issue. On Tuesday, September 20, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing entitled: *"The Kelo Decision: Investigating the Taking of Homes and other Private Property."* The witness list would not have been complete without Suzette Kelo from New London, CT. Ms. Kelo appeared with three other individuals; her lawyer, Dana Berliner from the Institute for Justice, Rev. Fred Jenkins, Pastor of St. Luke's Pentecostal Church in North Hempstead, NY, and Mayor Eddie Perez from Hartford, CT, representing the National League of Cities.

In the House, the witnesses were Dana Berliner from the Institute for Justice, Michael Cristofaro, resident of New London, CT, Hilary O. Shelton, Director, NAACP, Washington Bureau, and Mayor Bart Peterson, of Indianapolis, Indiana. The hearing on the House was almost a carbon copy of the one held two days earlier in the Senate.

On September 22nd a hearing entitled *"The Supreme Court's Kelo Decision and the Potential Congressional Responses,"* was convened by the House Judiciary Committee, and chaired by Representative Steve Chabot from Ohio. In each hearing, it was clear that Committee members had already made up their minds that the Supreme Court ruling was in error and that local governments' "willy nilly" use of the power of eminent domain must be curtailed.

Witnesses on each panel argued as suspected, the residents of New London thought that the taking was unjust because economic development did not constitute a public use. They indicated that they tried to work with the city and developers to incorporate their homes into the design of the project. The witnesses from the non-profit community has specific examples of how local governments had abused the power of eminent domain to take properties for reasons that were not clear, or that because of the neighborhood and resident population, often lower income or minority, could not fight the decisions. In effect, local governments prey on the disadvantaged and disenfranchised. And lastly, the local government representatives, each of whom were mayors and members of the National League of Cities, spoke eloquently on how the use of eminent domain had been invaluable in redeveloping neighborhoods, river fronts, and has revitalized local economies that created jobs which helped provide affordable housing and new schools. Mayor Perez from Hartford Connecticut explained the limited use of eminent domain in Hartford and explained what a difficult process it is. Each mayor submitted the same testimony but include specific references to his community. The most important point the mayors raised is that the *Kelo* decision does not expand local authority for taking. The Supreme Court simply upheld the local government's constitutional right to take private property, with just compensation, for a public use. In most of the news articles and video snippets, there is no mention of the fair market value paid for the properties taken, the relocation benefits that accompany a taking with federal dollars. Taking private property by eminent domain with federal funds is always a very expensive endeavor, and most often the project is expected to provide a greater public benefit for the community than what is currently being received.

***What does all of this mean for Community Development Practitioners*?**

Because of the Supreme Court's ruling in *Kelo*, states will most likely be required to define what a "public use" really means, and also define what economic development entails. Community development practitioners will need to keep a close eye on state legislators and provide comment on proposed laws that would be so restrictive that redevelopment activities, particularly those that require a taking with federal funds, may no longer be eligible, regardless of Congressional action. Presently, eminent domain language is being considered for the TTHUD bill as well as others, that would restrict the use of federal funds in the taking of private property for use for economic development activities. It is expected that language would limit a taking of private property through eminent domain to specific uses, such as mass transit activities, or for official governmental uses such as governmental buildings [post offices, court houses, or city halls]. Other uses would include public parks and playgrounds, walkways, and nature trails and uses that are provided for use by the general public. There is also some discussion of allowing local, state and federal governments to take property to address public safety issues, such as blighting conditions that are a danger to public health, and where property owners have the opportunity to participate in the redevelopment project that will result from the taking. As soon as we get any language or amendments, we will let you know.

The upcoming legislative sessions in many state houses will be more tempestuous than usual. Generally, it has been the practice for federal law to be more broad that state law. However, in the past four years, that has not been the case. The *Kelo* case will be another example of the federal government usurping state and local governance, as well and blurring the autonomy of the three branches of government.

Attached to this newsletter are copies of the testimonies of Suzette Kelo and Mayor Perez of Hartford. You may review the Congressional opening statements and the other testimonies on the Judiciary Committee web sites for both the House and the Senate. Go to the NCDA website www.ncdaonline.org and click on Important Links. Select the House or Senate, then click on Committees. Select the Committee on the Judiciary, then select Hearings.

NCDA NOTES

NCDA BOARD OF DIRECTORS CONTINUE ITS STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORTS 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. The strategic planning session and Board of Directors meeting will be held on October 28 and 29 – immediately following the Region VI Conference. Please contact Marti Luick for more information at; mluick@cabq.gov

NCDA MEMBER SURVEY

Part of the work of the Board of Directors in its strategic planning effort is to determine how the Association benefits its members. As time passes, the membership changes. Community development practitioners have more and more responsibilities, and in order to provide for the changing needs and roles, NCDA must know and understand, who the members are and how the Association can best serve them. To get a clear picture of the membership, staff, in conjunction with the Products and Services Committee and the Professional Planning and Development Committee, has designed and included a survey. Please complete and fax the survey to NCDA's offices at **202-887-5546, by October 14, 2005.** Staff will compile the results for the strategic planning effort and the Board of Directors at he Region VI Annual Conference.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WEEK POSTER ART COMPETITION

Over the past few years, NCDA has held a competition to determine the poster art for the National Community Development Week Campaign. For 2006, National Community Development Week is April 17-23. The submission requirements are attached. We encourage members, or friends of members to submit an entry.
All submissions must meet the requirements of the competition, and are due to NCDA offices by November 4, 2005. Submissions will be placed on the NCDA website and voted on by the membership. The winning entry will be posted on the website by December 2, 2005. *Good Luck!*

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

- *Testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity*
- *Testimony of Suzette Kelo*
- *Testimony of Hartford Mayor Eddie Perez*
- *National CD Week Poster Art Competition*

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.