


ADVOCATES' GUIDE 2020



A Primer on Federal
Affordable Housing &
Community Development
Programs



NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION



**NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION**

Established in 1974 by Cushing N. Dolbeare, the National Low Income Housing Coalition is dedicated solely to achieving socially just public policy that ensures people with the lowest incomes in the United States have affordable and decent homes.

NLIHC STAFF

Sonya Acosta, Policy Analyst
Jordon April, Research Intern
Kyle Arbuckle, Housing Advocacy Organizer
Andrew Aurand, Vice President for Research
Victoria Bourret, Housing Advocacy Organizer
Alayna Calabro, Field Intern
Josephine Clarke, Executive Assistant
Dan Emmanuel, Senior Research Analyst
Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor
Paul Kealey, Chief Operating Officer
Mike Koprowski, Director, Multisector Housing Campaign
Joseph Lindstrom, Director for Field Organizing
Mia Juliana, Graphic Design/Communications Intern
May Louis-Juste, Communications Specialist

Lisa Marlow, Manager of Media Relations and Communications
Sarah Saadian, Vice President of Public Policy
Khara Norris, Director of Administration
Noah Patton, Housing Policy Analyst
Ikra Rafi, Creative Services Specialist
Tyra Reed, Policy Intern
Catherine Reeves, Development Coordinator
Brooke Schipporeit, Housing Advocacy Organizer
Daniel Threet, Research Analyst
Chantelle Wilkinson, Multisector Housing Campaign Coordinator
Renee Willis, Vice President for Field and Communications
Diane Yentel, President and CEO

NLIHC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Marla Newman, Chair, City of Winston-Salem (NC), Winston-Salem, NC
Dora Gallo, First Vice-Chair, A Community of Friends, Los Angeles, CA
Lot Diaz, Second Vice-Chair, UnidosUS, Washington, DC
Moises Loza, Treasurer, Retired, Formerly with Housing Assistance Council, Alexandria, VA
Martha Weatherspoon, Secretary, Lincoln Home Resident Council, Clarksville, TN
Bob Palmer, At-Large Executive Committee, Housing Action Illinois, Chicago, IL
Dara Balwin, Center for Disability Rights, Inc., Washington, DC
Russell "Rusty" Bennett, Collaborative Solutions, Birmingham, AL
Emma "Pinky" Clifford, Oglala Sioux Tribe Partnership for Housing, Pine Ridge, SD
Yanira Cortes, Resident, Toms River, NJ
Chris Estes, Rebuilding Together, Washington, DC
Daisy Franklin, Resident, Norwalk, CT
Deirdre "DeeDee" Gilmore, Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents, Charlottesville, VA
Aaron Gornstein, Preservation of Affordable Housing, Boston, MA
Erhard Mahnke, Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition, Burlington, VT
Rachael Myers, Washington Low Income Housing Alliance, Seattle, WA
Karlo Ng, National Alliance for Safe Housing, San Francisco, CA
Ann O'Hara, Technical Assistance Collaborative, Boston, MA
Crishelle Palay, HOME Coalition, Houston, TX
Eric Price, Building America, Washington, DC
Shalonda Rivers, NAACP Miami Dade Branch, Opa Locka, FL
Nan Roman, National Alliance to End Homelessness, Washington, DC
Michael Steele, Rutgers Houses Resident Association, New York, NY

1000 Vermont Avenue, Suite 500, Washington, DC 20005
(Phone) 202.662.1530 • (Fax) 202.393.1973 • <https://nlihc.org>

Layout and Design by Ikra Rafi.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

About the <i>Advocates' Guide</i>	1-1
2020 Public Policy Agenda	1-2
A Brief Historical Overview of Affordable Rental Housing.....	1-6
The National Need for Affordable Housing	1-10
Income Targeting and Expenditures for Major Housing Programs	1-13
Housing as a Human Right	1-15

CHAPTER 2: ADVOCACY RESOURCES

How Laws Are Made	2-1
The Federal Budget and Appropriations Process	2-3
FY20 Budget Chart.....	2-6
Introduction to the Federal Regulatory Process	2-7
Lobbying: Individual and 501(c)(3) Organizations	2-12
Congressional Advocacy and Key Housing Committees	2-20
Federal Administration Advocacy	2-26
Using Federal Data Sources for Housing Advocacy	2-30
Using the “Freedom of Information Act” for Housing Advocacy.....	2-36
Avoiding and Overcoming Neighborhood Opposition to Affordable Rental Housing	2-40
Resident and Tenant Organizing	2-45
Resident Participation in Federally Subsidized Housing	2-49
Our Homes, Our Votes: A Guide to Voter Engagement Activities for Nonprofit Housing Providers and Resident Organizations	2-55
Our Homes, Our Votes Engagement Plan	2-61
Best Practices and Lessons Learned: Building Multi-Sector Coalitions to Influence Housing Policy	2-69
Working with the Media	2-73

CHAPTER 3: NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND

The National Housing Trust Fund	3-1
National Housing Trust Fund: Funding	3-12
Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Housing Finance Reform	3-15

CHAPTER 4: RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAMS FOR THE LOWEST INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Housing Choice Vouchers	4-1
Project-Based Vouchers	4-8
Tenant Protection Vouchers	4-12
Family Unification Program (FUP) Vouchers	4-17
Foster Youth to Independence Initiative	4-20
Mainstream and Non-Elderly Disabled (NED) Vouchers.....	4-23
Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers	4-26
Public Housing	4-30
Rental Assistance Demonstration	4-39
Repositioning of Public Housing	4-50
Moving to Work Demonstration & Expansion.....	4-57
Project - Based Rental Assistance	4-61
Section 202: Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program	4-67
Section 811: Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program.....	4-71
USDA Rural Rental Housing Programs.....	4-74
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA).....	4-79
Homeless Assistance: McKinney - Vento Homeless Assistance Programs	4-82
Homeless Assistance: Federal Surplus Property to Address Homelessness.....	4-85
Rental Housing Programs for the Lowest Income Households: Renters' Tax Credit.....	4-87

CHAPTER 5: ADDITIONAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

Federal Housing Administration	5-1
HOME Investment Partnerships Program.....	5-5

Housing Bonds	5–9	Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4	7–35
The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	5–13	The Community Reinvestment Act	7–48
Low-Income Housing Tax Credits	5–17	Consolidated Planning Process	7–51
Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing Programs	5–29	Continuum of Care Planning	7–58
The Affordable Housing Program and Community Investment Program of the Federal Home Loan Banks	5–33	Public Housing Agency Plan	7–61
Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program	5–36	HUD-Funded Service Coordination Programs: ROSS, Family Self-Sufficiency, and Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for Elderly and Disabled	7–67
State and Local Housing Trust Funds	5–38	Section 3: Job Training, Employment, and Business Opportunities Related to HUD Funding	7–75
Cuts to Housing Benefits	5–44		
CHAPTER 6: SPECIAL HOUSING ISSUES		CHAPTER 8: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES	
Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes	6–1	Capital Magnet Fund	8–1
Housing Needs of Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, and Stalking	6–6	Community Development Block Grant Program	8–3
Inclusionary Housing Policies	6–12	Community Development Financial Institutions Fund	8–6
Manufactured Housing	6–17	Opportunity Zones	8–11
Olmstead Implementation	6–21	CHAPTER 9 INCOME PROGRAMS AND LAWS	
Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure	6–26	Earned Income Tax Credit	9–1
Housing Access for People with Criminal Records	6–28	The Minimum Wage	9–5
Criminalization of Homelessness	6–35	Supplemental Security Income	9–9
The Mortgage Interest Deduction	6–40	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families	9–12
Medicaid Expansion	6–42	CHAPTER 10: ABOUT NLIHC	
Disaster Housing Programs	6–44	Make a Difference: Ways to Engage with and Support the Coalition	10–1
Attacks on Immigrants’ Access to Housing	6–51	NLIHC Resources	10–3
CHAPTER 7: HOUSING TOOLS		NLIHC State Coalition Partners	10–6
Housing Counseling Assistance	7–1	APPENDIX	
Fair Housing Programs	7–5	List of Abbreviated Statutory References	AP–1
Disparate Impact	7–8	Selected List of Major Housing and Housing-Related Laws	AP–3
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1:	7–14	Glossary	AP–5
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2:	7–21	<i>Advocates’ Guide</i> Authors	AP–16
Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3:	7–27		

Chapter 1:

INTRODUCTION

About the *Advocates' Guide*

The *Advocates' Guide: An Educational Primer on Federal Programs and Resources Related to Affordable Housing and Community*

Development is, as the title suggests, a guide to affordable housing. But on many levels it is much more than that. The guide comprises hundreds of pages of useful resources and practical know-how, written by leading experts in the affordable housing and community development field with a common purpose: to educate advocates and affordable housing providers of all kinds about the programs and policies that make housing affordable and accessible to low-income people across America.

The National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC) is pleased to present the 2020 edition of the *Advocates' Guide*. For many years, the *Advocates' Guide* has been the leading authoritative reference for advocates and affordable housing providers seeking a quick and convenient way to understand affordable housing programs and policies.

With the right information and a little know-how, all of us can effectively advocate for housing programs with our Members of Congress and other policymakers. Whether you are a student in an urban planning program, a new employee at a housing agency or community development corporation, a person living in HUD-subsidized housing or struggling to pay the rent, or a seasoned affordable housing advocate looking for a refresher on key programs, this book will give you the overview of housing programs and advocacy tools you need to be a leader in the affordable housing movement and to advocate effectively for socially-just housing policy for low-income people in American.

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

The first section orients you to affordable housing and community development programs with articles that explain how affordable housing works, why it is needed, and what NLIHC believes are the highest housing priorities, including

the national Housing Trust Fund. The advocacy resources section provides vital information to guide your advocacy with the legislative and executive branches of government, as well as tips about how organizations and individuals can be effective advocates.

The next few sections cover housing programs for low-income households, additional housing and community development programs, special housing issues, housing tools, community development resources, and low-income programs and laws. These are the core affordable housing programs and issues to understand.

Take this *Guide* with you to meetings with lawmakers and share it with your friends and colleagues. The more advocates use this *Guide*, the greater our collective impact will be.

A NOTE OF GRATITUDE

The *Advocates' Guide* was compiled with the help of many of our partner organizations. We are deeply grateful to each of the authors for their assistance as the *Advocates' Guide* would not be possible without them. Several articles build on the work of authors from previous versions of the *Advocates' Guide*, and we appreciate and acknowledge their contributions as well.

Thank you to PNC for their ongoing support for this publication.



The PNC Financial Services Group

2020 Public Policy Agenda

NLIHC works with members of Congress, the Administration, affordable housing and community development organizations and advocates, low-income renters, and other stakeholders across the nation to ensure that the lowest income people—including people of color, seniors, people with disabilities, families with children, people experiencing homelessness, and others—have a safe, affordable, and accessible place to call home.

Our policy priorities:

- Protecting, monitoring and expanding the national Housing Trust Fund;
- Preserving and increasing resources for federal affordable housing programs serving extremely low-income families;
- Ensuring protections for low-income renters;
- Ensuring federal disaster housing recovery efforts are fair and equitable;
- Promoting equitable access to affordable housing; and
- Championing anti-poverty solutions.

PROTECT AND EXPAND THE NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND

The national Housing Trust Fund is the first new federal housing resource in a generation. It is exclusively targeted to help build, preserve, and rehabilitate housing for people with the lowest incomes. NLIHC, its members, and other stakeholders played a critical role in the creation of the Housing Trust Fund in the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008.” In 2016, the first \$174 million in HTF dollars were allocated to states. In 2019, \$248 million was available nationally.

This is an important step, but far more resources are needed. NLIHC leads the [Housing Trust Fund Implementation and Policy Group](#), a coalition of national advocates committed to protecting and expanding this new resource. NLIHC works

with stakeholders to build Congressional support to increase funding to the Housing Trust Fund through housing finance reform, investments in infrastructure, and other legislative opportunities. We will also work to protect the Housing Trust Fund from any administrative or legislative threats.

PRESERVE AND INCREASE RESOURCES FOR FEDERAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS

Any new federal housing resources must be targeted to address the underlying cause of the affordable housing crisis—the severe shortage of affordable homes for people with extremely low incomes.

Increasing Federal Budgets for Affordable Housing

Despite a proven track record, federal housing programs have been chronically underfunded. Today, just one in four families eligible for federal housing assistance get the help they need. NLIHC leads the [Campaign for Housing and Community Development Funding \(CHCDF\)](#), a coalition of 75 national and regional organizations dedicated to ensuring the highest allocation of resources possible to support affordable housing and community development. NLIHC advocates for increased funding for Housing Choice Vouchers, public housing, project-based rental assistance, and homeless assistance grants, among many other programs.

Expanding and Reforming Resources in the Tax Code

NLIHC supports the creation of a new, innovative renters’ tax credit to help the lowest income families afford a place to call home, as well as an expansion of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit (Housing Credit) program. Any expansion of the Housing Credit must also reform and improve the program to ensure it better serves families with the greatest needs. Any effort to divert scarce

federal resources to address the limited housing challenges faced by higher income households is wasteful and misguided.

Increasing Resources to Build and Preserve Housing in Tribal and Rural Areas

Native Americans living in tribal areas have some of the worst housing needs in the United States, with exceptionally high poverty rates, low incomes, overcrowding, lack of plumbing and heat, and unique development issues. Despite the pressing need for safe, decent homes, federal investments in affordable housing on tribal lands have been chronically underfunded for decades. NLIHC works with tribal leaders and advocates to increase housing resources for tribal nations with the greatest needs, improve data collection on tribal housing needs, and reduce federal barriers to housing development.

NLIHC also works to preserve and expand affordable housing available in rural areas by supporting funding for USDA Rural Development programs and through opportunities to preserve the agency's rental housing portfolio.

ENSURE PROTECTIONS FOR LOW-INCOME RENTERS

Opposing Efforts to Cut Housing Benefits

NLIHC opposes efforts to cut housing benefits through rent increases, work requirements, time limits, and other restrictions. These so-called reforms are neither cost effective nor a solution to the very real issue of poverty impacting millions of families living in subsidized housing or in need of housing. NLIHC leads the [Preventing Benefit Cuts](#) coalition to educate members of Congress on proven solutions to ending housing poverty, including expanding—not slashing—investments in affordable homes, job training, education, childcare, and other policies to help families thrive.

Opposing Anti-Immigrant Proposals

NLIHC opposes proposals that deter eligible immigrant families from seeking housing benefits or that force immigrant families currently receiving housing benefits to forego

that assistance or face eviction. NLIHC co-leads the [Keep Families Together](#) campaign with the National Housing Law Project to oppose the Trump Administration's proposals to prohibit "mixed-status" families from living in public and other subsidized housing at HUD and USDA. NLIHC also participates in the Protecting Immigrant Families campaign to oppose proposals to make it easier for the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice to declare certain immigrants to be a "public charge," denying them admission to the U.S. and possibly threatening deportation.

Preventing Evictions and Housing Instability

NLIHC advocates for the creation of a national housing stabilization fund to provide emergency assistance to extremely low-income households to prevent housing instability and homelessness. Temporary assistance can stabilize households experiencing sudden economic shocks before it leads to situations which require more prolonged and extensive housing assistance. NLIHC supports legislation to support just cause evictions and a national right to counsel, among other anti-eviction protections.

Promoting Healthy Housing

All low-income renters deserve to live in healthy, accessible, high-quality homes. NLIHC supports efforts to improve housing conditions in federally assisted housing, including efforts to revise the REAC inspection process and address lead-based paint, carbon monoxide poisoning, and other unsafe and unhealthy housing conditions.

Protecting HUD Residents

For decades, Congress has failed to provide adequate funding to maintain public housing in good condition, and as a result, public housing faces a more than \$50 billion backlog in capital improvement needs. In response, HUD has sought to "reposition" public housing by reducing the number of homes in the public housing stock through the demolition or disposition of public housing, voluntary conversion of public housing to vouchers, and the retention of assets after a Declaration of Trust release. NLIHC monitors these efforts to help ensure that current and

future public housing residents are not negatively impacted.

NLIHC also monitors the Rental Assistance Demonstration, which seeks to convert public housing to Section 8 funding streams in order to better access needed financing to ensure resident protections and other requirements are enforced.

Protecting Survivors of Domestic Violence

NLIHC supports federal protections to ensure survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking have access to safe, accessible homes and the ability to leave an unsafe housing situation without risking possible homelessness. NLIHC supports legislation to bar federally assisted housing providers from screening out applicants or evicting tenants because of the criminal activity of an abuser and to prohibit retaliation against a tenant for calling law enforcement or emergency assistance for help.

ENSURE FEDERAL DISASTER RECOVERY EFFORTS ARE FAIR AND EQUITABLE

America's disaster housing response and recovery framework is broken, exacerbating racial, income and accessibility inequalities. NLIHC leads the [Disaster Housing Recovery Coalition](#) of 850 national, state, and local organizations, including many working directly with disaster-impacted communities and with first-hand experience recovering after disasters. We work to ensure a complete and equitable recovery for the lowest-income households, including people of color, seniors, people with disabilities, families with children, people experiencing homelessness, immigrants, and others and their communities. The coalition also works to advance a comprehensive set of recommendations for [Congress](#), [FEMA](#), and [HUD](#).

PROMOTE EQUITABLE ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND OPPORTUNITY

NLIHC believes in just communities, where everyone has access to economic and educational opportunities, as well as affordable housing. Evidence shows that access to stable, affordable housing in communities of opportunity has broad, positive impacts. It can lead to better health and education outcomes and higher lifetime earnings, especially for children.

Advancing Fair Housing

For more than 50 years, the "Fair Housing Act" has barred housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin, or disability and required communities take active steps to end racial segregation. The Trump Administration, however, has worked to weaken critical fair housing policies. NLIHC will continue to lead efforts to oppose these proposals and protect important regulations, such as the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule, the 2013 Disparate Impact rule, and the 2016 Equal Access in Accordance with an Individual's Gender Identity rule. These policies help promote more equitable communities, prevent hidden discrimination through biased policies or practices, and ensure appropriate access to services regardless of race, sexual orientation or gender identity. NLIHC also supports expanding the Fair Housing Act to bar discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, and source of income.

NLIHC supports increasing mobility opportunities through new allocations of mobility vouchers, expanded mobility counseling and regional mobility programs, and continued implementation of HUD Small Area Fair Market Rents (SAFMRs) in certain metropolitan areas that protect current and future tenants.

Achieving Criminal Justice Reform

The United States incarcerates its citizens at a shockingly high rate and nearly one in three Americans has a criminal record. Black and Latino people, people with a disability, and members of the LGBTQ community are disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system. As more formerly incarcerated individuals return to their communities, they face barriers to accessing affordable housing, putting them at risk of homelessness and recidivism. NLIHC advocates for safe, stable, affordable and accessible housing for those who have been involved in the criminal or juvenile justice system so that formerly incarcerated people can successfully reintegrate into their communities and make the most of their second chance.

In addition, NLIHC advocates to end the criminalization of homelessness. Nationwide, homeless people are targeted, arrested, and jailed under laws that criminalize homelessness by making illegal basic acts that are necessary for life. These laws are ineffective, expensive, and often violate homeless persons' civil and human rights.

Creating Greater Opportunities for Employment

NLIHC supports efforts to improve HUD's Section 3 program, which has the potential to serve as a robust resource for job creation in low-income communities. Section 3 aims to ensure jobs, training, and contracting opportunities associated with HUD-assisted projects go to low-income people, including residents of federally assisted housing, and to the businesses that hire them. NLIHC also supports an expansion of the Family Self Sufficiency program, linking HUD residents to services and educational opportunities that can lead to improved employment and earned income.

CHAMPION ANTI-POVERTY SOLUTIONS

Beyond ensuring access to affordable housing, NLIHC is strongly committed to enacting legislation and protecting resources that alleviate poverty. NLIHC supports efforts to protect vital safety net programs, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), unemployment insurance, Social Security, Medicaid, Medicare, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), the Affordable Care Act, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Moreover, NLIHC strongly supports efforts to increase the minimum wage and to target federal resources to communities with persistent poverty.

For more information or to get involved, contact Sarah Saadian, NLIHC's Vice President of Policy, at ssaadian@nlihc.org.

A Brief Historical Overview of Affordable Rental Housing

Affordable housing is a broad and complex subject intertwined with many disciplines including finance, economics, politics, and social services, among others. Despite this complexity, advocates can learn the essential workings of affordable housing and be prepared to advocate effectively for the programs and policies that ensure access to decent, affordable housing for people in need.

This article provides a broad, though not exhaustive, overview of the history of affordable rental housing programs in the United States and describes how those programs work together to meet the housing needs of low-income people.

HISTORY

As with any federal program, federal housing programs have grown and changed based on the economic, social, cultural, and political circumstances of the times. The programs and agencies that led to the establishment of the federal department now known as HUD began in the early 1930s with construction and finance programs meant to alleviate some of the housing hardships caused by the Great Depression. An act of Congress in 1934 created the Federal Housing Administration, which made home ownership affordable for a broader segment of the public with the establishment of mortgage insurance programs. These programs made possible the low down payments and long-term mortgages that are commonplace today but were almost unheard of at that time.

In 1937, the “U.S. Housing Act” sought to address the housing needs of low-income people through public housing. The nation’s housing stock at the time was of very poor quality in many parts of the country. Inadequate housing conditions such as a lack of hot running water or dilapidation was commonplace for poor families. Public housing provided significant improvements for those who were able to access it. At the same time, the post-

World War II migration from urban areas to the suburbs meant declining cities. Federal programs were developed to improve urban infrastructure and to clear “blight.” This often meant wholesale destruction of neighborhoods and housing, albeit often low-quality housing, lived in by immigrants and people of color.

In 1965, Congress elevated housing to a cabinet-level agency of the federal government, establishing HUD, which succeeded its predecessors the National Housing Agency and the Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA), respectively. HUD is not the only federal agency to have begun housing programs in response to the Great Depression, however. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) sought to address the poor housing conditions of farmers and other rural people with the 1935 creation of the Resettlement Administration, a predecessor to the USDA’s Rural Development programs. USDA’s rural rental and homeownership programs improved both housing access and housing quality for the rural poor.

The cost of operating public housing soon eclipsed the revenue brought in from resident rent payments, a reality endemic to any program that seeks to provide housing or other goods or services to people whose incomes are not high enough to afford marketplace prices. In the 1960s, HUD began providing subsidies to public housing agencies (PHAs) that would help make up the difference between revenue from rent and the cost of adequately maintaining housing. In 1969, Congress passed the Brooke Amendment, codifying a limitation on the percentage of income a public housing resident could be expected to pay in rent. The original figure was 25% of a person’s total income and was later raised to the 30% standard that exists today. Advocates often refer to these as “Brooke rents,” for Senator Edward W. Brooke, III (R-MA), for whom the amendment is named.

Beginning in the late 1950s and continuing into the 1960s, Congress created a number of

programs that leveraged private investment to create new affordable rental housing. In general, these programs provided low interest rates or other subsidies to private owners who would purchase or rehabilitate housing to be rented at affordable rates. The growth in these private ownership programs resulted in a boom in affordable housing construction through the 1970s, but once the contracts forged by HUD and private owners expired, or owners decided to pay their subsidized mortgages early, those affordable units were vulnerable to being lost from the stock.

The “Civil Rights Acts” of 1964 and 1968 included housing provisions that were intended to prevent discrimination against members of protected classes in private or public housing. Different Administrations have prioritized these fair housing provisions to varying extents, but their existence has provided leverage to advocates seeking to expand access to affordable, decent housing, particularly for people of color.

In January 1973, President Richard Nixon created a moratorium on the construction of new rental and homeownership housing by the major HUD programs. The following year, the Housing and “Community Development Act of 1974” made significant changes to housing programs, marked by a focus on block grants and an increase in the authority granted to local jurisdictions (often referred to as “devolution of authority”). This act was the origin of the tenant-based and project-based Section 8 rental assistance programs and created the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) from seven existing housing and infrastructure programs.

Structural changes in the American economy, deinstitutionalization of persons with mental illnesses, and a decline in housing and other support for low-income people resulted in a dramatic increase in homelessness in the 1980s. The shock of visible homelessness spurred congressional action and the “McKinney Act of 1987” (later renamed the “McKinney-Vento Act”) created new housing and social service programs within HUD specially designed to address homelessness.

Waves of private affordable housing owners deciding to opt out of the project-based Section 8 program occurred in the 1980s and 1990s. Housing advocates—including PHAs, nonprofit affordable housing developers, local government officials, nonprofit advocacy organizations, and low-income renters—organized to preserve this disappearing stock of affordable housing using whatever funding and financing was available.

The Department of the Treasury’s Internal Revenue Service was given a role in affordable housing development in the “Tax Reform Act of 1986” with the creation of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, which provides tax credits to those investing in the development of affordable rental housing. That same act codified the use of private activity bonds for housing finance, authorizing the use of such bonds for the development of housing for homeownership as well as the development of multifamily rental housing.

The “Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act of 1990” (NAHA) created the Comprehensive Affordable Housing Strategy (CHAS). It was now the obligation of jurisdictions to identify priority housing needs and to determine how to allocate the various block grants (such as CDBG) that they received. CHAS is the statutory underpinning of the current Consolidated Plan obligation. Cranston-Gonzales also created the HOME program, which provides block grants to state and local governments for housing. In addition, NAHA created the Section 811 program, which has provided production and operating subsidies to nonprofits for housing persons with disabilities.

Housing advocates worked for more than a decade for the establishment and funding of the national Housing Trust Fund (NHTF), which is the first new housing resource in a generation. The HTF is highly targeted and is used to build, preserve, rehabilitate, and operate housing affordable to extremely low-income people. The HTF was signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2008 as a part of the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act.” In 2016, the first allocation of HTF dollars was provided to states.

Outside of the HTF, no significant new investment in housing affordable to the lowest income people has been made in more than 30 years and there still exists a great shortage of housing affordable to that population. As studies from NLIHC show, federal investment in housing has not increased at pace with the overall increase in the federal budget, and expenditures on housing go overwhelmingly to homeownership, not to rental housing for people with the greatest need. Federal spending caps enacted in 2011 further strained efforts to adequately fund programs.

STATE AND LOCAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

State and local governments play a role in meeting the housing needs of their residents. The devolution of authority to local governments that began in the 1970s meant that local jurisdictions had greater responsibility for planning and carrying out housing programs. Some communities have responded to the decrease in federal housing resources by creating emergency and ongoing rental assistance programs, as well as housing production programs. These programs have been important to low-income residents in the communities where they are available, but state and local efforts have not been enough to make up for the federal disinvestment in affordable housing.

Cities, counties, and states across the country have begun creating their own rental assistance programs as well as housing development programs, often called housing trust funds, to meet local housing needs and help fill in the gaps left by the decline in federal housing production and rental assistance. Local funding sources may be targeted to specific income groups or may be created to meet the needs of a certain population, such as veterans, seniors, or families transitioning out of homelessness. Funding sources include local levy or bond measures and real estate transaction or document recording fees, among others.

Federal decision-making has had a direct impact on states' responses to the shortage of housing affordable to extremely low-income people. In

1999, the U.S. Supreme Court found in *Olmstead v L.C.* that continued institutionalization of people with disabilities who were able to return to the community constituted discrimination under the "Americans with Disabilities Act." This decision means that states are now developing and providing community-based permanent supportive housing for people with disabilities in response to *Olmstead* litigation or in order to avoid future litigation.

DEVELOPING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

The expense of producing and operating housing affordable to low-income renters, and the multitude of funding sources available to finance it, make affordable housing development a complicated task.

Affordable housing developers, including PHAs redeveloping their housing stock, must combine multiple sources of funding in order to finance housing development or preservation. These funding sources can be of federal, state or local origin, and can also include private lending and grants or donations. Some developers include market-rate housing options within a development in order to generate revenue that will cross-subsidize units set aside for lower income tenants. Each funding source will have its own requirements for income or population targeting, as well as oversight requirements. Some funding sources require developers to meet certain environmental standards or other goals, such as historic preservation or transit-oriented development.

Accessing these many funding sources requires entry into application processes which may or may not have complementary timelines and developers risk rejection of even the highest merit applications due to a shortage of resources. Developers incur costs before the first shovel hits the ground as they work to plan their developments around available funding sources and their associated requirements.

Developers encounter another set of requirements in the communities in which they work. They must operate according to local

land use regulations, and sometimes encounter community opposition to a planned development, which can jeopardize funder support for a project.

Once developments open, depending on the needs of the residents, services and supports may be included in the development. These can range from after-school programs to job training to physical or mental health care. This can mean working with another set of federal, state, and local programs, as well as nonprofit service providers.

Despite these challenges, affordable housing developers succeed every day, building, rehabilitating, and preserving quality housing for low-income people at rents they can afford.

THE FUTURE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The need for affordable housing continues to grow, particularly the need for housing affordable and accessible to the lowest-income people. Nationwide, there are only 37 units of housing affordable and available for every 100 extremely low-income Americans. Federal housing assistance only serves one quarter of those who qualify and special populations, such as disabled veterans returning from combat or lower income seniors, are increasing in number and need.

At the same time, the existing stock of affordable rental housing is disappearing due to deterioration and the exit of private owners from the affordable housing market. According to the National Housing Trust, our nation loses two affordable apartments each year for each one created. Local preservation efforts have seen success, and resources like the National Housing Preservation Database are helpful, but it is a race against time.

Finally, the very funding structure of most affordable housing programs puts them at risk, at both the federal and local levels. The majority of federal housing programs are appropriated, meaning that the funding amounts can change from year to year, or disappear altogether. State and local programs can be similarly volatile, because they are often dependent on revenue

from fees or other market-driven sources and are vulnerable to being swept into non-housing uses. Ensuring funding at amounts necessary to maintain programs at their current level of service, much less grow them, is a constant battle.

THE ROLE OF ADVOCATES

Just as the Great Depression caused lawmakers to consider an expanded role for government in the provision and financing of housing, the Great Recession of 2008 and the ensuing slow recovery have inspired advocates, lawmakers, and the general public to take interest in the housing and other needs of low-income people, and to reconsider the role of government in housing, particularly in homeowner-owned housing.

Affordable housing advocates have a unique opportunity to make the case for affordable rental housing with members of Congress as well as with local policymakers. As the articles in this *Guide* demonstrate, subsidized rental housing is more cost-effective and sustainable than the alternative, be it institutionalization, homelessness, or grinding hardship for working poor families. After decades of overinvestment in homeownership, the housing market collapse, and the growth of a gaping divide between the resources and prospects of the highest and lowest income people, it is necessary for Congress to significantly expand resources to help end homelessness and housing poverty once and for all.


Those who wish to see an end to homelessness must be unyielding in their advocacy for rental housing that is affordable and accessible to low-income people. Over the decades of direct federal involvement in housing, we have learned much about how the government, private, and public sectors can partner with communities to create affordable housing that will improve lives and heal whole neighborhoods. We must take this evidence, and our stories, to lawmakers to show them that this can, and must, be done.

The National Need for Affordable Housing

By Dan Emmanuel, Senior Research Analyst, NLIHC

The United States is facing a shortage of affordable rental housing. The shortage is most severe for households with extremely low incomes at or below the poverty guideline or 30% of their area's median income (AMI), whichever is higher. Only 7.3 million affordable rental homes exist for the nation's 10.9 million extremely low-income (ELI) renter households, assuming they should spend no more than 30% of their income on housing costs [unless otherwise noted, figures are based on 2018 American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data]. Not all of the 7.3 million homes, however, are available. Approximately 3.3 million are occupied by higher income households. As a result, fewer than 4 million rental homes are affordable and available for ELI renters, leaving a shortage of nearly 7 million. In other words, only 36 affordable and available rental homes exist for every 100 ELI renter households.

The severe shortage of affordable homes for the lowest income renters is systemic, affecting every state and metropolitan area. Absent public subsidy, the private market is unable to produce new rental housing affordable to these households because the rents that the lowest-income households can afford to pay typically do not cover the development costs and operating expenses of such housing. New private rental housing, therefore, is largely targeted to the higher-price end of the market and the lowest-income renters must rely on older, private rental housing or subsidies.




The private market, however, does not generate an adequate supply of older rental homes and subsidies are woefully inadequate. In strong markets, owners of older rental homes have an incentive to redevelop their properties to receive higher rents from higher-income households. In weak markets, owners of older rental homes have an incentive to abandon their rental properties or convert them to

other uses when rental income is too low to cover basic operating costs and maintenance. Adjusted for inflation, the share of rental homes renting for under \$600 per month declined from 46% of the rental stock in 1990 to just 25% in 2017 (Joint Center for Housing Studies (JCHS), 2019: *Documenting the Long-Run Decline in Low-Cost Rental Units in the US by State*). Meanwhile, just one in four households eligible for federal housing assistance get the help they need (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2017: *Chart Book: Federal Housing Spending Is Poorly Matched to Need*).

As a result of these challenges, 86% of ELI renter households spend more than 30% of their income on housing and 71% spend more than half of their income on housing, making them severely cost burdened. ELI households account for more cost burdened and severely cost burdened renter households than any other income group (Figure 1). The 7.7 million severely cost burdened ELI renter households account for 72% of the 10.8 million severely cost burdened renter households in the U.S.

FIGURE 2: HOUSING WAGE AND MEDIAN WAGES FOR OCCUPATIONS WITH MOST PROJECTED GROWTH 2016-2026



Source: Housing wages based on HUD fair market rents. Employment projections from BLS Employment Projections Program. Occupational wages from May 2018 Occupational Employment Statistics, BLS, adjusted to 2019 dollars.

The most vulnerable ELI renters, such as people with disabilities relying on Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and minimum wage workers, typically face the greatest burdens. A 2017 study, for example, found that rents for modest one-bedroom homes exceeded 100% of an individual's monthly SSI income in 220 housing markets across 40 states and the District of Columbia (Technical Assistance Collaborative, 2017: *Priced Out: The Housing Crisis for People with Disabilities*). In only 28 counties nationwide can a full-time worker at minimum wage afford a modest one-bedroom apartment at the fair market rent (NLIHC, 2019: *Out of Reach 2019: The High Cost of Housing*).

Low-wage employment often does not pay enough for workers to afford housing and other necessities. A person working full-time every week of the year needs to earn an hourly wage of \$22.96 in order to afford a modest two-bedroom rental home without spending more than 30% of his or her income on housing, or \$18.65 for a modest one-bedroom apartment. These wages are far higher than the federal minimum wage and higher than wages paid in many of the occupations projected to grow the most over the next decade (Figure 2).

The negative impact of severe housing cost burdens on low-income family members' mental and physical health is well documented, particularly due to increased stress from housing instability and fewer resources for food and health care (*Opportunity Starts at Home*, 2018: *Good Housing is Good Health*). The lowest-income cost burdened households are one financial emergency away from eviction. Among severely cost burdened renter households living in poverty in 2013, nearly 15% were unable to pay all or part of their rent in the previous three months and over 3% had been threatened with eviction due to their inability to pay rent in the past 12 months (NLIHC, 2018: *The Gap 2018: A Shortage of Affordable Rental Homes*). The poorest families with children who are severely cost burdened spend an average of \$700 less on non-housing expenses each month compared to similar households who are not cost burdened (JCHS, 2019: *The State of the Nation's Housing 2019*). As a result, the poorest cost burdened households often forego healthy food and delay healthcare or medications in order to pay for housing.

Many SSI recipients and seniors with mobility impairments need housing with accessible features like zero-step entrances, wider hallways and doorframes to accommodate wheelchairs, single-floor living, levered handles on doors and faucets, and electrical controls reachable from a wheelchair. Less than 1% of homes have all of these elements (JCHS, 2018: *Housing America's Older Adults: A Supplement to the State of the Nation's Housing Report*). The growing population of seniors with disabilities will increase the need for accessible housing in the coming years.

The lowest-income households face enormous barriers in obtaining affordable and accessible housing. The data clearly show that they have the greatest housing needs relative to all other income groups. Addressing their needs should be the highest national housing priority.

Income Targeting and Expenditures for Major Housing Programs

Housing Program	Income Targeting Requirements	National Annual Funding
Public Housing	At least 40% of units are for households with income less than 30% of area median income (AMI), with the remainder for households earning up to 80% of AMI.	\$7.4 billion (Fiscal year 2020; FY20 HUD appropriation)
Housing Choice Vouchers	At least 75% of vouchers are for households with income less than 30% of AMI, with the remainder for households earning up to 80% of AMI.	\$23.9 billion (FY20 HUD appropriation)
Project-Based Rental Assistance	At least 40% of units are for households with income less than 30% of AMI, with the remainder for households earning up to 80% of AMI.	\$12.6 billion (FY20 HUD appropriation)
Section 202 and Section 811	For Section 202 and the 811 Capital Advance/Project Rental Assistance Contract programs, all units are for households with income less than 50% of AMI. For the 811 Project Rental Assistance program, all units are for households with income less than 30% of AMI.	\$995 million (FY20 HUD appropriation)
HOME Investment Partnerships Program	If used for rental, at least 90% of units assisted by the jurisdiction must be for households with income less than 60% AMI, with the remainder for households with income up to 80% AMI. If more than five HOME-assisted units are in a building, then 20% of the HOME-assisted units must be for households with income less than 50% AMI. Assisted homeowners must have income less than 80% of AMI.	\$1.35 billion (FY20 HUD appropriation)
Community Development Block Grant	At least 70% of households served must have income less than 80% of AMI. Remaining funds can serve households of any income group.	\$3.4 billion (FY20 HUD appropriation)
McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Grants	All assistance is for participants who meet HUD's definition of homelessness (those who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence).	\$2.78 billion (FY20 HUD appropriation)

Housing Program	Income Targeting Requirements	National Annual Funding
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS	All housing is for households with income less than 80% of AMI.	\$410 million (FY20 HUD appropriation)
Low-Income Housing Tax Credit	All units are for households with income less than 50% or 60% of AMI (dependent upon developer's choice of 20% of units at 50% of AMI or 40% of units at 60% of AMI).	\$9 billion (FY20 estimated tax expenditure)
Federal Home Loan Banks' Affordable Housing Program	All units are for households with income less than 80% of AMI. For rental projects, 20% of units are for households earning less than 50% of AMI.	\$404 million (2018 FHLB assessment)
Section 515 Rural Rental Housing	All units are for households with income less than the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) definition of moderate income; 80% of AMI plus \$5,500. Households in substandard housing are given first priority.	\$40 million (FY20 USDA appropriation)
Section 521 Rural Rental Assistance	In new projects, 95% of units are for households with income less than 50% of AMI. In existing projects, 75% of units are for households with income less than 50% of AMI.	\$1.375 billion (FY20 USDA appropriation)
National Housing Trust Fund	At least 90% of funds must be for rental housing and at least 75% of rental housing funds must benefit households with income less than 30% of AMI or poverty level, whichever is greater. Remaining funds can assist households with income less than 50% of AMI. Up to 10% may be for homeowner activities benefitting households with income less than 50% of AMI.	\$247.7 million in 2019

AMI: area median income

Extremely low-income: income less than 30% of AMI or less than the federal poverty line

Very low-income: income less than 50% of AMI

Low income: income less than 80% of AMI

Housing as a Human Right

By Eric Tars, Legal Director, National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty

Polling results indicate that three-quarters of Americans believe that adequate housing is a human right and two-thirds believe that government programs need to be expanded to ensure this right. However, New Deal commitments to ensure that our neighbors do not go unhoused were broken in the massive cutbacks to federal housing funding in the early 1980s and have never been restored, resulting in the current homelessness crisis. Today only one out of four income-eligible renters receive assistance and reports of homeless encampments have surged more than 1,300% over the past 10 years, indicating that we are far from a rights-based approach. Human rights framing has made its way into federal policy, however. Thanks to well-organized advocacy, the [U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness \(USICH\)](#), the U.S. [Department of Justice \(DOJ\)](#), and Department of [Housing and Urban Development](#) have all taken enforcement actions and adopted human rights language against the criminalization of homelessness. At the state level, there is a trend of developing “homeless bills of rights,” and locally, many municipalities have passed resolutions declaring their belief in housing as a human right.

2019 saw for the first time numerous Presidential candidate platforms and Congressional statements openly embracing a human right to housing framework. While saying housing is a human right and making it happen in policy are two different things, changing the rhetorical frame is important to changing the policy. This was demonstrated by the embrace of healthcare as a human right framing that preceded the passage of the “Affordable Care Act.” Faced with the prospect of more cuts to already inadequate housing programs at the federal, state, and local levels, housing advocates can use the human right to housing framework to reframe public debate, craft and support legislative proposals,

supplement legal claims in court, advocate in international fora, and support community organizing efforts. Numerous United Nations (U.N.) human rights experts have recently visited the United States or made comments directly bearing on domestic housing issues including affordable and public housing, homelessness, and the foreclosure crisis, often providing detailed recommendations for federal- and local-level policy reforms. In 2020, advocates must work to consolidate these gains and push for action to accompany the rhetoric.

HISTORY

In his 1944 State of the Union address, Franklin Roosevelt declared that the United States had a “[Second Bill of Rights](#),” including the right to a decent home. In 1948, the United States signed the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights \(UDHR\)](#), recognizing adequate housing as a component of the human right to an adequate standard of living.

The UDHR is a non-binding declaration, so the right to adequate housing was codified into a binding treaty law by the [International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights \(ICESCR\)](#) in 1966. The United States signed the ICESCR, and thus must uphold the “object and purpose” of the treaty, even though the U.S. has not yet ratified it. The U.S. ratified the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#) in 1992 and the [International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination](#) in 1994. Both recognize the right to be free from discrimination, including in housing, on the basis of race, gender, disability, and other status. They also emphasize the need for equitable policies to make up for past discrimination. The U.S. also ratified the [Convention Against Torture](#) in 1994, protecting individuals from torture and other cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment, including the criminalization of homelessness.

In more recent years, the U.S. government supported, in part, a recommendation from the

Human Rights Council in 2015 to “guarantee the right by all residents in the country to adequate housing, food, health and education, with the aim of decreasing poverty, which affects 48 million people in the country.” In October 2016, the U.S. signed onto the New Urban Agenda, “commit[ing] to promote national, sub-national, and local housing policies that support the progressive realization of the right to adequate housing for all as a component of the right to an adequate standard of living, that address all forms of discrimination and violence, prevent arbitrary forced evictions, and that focus on the needs of the homeless, persons in vulnerable situations, low-income groups, and persons with disabilities, while enabling participation and engagement of communities and relevant stakeholders in the planning and implementation of these policies including supporting the social production of habitat, according to national legislations and standards.” The Agenda also stated, “we commit to combat homelessness as well as to combat and eliminate its criminalization through dedicated policies and targeted active inclusion strategies, such as comprehensive, inclusive, and sustainable housing first programs.”

USICH, DOJ, and HUD all currently address the criminalization of homelessness as a human rights issue on their websites. Implementing recommendations of human rights treaty bodies, the DOJ filed a [statement of interest brief](#) arguing that the criminalization of homelessness violates the 8th Amendment and human rights standards, and HUD provided two points on their funding applications to [incentivize Continuums of Care](#) to demonstrate steps taken to end and prevent criminalization.

The U.S. has hosted several official and unofficial visits of top U.N. human rights in recent years which have garnered significant press, as well as meetings with high profile elected officials. In 2019, the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty and others worked with Sen. Cory Booker’s office to host a packed-room [Congressional briefing](#) on the report of the U.N. [Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty & Human Rights](#) on his mission to the U.S. There, the Law

Center called on the attendees to embrace human right to housing framing. Following further meetings, now seven of the leading Democratic candidates for President (Senators [Booker](#), [Harris](#), [Sanders](#), and [Warren](#), former HUD Sec. [Castro](#), former Rep. [O’Rourke](#), and Tom [Steyer](#)) have addressed housing as a human right in their speeches and platforms, those in Congress have introduced bills to address the right, and all of the members of “[the Squad](#)” have been actively messaging the human right to housing on the House floor in introducing their housing legislation.

ISSUE SUMMARY

According to the U.N. Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, which oversees the ICESCR, the human right to adequate housing consists of [seven elements](#): (1) security of tenure; (2) availability of services, materials, and infrastructure; (3) affordability; (4) accessibility; (5) habitability; (6) location; and (7) cultural adequacy.

In the human rights framework, every right creates a corresponding duty on the part of the government to respect, protect, and fulfill the right. Having the right to housing does not mean that the government must build a house for every person in America and give it to them free of charge. It does, however, allocate ultimate responsibility to the government to progressively realize the right to adequate housing, whether by devoting resources to public housing, vouchers, or renters tax credits by creating incentives for the private development of affordable housing such as inclusionary zoning or the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, through market regulation such as rent control, through legal due process protections from eviction or foreclosure, as well as upholding the right to counsel to enforce those protections and ensuring habitable conditions through housing codes and inspections, or by ensuring homeless persons are not threatened with civil or criminal penalties for sheltering themselves in the absence of adequate alternatives. Contrary to our current framework that views housing as a commodity to be

determined primarily by the market, the right to housing framework gives advocates a tool for holding each level of government accountable if any of those elements are not satisfied.

[France](#), [Scotland](#), [South Africa](#), and several other countries have adopted a right to housing in their constitutions or legislation, leading to improved housing conditions. In Scotland, the “Homelessness Act of 2003” includes the right for all homeless persons to be immediately housed and the right to long-term, supportive housing for as long as needed. The law also includes an individual right to sue if one believes these rights are not being met and requires jurisdictions to plan for the development of adequate affordable housing stock. Complementary policies include the right to purchase public housing units and automatic referrals by banks to foreclosure prevention programs to help people remain in their homes. All these elements work together to ensure that the right to housing is upheld. Although challenges remain in its implementation, in general, Scotland’s homelessness is a brief, rare, and non-recurring phenomenon.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Building on the success of 2019, 2020 could be the true breakout year for the human right to housing in the U.S.

On the positive side, the increasing adoption of the language of the human right to housing by presidential candidates and Members of Congress indicates a comfort with this framing, and a potential for a mutually reinforcing cultural shift. Ambitious legislative proposals including renters tax credits, reparations for decades of racist exclusions from the housing market for racial minorities, and a new commitment to public housing, while not likely to be immediately enacted, show a move toward a rights-based approach, as opposed to one that accepts budget limitations as an excuse to not meet the need.

That said, the current U.S. Administration poses a dire threat both to the enjoyment of the right to adequate housing by Americans and to the acceptance of a rights-based

approach to housing. Most worryingly, as of the time of this writing, the Administration is reportedly working on an executive order that would potentially include mechanisms to raze homeless encampments and forcibly relocate and effectively incarcerate people experiencing homelessness in mass encampments or in vacant properties. In the meantime, the President’s budget repeatedly cuts funding for affordable housing, and his new appointment to head the USICH indicates a turn away from housing-based solutions and toward criminalization of homelessness and mass homeless incarceration facilities.

It is precisely in this time of ongoing economic hardship that a rights-based approach to budgeting and policy decisions would help generate the will to protect people’s basic human dignity first, rather than relegating it to the status of an optional policy. The National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, together with many other housing and homelessness organizations (including NLIHC), launched the [Housing Not Handcuffs](#) Campaign in 2016 linking local and national advocacy against the criminalization of homelessness and in favor of housing access.

Advocates can also take advantage of the [Universal Periodic Review](#) of the U.S. by the U.N. Human Rights Council in May 2020 as an opportunity to highlight the U.S.’s poor performance on housing and generate recommendations to reinforce our policy solutions.

At the state level, Rhode Island, Illinois, and Connecticut have all passed [Homeless Bills of Rights](#) and California is reportedly considering human right to housing legislation for 2020.

Locally, advocates in many cities are working to pass right to housing resolutions or to directly implement the right to housing. Advocates in Eugene, OR, have successfully used human rights framing to create political will for a safe camping area for homeless persons. Groups like the Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign are organizing eviction and foreclosure defenses and using a state law allowing nonprofits to take over and

rehabilitate vacant properties to draw attention to and directly implement the human right to housing.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Local groups wishing to build the movement around the human right to housing in the United States can use international standards to promote policy change, from rallying slogans to concrete legislative proposals. Groups can start with a non-binding resolution stating that their locality recognizes housing as a human right in the context of the ongoing economic and foreclosure crisis, such as the resolution passed by the Madison, WI, city council and the surrounding Dane County Board of Supervisors in November 2011, which later served as the basis for an \$8 million investment in affordable housing. Advocates can also hold local government accountable to human rights standards by creating an annual Human Right to Housing Report Card. Using international mechanisms and the domestic process around them, such as the review by the U.N. Human Rights Council described above, can also cast an international spotlight on local issues.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

It is important for legislators and their staff (as well as other advocates) to hear their constituents say that housing is a human right and ask for them to say it too, and call for policies to support it as such, as this helps to change the normative framework for all of the housing issues that we work on. Tying the concept to the United States' origins and acceptance of these rights in Roosevelt's "Second Bill of Rights," the polling data above, and showing the affirmations of this language by USICH, HUD, and the DOJ or other leading political figures all emphasize that it is a homegrown idea rather than one imposed from abroad. On a somewhat converse point, using the recommendations made by human rights monitors can also reinforce advocates' messages by lending them international legitimacy.

Both the American Bar Association and the International Association of Official Human

Rights Agencies (the association of state and local human rights commissions) have passed resolutions endorsing a domestic implementation of the human right to housing, which local groups are using as tools in their advocacy. In reaching out to religiously motivated communities, it may be helpful to reference the numerous endorsements of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops in favor of the human right to housing and to point out that Pope Francis called for the human right to housing to be implemented during his 2015 visit to the U.S. All of these can lead us to a future where housing is enjoyed as a right by all Americans.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 202-638-2535, www.nlchp.org.

Chapter 2: ADVOCACY RESOURCES

How Laws Are Made

The lawmaking process can be initiated in either chamber of Congress, the House of Representatives or the Senate. Revenue-related bills must originate in the House of Representatives. Legislators initiate the lawmaking process by crafting a bill or a joint resolution.

Although members of Congress introduce bills and help maneuver legislation through the lawmaking process, congressional staff also play an essential role in the process. Members of Congress have staff working in their personal offices and those who serve as Chair or Ranking Members of committees or subcommittees have separate committee staff as well. Both personal and committee staff have significant input in the legislative process.

The following steps, adapted from the Government Printing Office (GPO), describe the process of enacting a bill into law that is introduced in the House of Representatives. Enacting a joint resolution into law requires the same steps as a bill.

ENACTING A BILL INTO LAW

1. When a representative has an idea for a new law, he or she becomes the sponsor of that bill and introduces it by submitting it to the clerk of the House of Representatives or by placing it in a box called the hopper. The clerk assigns a legislative number to the bill, with H.R. for bills introduced in the House of Representatives (and S. for bills introduced in the Senate). GPO then prints the bill and distributes copies to each representative.
2. The bill is assigned to a committee by the Speaker of the House so that it can be studied. The House has standing committees, each with jurisdiction over bills in certain areas. The standing committee, or often a subcommittee, studies the bill and hears testimony from experts and people interested in the bill. The committee then may release the bill with a recommendation to pass it, or revise the bill and release it, or lay it aside so that the House cannot vote on it. Releasing the bill is called “reporting it out,” while laying it aside is called “tabling.”
3. If the bill is released, it then goes on a calendar, which is a list of bills awaiting action. Here the House Rules Committee may call for the bill to be voted on quickly, may limit the debate, or may limit or prohibit amendments. Undisputed bills may be passed by unanimous consent or by a two-thirds majority vote if members agree to suspend the rules.
4. The bill then goes to the floor of the House for consideration and begins with a complete reading of the bill. Sometimes this is the only complete reading. A third reading of the title only occurs after any amendments have been added. If the bill is passed by simple majority (218 of 435), the bill moves to the Senate.
5. In order to be introduced in the Senate, a senator must be recognized by the presiding officer and announce the introduction of the bill. Sometimes, when a bill has passed in one chamber, it becomes known as an act; however, this term usually means a bill that has been passed by both chambers and becomes law.
6. Just as in the House, the bill is then assigned to a committee in the Senate. It is assigned to one of the Senate’s standing committees by the presiding officer. The Senate committee studies and either releases or tables the bill just like the House standing committee.
7. Once released, the bill goes to the Senate floor for consideration. Bills are voted on in the Senate based on the order in which they come from the committee; however, an urgent bill may be pushed ahead by leaders of the majority party. When the Senate considers the bill, it can be debated indefinitely. When there is no more debate, there is a vote on the bill. In many cases, a simple majority (51 of 100)

passes the bill. In recent years, however, the Senate has needed 60 votes to overcome the threat of a filibuster.

8. The bill now moves into a conference committee, which is made up of Members from each chamber of Congress. The conference committee works out any differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The revised bill is sent back to both chambers for their final approval. Once approved, the bill is printed by the GPO in a process called enrolling. The clerk from the introducing chamber certifies the final version.
9. The enrolled bill is now signed by the Speaker of the House and then the vice president. Finally, it is sent for presidential consideration. The president has 10 days to sign or veto the enrolled bill. If the president vetoes the bill, it can still become a law if two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House then vote in favor of the bill and override the veto.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The Legislative Process, from the U.S. House of Representatives: <https://www.house.gov/the-house-explained/the-legislative-process>.

Ben's Guide to the U.S. Government: <https://bensguide.gpo.gov/how-laws-are-made>.

The Federal Budget and Appropriations Process

By Sarah Saadian, Vice President of Public Policy, NLIHC

Funding the federal government is a two-part process that occurs annually. First, a federal budget resolution is passed, and then funds are appropriated among federal agencies and programs.

Both the Administration and Congress participate in the process of developing a federal budget resolution that establishes the overall framework and maximum dollar amount for government spending in a fiscal year (FY). The appropriations process is also handled entirely by Congress and establishes the amount of funding for individual activities of the federal government. Although the budget resolution should be completed, and funds appropriated during the prior FY, in recent years Congress has not completed the appropriations processes in advance of the start of the FY due to disagreements between the House and Senate over top line budget amounts.

TYPES OF FEDERAL SPENDING AND REVENUE

There are three categories of spending for which the budget and appropriations process establishes limits and defines uses: discretionary spending, mandatory spending, and tax revenue.

Discretionary Spending

As the name suggests, government expenditures in the discretionary portion of the budget are subject to annual evaluation by the president and Congress. Although the discretionary portion of the budget represents less than half of total annual expenditures, it is the area of spending that the president and Congress focus on most. Each year, the Administration and Congress re-evaluate the need to allocate funds for federal departments, programs, and activities. Discretionary spending amounts vary

annually, depending upon the Administration and congressional policy priorities.

Mandatory Spending

Mandatory spending is almost entirely made up of spending on entitlements, such as Social Security and Medicaid. Expenditures for entitlements are based on a formula that is applied to the number of households eligible for a benefit. The amount of funding in a given year is determined by that formula. Typically, the Administration and Congress do not focus much on this spending in the budget and appropriations processes. However, Congress can use the budget resolution to direct authorizing committees to participate in a budget cutting processes called budget reconciliation, whereby authorizing committees are required to suggest savings from mandatory programs.

Tax Revenue

Taxes provide revenue to the government to fund spending priorities. Tax policy includes not just revenues, but also expenditures in the form of deductions, credits, and other tax breaks. These expenditures reduce the total tax amount that could potentially be collected to provide revenue for the federal government. Each year, the Administration and Congress decide what tax revenues to collect and what tax expenditures to make by forgoing revenue collection in pursuit of certain policy priorities.

BUDGET PROCESS

The federal FY runs from October 1 through September 30. Planning for the upcoming FY begins as early as a year-and-a-half prior to the beginning of the FY.

President's Budget Request

The budget process officially commences on the first Monday of February, when the president is required by law to provide a budget request to

Congress for all Administration activities in the coming FY.

The president's budget request to Congress includes funding requests for discretionary programs, mandatory programs, and taxes. The majority of housing programs are funded through the discretionary portion of the budget. The president's funding request for discretionary programs varies from year to year to reflect the Administration's evolving policy priorities.

Congressional Budget Resolution

Once the president submits a budget to Congress, the House and Senate Committees on the Budget prepare a budget resolution. The budget resolution sets the overall framework for spending for a one-year fiscal term. The resolution includes a top-line spending figure for discretionary activities. The House and Senate Committees on Appropriations use this figure as the maximum amount of funding that can be appropriated in the next FY. This new discretionary cap either increases or decreases the overall amount of funding that the Committees on Appropriations have available to allocate to HUD and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s affordable housing activities. Even though the budget resolution establishes the overall spending level for the FY, it does not go into detail as to how this funding will be allocated. The details are the job of the Committees on Appropriations, which begin their work after Congress agrees to a budget resolution.

To craft the budget resolution, the House and Senate Committees on the Budget first hold hearings at which Administration officials testify regarding the president's budget request. The Committees on the Budget each craft their own budget resolutions. The House and Senate then attempt to agree on a final budget resolution. Since this is a resolution and not a bill, it does not have to be signed into law by the president.

Once Congress passes a budget resolution, the appropriations work begins. If Congress does not pass a budget resolution by the statutory deadline of April 15, the Committees on Appropriations are free to begin their appropriations work.

If Congress does not pass its appropriations bills by the October 1 start of the FY, it must provide funding for the period after the FY ends and before an appropriations bill is passed. This funding is provided by a continuing resolution (CR). A CR continues funding for programs funded in the prior FY, usually at the funding level from the year prior, although exceptions or "anomalies" may sometimes be included for certain programs. If Congress does not pass a CR and appropriations bills have not been enacted, the government shuts down, as it did for 17 days in October 2013.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Unlike the budget process, which is initiated by the Administration, the appropriations process rests entirely in the hands of Congress. After Congress passes a budget resolution, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations divide the top-line figure for discretionary spending among their 12 respective appropriations subcommittees. The two appropriations subcommittees that provide the majority of funding for affordable housing and community development programs are the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development (THUD) Subcommittee and the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food, and Drug Administration Subcommittee in each chamber of Congress.

Each subcommittee must divide the amount of funding allocated by the Committee on Appropriations between the various priorities funded in its bill. Each subcommittee must also determine the priority programs within each of their bills and provide sufficient funding for those priorities. In order to determine its priorities, the THUD subcommittees hold hearings, during which HUD or USDA officials testify regarding specific programs and initiatives included in the president's request. Witnesses in these hearings provide a far greater level of detail on programmatic activity than witnesses testifying at budget committee hearings, which focus on overall proposed spending rather than particular activities.

After appropriations hearings are completed, the subcommittees craft their bills. The

subcommittees then hold a markup of their draft bills and report out the bill they pass to their respective appropriations committees. The appropriations committees hold a markup of each bill and report out on those bills to Congress. The House and Senate must then negotiate final THUD and Agriculture bills. Once these bills are passed by Congress, they are signed into law by the president.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The appropriations process is challenging at best. Each year, Congress must contend with low spending caps that were put in place under the “Budget Control Act of 2011” (BCA). These low spending caps have made it difficult for Congress to fund domestic programs, including affordable housing and community development, at the necessary levels. Some conservative members of Congress and President Donald Trump continue to advocate for even deeper cuts below BCA levels. NLIHC and other advocates believe that Congress should end sequestration, or at least lift the spending cuts to provide temporary relief. It is critical that, in doing so, Congress provide equal treatment for defense and domestic programs. At the time of writing, it is unknown whether Congress agreed to lift the low spending caps for the current FY.

Beyond the issue of spending caps, it is critical that housing advocates urge Congress to provide the highest level of funding possible for affordable housing and community development programs under the Transportation, HUD, and

Agriculture 302(b) allocations. These allocations are the top-line spending numbers available for the THUD and Agriculture spending bills. Congress must provide a substantial allocation in order to prevent the loss of affordable housing.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should weigh in with the Administration and Congress on the importance of ending sequestration altogether and strong funding for affordable housing.

- Advocates should urge their members of Congress to provide robust funding for HUD and USDA affordable housing programs. If members of Congress do not hear from advocates, they will not know how important these programs are in their districts and states.
- Advocates should let their members of Congress know that the low spending caps required by law have already resulted in the loss of affordable housing opportunities in their states and districts. In order to prevent further loss of HUD and USDA rural housing units, Congress must end sequestration. At this time, Congress has not yet agreed to lift the low spending caps for the current FY.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org/issues/budget

FY20 Budget Chart

FOR SELECTED HUD AND USDA PROGRAMS (DECEMBER 2019)

HUD PROGRAMS <i>(In millions of \$; set asides italicized)</i>	FY19 FINAL	FY20 PRESIDENT	FY20 HOUSE	FY20 SENATE	FY20 ENACTED
Tenant Based Rental Assistance	22,598	22,244	23,810	23,833	23,874
<i>Contract Renewals</i>	20,313	20,116	21,400	21,502	21,502
<i>Tenant Protection Vouchers</i>	85	130	150	75	75
<i>Administrative Fees</i>	1,886	1,738	1,925	1,977	1,977
<i>Section 811 Mainstream Vouchers</i>	225	260	225	218	229
<i>Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers</i>	40	0	40	40	40
<i>Tribal Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Vouchers</i>	4	0	5	1	1
<i>Family Unification</i>	20	0	40	20	25
<i>Mobility Demonstration</i>	25	0	25	0	25
Public Housing Capital Fund	2,775	0	2,855	2,855	2,869
<i>Emergency/Disaster Grants</i>	30	10	30	50	65
Public Housing Operating Fund	4,653	2,863	4,753	4,650	4,549
Choice Neighborhoods Initiative	150	0	300	100	175
Self-Sufficiency Programs					
<i>Family Self-Sufficiency</i>	80	75	105	80	80
<i>Jobs-Plus Pilot</i>	15	15	15	15	15
NAHASDA					
<i>Native American Housing Block Grant</i>	655	600	671	646	646
<i>Competitive Grants</i>	100	0	100	100	100
Native Haw. Hsg. Block Grants	2	0	2	2	2
Hsg. Opp. for Persons with AIDS	393	330	410	330	410
Community Development Fund	3,365	0	3,600	3,325	3,425
HOME Investment Partnerships	1,250	0	1,750	1,250	1,350
Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity	10	0	10	10	10
Homeless Assistance Grants	2,636	2,599	2,800	2,761	2,777
Rental Assistance Demonstration	0	100	0	0	0
Project-Based Rental Assistance	11,747	12,021	12,590	12,560	12,570
Hsg. for the Elderly (202)	678	644	803	696	793
Hsg. for Persons w/Disabilities (811)	184	157	259	184	202
Housing Counseling Assistance	50	45	60	45	53
Policy Development & Research	96	87	98	96	98
Fair Hsg. & Equal Opportunity	65	62	75	65	70
<i>Fair Housing Assistance Program</i>	24	24	27	23.5	23.5
<i>Fair Housing Initiatives Program</i>	39	36	46.4	39.9	45
Healthy Homes & Lead Hazard	279	290	290	290	290
USDA PROGRAMS <i>(IN MILLIONS OF \$; SET ASIDES ITALICIZED)</i>	FY19 FINAL	FY20 PRESIDENT	FY20 HOUSE	FY20 SENATE	FY20 FINAL
Section 514 Farm Labor Hsg. Loans	27.5	0	30	27.5	28
Section 516 Farm Labor Hsg. Grants	10	0	10	10	10
<i>Combined 514/516 Subsidy</i>	16.9	0	19.4	18.6	18.7
Section 515 Rental Housing Direct Loans	40	0	45	40	40
<i>515 Subsidy</i>	9	0	13.6	12.1	12.1
Section 521 Rental Assistance	1,331	1,407	1,375	1,375	1,375
Multifamily Preservation & Revitalization	51.5	0	75	56.5	60
<i>Preservation Demonstration</i>	24.5	0	40	24.5	28
<i>Section 542 Vouchers</i>	27	0	35	32	32

Introduction to the Federal Regulatory Process

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

When Congress changes an existing law or creates a new one, federal agencies like HUD must implement the changes or the new law by modifying an existing regulation or by creating a new one. Federal agencies also often review existing regulations and amend them even when there are no changes to the underlying law. Both the creation of a new regulation and the modification of an existing regulation provide advocates with an opportunity to shape policy.

Congress passes legislation and the president, by signing that legislation, turns it into a law. Usually, these laws spell out the general intent of Congress but do not include all of the technical details essential to putting Congress' wishes into practice. Regulations add those details and usually present the law's requirements in language that is easier to understand.

Two publications are key to the federal regulatory process. The *Federal Register* is a daily publication that contains proposed regulations, final rules, and other official notices, presidential documents, and other items. All final regulations published in the *Federal Register* are eventually gathered together ("codified") in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The HUD-related rules in the CFR are updated each April. The federal government uses the words "regulation" and "rule" interchangeably; however, technically HUD defines a "rule" as a document published in the *Federal Register* and a "regulation" as a rule that is codified in the CFR.

SUMMARY OF THE REGULATORY PROCESS

Proposed Regulations

In order to carry out laws, Congress gives federal agencies, like HUD, the power to write rules to interpret laws and enforce them. When housing law is created or modified, HUD will

draft suggested regulations that specify how the law is to be carried out. These are "proposed" regulations.

Before publishing proposed regulations, HUD must send them to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB's) Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA), which theoretically has up to 90 days to review the regulations' consistency with Executive Order 12866, "Regulatory Planning and Review" (although OIRA has been known to hold on to proposed regulations for more than 90 days). If OIRA judges the proposed regulations to be inconsistent, they are sent back to HUD "for further consideration." However, technically, HUD has authority from Congress to issue the rules.

Once cleared by OIRA, HUD must publish a "notice of proposed rulemaking" in the *Federal Register* that contains the proposed language of the regulations. The public must have an opportunity to submit written comments and is generally given a 60-day period to comment.

Final Regulations

Once the comment period on a proposed rule is closed, HUD must consider all comments and may make changes based upon them. Once those changes are complete, and after another review by OIRA, HUD publishes a final rule in the *Federal Register*.

In the introduction, or preamble, to the final rule, HUD must present all meaningful comments received and explain why each was accepted or rejected. In addition to the actual text of the changed or new regulations, the final rule must state a date when it will go into effect, generally 30 or 60 days in the future. However, before the final regulations go into effect, they are sent to the Congressional subcommittee responsible for the subject matter for at least 15 days to ensure that all rules meet, but do not overstep, Congressional intent.

It is not unusual for more than a year to pass between publication of a proposed rule and final implementation. It is even possible for proposed rules to be withdrawn. For example, during the Obama Administration, proposed changes to the public housing demolition regulations and to the Section 3 employment opportunities regulations were not acted on by the Administration for several years and were subsequently removed by the Trump Administration before they could be made final.

Other Regulatory Options

In addition to proposed and final rules, the regulatory process can occasionally include:

- **Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR).** HUD can ask for information from the public to help it think about issues before developing proposed regulations. For instance, in the second year of the Trump Administration, HUD issued an ANPR regarding streamlining the affirmatively furthering fair housing rule and an ANPR regarding streamlining the fair housing disparate impact rule.
- **Interim Final Rules.** HUD can issue regulations that are to be followed as if they are final yet ask for continued public comment on some parts of the rules. Subsequent final rules can include changes based on any additional public comment. For example, the new National Housing Trust Fund program was implemented by an interim rule in 2015. HUD's intention was to allow states and developers to have experience using the new program and then seek input regarding suggested changes before implementing a final rule.
- **Supplemental Notice of Rulemaking.** HUD may seek additional comment on a proposed rule in order to further focus consideration before issuing a final rule.
- **Direct Final Rules.** HUD can issue regulations thought to be minor and uncontroversial but must withdraw them if negative comments are submitted.

- **Negotiated Rulemaking.** This is a seldom-used approach that engages knowledgeable people to discuss an issue and negotiate the language of a proposed regulation, which is then submitted to the *Federal Register*. When HUD sought to change the public housing operating fund rule, it engaged in negotiated rule making with public housing agencies and a handful of public housing leaders.
- **Petition for Rulemaking.** This is a process through which anyone can submit suggested regulations along with supporting data and arguments in support of the suggestions. If HUD agrees, it will publish proposed rules; if HUD denies the petition, the denial must be in writing and include the basis for denial. For example, advocates thought the Obama Administration was not moving on improvements regarding lead-based paint hazards and used the petition for rulemaking process. Although not officially in response to the petition, HUD did move on proposed changes.
- **Informal Meetings.** HUD has the authority to gather information from people using informal hearings or other forms of oral presentations. The transcript or minutes of such meetings are on file in the Rules Docket. For example, after the Trump Administration effectively suspended implementation of the affirmatively furthering fair housing rule, it conducted five invitation-only listening sessions.

The Role of Congress

Before HUD can publish a rule for comment or publish an interim rule, the rule must be submitted to HUD's congressional authorizing committees for a review period of 15 calendar days (which does not depend on Congress being in session).

The "Congressional Review Act" (CRA) requires all federal agencies to submit final rules to Congress and the GAO. The CRA provides an expedited legislative process that allows Congress to overturn a rule if both houses pass a "resolution of disapproval" and the president

signs the joint resolution of disapproval. Senate rules have a timetable for this expedited process of 60 days during which the Senate is in session. The Trump Administration has made extensive use of the CRA. More information about the “Congressional Review Act” can be found in *The Congressional Review Act: Frequently Asked Questions*.

HOW TO FIND PROPOSED AND FINAL REGULATIONS IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER

The Government Printing Office (GPO) publishes the *Federal Register* and the CFR.

- The current day’s *Federal Register* and links to browse back issues are at <https://bit.ly/2wSM2r8>.
- A preview of the next day’s *Federal Register* is at <http://bit.ly/2iVERG4>.
- *Federal Register* notices for both proposed and final rules can be tracked by subscribing to a daily email of the table of contents of the *Federal Register* at <http://bit.ly/2iNz1sY>.

The public can read and copy comments made by others at HUD headquarters or at <https://www.regulations.gov>, which also provides all rules open for comment and enables electronic submission of comments.

HOW TO READ THE FEDERAL REGISTER

There are standard features in the *Federal Register* for both proposed and final rules. The opening heading will look like this (with different numbers and topics):

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

24 CFR Part 990

[Docket No. FR-4874-F-08]

RIN 2577-AC51

Revisions to the Public Housing Operating Fund Program

AGENCY: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing, HUD

ACTION: Final rule

Below the heading will be the following categories:

SUMMARY: This is a short presentation of what is proposed or implemented and what the related issues and rulemaking objectives are.

DATES: Here is either: “*Comment due date*,” the date by which comments to proposed rules are due; or “*Effective Date*,” the date the final rule will go into effect.

ADDRESSES: For proposed regulations only, this section provides the room number and street address for sending written comments, although it is now preferable to submit comments electronically at www.regulations.gov

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

CONTACT: The name of a HUD staff person responsible for the issue is presented, along with a phone number and office address.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This section is often called the “preamble” and can go on for many pages. It contains a detailed discussion of the issues and the rule-making objectives. The law or sections of a law that give legal authority for the regulations are generally mentioned. With final rules, there must also be a discussion of all of the significant public comments submitted, along with HUD’s reasons for accepting or rejecting them.

LIST OF SUBJECTS IN *XX* CFR PART *XXX*

***XXX*:** The actual changes begin at this heading. Key words are presented here.

Next there is a sentence that says “Accordingly, for the reasons described in the preamble, HUD revises [or proposes to revise] *nn* CFR Part *nnn* to read as follows:”

The sections of the regulations subject to change then follow in numerical order.

At the very end the document is dated and “signed” by the appropriate HUD official.

SENDING COMMENTS ABOUT PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Your Comment Letter

Be sure to follow the guidance provided in the “ADDRESSES” section of the proposed rule. For example, regarding proposed changes to the Consolidated Plan rules, one would have addressed comments to:

Regulations Division, Office of General Counsel
Room 10276
Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410-0500
RE: Docket No. FR-4923-P-01; HUD 2004-0028
Revisions and Updates to Consolidated Plan

It is very important to indicate the docket number and it is helpful to include the subject title as it appears in the heading of the proposed rule. There is no set format for writing comments, although HUD’s “How do I prepare effective comments?” (<http://bit.ly/2jjqVcg>) is a useful guide. It is best to indicate which of the proposed rules are of concern by citing them and commenting on them individually. For example:

*ABC Tenant Organization thinks that there are problems with proposed section 91.315(k)(3) because...
We strongly endorse proposed section 91.205(b)(1) because...*

Advocates should rely on their experiences to explicitly state why they agree or disagree. When there is disagreement, suggest words that address

the concern. Don’t just write about the problems; be sure to tell HUD what is beneficial. Declaring support for key provisions is often essential to counterbalance negative comments from those in opposition.

How to Submit Comments via Regulations.gov

It is best to submit comments electronically at www.regulations.gov. There you will see a big blue box that says, “SEARCH for: Rules, Comments, Adjudications or Supporting Documents:”

In the search line, type in either the docket number, the registrant identification number (RIN), or the title of the rule, such as “Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing.” That should provide the rule open for comment.

Next, click on the blue “Comment Now” button on the right. Assuming you’ve written at least a page of text, it is suggested that you do not insert your comment in the big “comment” box. Instead, it is recommended that you use the “Upload files” button just below the big “comment” box. There you will have to click on “Choose files”. That should open your own computer files. Go to your appropriate folder and select your comment letter. Then choose “open” on your system. That should attach your comment letter in the regulations.gov system. Then complete the name, contact information, etc. as required. Next go to the “Continue” button at the bottom right and follow the straightforward instructions.

If you want to see what others have submitted, go back to the page where the rule open for comment was found from the initial search. There you will see “Open Docket Folder.” Where it says “Comments” click on “View All”. The total number of comments submitted is indicated, but it sometimes takes several days for all submitted comments to be posted on the rule’s site. Identical comments that are obviously mass-produced are not counted in the total.

THE CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS

All final rules published in the *Federal Register* are eventually collected and placed in the CFR and “codified.” To look up a rule that has not changed in the past year, turn to the CFR, which is generally updated each April for HUD-related rules. All titles updated through 2019 are available at <https://bit.ly/2EqaJ3w>.

There are 50 “titles” in the CFR, each representing a broad topic. HUD-related regulations are in Title 24. Each title is divided into “parts” that cover specific program areas. For example, within Title 24, Part 93 covers the national Housing Trust Fund rules and Part 982 lays out the Housing Choice Voucher program rules.

In addition, the GPO provides the Electronic Code of Federal Regulations (e-CFR). Although it is not an official legal edition of the CFR, it is an editorial compilation of CFR material and *Federal Register* amendments that is updated daily. Access the e-CFR at <http://bit.ly/YIVWrv>. On the e-CFR home page select Title 24 from the dropdown box and a list of HUD-related “parts” will appear.

TALKING ABOUT REGULATIONS

Two levels of regulatory citation have already been mentioned, the “title” and the “part.” Below that comes the “section” that covers one provision of a program rule and then a “paragraph” that provides specific requirements.

For example, the Public Housing Authority Plan regulations are in Title 24 at Part 903, written as 24 CFR 903. Resident Advisory Boards (RABs) and their role in developing the annual PHA Plan are presented in Section 13, cited as 24 CFR 903.13. “Paragraph” (c) specifies that PHAs must consider the recommendations made by the RAB and subparagraph (c)(1) goes into more detail by requiring PHAs to include a copy of the RAB’s recommendations with the Plan. This is written as 24 CFR 903.13(c)(1).

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

National Archives and Records Administration has a good online tutorial at <http://bit.ly/2ijLMIo>.

Office of the *Federal Register*, <http://bit.ly/2jbBM3I>.

HUD’s Office of General Counsel has an Overview of HUD’s Rulemaking Process at <http://bit.ly/2hYyekB>

Rules that might be at OIRA, or that have recently cleared OIRA, are at <https://bit.ly/2SFpUZw>

Lobbying: Individual and 501(c)(3) Organizations

By Joey Lindstrom, Director for Field Organizing, NLIHC

Lobbying is the most direct form of advocacy. Many people think there is a mystique to lobbying, but it is simply the act of meeting with a government official or their staff to talk about an issue that concerns you and that you would like addressed. The most common type of lobbying is contact with members of Congress or their staff, but housing advocacy should not be limited only to legislators. It is often important to lobby the White House or officials at HUD and other agencies. Lobbying the White House can be especially important leading up to the President's budget proposal each year, setting the tone for budget work to come in the House and Senate.

Whether meeting with members of Congress or officials of the Administration, remember that constituent feedback is a valued and necessary part of the democratic process. You do not have to be an expert on housing policy to lobby. The perspective you can provide on the housing situation in your local area is extremely valuable. Indeed, you are the expert on what is happening in your district or state and you are a resource to officials in DC.

It is helpful to remember that the most effective advocacy requires positive relationships, usually with staff members in congressional and administrative offices. Sometimes officials may seem to be staunch opponents, but simply must be educated on housing issues before they can become allies. It can be a gradual process. Expose officials and their staff to the issues of homelessness and affordable housing by inviting them to your events, or to tour your agency or a housing development. Keep in mind that even those offices who support affordable housing issues and legislation still need to hear from you so that it remains a top priority on their agenda. Legislative allies are more likely to continue their support when they feel their efforts are

getting noticed, so make sure to offer your thanks, publicly if possible, and find ways to keep legislative allies engaged.

There are several important initial factors to consider when you lobby. Determine the proper target of your advocacy efforts. On federal issues, you will want to decide whether it is best to bring your message to a member of Congress for legislative action or to Administration officials. Also think about whether you are lobbying on behalf of yourself or on behalf of an organization. This can determine not only the type of message you present, but also whether there is necessary record keeping for your lobbying activity.

EFFECTIVE MEETINGS

If you have never lobbied before, it may help to think of the visit as a twenty-minute conversation in which you will share your insight and positions on affordable housing policy. Consider your meeting an opportunity to build working relationships with decision makers and to educate them on the importance of your local work.

A face-to-face meeting is often the most effective way to get your voice heard. Given the busy schedule of most officials, they may ask you to meet with a staff person who handles housing issues. Very often, staffers can spend more time delving into your concerns than an elected official would be able to devote, so getting to know influential staff people and building relationships with them is crucial.

Scheduling a Meeting

Call the office you hope to meet with to request an appointment well in advance of your visit. Usually you will want to call about two to four weeks ahead of your intended meeting date. It may take a while for the office to schedule the meeting once you have made the request. In some cases, offices do not like to assign specific staff to meetings more than one week in advance

because they like to remain flexible as committee hearings and floor votes are being scheduled.

If you are setting up a local meeting, locate the contact information for your member of Congress's district office or for the local field office of the administrative agency. If you are planning to visit Washington, DC, contact the member's Capitol Hill office or the appropriate federal agency (for contact information for key members of Congress and offices of the Administration, see *Congressional Advocacy and Key Housing Committees* and *Federal Administrative Advocacy*).

When you call, identify yourself as a constituent to the person who answers the phone. Many offices give priority to arranging meetings for constituents because the time of members of Congress and their staff is limited. Ask first to schedule a meeting with the official. If the scheduler indicates that he or she will not be available, ask to meet with the relevant staff person which will most often be the legislative assistant who covers housing issues.

When scheduling the appointment, be sure to tell the office where you are from in the district or state, the organization you represent, the purpose of the meeting, and the number of people who will be attending the meeting so the staffer can reserve an appropriately sized meeting room.

The scheduler may ask for a list of names of attendees; this is information that can often be sent closer to the date of the meeting. Some offices may ask you to email or fill out a web form to request the meeting rather than give the information over the phone.

Call the office the week prior to the meeting to confirm. If you are meeting with a specific staff person, email them the week prior to confirm the meeting date and time, to reiterate the purpose of the meeting, and to send relevant information for them to review in advance.

Crafting Your Agenda

Developing a well-planned agenda for your meeting will help you maximize your time. Set an agenda based on how much time you have,

usually no more than 20 or 30 minutes. If you will be lobbying in a group, decide who will lead the meeting and what roles everyone will play.

Before you set the agenda, it is useful to research the office's past positions and statements on housing issues. You can review roll call votes on key affordable housing bills at <http://thomas.gov> to find out how a member of Congress has voted on housing legislation. If you need help, don't hesitate to contact the NLIHC Housing Advocacy Organizer for your state, which you can find at nlihc.org/nlihc-field-team.

Logistics of the Meeting

Make sure you know the building address and room number where your meeting is being held. Arrive early, as security can be tight at federal offices, especially those on Capitol Hill. If there are congressional hearings at the same time as your meeting, the lines to enter the buildings can be very long and you can end up waiting 15 minutes or more to enter. Do not bring items that may trigger a security concern and delay your entry into a building. The House and Senate office buildings are large, and it takes time to navigate to the office where your meeting will be held. Have the name of the person with whom you are meeting readily available.

Conducting Your Meeting

At your meeting, take the time to introduce each attendee and their unique expertise or role in local work. Start the meeting by offering thanks to the official for an action they have taken to support affordable housing, or by highlighting a specific area of interest that you might share. If you are meeting with a regular ally of affordable housing efforts, acknowledge past support at the beginning of the meeting. If meeting with an office that has an unfavorable record on your issues, indicate that you hope to find common ground to work together on issues critical to your local community. Keep in mind that as you educate congressional or administrative offices over time, they may eventually shift their positions favorably.

Next, provide a brief overview of the affordable housing challenges in your community and the

nation. Unless you already have a relationship with the person you are meeting with, do not assume that they have a deep understanding of the problem. Make sure, however, not to spend too much time on these first portions of the meeting so that you have time to substantively discuss your specific issue of concern. Including personal stories and experiences within your message can often get your point across in a more compelling fashion.

Move into the main portion of the meeting by giving a brief description of the top two or three specific housing issues you want to discuss. Try to present the issues positively, as solvable problems. In deciding how to frame your message, research the background of the official you are meeting with to gain insight regarding their professional interests and personal concerns, memberships, affiliations, and congressional committee assignments. These roles and interests are often listed on their website. This information may help you gauge how your concerns fit in with their priorities.

When discussing these issues, do not feel like you must know everything about the topic. If you are asked a question you cannot sufficiently answer, indicate that you will follow up with more information. Offering to provide further detail and answers is an excellent way to continue being in touch with the office after the meeting. If the conversation turns to a topic that is not on your agenda, listen and respond appropriately but steer the meeting back to your agenda since you will have limited time to discuss your main points. Be sure to make the meeting conversational; you want to learn the perspective of the official in addition to making your points.

Have a specific “ask” on the housing issues you raise; for example, suggest that a member of Congress sponsor, co-sponsor, or oppose a bill. Decide on a concrete action you would like to see taken as a step in resolving the local affordable housing challenges you have presented. Explain how your ask fits within the official’s priorities. The office will agree to this ask, decline, or say they need time to consider. If they decline, ask how else they might be willing to address the

issues you have raised. Suggest ways that you or your organization can be helpful in achieving the end goal of solving housing poverty.

Before closing the meeting, it is important to try to get an answer on your ask regarding specific legislation or policy changes, even if the answer is “maybe” or “no.” Make a follow-up plan based on this response; you will often want to present further information or recruit additional voices. If at the end of your meeting the official or staff person seems to be leaning against your position, keep the door open for future discussion. Agree to check in with staff after an appropriate amount of time to find out if there is a final decision or to support other next steps. In closing the meeting, be sure to express thanks for their time and interest in the topics they raised.

Leave Behind Written Materials

It is useful to have information to leave with the official or staffer for further review and reference it as needed. To emphasize the extent of the housing crisis in your community, provide information such as: your state’s section of *Out of Reach*, which shows the hourly housing wage in each county; the appropriate NLIHC Congressional District Profile or State Housing Profile that shows rental housing affordability data by congressional district and state; your state’s Housing Preservation Profile, which can be found under “Reports” at preservationdatabase.org; and other NLIHC research reports which can be found at nlihc.org/housing-needs-by-state. Be sure to bring information on Opportunity Starts at Home and the national Housing Trust Fund.

Follow up After Your Meeting

Following your visit, send a letter or email thanking the official or staff member for their time, reaffirming your views, and referencing any agreements made during the meeting. Include any additional information that you promised to provide. Monitor action on your issues and asks over the coming months and contact the official or staff member to encourage them to act during key moments, or to thank them for taking action. If the issue that you lobbied on is being tracked by your statewide affordable housing coalition

or NLIHC, it is helpful to report the results of the meeting. If aware of your meeting, statewide coalitions and NLIHC can build on your lobbying efforts and keep you informed as issues move forward.

CONGRESSIONAL RECESS

Throughout the year, Congress goes on recess, and Senators and Representatives leave Washington for their home districts. Members spend this time meeting with constituents and conducting other in-district work. Recess provides advocates with a great opportunity to interact with members of Congress face-to-face, without having to travel to Washington, DC. Take advantage of recesses by scheduling meetings with your senators and representative.

Many members of Congress also hold town hall meetings during recesses; these events provide the opportunity to come together as a community to express concerns and ask questions about an official's positions on important policy issues. If your members of Congress are not planning to convene any town hall meetings during a recess, you may be able to work with others in the district to organize one and invite your Senators or Representative to participate.

It is important to note that members of Congress cannot officially introduce or co-sponsor legislation during recess, and because Congress is not in session, there are no votes on legislation during this time. It is therefore especially important to follow up on any meetings held during recess once Congress resumes session, especially if commitments were made regarding legislation.

To find out when the House is scheduled to go on recess, visit <http://house.gov/legislative>. To find out when the Senate is scheduled to go on recess, visit <https://www.senate.gov/>.

SENDING EMAILS

Email is now the most common way to communicate with members of Congress and their staff. Many congressional staff prefer emails because they can be easily labeled, archived,

and tallied. Make sure to present your affordable housing concern concisely and specifically. Reference specific bills when possible. In general, it is best to reach out to a specific staff person in a congressional office, because emails to a general inbox may not be correctly forwarded according to your issue area. Remember, congressional offices can receive upwards of 50,000 emails each month, so it is key to make contact with a specific housing staffer. If you do not know how to find the email address of the best person for a particular office, contact NLIHC's Field Team at outreach@nlihc.org and they will provide that information.

MAKING PHONE CALLS

Calls can be especially effective if a staff person receives several calls on the same topic within a few days of each other, so you may want to encourage others in your district or state to call at the same time you do. When you call, ask to speak to the staff person who deals with housing issues. If calling a member of Congress, be sure to identify yourself as a constituent, say where you are from, and if applicable, have the names and numbers of relevant bills. The days before a key vote or hearing are an especially effective time to call.

WRITING LETTERS

Because of extensive security screening that delays delivery, letters are a decreasingly effective tool for letting members of Congress and other decision makers know how you feel about issues. For members of Congress, address the letter to the housing staffer to ensure it ends up in the right hands. Use the following standard address blocks when sending letters to Congress:

Senate

The Honorable [full name]
ATTN: Housing Staffer
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

House of Representatives

The Honorable [full name]
ATTN: Housing Staffer
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

To find out the phone number for your member of Congress, call the U.S. Capitol Switchboard at 202-224-3121.

ADDITIONAL WAYS TO ENGAGE ELECTED OFFICIALS

Visits, letters, and calls are not the only effective ways to communicate your priorities to officials. Other ways to engage them include:

- Inviting an official to speak at your annual meeting or conference.
- Tweeting at them or commenting on their Facebook posts can be effective because many legislators are increasingly focused on cultivating an active presence on social media.
- Organizing a tour of agencies or housing developments and featuring real people telling their success stories.
- Holding a public event and inviting an official to speak.
- Getting media coverage on your issues. Organize a tour for a local reporter or set up a press conference on your issue. Call in to radio talk shows or write letters to the editor of your local paper. Call your newspaper's editorial page editor and set up a meeting to discuss the possibility of the paper's support for your issue. If you succeed in generating press, be sure to forward the coverage to housing staffers for your members of Congress.
- Eliciting the support of potential allies who are influential with officials, like your city council, mayor, local businesses, unions, or religious leaders.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

- National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.
- Contact NLIHC's Field Team by visiting nlihc.org/nlihc-field-team and finding the Housing Advocacy Organizer for your state.

For contact information for key Members of Congress and offices of the Administration, see *Congressional Advocacy and Key Housing Committees* and *Federal Administrative Advocacy*.

LOBBYING AS AN INDIVIDUAL

The undeniable benefit of lobbying in an official capacity on behalf of an organization or coalition is that the broad reach of the group's membership, clients, and staff deepens the impact of your message. By contrast, a benefit of lobbying as an individual is that it can free you to discuss issues you care about in a more personal manner without concern for any potential limitations placed by a board of directors or organizational policy. Remember that even when you do not speak on behalf of your organization or employer, it is always appropriate to mention what affiliations or work have informed your perspective.

Much like organizational lobbying, the key to lobbying as an individual is to ensure that your voice is heard and that congressional and Administration officials are responding to your particular concerns. This is most effectively achieved by doing in-person meetings, but phone calls and emails can be influential as well.

LOBBYING AS A 501(C)(3) ORGANIZATION

Contrary to what many nonprofits believe, 501(c)(3) organizations are legally allowed to lobby in support of their organization's charitable mission. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) defines lobbying as activities to influence legislation. Electoral activities that support specific candidates or political parties are forbidden, and nonprofits can never endorse or assist any candidate for public office. The amount of lobbying an organization can do

depends on how the organization chooses to measure its lobbying activity. There are two options to determine lobbying limits for 501(c)(3) groups—the insubstantial part test and the 501(h) expenditure test.

Insubstantial Part Test

The insubstantial part test automatically applies unless the organization elects to come under the 501(h) expenditure test. The default insubstantial part test requires that a 501(c)(3)'s lobbying activity be an “insubstantial” part of its overall activities. Unfortunately, the IRS and courts have been reluctant to define the line that divides substantial from insubstantial. Most lawyers agree that if up to 5% of an organization's total activities are lobbying, then the organization is generally safe. The insubstantial part test is an activity-based test that tracks both activity that the organization spends money on, as well as activity that does not cost the organization anything. For example, when unpaid volunteers lobby on behalf of the organization, these activities would be counted under the insubstantial part test. There are no clear definitions of lobbying under the insubstantial part test.

501(h) Expenditure Test

Fortunately, there is an alternative test that provides much clearer guidance on how much lobbying a 501(c)(3) can do and what activities constitute lobbying. The 501(h) expenditure test was enacted in 1976 and implementing regulations were adopted in 1990. This choice offers a more precise way to measure an organization's lobbying limit because measurements are based on the organization's annual expenditures. The organization is only required to count lobbying activity that actually costs the organization money (i.e., expenditures); therefore, activities that do not incur an expense do not count as lobbying. A 501(c)(3) can elect to use these clearer rules by filing a simple, one-time form: IRS Form 5768 (available at www.irs.gov).

To determine its lobbying limit under the 501(h) expenditure test, an organization must first

calculate its overall lobbying limit. This figure is based on an organization's “exempt purpose expenditures;” generally this is the amount of money an organization spends per year. Once an organization has determined its exempt purpose expenditures, the following formula is applied to determine the organization's overall lobbying limit: 20% of the first \$5,000,000 + 15% of the next \$500,000 + 5% of the remaining.

There is a \$1 million yearly cap on an organization's overall lobbying limit. This means that if an organization chooses to measure its lobbying under the 501(h) expenditure test, it also agrees not to spend more than \$1 million on lobbying activity each year.

There are two types of lobbying under the 501(h) expenditure test: direct lobbying and grassroots lobbying. An organization can use its entire lobbying limit on direct lobbying, but it can only use one-fourth of the overall limit to engage in grassroots lobbying.

Direct lobbying is communicating with a legislator or legislative staff member (federal, state, or local) about a position on specific legislation. Remember that legislators also include the President or governor when you are asking them to sign a bill into law or veto a bill, as well as Administration officials who have the ability to influence legislation.

Grassroots lobbying is communicating with the general public in a way that refers to specific legislation and that takes a position on the legislation and calls for action. A call to action contains one to four different ways the organization asks the public to respond to its message: (1) asking the public to contact their legislators; (2) providing the contact information, for example the phone number, for a legislator; (3) providing a mechanism for contacting legislators such as a tear-off postcard or an email link that can be used to send a message directly to legislators; or (4) listing those voting undecided or opposed to specific legislation. Identifying legislators as sponsors of legislation is not considered a call to action.

The regulations clarify how the following communications should be classified:

- **Ballot Measures:** communications with the general public that refer to and state a position on ballot measures (for example, referenda, ballot initiatives, bond measures, and constitutional amendments), count as direct lobbying, not grassroots lobbying, because the public are presumed to be acting as legislators when voting on ballot measures.
- **Organizational Members:** the 501(c)(3)'s members are treated as a part of the organization, so urging them to contact public officials about legislation is considered direct, not grassroots, lobbying.
- **Mass Media:** any print, radio, or television ad about legislation widely known to the public must be counted as grassroots lobbying if the communication is paid for by the nonprofit and meets other, rather nuanced provisions; refers to and includes the organization's position on the legislation; asks the public to contact legislators about the legislation; and appears on the media source within two weeks of a vote by either legislative chamber, not including subcommittee votes.

Lobbying Exceptions

There are some specific exceptions for activities that otherwise might appear to be lobbying under the 501(h) expenditure test. It is not lobbying to:

- Prepare and distribute a substantive report that fully discusses the positives and negatives of a legislative proposal, even if the analysis comes to a conclusion about the merits of that proposal. The report cannot ask readers to contact their legislators or provide a mechanism to do so, and it must be widely distributed to those who would both agree and disagree with the position. This non-partisan distribution can be achieved through an organization's website and to all members of the legislative body considering the proposal.

- Respond to a request for testimony or assistance at the request of the head of a government body such as a legislative committee chair.
- Support or oppose legislation if that legislation impacts its tax-exempt status or existence. This lobbying exception is narrow and should be used with caution after consultation with an attorney.
- Examine and discuss broad social, economic, and similar problems. For example, materials and statements that do not refer to specific legislation are not lobbying even if they are used to communicate with a legislator. Additionally, materials and statements communicating with the general public and expressing a view on specific legislation but that do not have a call to action are also not considered lobbying.
- Litigate and attempt to influence administrative (regulatory) decisions or the enforcement of existing laws and executive orders.

Record Keeping

A 501(c)(3) organization, when it is measuring its lobbying under the insubstantial part test or the 501(h) expenditure test, is required to reasonably track its lobbying in a way sufficient to show that it has not exceeded its lobbying limits. There are three costs that 501(h)-electing organizations must count toward their lobbying limits:

- **Staff Time:** for example, paid staff time spent meeting legislators, preparing testimony, or encouraging others to testify.
- **Direct Costs:** for example, printing, copying, or mailing expenses to get the organization's message to legislators.
- **Overhead:** for example, the pro-rated share of rented space used in support of lobbying (a good way to handle this is to pro-rate the cost based on the percentage of staff time spent lobbying).

Although the 501(h) election is less ambiguous than the insubstantial part test, it is important to carefully consider which option is best for your organization.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Bolder Advocacy, an Alliance for Justice (AFJ) campaign: Bolder Advocacy publishes a detailed, plain-language book on the 501(c)(3) lobbying rules called *Being a Player: A Guide to the IRS Lobbying Regulations for Advocacy Charities*.

Another Bolder Advocacy publication, *The Rules of The Game: A Guide to Election-Related Activities for 501(c)(3) Organizations (Second Edition)*, reviews federal tax and election laws which govern nonprofit organizations with regard to election work and explains the right and wrong ways to organize specific voter education activities. Bolder Advocacy also publishes guides on related topics, such as influencing public policy through social media, praising or criticizing incumbent elected officials who are also candidates, and rules on coordinating with 501(c)(4) organizations. Bolder Advocacy maintains a free technical assistance hotline and offers workshops or webinars for nonprofit organizations.

Bolder Advocacy, 866-NP-LOBBY
(866-675-6229), www.bolderadvocacy.org.

Congressional Advocacy and Key Housing Committees

By Kimberly Johnson, Policy Analyst,
NLIHC

Lobbying Congress is a direct way to advocate for the issues and programs important to you. Members of Congress are accountable to their constituents and as a constituent, you have the right to lobby the members who represent you. As a housing advocate, you should exercise that right.

CONTACT YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS

To obtain the contact information for your member of Congress, call the U.S. Capitol Switchboard at 202-224-3121.

MEETING WITH YOUR MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Scheduling a meeting, determining your main “ask” or “asks,” developing an agenda, creating appropriate materials to take with you, ensuring your meeting does not veer off topic, and following-up afterward are all crucial to holding effective meetings with Members of Congress.

For more tips on how to lobby effectively, refer to the lobbying section of this chapter.

KEY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The following are key housing authorizing and appropriating committees in Congress:

- The House of Representatives Committee on Financial Services.
- The House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations.
- The House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means.
- The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

- The Senate Committee on Appropriations.
- The Senate Committee on Finance.

See below for details on these key committees as of December 1, 2019. For all committees, members are listed in order of seniority and members who sit on key housing subcommittees are marked with an asterisk (*).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

Visit the committee’s website at <http://financialservices.house.gov>.

The House Committee on Financial Services oversees all components of the nation’s housing and financial services sectors, including banking, insurance, real estate, public and assisted housing, and securities. The committee reviews laws and programs related to HUD, the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, government sponsored enterprises including Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and international development and finance agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

The Committee also ensures the enforcement of housing and consumer protection laws such the “U.S. Housing Act,” the “Truth in Lending Act,” the “Housing and Community Development Act,” the “Fair Credit Reporting Act,” the “Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act,” the “Community Reinvestment Act,” and financial privacy laws.

The Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance oversees HUD and the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae). The Subcommittee also handles matters related to housing affordability, rural housing, community development including Opportunity Zones, and government sponsored insurance programs such as the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the National Flood Insurance Program.

*Members marked with an asterisk sit on the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance.

Majority Members (Democrats)

- Maxine Waters (CA), *Chair*
- Carolyn B. Maloney* (NY)
- Nydia M. Velázquez* (NY)
- Brad Sherman* (CA)
- Gregory Meeks (NY)
- Wm. Lacy Clay* (MO), *Subcommittee Chair*
- David Scott (GA)
- Al Green* (TX)
- Emanuel Cleaver* (MO)
- Ed Perlmutter (CO)
- Jim A. Himes (CT)
- Bill Foster (IL)
- Joyce Beatty* (OH)
- Denny Heck* (WA)
- Juan Vargas* (CA)
- Josh Gottheimer (NJ)
- Vicente Gonzalez* (TX)
- Al Lawson* (FL)
- Michael San Nicolas (GU)
- Rashida Tlaib* (MI)
- Katie Porter (CA)
- Cindy Axne* (IA)
- Sean Casten (IL)
- Ayanna Pressley (MA)
- Ben McAdams (UT)
- Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (NY)
- Jennifer Wexton (VA)
- Stephen F. Lynch (MA)
- Tulsi Gabbard (HI)
- Alma Adams (NC)
- Madeleine Dean (PA)
- Jesús “Chuy” García (IL)

- Sylvia Garcia (TX)
- Dean Phillips (MN)

Minority Members (Republicans)

- Patrick McHenry (NC), *Ranking Member*
- Peter T. King (NY)
- Frank D. Lucas (OK)
- Bill Posey (FL)
- Blaine Luetkemeyer* (MO)
- Bill Huizenga* (MI)
- Steve Stivers* (OH), *Subcommittee Ranking Member*
- Ann Wagner (MO)
- Andy Barr (KY)
- Scott Tipton* (CO)
- Roger Williams (TX)
- French Hill (AR)
- Tom Emmer (MN)
- Lee M. Zeldin* (NY)
- Barry Loudermilk (GA)
- Alexander X. Mooney (WV)
- Warren Davidson (OH)
- Ted Budd (NC)
- David Kustoff* (TN)
- Trey Hollingsworth (IN)
- Anthony Gonzalez* (OH)
- John Rose* (TN)
- Bryan Steil* (WI)
- Lance Gooden* (TX)
- Denver Riggleman (VA)
- William Timmons (SC)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Visit the committee's website at
<http://appropriations.house.gov>.

The House Committee on Appropriations is responsible for determining the amount of funding made available to all authorized programs each year.

The Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development and Related Agencies (THUD) determines the amount of government revenues dedicated to HUD and other relevant agencies, including the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.

*Members marked with an asterisk sit on the THUD Subcommittee.

Majority Members (Democrats)

- Nita Lowey (NY), *Chair*
- Marcy Kaptur (OH)
- Peter Visclosky (IN)
- José Serrano (NY)
- Rosa DeLauro (CT)
- David Price* (NC), *Subcommittee Chair*
- Lucille Roybal-Allard (CA)
- Sanford Bishop (GA)
- Barbara Lee (CA)
- Betty McCollum (MN)
- Tim Ryan (OH)
- C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger (MD)
- Debbie Wasserman Shultz (FL)
- Henry Cuellar (TX)
- Chellie Pingree (ME)
- Mike Quigley* (IL)
- Derek Kilmer (WA)
- Matt Cartwright (PA)
- Grace Meng (NY)
- Mark Pocan (WI)

- Katherine Clark* (MA)
- Pete Aguilar* (CA)
- Lois Frankel (FL)
- Cheri Bustos (IL)
- Bonnie Watson Coleman* (NJ)
- Brenda Lawrence* (MI)
- Norma Torres* (CA)
- Charlie Crist (FL)
- Ann Kirkpatrick (AZ)
- Ed Case (HI)

Minority Members (Republicans)

- Kay Granger (TX), *Ranking Member*
- Harold Rogers (KY)
- Robert Aderholt (AL)
- Michael Simpson (ID)
- John Carter (TX)
- Ken Calvert (CA)
- Tom Cole (OK)
- Mario Diaz-Balart* (FL), *Subcommittee Ranking Member*
- Tom Graves (GA)
- Steve Womack* (AR)
- Jeff Fortenberry (NE)
- Charles Fleischmann (TN)
- Jamie Herrera Beutler (WA)
- David Joyce (OH)
- Andy Harris (MD)
- Martha Roby (AL)
- Mark Amodei (NV)
- Chris Stewart (UT)
- Stephen Palazzo (MS)
- Dan Newhouse (WA)
- John Moolenaar (MI)
- John Rutherford* (FL)
- Will Hurd* (TX)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Visit the committee's website at
<http://waysandmeans.house.gov>.

The Committee on Ways and Means is the chief tax writing committee in the House of Representatives and has jurisdiction over taxation, tariffs, and a number of programs including Social Security, Medicare, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and unemployment insurance.

Majority Members (Democrats)

- Richard Neal (MA), *Chair*
- John Lewis (GA)
- Lloyd Doggett (TX)
- Mike Thompson (CA)
- John Larson (CT)
- Earl Blumenauer (OR)
- Ron Kind (WI)
- Bill Pascrell (NJ)
- Danny Davis (IL)
- Linda Sanchez (CA)
- Brian Higgins (NY)
- Terri Sewell (AL)
- Suzan DelBene (WA)
- Judy Chu (CA)
- Gwen Moore (WI)
- Dan Kildee (MI)
- Brendan Boyle (PA)
- Don Beyer (VA)
- Dwight Evans (PA)
- Brad Schneider (IL)
- Tom Suozzi (NY)
- Jimmy Panetta (CA)
- Stephanie Murphy (FL)

- Jimmy Gomez (CA)
- Steven Horsford (NV)

Minority Members (Republicans)

- Kevin Brady (TX), *Ranking Member*
- Devin Nunes (CA)
- Vern Buchanan (FL)
- Adrian Smith (NE)
- Kenny Marchant (TX)
- Tom Reed (NY)
- Mike Kelly (PA)
- George Holding (NC)
- Jason Smith (MO)
- Tom Rice (SC)
- David Schweikert (AZ)
- Jackie Walorski (IN)
- Darin LaHood (IL)
- Brad Wenstrup (OH)
- Jodey Arrington (TX)
- Drew Ferguson (GA)
- Ron Estes (KS)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Visit the committee's website at
www.banking.senate.gov.

The Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs oversees legislation, petitions, and other matters related to financial institutions, economic policy, housing, transportation, urban development, international trade and finance, and securities and investments.

The Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development oversees mass transit systems, general urban affairs and development issues and is the primary oversight committee for HUD. The subcommittee oversees HUD community development programs, the FHA, the Rural Housing Service, Fannie Mae and

Freddie Mac, and all issues related to public and private housing, senior housing, nursing home construction, and indigenous housing issues.

*Members marked with an asterisk sit on the Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development.

Majority Members (Republicans)

- Michael Crapo (ID), *Chair*
- Richard Shelby* (AL)
- Patrick Toomey (PA)
- Tim Scott (SC)
- Ben Sasse (NE)
- Tom Cotton* (AR)
- Mike Rounds* (SD)
- David Perdue* (GA), *Subcommittee Chair*
- Thom Tillis (NC)
- John Kennedy (LA)
- Martha McSally* (AZ)
- Jerry Moran* (KS)
- Kevin Cramer* (ND)

Minority Members (Democrats)

- Sherrod Brown (OH), *Ranking Member*
- Jack Reed* (RI)
- Robert Menendez* (NJ), *Subcommittee Ranking Member*
- Jon Tester (MT)
- Mark Warner (VA)
- Elizabeth Warren* (MA)
- Brian Schatz (HI)
- Chris Van Hollen (MD)
- Catherine Cortez Masto* (NV)
- Doug Jones* (AL)
- Tina Smith* (MN)
- Kyrsten Sinema (AZ)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Visit the committee's website at <http://www.appropriations.senate.gov>.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations is responsible for determining the amount of funding made available to all authorized programs each year.

The Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies (THUD) has jurisdiction over funding for the Department of Transportation and HUD, including community planning and development, fair housing and equal opportunity, the FHA, Ginnie Mae, public housing, and indigenous housing issues.

*Members marked with an asterisk sit on the THUD Subcommittee.

Majority Members (Republicans)

- Richard Shelby* (AL), *Chair*
- Mitch McConnell (KY)
- Lamar Alexander* (TN)
- Susan Collins* (ME), *Subcommittee Chair*
- Lisa Murkowski (AK)
- Lindsey Graham* (SC)
- Roy Blunt* (MO)
- Jerry Moran (KS)
- John Hoeven* (ND)
- John Boozman* (AR)
- Shelley Moore Capito* (WV)
- John Kennedy (LA)
- Cindy Hyde-Smith (MS)
- Steve Daines* (MT)
- Marco Rubio (FL)
- James Lankford (OK)

Minority Members (Democrats)

- Patrick Leahy (VT), *Ranking Member*
- Patty Murray* (WA)
- Dianne Feinstein* (CA)
- Richard Durbin* (IL)
- Jack Reed* (RI), *Subcommittee Ranking Member*
- Jon Tester (MT)
- Tom Udall (NM)
- Jeanne Shaheen (NH)
- Jeff Merkley (OR)
- Chris Coons* (DE)
- Brian Schatz* (HI)
- Tammy Baldwin (WI)
- Christopher Murphy* (CT)
- Joe Manchin* (WV)
- Chris Van Hollen (MD)

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Visit the committee's website at www.finance.senate.gov.

The Senate Committee on Finance oversees matters related to taxation and other general revenue measures, including health programs under the “Social Security Act” such as Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), as well as TANF and health and human services programs financed by a specific tax or trust fund.

Majority Members (Republicans)

- Chuck Grassley (IA), *Chair*
- Mike Crapo (ID)
- Pat Roberts (KS)
- Michael B. Enzi (WY)
- John Cornyn (TX)
- John Thune (SD)
- Richard Burr (NC)
- Johnny Isakson (GA)
- Rob Portman (OH)
- Patrick Toomey (PA)
- Tim Scott (SC)
- Bill Cassidy (LA)
- James Lankford (OK)
- Steve Daines (MT)
- Todd Young (IN)

Minority Members (Democrats)

- Ron Wyden (OR), *Ranking Member*
- Debbie Stabenow (MI)
- Maria Cantwell (WA)
- Robert Menendez (NJ)
- Thomas Carper (DE)
- Benjamin Cardin (MD)
- Sherrod Brown (OH)
- Michael Bennet (CO)
- Robert Casey, Jr. (PA)
- Mark Warner (VA)
- Sheldon Whitehouse (RI)
- Maggie Hassan (NH)
- Catherine Cortez Masto (NV)

Federal Administration Advocacy

Not all efforts to shape federal housing policy involve congressional advocacy. Once legislation is enacted by Congress, it must be implemented and enforced by the executive branch.

Opportunities for administrative advocacy generally fall into five categories:

- Providing commentary during the regulatory process,
- Calling for enforcement of existing laws,
- Influencing policy and program implementation,
- Advocating for or against executive orders, and
- Litigating against federal agencies and officials.

These types of advocacy are not considered lobbying by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS); therefore, 501(c)(3) organizations are free to engage in such activities without limit so long as there is no intent to influence legislation. For nonprofits interested in housing advocacy, engaging federal agencies through the regulatory process falls entirely outside the definitions of lobbying.

Numerous federal agencies contribute to the development and implementation of our nation's housing policy. There are seven key divisions of the federal government that administer affordable housing programs and carry out a variety of functions, such as providing funding to incentivize affordable housing development, managing government sponsored enterprises (GSEs) that have an affordable housing directive, coordinating housing resources of multiple departments, or influencing the direction of affordable housing policy. It is important for advocates to weigh in with these agencies as they shape federal affordable housing priorities, determine the level of resources available to reach affordability objectives, and implement housing laws passed by Congress.

Many other parts of the executive branch are also involved in housing and related issues. Important targets for federal administrative advocacy include, but are not limited to:

- The White House.
- HUD.
- The Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH).
- The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA).
- The Department of Agriculture's Rural Housing Service (USDA RHS).
- The Department of the Treasury.
- The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA).

THE WHITE HOUSE

The White House develops and implements housing policy through a variety of means and has multiple councils and offices that are involved with affordable housing.

The Domestic Policy Council (DPC) coordinates the domestic policymaking process of the White House, offers advice to the president, supervises the execution of domestic policy, and represents the president's priorities to Congress. The Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships is part of the DPC and works to build bridges between the federal government and nonprofit organizations, both secular and faith-based, in order to better serve Americans in need. The Office of National AIDS Policy is also part of the DPC; it coordinates the continuing efforts to reduce the number of HIV infections across the U.S. through a wide range of education initiatives and by coordinating the care and treatment of people with HIV/AIDS. The Office of Social Innovation and Civic Participation, another part of the DPC, is focused on promoting service as a solution and a way to develop community leadership, increase investment in innovative community solutions that demonstrate results, and develop new models of partnership.

The National Economic Council coordinates policy making for domestic and international economic issues, provides economic policy advice for the president, ensures that policy decisions and programs are consistent with the president's economic goals, and monitors the implementation of the president's economic policy agenda.

The Office of Public Engagement (OPE) and Intergovernmental Affairs creates and coordinates opportunities for direct dialogue between the Administration and the public. This includes acting as a point of coordination for public speaking engagements for the Administration and the departments of the Executive Office of the President. Federal agencies, including HUD and USDA, have liaisons that work with the White House OPE. The Office of Urban Affairs is part of the OPE; it provides leadership for and coordinates the development of the policy agenda for urban areas across executive departments and agencies.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

HUD is the federal government's primary affordable housing agency. The agency administers programs that provide rental and homeownership units that are affordable to low-income, very low-income, and extremely low-income (ELI) households. HUD also manages grants for community development activities and plays a vital role in the Administration's efforts to strengthen the housing market. HUD administers a variety of housing programs through the Offices of Public and Indian Housing (PIH), Community Planning and Development (CPD), Housing, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), and the Government National Mortgage Association.

PIH, CPD, and the Office of Housing administer HUD's main rental assistance programs for ELI households. PIH administers funds to local public housing agencies to operate public housing units, administer Housing Choice Vouchers, and offer programs that support residents.

CPD administers funding for the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF), the McKinney-Vento Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Grants, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, the HOME Investment Partnerships program, and the Community Development Block Grant program. The Office of Housing oversees a range of programs including Project-Based Section 8, special needs housing programs such as Section 202 Housing for the Elderly and Section 811 Housing for People with Disabilities, and the FHA. FHA provides insurance for mortgage loans to increase private lending interest by reducing institutions' risk. FHA's Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund provides profits, or receipts, that have been used to offset a portion of HUD's annual costs to operate its other programs.

INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON HOMELESSNESS

The Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) coordinates the homeless policies of 19 federal departments that administer programs or provide resources critical to solving the nation's homelessness crisis; USICH comprises the secretaries and directors of these 19 federal agencies. The agencies with the largest roles in providing these resources include HUD, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. These agencies rotate responsibility for chairing the USICH. The USICH's main task is implementing *Opening Doors*, the federal 10-year plan to end homelessness, which was released in spring 2010. USICH also coordinates with state and local governments on developing and implementing their strategies to end homelessness.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

The Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) was created in 2008 by the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act" as the successor to the Federal Housing Finance Board. FHFA regulates Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which are both GSEs. It

also regulates the Federal Home Loan Banks to ensure there is sufficient funding for housing finance and community investments.

The GSEs were taken into conservatorship by FHFA due to financial problems stemming from the housing crisis. Prior to being taken into conservatorship, the GSEs were to provide a percentage of their book of business to the HTF; these contributions were suspended in 2008. The GSEs were also meant to provide funding for the Capital Magnet Fund (CMF). On December 11, 2014, FHFA Director Mel Watt lifted the suspension so that the GSEs must set aside funds for the HTF and CMF. In 2016, the first HTF dollars were allocated to the states.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RURAL HOUSING SERVICE

The USDA RHS administers programs that provide affordable rental and homeownership opportunities in rural areas of the country. Although HUD funding is used in rural areas, USDA's Office of Rural Development (RD) programs uniquely target the needs of rural communities and supplement HUD funding.

RHS affordable housing programs provide grants, loans, and direct funding for rental housing operations and development. Programs target low-income families, seniors, and farm workers, providing a range of housing options. RD also provides programs to support energy efficiency, economic development, and infrastructure for rural areas.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The Department of the Treasury administers several housing and community development programs including the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program, the Making Home Affordable program, the Hardest Hit Fund, and Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI). The CDFI administers the CMF and the New Market Tax Credit. The Treasury has overseen funding for several recent disaster recovery efforts, including special allocations of LIHTCs and other incentives to spur redevelopment. The Treasury also oversees

Housing Bonds, which finance the development of rental and homeownership units. The Treasury offers backing to HUD's FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund and also played a key role in the nation's housing crisis recovery efforts by purchasing mortgage-backed and debt securities issued by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) sets policy and administers a range of programs for veterans including homeownership loans and a supportive housing initiative. The VA partners with HUD to provide the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Voucher Program. HUD provides an allocation of Housing Choice Vouchers to certain public housing agencies to make units affordable; local VA offices select voucher recipients and provide supportive services to the individual or family prior to and during their housing tenure. The VA also works cooperatively with the Interagency Council on Homelessness, which helped coordinate resources for veterans through Opening Doors, its plan to end homelessness.

CONTACT FEDERAL AGENCIES

Contact information for the agencies mentioned above, as well as additional key federal agencies and offices, can be found below and online.

White House, 202-456-1414,
www.whitehouse.gov.

Office of Management and Budget, 202-395-3080, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/>.

HUD, 202-708-1112, www.hud.gov.

HUD USER, 202-708-1112, www.huduser.org. (HUD USER contains valuable statistics for those interested in financing, developing, or managing affordable housing, including HUD-mandated rent and income levels for assisted housing programs and Fair Market Rents).

Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Housing and Community Facilities Programs, 202-699-1533, www.rd.usda.gov.

Federal Housing Finance Agency, 202-414-3800,
www.fhfa.gov.

Department of Health and Human Services,
Office of Community Services, 202-690-7000,
www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs.

Department of Justice, 202-514-2000,
www.usdoj.gov.

Department of Transportation, 202-366-4000,
www.dot.gov.

Department of the Treasury, Community
Development Financial Institutions Fund,
202-622-6355, <https://www.cdfifund.gov>.

Department of Veterans Affairs,
<http://www.va.gov/>.

FEMA, 202-646-2500, www.fema.gov.

Environmental Protection Agency,
202-272-0167, www.epa.gov.

Small Business Administration, 202-205-8885,
www.sba.gov.

Using Federal Data Sources for Housing Advocacy

By Andrew Aurand, Vice President for Research, NLIHC

Housing advocates have long used federal data to measure, visualize, and communicate their communities' unmet housing needs to inform policy at the national, state, and local levels. Data from the American Community Survey (ACS), for example, allow us to quantify the critical housing shortage for extremely low-income renters. HUD's *A Picture of Subsidized Households*, meanwhile, gives us a look at the quantity and geographic distribution of HUD-subsidized housing.

The following section provides a brief overview of federal data sources for housing advocacy. Members of Congress often threaten to cut financial resources for data collection and dissemination, making it imperative that advocates and organizations promote and protect these programs. The Census Project, for example, is a network of national, state, and local organizations that advocates for sufficient funding for U.S. Decennial Census and the ACS.

HOUSING NEED, SUPPLY, AND QUALITY

American Community Survey (ACS)

See <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/> and <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>.

A series of brief tutorials on obtaining ACS data is available at <https://www.census.gov/data/academy/data-gems.html>.

The ACS is a nationwide mandatory survey of approximately 3.5 million addresses annually, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau. The survey is distributed on a rolling basis, with approximately 295,000 housing units surveyed each month. The annual data provide timely information on the demographic, economic, and housing characteristics of the nation, each state,

the District of Columbia, and other jurisdictions with at least 65,000 residents.

The sample size from one year of ACS data is not large enough to draw annual estimates for smaller populations. Therefore, multiple years of ACS data are combined for smaller areas. The Census Bureau releases five-year ACS data that provides a five-year moving average for all communities, down to census tracts. The five-year data are not as timely as the annual data, but they are more reliable (because of the larger sample) and available for many more communities. ACS data are often used by federal agencies to determine how money is distributed across the country.

The ACS provides housing advocates with important information. For example, the ACS captures data on housing costs and household income, allowing us to calculate the prevalence of housing cost burdens across communities. The data also allow us to measure the shortage (or surplus) of housing for various income groups. NLIHC uses ACS data to produce its annual report, *The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes*, which estimates the shortage of affordable rental housing in each state, DC, and the largest metropolitan areas. Other important variables in the ACS include race, household type, and employment.

Legislation has been introduced in recent years to make participation in the ACS voluntary rather than mandatory of U.S. residents by prohibiting enforcement. Research from the Census Bureau shows that a voluntary ACS would lower response rates by as much as 20% (see *The American Community Survey: Development, Implementation, and Issues for Congress*), forcing the Bureau to send surveys to a larger number of households and spend more time following up with them in person and by telephone to encourage participation. These additional steps would add to the Bureau's expenses. If the ACS

became voluntary and the Bureau did not take these additional steps, the survey's sample size would decline, resulting in less accurate data, especially for small communities and hard-to-reach populations.

Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy Data

See <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/cp.html>.

The U.S. Census Bureau provides HUD with custom tabulations of ACS data that allow users to gain a better understanding of the housing problems among households of different income levels. The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data are primarily used by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)-entitled communities in their HUD-required Consolidated Plan and can also be useful for housing advocates in measuring the housing needs in their community. The CHAS data use HUD-defined income limits to categorize households as extremely low-, very low-, low-, and moderate-income. The data also count the number of housing units affordable to each of these income groups. Therefore, the data provide a count of households at different income levels and the number of housing units affordable to them at the national, state, and local levels. The data also provide important information on cost burdens, overcrowding, and inadequate kitchen and plumbing by income level. The data can also be broken down by race, elderly/non-elderly status, household size, and disability status.

The most recent CHAS data are from the five year 2012-2016 ACS. HUD provides a web-based query tool that makes commonly used CHAS data readily available, particularly housing cost burdens, for communities. More advanced users can download the CHAS raw data for more detailed analyses.

NLIHC uses the CHAS data to estimate the shortage (or surplus) of rental housing by income category for every county and place in the U.S. Data can be obtained by contacting the NLIHC research team at aurand@nlihc.org.

HUD Point-in-Time Count and Housing Inventory Count

See www.hudexchange.info/resource/3031/pit-and-hic-data-since-2007 and <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/hdx/guides/ahar/#reports>.

HUD's Point-in-Time (PIT) count is the primary tool for measuring the extent of homelessness in the nation. Continuums of Care (CoC) that provide housing and services to people experiencing homelessness must conduct a count each January of sheltered homeless persons in emergency shelter, transitional housing, and Safe Havens. A separate count is conducted every other January (every two years) of unsheltered homeless persons whose primary nighttime residence is not ordinarily used as a regular place to sleep, such as a car, park, abandoned building, or bus or train station. Although not required, HUD encourages CoCs to conduct an annual count of unsheltered homeless persons.

The PIT count is a labor-intensive task coordinated at the local level. The result is a point-in-time estimate of the number of homeless in the U.S. and among specific subpopulations, such as individuals, families with children, veterans, unaccompanied youth, and the chronically homeless. These estimates are published in HUD's *Annual Homeless Assessment Report* (AHAR) to Congress.

The National Alliance to End Homelessness produced a series of research briefs on the state of homeless, including by race, gender, and geography, using PIT data. They are available at https://endhomelessness.org/resources/?fwp_content_filter=data-and-graphics.

The Housing Inventory Count (HIC) is an inventory of beds available for the homeless population by program, including emergency shelters, supportive housing, and rapid rehousing.

American Housing Survey

See

<http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/ahs.html>.

The national American Housing Survey (AHS) is a longitudinal survey of housing units. It is funded and directed by HUD and conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau every odd numbered year. The AHS is unique in that it follows the same housing units over time. The survey includes questions about the physical characteristics and quality of housing units and about their occupants, so users can identify how the price, quality, and occupants of dwellings change over time. The same sample of housing units were followed from 1985 to 2013 with changes to the sample to account for new construction, demolitions, and conversions.

A new national sample of housing units was drawn for the 2015 AHS. The core national sample represents the nation plus its 15 largest metropolitan areas. For the first time, HUD-assisted units were identified through administrative data and oversampled, so comparisons between subsidized and unsubsidized housing would be more reliable than in the past. Supplemental samples in the AHS provide data for additional metropolitan areas, contingent upon HUD's budget. The 2015 AHS also included supplemental questions on food security, healthy homes, housing counseling, and neighborhood arts and culture. Supplemental questions typically change from survey-year to survey-year. The 2017 AHS included supplemental questions on delinquent housing payments, disaster preparedness, and commuting. The 2019 AHS included supplemental questions on food security, accessibility of homes for persons with disabilities, and post-secondary education.

The AHS is the data source for HUD's *Worst Case Housing Needs Report* provided to Congress every two years. This report identifies the number of very low-income households in the U.S. who either spend more than half of their income on housing or live in physically inadequate housing. The AHS sample is not large enough to calculate estimates for specific states or smaller areas

other than the metropolitan areas for which HUD includes a supplemental sample.

Fair Market Rents

See

<https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/fmr.html>.

Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are published by HUD each year for every metropolitan area and nonmetropolitan county in the U.S. FMRs represent the estimated cost of a modest apartment for a household planning to move. They are used to determine payment standards for Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs), initial renewal rents for some expiring project-based Section 8 contracts, and initial rents in the Moderate Rehabilitation Single Room Occupancy program. FMRs also serve as rent ceilings for the HOME Investments Partnership program and the Emergency Solutions Grants program.

In most metropolitan areas and nonmetropolitan counties, FMRs are set at the 40th percentile of gross rents, which is the top end of the price range that movers could expect to pay for the cheapest 40% of apartments.

HUD published a final rule on November 16, 2016 that requires local public housing agencies in 24 metropolitan areas to use Small Area FMRs rather than traditional FMRs to set HCV payment standards. Small Area FMRs reflect rents for U.S. Postal ZIP Codes, while traditional FMRs reflect a single rent standard for an entire metropolitan region. The intent of Small Area FMRs is to provide voucher payment standards that are better aligned with neighborhood-scale rental markets, resulting in relatively higher subsidies in neighborhoods with more expensive rents and lower subsidies in neighborhoods with lower rents. Small Area FMRs are intended to help households use vouchers in higher opportunity neighborhoods. Small Area FMRs for all metropolitan areas are available on HUD's FMR webpages.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Data and Mapping Tool

See <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/4867/affh-data-and-mapping-tool/> and <https://egis.hud.gov/affht/>.

HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule required CDBG-entitled jurisdictions to conduct an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) as part of their five-year Consolidated Plan. The purpose of the AFFH rule was to provide jurisdictions with a planning approach to help them address patterns of segregation, promote fair housing, and foster inclusive communities free from discrimination. HUD effectively suspended implementation of the rule in August 2018 (see the AFFH section(s) in Chapter 7 of this guide).

HUD's AFFH Data and Mapping Tool (AFFH-T) provides some of the data HUD required communities to include in their AFH. The AFFH-T provides maps of demographics, combined with job proximity, school proficiency, environmental health, poverty, transit, and housing burdens. The map data also include the location of publicly supported housing and Housing Choice Vouchers. A User Guide with instructions for using the AFFH-T is also available. HUD last updated the AFFH-T in 2017.

U.S. Decennial Census

See <http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/decennial-census/about.html>.

The Decennial Census asks U.S. citizens a limited number of questions but serves an important Constitutional and governmental function. Article 1, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution mandates a full count of American residents every 10 years, which is used to apportion seats in the U.S. House of Representatives among the states. The Census Bureau distributes a questionnaire to every U.S. household and group quarters, requesting basic demographic information, such as age, sex, and race. The count is also used to help determine the distribution of billions of dollars in federal money for infrastructure and other services.

PUBLICLY ASSISTED HOUSING

Picture of Subsidized Households

See <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/picture/yearlydata.html>.

HUD's *Picture of Subsidized Households* provides data on the location and occupants of HUD's federally subsidized housing stock. The programs represented in the dataset are Public Housing, Housing Choice Vouchers, Project Based Section 8, Section 236, Section 202, and Section 811. This dataset allows users to examine the income, age, household type, and racial distribution of occupants in subsidized housing at the national, state, metropolitan area, city, Public Housing Agency, and project level. The data also include the poverty rate and percentage of minorities in census tracts of subsidized developments to examine the extent to which subsidized housing is concentrated in high poverty or high minority neighborhoods.

HUD Community Assessment Reporting Tool

See <https://egis.hud.gov/cart/>.

The Community Assessment Reporting Tool (CART) allows users to map and explore HUD investments in cities, counties, metropolitan areas, and states. The tool provides information about Community Planning and Development competitive and formula grants (e.g., HOME, CDBG, and CoC grants), rental programs (e.g. Housing Choice Vouchers, Public Housing, and Project Based Rental Assistance), mortgage insurance, housing counseling, and other HUD grants and programs. The tool also provides data on selected demographics of assisted households and on the demographics and cost burdens of the general population.

National Housing Preservation Database

See <http://www.preservationdatabase.org/>.

The National Housing Preservation Database (NHPD) was created in 2012 by NLIHC and the Public and Affordable Housing Research Corporation (PAHRC) to provide communities and housing advocates with the information they need to effectively identify and preserve

subsidized housing at risk of being lost from the affordable housing stock. NHPD is an online database of properties subsidized by federal housing programs, including HUD Project-Based Rental Assistance, Section 202, HOME, USDA Rural Development (RD) housing programs, and the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit. This unique dataset includes the earliest date at which a property's subsidies might expire and property characteristics significant in influencing whether the subsidized property might be at risk of leaving the subsidized housing stock, such as neighborhood location and ownership information.

OTHER DATA SOURCES

HUD eGIS Open Data Storefront

See <http://hudgis-hud.opendata.arcgis.com/>.

HUD eGIS Open Data Storefront is a data portal that provides users with access to multiple HUD datasets, including Community Development activities, HUD-insured multifamily properties, and other rental housing assistance programs. The portal also provides access to HUD's mapping tools.

Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) Data

See <http://www.consumerfinance.gov/hmda/>.

The "Home Mortgage Disclosure Act" requires many lending institutions to publicly report information about mortgage applications and their outcomes. The information that institutions report includes whether the mortgage application was for a home purchase, home improvement, or refinancing; the type of loan (e.g. conventional vs. FHA); mortgage amount; the applicant's race, ethnicity, gender, and age; whether the application was approved; census tract of the property's location; and other features of the mortgage. The data can be used to help identify discriminatory lending practices, as well as examine the extent to which lenders meet the mortgage investment needs of communities. Small lenders and those with offices only in nonmetropolitan areas are not required to report data.

POLICYMAP

PolicyMap (<https://www.policymap.com/>) is an online mapping and data tool that provides information on demographics, housing, employment, and other characteristics of communities across the U.S. Some of PolicyMap's data are available at no charge to the public, while other data require a subscription. The site's housing data include home values, rent prices, vacancy rates, affordability, and federally subsidized housing information.

Other Surveys

The Current Population Survey (CPS) (www.census.gov/cps) is a joint venture between the Department of Labor and the Census Bureau and is the primary source of labor force statistics for the U.S. population. The CPS' Annual Social and Economic Supplement provides official estimates of income, the poverty rate, and health insurance coverage of the non-institutionalized population.

The Housing Vacancy Survey (www.census.gov/housing/hvs) is a supplement of the CPS that quantifies rental and homeowner vacancy rates, characteristics of vacant units, and the overall homeownership rate for states and the 75 largest metropolitan areas.

The Survey of Market Absorption (www.census.gov/programs-surveys/soma.html) is a HUD-sponsored survey conducted by the Census Bureau of newly constructed multifamily units. Each month, a sample of new residential buildings containing five or more units is selected for the survey. An initial three-month survey collects data on amenities, rent or sales price levels, number of units, type of building, and the number of units taken off the market (absorbed). Follow-up surveys can be conducted at six, nine, and 12 months. The data provide the absorption rate of new multifamily housing.

WHAT ADVOCATES SHOULD KNOW

High-quality data that accurately reflect the population requires participation. Housing advocates should encourage everyone to fully participate in the Decennial Census, ACS, and other federal surveys for which they are selected. The accuracy and reliability of the Census' data products depend on it.

Advocacy organizations, such as NLIHC and its state partners, use a variety of federal data to quantify the scarcity of housing affordable to the lowest income families, which makes it easier to set specific and defensible goals for expanding the affordable housing stock. NLIHC, for example, provides housing profiles for each U.S. state and Congressional district, which can be found at <https://nlihc.org/housing-needs-by-state> by selecting the state and then clicking on the Resources tab.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Housing advocates should remind members of Congress of the importance of reliable and unbiased data to understanding and addressing housing needs. Specific issues that advocates should highlight to members of Congress include:

- Adequate funding for the ACS, AHS, and other federal surveys is imperative for up-to-date and reliable data regarding the nation's housing supply and needs.
- Participation in the ACS needs to remain mandatory. Changing the ACS to a voluntary survey would lower response rates. The reliability of the survey's findings would decline without the Census Bureau spending millions of additional dollars each year to send the survey to a larger number of households and to conduct in-person or phone follow-ups to encourage participation.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Association of Public Data Users, <http://apdu.org/>.

HUD Office of Policy Development and Research, <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/home.html>.

The Census Project, <https://thecensusproject.org/>.

Using the “Freedom of Information Act” for Housing Advocacy

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Everyone has the right to request federal agency records or information under the “Freedom of Information Act” (FOIA).

Federal agencies, subject to certain exceptions, must provide the information when it is requested in writing. In order to use FOIA, advocates do not need to have legal training or use special forms. All that is necessary is a letter.

SUMMARY

FOIA allows individuals and groups to access the records and documents of federal agencies such as HUD and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Office of Rural Development (RD).

Requests must be made in writing. Each agency has its own practices and regulations. HUD’s FOIA regulations are at 24 CFR Part 15. USDA’s regulations are at 7 CFR Part 1 Subpart A.

HUD’s FOIA webpages are at https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia and RD’s FOIA webpages are at <https://www.rd.usda.gov/contact-us/freedom-information-act-foia>.

The Department of Justice FOIA webpages are at <https://www.foia.gov>. Check out the “Learn about FOIA” option on the top, left-hand side of the menu bar to learn more.

FOIA does not provide access to the records and documents of parts of the White House, Congress, the courts, state and local governments or agencies, private entities, or individuals.

Records include not only print documents, such as letters, reports, and papers, but also photos, videos, sound recordings, maps, email, and electronic records. Agencies are not required to research or analyze data for a requester, nor are they required to create a record or document in response to a request. They are only obligated to look for and provide existing records. Agencies must, however, make reasonable efforts to search for records in electronic form. The term search

is defined as reviewing, including by automated means, agency records (e.g., performing relatively simple computer searches).

A formal FOIA request might not be necessary. By law and presidential order, federal agencies are required to make a substantial amount of information available to the public. Before considering a FOIA request, advocates should explore the HUD or RD websites and be confident that the information sought is not already available online.

If advocates cannot find the information they seek on an agency’s website, it might be readily available from agency staff in the field, regional, or headquarters’ offices. Rather than invoking the formal FOIA process, it is often quicker and easier to start with an informal approach. Simply phone or email the agency office and ask for information. Formal, written FOIA requests generally trigger a slower, formal, bureaucratic process. In recent years, HUD has been very slow in responding to FOIA requests.

- Some HUD contact information can be found under the “Contact Us” tab on the HUD website, www.hud.gov. Other HUD staff might be found on a specific program area’s website, such as Public and Indian Housing (PIH) under “About PIH” or even going deeper, for example, in the Housing Choice Voucher Program’s staff directory, <https://bit.ly/2SexKJY>.
- RD state offices can be located at <https://www.rd.usda.gov/contact-us/state-offices>, and state and local offices can be located at <https://www.rd.usda.gov/browse-state>. If you are not sure where to submit a FOIA request, send it to the RD FOIA/Privacy Act Officer in Washington, DC, at <https://www.rd.usda.gov/contact-us/freedom-information-act-foia>.

- USDA Service Centers (which might have an RD area office) can be found at <https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?state=us&agency=rd>.

Making a FOIA Request

If an informal request does not produce the desired information, a formal request may be necessary. A formal FOIA request can be simple and short, but it must be in writing. In your letter, state that you are making a request under FOIA. Describe what you are looking for in as much detail as possible, including dates, names, document numbers, titles, types of beneficiaries you are concerned about, etc. Specify the format, paper or electronic, in which you would like to receive the requested information.

Request a waiver of any fees for copying or searching, explaining your organization's mission and its nonprofit status in order to demonstrate that you do not have a commercial interest in the information. Explain how this information will:

- Be of interest to more than a small number of people, and how your organization can distribute the information to many people.
- Lead to a level of public understanding of a HUD or RD activity that is far greater than currently exists.

Provide contact information for the individual or organization requesting the information, including mailing address, phone number, and email address. Ask the agency to provide detailed justifications for any information that it refuses to release. Include a statement that the law requires the agency to respond within 20 working days indicating whether the request will be processed.

Formal requests must be in writing, but they can be made through email, by fax, or through postal mail.

HUD FOIA requests:

- To make a FOIA request of HUD headquarters electronically, go to https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia/requests.
- To make a FOIA request through the mail write to:

– U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Freedom of Information Act Office
451 Seventh Street, SW, Room 10139
Washington, DC 20410-3000

- If the response is not adequate, contact the FOIA Public Liaison for HUD headquarters at https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia/servicecenters.
- To make a FOIA request of documents from a HUD regional office, advocates should locate the appropriate person and address from the HUD FOIA Requester Service Centers webpage at https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia/servicecenters.
- The Department of Justice also has list of HUD regional FOIA contacts as well as FOIA liaisons at <https://www.foia.gov/#agency-search>.
- If the response from the FOIA Requester Service Center is not adequate, contact the FOIA Public Liaison for the appropriate geographic region.

RD FOIA requests:

- To make a FOIA request for RD documents at either the local level or at RD headquarters, advocates can write to the RD FOIA Coordinator for their state. Contact information for RD FOIA State Coordinators can be found at https://www.rd.usda.gov/files/USDA_RDFOIAStateContacts.pdf.
- If you are not sure where the information is located, send the FOIA request to the RD FOIA Officer at RD headquarters in Washington, DC, <http://www.rd.usda.gov/contact-us/freedom-information-act-foia>.

The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press provides an interactive tool to generate a FOIA request to any agency, <https://www.ifoia.org>.

Timeline

Once a request is made, HUD and RD will log the request and provide a tracking number. The agencies must grant or deny a FOIA request within 20 working days of receipt. This response simply shows whether the agency intends to

provide the information. There is no time limit on providing the information; however, USDA's regulations require RD to approximate the date that the information will be provided.

When an agency determines whether to comply with a FOIA request, the "FOIA Improvement Act of 2016" requires the agency to immediately notify the requester of the determination and the reasons for it. The 2016 act also requires the agency to notify the requester that there is a right to seek assistance from the agency's FOIA public liaison.

If there are unusual circumstances, such as large numbers of records to review, staffing limitations, or the need to search for records in another physical location or from another agency, the agency must give written notice and can add an extra 10 days, as well as provide the requester with an opportunity to limit the scope of the request so that the request can be processed more quickly. The 2016 act adds that when unusual circumstances exist and an agency needs to extend the time limits by more than 10 additional working days, the written notice to the requester must notify the requester of the right to seek dispute resolution services from the Office of Governmental Information Services.

The 2016 act requires agencies to make records available for public inspection in an electronic format that, because of their subject matter, the agency determines have become or are likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records, or that have been requested three or more times.

Expedited Requests

If there is imminent threat to life or physical safety, or if there is an urgent need to inform the public, advocates can ask for expedited processing. HUD and RD will issue a notification within 10 working days indicating whether a request will get priority and more rapid processing.

Denial of Requests

Information can only be denied if it is exempt. The law lists nine exemptions, such as classified

national defense information, trade secrets, personal information, and certain internal government communications. The letter denying a FOIA request must give the reasons for denial and inform the requester of the right to appeal to the head of the agency.

The "internal government communications" exemption might be relevant to housing advocates. The intent of this exemption is to promote uninhibited discussion among federal employees engaged in policymaking. This exemption would apply to unfinished reports, preliminary drafts of materials, and other internal communications taking place as agency staff undertake a decision-making process.

Appeals

Decisions to deny a fee waiver, deny a request for expedited disclosure, or failure to release the requested information can be appealed. Appeals to HUD should be made within 30 days. A letter should be sent to the HUD official indicated in the denial letter and generally include a copy of the original request, a copy of the denial, and a statement of the facts and reasons the information should be provided. Specific information for appeals pertaining to fees or expedited processing are listed at https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia/foiaappeals.

For adverse determinations, the 2016 act requires agencies to give the requester at least 90 days from the date of the adverse determination to file an appeal. In addition, the 2016 act requires agencies to notify the requester that there is a right to seek dispute resolution services from the FOIA Public Liaison or from the Office of Government Information Services.

To appeal an RD denial, advocates can send a letter to the RD official indicated in the denial letter within 45 days. If that appeal fails, advocates can appeal to the RD FOIA Officer. If still not satisfied, advocates should write to the Rural Housing Service Administrator. The agency has 20 working days to decide on an appeal.

SAMPLE FOIA LETTER

Date

Agency/Program FOIA Liaison

Name of Agency or Program

Address

RE: Freedom of Information Act Request

Dear [name]:

Under the Freedom of Information Act, I am requesting copies of [identify the records as specifically as possible].

I request a waiver of fees because my organization is a nonprofit with a mission to [state the organization's mission and activities, demonstrating that it does not have a commercial interest in the information]. In addition, disclosure of the information will contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations and activities of HUD/RD.

[Explain how the information is directly related to HUD/RD, how the information will contribute to public understanding of HUD/RD operations or activities, and how you or your organization, as well as a broader segment of the public, will gain a greater understanding of these agencies by having the requested information. Describe the role and expertise of your organization as it relates to the information and how the information will be disbursed to a broader audience].

As provided by law, a response is expected within 20 working days. If any or part of this request is denied, please describe which specific exemption it is based on and to whom an appeal may be made.

If you have any questions about this request, please phone me at _____.

Sincerely,

Your name

Address

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Public Citizen's "Freedom of Information Act" webpage, <https://www.citizen.org/our-work/transparency/freedom-information-act>.
Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press FOIA, <https://www.ifoia.org/#/>.

Federal Open Government Guide (Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press), <https://www.rcfp.org/federal-open-government-guide>.

HUD FOIA webpage, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/administration/foia.

USDA RD FOIA webpage, <https://www.rd.usda.gov/contact-us/freedom-information-act-foia>.

General Services Administration, Your Right to Federal Records, https://www.gsa.gov/cdnstatic/Your_Right_to_Federal_Records.pdf.

Department of Justice FOIA websites, <http://www.justice.gov/oip> and <http://www.foia.gov>.

Avoiding and Overcoming Neighborhood Opposition to Affordable Rental Housing

By Jaimie Ross, President and CEO,
Florida Housing Coalition

Not in My Backyard (NIMBY) connotes objections made to stop the development of affordable housing based on fear and prejudice. NIMBY-ism presents a particularly pernicious obstacle to meeting local housing needs. The outcry from constituents expressing concerns over the siting and permitting of affordable housing can lead to lengthy and hostile public proceedings, frustrated Consolidated Plan implementation, increased development costs, and property rights disputes. The consequence is less development and preservation of housing at a time when the country is in desperate need of more rental housing. The resulting unmet need for rental units leads to an increase in homelessness. Avoiding and overcoming opposition to affordable rental housing is key to producing and preserving desperately needed affordable homes.

TOOLS FOR SUCCESS

Reduce Unnecessary Approvals

The greater the number of land use and development approvals that require a vote by the elected body, the more opportunities there will be for neighborhood opposition. Two ways to reduce unnecessary approvals are (1) “by right” development and (2) approvals made at the staff level rather than at a public hearing. In Los Angeles, neighborhood opposition for siting supportive housing led advocates to push for a local code change to permit supportive housing on property zoned for public facilities, removing the requirement for a zoning change in certain circumstances, and thereby reducing the threat of neighborhood opposition.

To encourage “by right” affordable rental housing development, advocates should fight for zoning codes that contain predictable standards for development with quick administrative review,

reducing the opportunity for community pushback. There must be a balance between public input at the outset while also giving affordable housing developers the predictability needed to carry out their projects without delay.

Restrictive zoning, particularly single-family zoning, creates a high hurdle for affordable housing. In December 2018, Minneapolis, Minnesota became the first major city in the United States to adopt a plan to allow up to three dwelling units on a single family lot in areas zoned for single-family only housing. This will allow duplex and triplex rental housing in what would otherwise be an exclusively single-family homeownership area. In 2019, Oregon passed a law requiring cities with populations of 25,000 or more to allow duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, and other “missing middle” housing types in single-family districts. Cities of 10,000-25,000 in population are required to allow duplexes in single-family zones. Up-zoning policies such as these remove the obligation for an affordable housing developer to seek land use changes on a case-by-case basis that typically invites NIMBY-ism. If clear and predictive development standards are implemented from the outset, there will be less NIMBY-ism on the back end.

Launch General Audience Education Campaigns

Increased understanding of affordable rental housing and the positive impact it has on individuals, families, and the community at large is instrumental to gaining wide support. The more informed the public, local government staff, and elected officials are about the need for affordable rental housing and the benefits of avoiding housing insecurity and homelessness, the more leverage advocates will have to advance the development of affordable rental homes.

Advocates should make use of credible research and local data to support their message. Anecdotal information about particular residents

and the success of previous developments goes a long way in a public education effort. There are many resources available to help in an education campaign. The *ALICE* Report (Asset Limited, Low-Income, Constrained, Employed) by United Way, which busts the myths about those who need rental housing, is based on research showing that fulltime low-income employed workers do not make enough money to pay for market rate apartments. Reports from credible entities that are not housing organizations can bolster reports prepared by housing organizations, such as the *Out of Reach* Report, The Gap Report, and *Home Matters* reports. Reports on housing prepared by non-housing advocacy organizations attract the attention of news outlets and provide allies for the cause.

Advocates should educate elected officials and the community at large to view affordable rental housing as a community asset or as infrastructure. Without an adequate supply of affordable rental housing, local businesses will suffer, and communities will lose essential workforce including teachers, first responders, and hospital personnel. If there is a lack of affordable rental housing, workers will be forced to live far away from their jobs and will spend more of their money on transportation and housing costs, leaving less money to invest in the local economy.

Affordable rental housing should be viewed as an essential infrastructure need for communities in the same vein as roads, bridges, parks, and sanitary water. When affordable housing is viewed as infrastructure, it may also help advocates to gain approval for inclusionary housing policies, whereby affordable rentals are produced concurrent with market rate housing. This has the double benefit of producing more affordable housing and overcoming NIMBY opposition, as the developer can respond to neighborhood opposition, if any, by explaining that the affordable housing component of the development is a local government requirement.

Garner Support from a Broad Range of Interests

Advocates should ask members of the business community, clergy, social service agencies, and others who will be well received, to stand with them in advancing affordable housing goals. State and local business chambers and economic development councils are increasingly adopting workforce housing as a legislative priority. These supporters can be helpful in making the connection between housing development and other community concerns. For instance, local chambers can speak to the need for workforce housing. Members of the local school board or parent advisory committees can attest to the need for stable rental housing for teachers, support staff, and lower income families to support children's success in school. Potential beneficiaries of the development, including future residents, may also be effective advocates.

The media can be a crucial ally; whenever advocates foresee a potential NIMBY problem, it is best to contact the media right away so that they understand the development plans, the public purpose, and the population to be served before they hear neighborhood opposition.

Engage Elected Officials

Once a NIMBY battle ensues, it is often too late to educate. Advocates should anticipate the value of and the need to build relationships with elected officials and their staff members before a NIMBY issue arises. It is imperative to underscore the importance of affordable housing and the consequences of not having enough rental housing, such as homelessness, so that elected officials make the connection between adequate rental housing and the economic health of the entire community. Embracing affordable rental housing as a community asset and as an essential infrastructure need helps shape the vision of a successful affordable housing strategy and maximizes community potential. When residents come out in force to oppose lower-priced housing in their neighborhoods, it will help elected officials overcome any opposition knowing that workforce housing is a critical part of the community's infrastructure.

Advocates should include allies in the engagement process. Learning about elected officials' interests will help inform advocates of the best allies to bring to meetings. For example, one elected official may be more inclined to hear from local businesses about the need for employee housing, while another may be moved by hearing from local clergy about the needs of homeless veterans, elders, and people with disabilities. Whenever possible, advocates should invite elected officials to visit completed developments and should share credit with them at ribbon cuttings and when speaking with the media. Whether advocates can meet with elected officials regarding a pending approval depends upon the *ex parte* rules in each jurisdiction. If advocates discover that community opposition is meeting with elected officials about a development, advocates should try to do the same.

Engage Neighborhood Groups with Specific Developments

Outreach to the neighborhood can be key to avoiding a NIMBY battle but it can also ignite a NIMBY battle. The decision about when and how to engage the neighborhood is one that is best done with as much consideration as the development plans themselves. If neighborhood engagement is done well, it can smooth the development process to success. But if the first step is a misstep, it can be extremely difficult to get the project back on track.

Here is some general, but critical guidance for neighborhood engagement: (1) find out if there is a neighborhood association, either formally incorporated or organically comprised; (2) identify the leader (s) of the neighborhood group; (3) set up a one on one or very small group meeting with the leaders; (4) encourage the neighborhood leaders to share any concerns with you after you have shared your development plans; (5) be willing to revise your plans in ways that respond to any legitimate concerns of the neighborhood; (6) include the neighborhood leaders in your presentation to the larger neighborhood group. An inclusive, transparent, and collaborative approach from the outset can

be key for the success of a new affordable housing project.

Address All Legitimate Opposition

The key to overcoming community opposition is addressing the opposition's legitimate concerns. Legitimate, non-discriminatory concerns around issues like traffic or project design may lead the affordable housing developer to adjust a proposed development. For example, modifying the location of an entrance driveway or modifying the design of the building to ensure that the affordable rental development fits within the aesthetics of the existing community may be changes worth making, even if they come with an increase in cost. It is always wise for the affordable housing developer to work with the neighbors and be able to report to the local elected body that they have done their best to address the concerns of the opposition.

Property values are often at the root of neighborhood opposition. Yet, virtually without exception, property value and affordable housing research finds no negative effect on neighboring market rate property values. In fact, in some instances, affordable housing has increased the value of neighboring property. In November 2016, Trulia released a report, *There Doesn't Go the Neighborhood: Low-Income Housing Has No Impact on Nearby Home Values*, adding fresh data to the large body of research showing that affordable housing does not decrease neighboring property values.

The critical point is this: once all legitimate concerns are addressed, if opposition persists, it can be stated with certainty that the opposition is illegitimate and is therefore inappropriate, arbitrary, capricious, or unlawful for the local government to consider in making its land use decision. The unlawfulness of the opposition may be a violation of fair housing laws and in violation of the substantive due process rights afforded by the 14th Amendment to the U.S Constitution, as explained below.

Know the Law and Expand Legal Protections

The federal "Fair Housing Act" is not new. Advocates should view neighborhood opposition

through the lens of fair housing and fundamental rights. If all legitimate concerns have been addressed, it is likely that thwarting the affordable rental development violates federal fair housing law and/or the 14th Amendment, as well as private property rights.

Under 14th Amendment jurisprudence, local officials must have some rational, police power-based (public health, safety, or welfare) purpose for exercising development decisions. Individuals have a fundamental right to fair and non-arbitrary land use decisions. Courts have held that the public's negative attitude, or fear, unsubstantiated by factors that are properly cognizable in a development proceeding, are not permissible bases for land use decisions. If a local government denies an affordable rental housing development due to illegitimate political or otherwise irrational motives not based on rational evidence, its decision may be challenged under the "Civil Rights Act of 1871" (42 U.S.C. § 1983) for violating the affordable housing developer's substantive due process rights. As advocates, we can help local elected officials avoid liability by providing education about the protections provided by fair housing law and the affirmative duty that government must safeguard fair housing.

Advocates can push for state or local discrimination laws that make it harder for NIMBY-ism to prevail. For example, in 2000, the "Florida Fair Housing Act" (the state's substantial equivalent to the federal "Fair Housing Act") was amended to include affordable housing as a protected class (Section 760.26, Florida Statutes). In 2009, North Carolina adopted a similar statute to add affordable housing as a protected class in its fair housing law. Laws similarly intended to provide protection for affordable housing developments have been adopted in California and the state of Washington (see Additional Examples at the end of this section). Decision makers and their staffs must be aware of the law if it is to be helpful to the cause. The expansion of State Fair Housing Protections to include affordable housing in Florida has been successful because housing advocates have

been conscientious about ensuring that local government lawyers know about the statutory change. It is now commonplace in Florida for a city or county attorney to inform the elected body during a heated public hearing that they will run afoul of the state's fair housing law if they deny an affordable housing developer's application.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Managing Local Opposition through Education and Communication

Opposition to Affordable Housing in the USA: Debate Framing and the Responses of Local Actors: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263225197_Opposition_to_Affordable_Housing_in_the_USA_Debate_Framing_and_the_Responses_of_Local_Actors.

The Original NPH Toolkit: <http://nonproflthousing.org/resources/the-original-nph-toolkit>.

California Department of Housing and Community Development: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/community-acceptance/index.shtml>.

Myths and Facts About Affordable and High Density Housing: <http://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/community-acceptance/index/docs/mythsnfacts.pdf>.

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development on House Bill 2001: <https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/UP/Pages/Housing-Choices.aspx>.

Property Value Studies

There Doesn't Go the Neighborhood: Low-Income Housing Has No Impact on Nearby

Home Values: <https://www.trulia.com/blog/trends/low-income-housing/>.

Documents and Websites on Affordable Housing and the Relationship to Property Values: http://www.hcd.ca.gov/community-development/community-acceptance/index/docs/prop_value.pdf.

Effects of Low-Income Housing on Property Values: <https://www.nar.realtor/effects-of-low-income-housing-on-property-values#>.

Additional Examples of State Laws

California law bars state-sponsored discrimination in residency, ownership, and land use decisions based on the method of financing and the intended occupancy of any residential development by persons who are very low-, low-, moderate-, or middle-income. CA: Cal Gov. Code S. 65008 (1984).

Washington law provides that “A city, county, or other local governmental entity or agency may not adopt, impose, or enforce requirements on an affordable housing development that are different than {sic} the requirements imposed on housing developments generally.” WA: RCW 36.130.020 (2008).

Resident and Tenant Organizing

WHY ORGANIZE?

Organizing balances power. When ordinary people come together to take collective action on their own behalf, they have a greater ability to influence people in decision-making positions. Organizing undermines existing social structures and creates a more just distribution of power.

WHY DO TENANTS ORGANIZE?

Tenants organize to address immediate problems and create ongoing solutions. If tenants have mold in their apartments and the landlords keep saying that they will address it but never do, chances are that other tenants in the building are facing the same problem. It is easy for the landlord to avoid each person individually, but when tenants come together and put pressure on the landlord as a group, they become much harder to ignore.

Organizing doesn't stop when an immediate problem is fixed. As a group, tenants can identify systematic problems in their building. They can see patterns of neglect or harassment and demand long-term solutions that prevent problems instead of only dealing with them once they occur. It doesn't have to stop at the building level. An organized group of tenants may identify issues, such as local school conditions, that need to be addressed on their block or in their neighborhood as a whole. A united tenant organization with experience dealing with their landlord and building management knows how to work together as a group to demand accountability from people in positions of power, like the local school board.

Ultimately, tenants organize to gain power. In an apartment building, a small minority of people hold almost all of the power. Landlords and management companies have the power to withhold repairs, to raise rents in many cases, and to refuse to renew leases and even evict people. In federally assisted buildings, tenants have rights and protections provided by the government. Some cities and states also provide additional

protections, but even these are more effective if tenants are organized. Organizing gives tenants more power to draw attention to problems and get them resolved.

Typically, there are several types of issues that prompt tenants to organize:

- Substandard living conditions.
- Systematic harassment or intimidation.
- The threat of an end to assistance programs that keep units affordable to existing tenants.

TENANT ORGANIZING TIPS

Be Open

To function well, a tenant association must be open to all residents in a building. If it is not, competing tenant organizations can develop and landlords or management companies can exploit this lack of unity among residents.

Be Democratic

For long-term success, it is crucial for a group to function democratically. When the special interests of only a few members begin to dictate group decisions and interactions with landlords or management companies, the cohesion of a group is weakened and therefore so is its strength.

Keep an Eye on Process

There is no one-size-fits-all decision-making process or leadership structure for tenant associations, but it is important for residents to figure out what works well for them, build consensus, and formalize their processes in some way. A group may re-evaluate and change its structure at some point, but it is critical to have a defined and agreed upon method, so that when decisions need to be made, they can be made without conflict or disarray.

Be Informed

Tenants need to know what is going on in their building and in their community. Tenants should determine whether their landlord owns other

buildings in the neighborhood or city and if residents in those buildings experience similar problems. Tenants should also learn about federal, state, or local laws that apply to the right to organize, affordability restrictions, or living-condition standards. They should figure out who can help them get the resources they need to be successful.

Know Your Elected Officials

Tenants should learn who their elected officials are at every level of government and engage them on the issues facing residents in the building. For local offices, attending neighborhood and city meetings can often be a great way to make connections with elected officials or their staff.

Find a Location to Hold Meetings and Access Community Resources

A public library, community center, or local church may be willing to provide space. Does the group need to create and photocopy meeting notices? A community-based organization in your neighborhood may be able to help you access a computer, a photocopier, and other useful resources.

Set a Goal or Goals as a Group

Most importantly, tenants must determine their goal(s) as a group, identify and engage allies that can help achieve the goal(s), make sure that all interested residents have a role to play, and develop solidarity within the group. Strength in numbers and unity of purpose are instrumental forces in organizing.

Ultimately, an organized tenant group becomes a critical resource for advocates. No one knows the direct implications and effects of housing policy better than the residents who live each day in subsidized housing properties. A tenant organization can solve immediate problems in an individual building and can also play an important role in advocating for better, more just public policy over the long term.

Timeline of a Tenant Association

The timeline for developing a tenant association will vary from building to building, depending

on the issues facing residents in the building, the dynamics among residents, and other factors unique to any given community. Here is a sample timeline that contains some useful tips.

WEEK 1: RESEARCH

To start, ask yourself the following questions:

- What issues do residents in the building experience?
- What are the relevant affordability programs affecting the building?
- Does it have a subsidized mortgage?
- Is there a federal rental assistance program in place?
- Are there state or local assistance programs at play?
- Who governs and regulates these programs?
- Are there protections in place for the tenants as a result of these programs?
- Who are the elected officials representing the area where the building is located?
- What other issues do community members face?

WEEK 2: DOOR KNOCKING

Prepare. Make sure you have everything you need to door knock effectively: a clipboard, a sign-up sheet where people can share contact information, and a place to make notes about the conversations you have with people. Bring a copy of any regulations, federal or local, ensuring your right to organize in case you are confronted by the landlord, property manager, or building security. Bring business cards or information about your organization.

Knock on doors. There is no more effective way to find out about the issues facing tenants and how likely they are to organize than by talking to them face to face. It is usually most effective to door knock in the evening, since that is when most people will be home from work.

Identify potential leaders. Use door knocking as a way not only to identify problems, but also to identify potential leaders. Note whether there are any tenants that people seem to defer to or

listen to. Who are the long-time tenants? Who seems enthusiastic about taking action? Don't predetermine leaders; let leaders emerge.

Door-knocking is about listening, observing, and beginning to build trust.

WEEKS 3 AND 4: PLANNING AND MEETINGS

Get the group started. After door knocking, engage a small group of tenants who seem the most enthusiastic about addressing the problems facing residents in the building.

Organize one or two smaller meetings. Meetings will likely take place in one of the tenants' apartments. Brainstorm with this small group about the following:

- What are the underlying common issues facing the building?
- Who seems to be the decision maker?
- How should things change?
- How can things change?

Determine a goal for the building that has consensus among the small group. Pick a date for a building-wide meeting. Develop an agenda for the big meeting. Delegate roles and tasks among the group:

- Who is going to create, copy, and distribute meeting notices?
- Who is going to facilitate the meeting?
- Who is going to take notes?
- Will you need spoken-language translation or sign-language interpretation?
- If so, what community resources are available to provide translation or interpretation?

Make sure that everyone who wants a responsibility has one. Remember that the role of the organizer is not to lead, or even talk much; it is to provide the resources that the tenants need to meet their goals and to facilitate this small group's leadership.

Consider a resident survey. Organizers should consider developing and conducting a resident needs/satisfaction survey to measure resident perceptions about building maintenance, security,

responsiveness of management and maintenance, interest in social activities, etc. Organizers could conduct in-person interviews and/or distribute surveys under tenant doors with return information included.

WEEK 5: FIRST BUILDING-WIDE MEETING

Once a date is determined, choose a location that is physically accessible to all who may want to attend. Many buildings have a community room. Community rooms are a great resource because they don't require people to travel anywhere to get to the meeting. If the building does not have a meeting place, try to find a space in the neighborhood. Public libraries, community centers, or churches often have adequate space that is open to the community.

Create and distribute flyers detailing the logistics of the meeting. Make sure that everyone is aware of the meeting. Not every tenant will come, but everyone should have the opportunity to attend if they choose.

Consider multilingual/sign language needs. Not all residents may speak the same language. Additionally, some residents may be hearing impaired and need sign language interpretation. Therefore, it is important to consider multilingual/interpreter needs in terms of fliers and translation. A great way to accomplish this is by reaching out to bilingual and hearing-impaired residents for help with translation.

Finalize the agenda. Make sure that everyone who will speak knows their role. Keep the agenda very tight. Address why you are meeting, build consensus around your goal(s), and determine the date for your next meeting and the next steps that need to happen. Make sure that every action item has a person assigned to it.

WEEK 6: DEVELOP AN ACTION PLAN

Once you have determined your goal(s) as a group and have developed some immediate next steps, begin the process of creating an action plan.

Figure out contingency plans. For example, if you are writing the landlord a letter asking them to meet with your group, what are your next steps if they say yes? What are your next steps if they say no? If your city has a tenant advocate or public

advocate within the local government, at what point will you involve that office? At what point will you engage your elected and appointed public officials? At what point might you go to the media? How might a combination of your local media and public officials place pressure on your landlord, if your group considers it necessary?

Your action plan will develop and change over the course of your campaign as events unfold, but it is useful to plot out your steps and expectations as a group in advance.

WEEKS 7 THROUGH 10: ELECTIONS AND BY-LAWS

After you have developed your action plan and taken initial steps in your campaign, it is useful to begin formalizing leadership and decision-making processes.

Determine the group's leadership and bylaws. There are many different leadership structures. Tenants should consider different options and determine what makes the most sense for their group. Do they want a president? Co-chairs? Does a non-hierarchical structure make the most sense? Does a committee structure make the most sense? Tenants must determine the basic functions that need to be fulfilled within their group and then craft a leadership structure that meets those needs. The organization's bylaws document should answer these questions and provide processes for your organization's operation.

Determine the decision-making process. This should be a process that all active members of the group are comfortable with, and one that is formalized in writing. Without basic rules and regulations in place, a group can fracture, and a fractured group loses power.

SUSTAINING THE TENANT ASSOCIATION

Many tenant groups emerge in moments of crisis. After the immediate problem that brought a group together is addressed, the group may lose momentum, stop meeting, and begin to dissolve.

Stay Engaged, but Set Realistic Expectations

It is important to keep residents engaged, but it is just as important to understand that the level of activity within a tenant group can vary, depending on how urgently tenants wish to address issues at hand. During an active campaign a group may meet every week. Once the issue is resolved, the group may decide to scale back to meeting once a month. Scaling back is okay. Although you want to keep the group going, you don't want to burn people out or make them feel like they are meeting for no reason.

Look to the Community

Although it is usually a problem in the building that brings tenants together, there may be broader issues in the community around which a tenant group can organize or stay organized once initial problems are resolved, such as conditions of the local school or public transportation systems. Give members of the tenant association space to raise issues of greater concern. If common issues arise, brainstorm ways the tenant association can address those issues and influence the community.

Look Beyond the Community

- Does the tenant group have concerns about the way a federal or local program is regulated or run? How can they best advocate for themselves and their neighbors?
- Finding ways to maintain a strong tenant association is important. Although the group may win one fight, another crisis could arise at any point and having a strong and unified body in place means you will be ready to respond quickly and effectively.

Adapted from New York State Tenants & Neighbors' 2008 Organizers' Manual, by Michele Bonan. For more information, visit the Tenants & Neighbors' website at <http://tandn.org/>.

Resident Participation in Federally Subsidized Housing

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Subsidized housing residents have important personal perspectives about the impact of established and emerging subsidized housing policies on their homes and communities. Consequently, they also have good ideas about how their housing developments should be managed. Resident participation in all aspects of housing management is critical to the long-term success of federal housing programs.

HUD has three major programs that provide rent subsidies to approximately 4.4 million households nationwide. These programs are the public housing program, private multifamily HUD-assisted rent programs, and the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program. Each program has its own set of challenges and opportunities related to resident participation.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Administering agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing

Year started: 1986 for public housing tenant participation, 1998 for Resident Advisory Boards

Population targeted: Residents of public housing

See also: For related information, refer to the *Public Housing*, *Public Housing Agency Plan*, and *Rental Assistance Demonstration* sections of this guide.

There are a number of HUD policies that help support the participation of all public housing residents in public housing agency (PHA) decision making.

PHA Plan Process

Opportunities for resident participation exist in the annual and five-year planning processes, collectively called the PHA Plan, required by the "Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998" (QHWRA). Many PHAs only have minimal

PHA Plan resident engagement requirements, but the process does open the door for residents and other community members to interact and influence PHA decisions.

For larger PHAs (referred to as Non-Qualified PHAs), the PHA must conduct reasonable outreach to encourage broad public participation in the PHA Plan process. It must invite public comment regarding a proposed PHA Plan and conduct a public hearing to discuss it, whether it is a 5-Year Plan or an Annual Plan. With smaller PHAs (called Qualified PHAs), the public hearing applies to the 5-Year Plan and each year there must still be a public hearing to discuss any changes to the PHA's goals, objectives, or policies even though they do not submit an Annual Plan. Hearings must be held a location convenient to PHA residents.

At least 45 days before a public hearing:

- Non-Qualified PHAs must make the proposed PHA Plan, required attachments, and other relevant information available for public inspection at the PHA's main office during normal business hours.
- Qualified PHAs must make information relevant to any changes in goals, objectives, or policies available for public inspection at the PHA's main office during normal business hours.

The regulations for the PHA Plan process are at Part 903 of Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (24 CFR Part 903). For more, see *Public Housing Agency Plan* in Chapter 7 of this guide.

Resident Advisory Boards

QHWRA created Resident Advisory Boards (RABs) to ensure that public housing and voucher-assisted households can meaningfully participate in the PHA Plan process. Each PHA must have a RAB consisting of residents elected to reflect and represent the population served

by the PHA. Where residents with Housing Choice Vouchers make up at least 20% of all assisted households served by the PHA, voucher households must have reasonable representation on the RAB.

The basic role of the RAB is to make recommendations and assist in other ways with drafting the PHA Plan and any significant amendments. By law, PHAs must provide RABs with reasonable resources to enable them to function effectively and independently of the housing agency. Regulations regarding RABs are in the PHA Plan regulations, Part 903.

Part 964 Resident Participation Regulations

A federal rule provides public housing residents with the right to organize and elect a resident council to represent their interests. This regulation, 24 CFR Part 964, spells out residents' rights to participate in all aspects of public housing development operations. Residents must be allowed to be actively involved in a PHA's decision-making process and to give advice on matters such as maintenance, modernization, resident screening and selection, and recreation. The rule defines the obligation of HUD and PHAs to support resident participation activities through training and other activities.

A resident council is a group of residents representing the interests of the residents and the properties they live in. Some resident councils are made up of members from just one property, so a PHA could have a number of resident councils. Other resident councils, known as jurisdiction-wide councils, are made up of members from many properties. A resident council is different from a RAB because the official role of a RAB is limited to helping shape the PHA Plan. Resident councils can select members to represent them on the RAB.

Most PHAs are required to provide \$25 per occupied unit per year from their annual operating budget to pay for resident participation activities. A minimum of \$15 per unit per year must be distributed to resident councils to fund activities such as training and organizing. Up to \$10 per unit per year may be used by the PHA for

resident participation activities. On August 23, 2013, HUD issued Notice PIH 2013-21 providing guidance on the use of tenant participation funds.

Resident Commissioners

The law also requires every PHA, with a few exceptions, to have at least one person on its governing board who is either a public housing or voucher resident. HUD's rule regarding the appointment of resident commissioners, at Part 964, states that residents on boards should be treated no differently than non-residents.

Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Program

HUD's Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Program is designed to help public housing residents become more self-sufficient by linking them to supportive services and resident empowerment activities. It is also intended to help elderly and disabled public housing residents remain in place. Competitive grants under the ROSS program can be awarded to PHAs, resident councils, resident organizations, and other entities. ROSS funds have been appropriated annually by Congress, followed by a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) from HUD inviting eligible applicants to compete for the funds. Twenty-five percent of ROSS grants have been set aside for formally recognized resident councils, but few ever apply for it. For FY16, FY17, FY18, and FY19, Congress appropriated \$35 million for ROSS; \$10 million less than FY15, and \$15 million less than FY12 and earlier.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION

The Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) allows PHAs and owners of private, HUD-assisted housing to leverage Section 8 rental assistance contracts in order to raise private debt and equity for capital improvements. The public housing component allows up to 455,000 units of public housing to compete for permission to convert their existing public housing capital and operating fund assistance to project-based Housing Choice Vouchers (PBVs) or to Section

8 project-based rental assistance (PBRA) by September 30, 2024.

Before submitting a RAD application to HUD, the PHA must notify residents and resident organizations of a project proposed for conversion. The notice (since January 2017) must be a written RAD Information Notice (RIN) that indicates, among other things:

- The PHA's intention to convert units through RAD;
- A general description of the conversion (for example whether there will be rehabilitation or new construction);
- Resident relocation protections if relocation is involved; and
- All of the resident rights provided by the RAD statute (such as the right to remain, right to return if there is temporary relocation, and no rescreening upon return).

The PHA is not required to notify the RAB or residents of other developments.

After a RIN is issued, the PHA must conduct at least two meetings with residents of the selected project(s). Since January 2017, at these meetings the PHA must discuss conversion plans, give residents a chance to comment, and describe all of the RAD resident rights. The PHA must also explain whether there will be:

- Any change in the number of assisted units, change in bedroom sizes, or other change that might impact a household's ability to re-occupy the property.
- Any reduction of units that have been vacant for more than 24 months.
- Plans to partner with an entity other than an affiliate of the PHA, and if so, whether that partner will have an ownership interest.

After a RAD application has received preliminary HUD approval (called a CHAP) but before the PHA requests a "Concept Call" with HUD, the PHA must have at least one meeting with residents to discuss updated conversion plans and ask for feedback regarding the proposed improvements. The PHA must provide comprehensive written

responses to comments made by residents at this meeting.

After the Concept Call and before submitting a Financing Plan, a PHA must have at least one more meeting with residents to discuss updated conversion plans and the anticipated Financing Plan. The PHA must provide comprehensive written responses to comments made by residents at this meeting.

After HUD has issued a RAD Conversion Commitment (RCC), the PHA must notify residents that the RAD conversion has been approved. The notice must include the anticipated timing of the conversion, the anticipated duration of rehab or new construction, the revised term of the lease and house rules, and whether relocation is anticipated.

More meetings with residents are required to discuss any substantial changes in a conversion plan.

See the RAD entry in Chapter 4 of this guide for more details.

RAD is a Significant Amendment

RAD conversion is a significant amendment to the PHA Plan. However, HUD does not require a significant amendment process to begin until late in the conversion process, which could be as late as five months after HUD has issued a preliminary approval for RAD conversion of a specific development, by which time the PHA has secured all necessary private financing. Consequently, RAB involvement and the PHA-wide notice, broad public outreach, and public hearing required by the significant amendment regulations will not take place until the conversion application process is too far along. Rather than engage all PHA residents before an application for RAD conversion is submitted, the public engagement process is only required to take place close to the time when a PHA has all of its financing and construction plans approved and is ready to proceed.

Resident Organizations Continue to Receive \$25 Per Unit

Whether a property is converted to PBV or PBRA, each year the PHA must provide \$25 per occupied unit at the property for tenant participation; of this amount, at least \$15 per unit must be provided to the legitimate resident organization for resident education, organizing around tenancy issues, or training. The PHA may use the remaining \$10 per unit for resident participation activities; however, some PHAs distribute the entire \$25 per unit to the resident organization.

Residents' Right to Organize

Residents have the right to establish and operate a resident organization. If a property is converted to PBRA, then the current multifamily program's resident participation provisions apply; these are the Section 245 provisions (see Privately Owned, HUD-Assisted Multifamily Housing (Project-Based Section 8 Rental Assistance below). If a property is converted to PBV, instead of using Public Housing's Section 964 provisions (see Part 964 Resident Participation Regulations above), RAD requires resident participation provisions similar to those of Section 245. For example, PHAs must recognize legitimate resident organizations and allow resident organizers to help residents establish and operate resident organizations. Resident organizers must be allowed to distribute leaflets and post information on bulletin boards, contact residents, help residents participate in the organization's activities, hold regular meetings, and respond to a PHA's request to increase rent, reduce utility allowances, or make major capital additions.

Properties converted to PBRA are no longer required to meet PHA Plan requirements. In addition, PBRA residents can no longer be on the RAB, be a PHA commissioner, or be on a jurisdiction-wide resident council, unless the PHA voluntarily agrees.

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHERS (SECTION 8)

Administering agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing

Year started: 1998 RABs

Population targeted: Residents with Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers

See also: *Housing Choice Vouchers* and *Public Housing Agency Plan*

Approximately 2 million households receive tenant-based assistance through the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Housing Choice Voucher households, often referred to as Section 8 voucher households, are among the most difficult residents to organize because they can choose a private place to rent anywhere in the PHA's market and are thus less likely to live close to or have contact with each other. However, the PHA Plan process, and the requirement that voucher households be included on the RAB, offers platforms for organizing voucher households so that they can amplify their influence in the decision making affecting their homes.

Participating in PHA Plan Processes

At the local level, voucher households can play a key role in shaping PHA policies by participating in the annual and five-year PHA Plan processes. PHAs make many policy decisions affecting voucher households, such as setting minimum rents, developing admissions criteria, determining the amount of time a voucher household may search for a unit, giving preferences for people living in the PHA's jurisdiction, as well as creating priorities for allocating newly available vouchers to categories of applicants (for example, homeless individuals, families fleeing domestic violence, working families, or those with limited English-speaking capability).

Participation on Resident Advisory Boards

Voucher households can play an integral role in setting the agenda for local PHAs because the RAB regulations require reasonable

representation of voucher households on the RAB if voucher households comprise at least 20% all households assisted by a PHA.

PRIVATELY OWNED, HUD-ASSISTED MULTIFAMILY HOUSING (PROJECT-BASED SECTION 8 RENTAL ASSISTANCE)

Administering agency: HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs

Year started: 1978, with significant regulatory changes in 2000

Population targeted: Residents of private multifamily HUD-assisted rental developments

See also: *Project-Based Rental Assistance*

Tenants' rights to organize is based on law at 12 USC 1715z-1b and spelled out in regulations at 24 CFR Part 245, Subpart B, which require owners of privately owned, HUD-assisted multifamily housing to recognize tenant organizations. A legitimate tenant organization is one established by tenants that represents all tenants, operates democratically, meets regularly, and is completely independent of owners and management. The regulations recognize the rights of tenants to distribute leaflets, canvass, post notices, and convene meetings without management present and without prior notice or permission from management. Residents can invite outside organizers to assist them. HUD-funded organizers have the right to go into a building without a tenant invitation to help residents organize.

Unlike the Section 964 regulations on Public Housing, the Section 245 regulations do not require a specific structure, written bylaws, or even elections for a tenant association to be "legitimate," as long as the "organic" tests are met: the group meets regularly, operates democratically, represents all tenants, and is completely independent of owners. This allows "early stage" tenant organizing committees to demand recognition as legitimate tenant groups and to claim their right to organize in the face of common resistance or hostility from private owners and managers.

The civil money penalties regulation from 2001 (24 CFR Part 30) allows HUD to assess fines on owners or management agents for major violations of tenants' right to organize. On June 18, 2010, HUD sent a letter to all owners and management agents highlighting key features of Part 245, emphasizing the right of tenants to organize and repeating the list of protected tenant organizing activities. Policy Notice H 2011-29 of October 13, 2011, and Notice H 2012-21 of October 17, 2012, repeated and elaborated on the content of the June 2010 letter, adding civil money penalties that HUD could impose on an owner or manager failing to comply with Part 245. Notice H 2014-12, issued on September 4, 2014, revised Notice H 2011-29 and Notice H 2012-21 by adding a tenant appeals process when a decision by the local HUD office concludes that an owner did not violate the tenant participation regulations or other program obligations.

Notice H 2016-05, issued on March 31, 2016, updated the previous notice regarding filing complaints, added to the list of property types that may be assessed a civil money penalty, and clarified that that civil money penalties may be assessed on Project-based Section 8 developments, not just buildings with HUD mortgages. Notice H 2016-05 also elaborated on the responsibility of owners to give priority to meeting spaces that provide physical access to people with disabilities. In addition, when residents have complaints, the notice allowed tenants to reject "mediation" with owners as an option for resolving complaints because many tenants found mediation unproductive; instead tenants may seek a ruling by HUD regarding owner infractions.

Other HUD guidance includes HUD's Model Lease, which is applicable to all HUD tenants, and explicitly refers to the regulations' provisions about the right to organize. HUD's Management Agent Handbook 4381.5 Revision 2 requires owners to recognize tenant unions and specifies management practices that would violate tenants' rights and therefore potentially result in HUD-imposed sanctions.

Resident Rights and Responsibilities is a resident-oriented HUD brochure explaining that tenants have the right to organize free from management harassment or retaliation. This brochure must be made available in appropriate languages and distributed annually to all HUD tenants at lease signing or recertification.

In addition, over the years, Congress and HUD have expanded the formal process for tenant participation in decisions affecting HUD-assisted housing. For example, HUD must notify tenants about a pending auction or sale of their building if it is owned by HUD or is under HUD foreclosure so that tenants can either submit a purchase offer as a nonprofit or limited-equity cooperative or support purchase by others. In addition, when owners choose to go into HUD's Mark-to-Market program, HUD is required to notify tenants prior to a first and second tenant meeting so that tenants can comment on the owner's plans to rehabilitate the building and change the financing.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak to their members of Congress and ask them to:

- Fund the public housing ROSS program at \$50 million in FY20.
- Monitor HUD's oversight of PHA and owner compliance with residents' rights when public housing is converted under RAD.
- Reverse HUD's administrative weakening of the PHA Plan and Congress' streamlining of the Plan's requirements for 75% of the nation's PHAs.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Alliance of HUD Tenants, 617-522-4523, www.saveourhomes.org.

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, www.nhlp.org.

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

24 CFR Part 964, *Tenant Participation and Tenant Organizing in Public Housing Regulations*, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2018-title24-vol4/pdf/CFR-2018-title24-vol4-part964.pdf>.

24 CFR Part 903, *Public Housing Agency Plans Regulations*, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2018-title24-vol4/pdf/CFR-2018-title24-vol4-part903.pdf>.

24 CFR Part 245, *Tenant Participation in Multifamily Housing Projects*, <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2018-title24-vol2/pdf/CFR-2018-title24-vol2-part245.pdf>.

HUD Resident Rights and Responsibilities brochure: English, https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/DOC_12162.pdf.

Other languages, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp/17lep (scroll down to Multifamily section)

Notice PIH 2013-21, *Guidance on the use of Tenant Participation Funds*, <https://bit.ly/2qMmrAj>.

Notice H 2014-12, *Implementation of Tenant Participation Requirements in Accordance with 24 CFR Part 245*, <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=14-12hsgn.pdf>.

Notice H 2016-05, *Revision of Tenant Participation Requirements in accordance with 24 CFR Part 245*, <https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=16-05hsgn.pdf>.

Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) Implementation Notice –REV4, <https://bit.ly/2shSyrT>.

RAD Fair Housing, Civil Rights, and Relocation Notice 2016-17, https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/16-17hsgn_16-17pihn.pdf.

Our Homes, Our Votes

A GUIDE TO VOTER ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES FOR NONPROFIT HOUSING PROVIDERS AND RESIDENT ORGANIZATIONS

By Joey Lindstrom, Director for Field Organizing, NLIHC

Our Homes, Our Votes is NLIHC's effort to expand voter engagement work conducted by community organizations dedicated to expanding affordable housing. This guide is designed to help you through the steps of planning your agency's voter engagement work. The materials presented here offer resources for organizations seeking to engage traditionally underrepresented people in the civic process. Be sure to visit www.ourhomes-ourvotes.org for the most updated materials and announcements.

The *Our Homes, Our Votes* Plan provides all of the steps necessary to implement a campaign to integrate registration, education, mobilization, and voter protection without overtaxing staff or resources, while staying within legal guidelines for nonprofits. Our plan presents a menu of activities for your group to consider. Your organization may or may not be able to undertake all the suggested activities, so plan according to available resources. If this is your first voter engagement project, remember to think long-term. It is usually best to start small and build your project over several election cycles.

Please let us know if you are conducting a voter engagement effort so that we can provide assistance, connect you with helpful resources, and/or spotlight your election-related work on our blog or in other NLIHC publications such as *Tenant Talk*. Call NLIHC's Field Team at 202-662-1530, or email us at outreach@nlihc.org.

WHY ENGAGE IN ELECTION WORK?

Raising housing on the national agenda will happen only when candidates for elected office understand that the issue of affordable housing is important to voters. At the same time, it is vital that low-income voters understand how

the decisions made by federal elected officials directly affect their lives, know how to register to vote, and know how to get to the polls on Election Day.



Census data confirm that low-income voters are registered and vote at lower rates than higher income citizens. While 85% of people with incomes over \$100,000 were registered to vote in 2016 and 74% voted, just 60% of people with incomes below \$20,000 were registered, and only 38% actually voted (U.S. Census Bureau. *Voting and Registration in the Election of November 2016*, May 2017).

Low-income people face several challenges to voting, such as less-flexible work schedules that may not allow time off to vote, more difficulty obtaining legal identification, transportation impediments that may make getting to the polls more difficult, and a greater likelihood of having been given misinformation about their rights as voters. People experiencing homelessness, ex-offenders, and survivors of a natural disaster may face especially tough barriers to voting.

Nonprofit organizations, which benefit from close ties with their clients, are a natural fit in helping people overcome these challenges. Nonprofits that have implemented voter engagement projects have identified several benefits of doing so:

- Residents engage in civic life and learn how decisions of elected officials affect their lives.
- The issue of homelessness and housing scarcity is elevated in public debate.
- Elected officials become educated on low-income housing issues and on how their decisions affect residents.

- Influential relationships are built with elected officials.
- Residents develop leadership skills.
- Residents are assisted in meeting community service requirements, if applicable.
- Positive press is earned for the program or project.

LEGALLY SPEAKING

Nonprofit organizations can, and should, engage in nonpartisan election-related activity, including voter registration, education, and mobilization. The basic rule is that 501(c)(3) organizations cannot in any way support or oppose candidates or political parties. For detailed legal guidance, you may want to consult:

Nonprofit VOTE, www.nonprofitvote.org

Specifically, read their comprehensive legal guide on what nonprofits can and cannot do: *Nonprofits, Voting, and Elections*.

Bolder Advocacy, www.bolderadvocacy.org.

Through their Bolder Advocacy campaign, Alliance for Justice (AFJ) works to ensure that nonprofit groups are up to date on rules governing campaign involvement. Review their materials and sign up for upcoming webinars at www.bolderadvocacy.org.

League of Women Voters, www.vote411.org.

The League offers Vote411.org, an online resource providing nonpartisan information to the public, with both general and state-specific information on all aspects of the election process. An important component of Vote411.org is the polling place locator, which enables users to type in their address and retrieve the polling location for the voting precinct in which that address is located.

HUD, www.hud.gov.

Public housing agencies are often under the impression that they are not able to register residents to vote. That is not the case; in fact, HUD issued a Notice (FR-3968-N-01) in 1996 that encouraged housing agencies, Indian housing

authorities, and resident management companies to become involved in voter registration activities.

Organizations with specific legal questions related to their voter engagement projects after consulting the above resources are encouraged to contact an attorney who specializes in election law. It is important to remember that 501(c)(3) organizations cannot consult with campaign staff or political parties, even on simple technical questions.

REGISTERING VOTERS: BEFORE YOU START

Before your organization begins to register voters, you will want to prepare in several ways:

Set Goals

Setting goals for both registration and mobilization can be an important part of your plan. The staff and volunteers involved in the project will have something to work toward and you will have a way to evaluate your project after the election. The *Our Homes, Our Votes* Plan provides a framework for setting these goals.

Get to Know Your Local Board of Elections

Your local Board of Elections or County Clerk's office can be a wealth of information as you plan to register low-income renters to vote. You will want to check with them to learn the registration deadline for the general election in your state. Ask whether anyone can register voters in your state or whether a person must first become deputized or meet other requirements. Request the voter rolls for your community so you will know who in your target audience is already registered. Learn about identification requirements for registration and voting. Request enough voter registration forms to meet your registration goals. In many places, the role of the Board of Elections will be conducted out of the office of the County or City Clerk. Please contact NLIHC if you need help determining who is the best local authority for your organization.

Offer Registration Trainings

Residents and staff who plan to register voters will often benefit from receiving training on the process. You may want to bring in someone from the local Board of Elections who can explain the state's registration requirements and how voter registration forms must be filled out. It can also help to spend a bit of time role-playing so that people who are registering voters are not discouraged when confronted with apathy. It is also helpful to compile voter registration updates for renters who have recently moved.

Consider Resources

Whether simple or more involved, all voter engagement projects will involve some investment of resources. Once you know what you would like to accomplish, you should consider potential funding sources for your project and how you might work with other organizations to maximize resources.

Other organizations may have resources that your organization can access. Student groups may be interested in registering voters as part of a community service project or a civic group may already be providing rides to the polls and could include your clients in its plans. Remember to partner only with nonpartisan organizations.

REGISTERING VOTERS

Once you know the voting guidelines for your state and have set registration goals for your agency, you are ready to begin registering voters. As described in the sample plan, there are four ways to approach voter registration.

Fit Voter Registration into Your Agency's Regular Contact with Residents

The first option is to incorporate registration into day-to-day activities that already take place at your agency. Registration can usually be incorporated with few resources and little hassle into the intake process, training sessions, resident association meetings, and any other meetings of clients.

Plan Specific Voter Registration Activities

A second way to think about registration at your agency is to plan special registration activities or campaigns. Many organizations have had success holding social or other events at which residents are encouraged to register to vote. Consider hosting an event for National Voter Registration Day on September 22, 2020.

Organize a Door-To-Door Campaign

The third and most effective way for larger organizations to systematically register clients is through a door-to-door campaign. If your agency is a housing provider or a resident council, such a campaign can be especially effective. In particular, resident leaders can volunteer to receive training and serve as 'building captains' or 'floor captains.' Captains can take on responsibility for registering, keeping registration records, and then turning out all of the people in their building or on their floor, etc. Such a system can be a great way to get residents or clients involved while ensuring that staff does not become overwhelmed with additional responsibilities. The key is to have personal and organized contact with potential voters by people they know or trust. Especially in this type of campaign, you will want to use the voter list from your county to see who in your buildings is already registered or whose registration needs updating. Voter lists may cost a small fee, but they are essential for tracking who is already registered.

Go into the Community

Finally, especially if you have a smaller membership or client base, you may also want to think about having your volunteers reach out into the community to register other low-income, homeless, or underrepresented people. Consider staffing voter registration and information tables at community events. Also, make sure to promote your voter registration efforts through your website and other social media platforms. Do not forget to make sure that everyone on the staff and board is also registered!

KEEPING RECORDS

It is crucial to have a plan for how you will keep a record of who you have registered to vote, as well as who is already registered, so that you will be able to contact these people as part of your mobilization activities. You will be able to compile a list of residents who are already registered from the voter rolls you acquire from your local Board of Elections.

Collect Information

For new registrants, there are two ways to collect this information. One easy way, if allowed by the laws in your state, is to collect voter registration forms from new registrants, then photocopy the forms before mailing them in (note that some states require forms to be returned within a specific number of days after they have been completed). This also allows you to review and catch mistakes before a form is submitted. You may also ask registrants to fill out two-part pledge cards. They will keep the half of the card that reminds them of their pledge to vote and you will keep the half with their contact information.

Enter the Information into a Database

Once you have collected voters' information, it is important to enter it into a database so the data can be easily accessed for mobilization purposes.

EDUCATING VOTERS AND ELECTED OFFICIALS

There can be as many as three components to the education piece of your plan.

Educate Low-Income Renters on Voting and Their Rights as Voters

Clients should be informed of where their polling place is, what documentation they will need to have with them in order to vote, and their rights if election officials attempt to prevent them from voting. Arranging for local election officials to demonstrate how voting machines work can be helpful in easing fears about voting for the first time.

The National Coalition for the Homeless' "You Don't Need A Home to Vote" Voting Rights

Campaign seeks to protect and promote the right of homeless people to vote. It offers materials on all aspects of a voter engagement campaign, including specific, state-by-state information on the legal issues affecting the rights of people experiencing homelessness to vote. Find the campaign at www.nationalhomeless.org/campaigns/voting.

Many states have new requirements for showing identification during the registration process or at the voting booth. The League of Women Voters has updated information about the rules in each state at www.Vote411.org.

Educate Your Network and Clients on the Issues

Nonprofits can best assist low-income voters in becoming familiar with campaign issues by providing opportunities for people to hear directly from the candidates. Distribution of candidate questionnaires, hosting debate watch parties, or holding candidate forums are examples of such opportunities. It can often be very powerful when candidates are asked about housing issues or homelessness in public forums or town hall meetings. Please contact NLIHC if you would like help putting together a candidate questionnaire that includes federal policy. This is an activity in which you must be especially vigilant about ensuring that your agency follows IRS requirements. Please refer to the guide *Nonprofits, Voting, and Elections* before you send questionnaires to your candidates or invite candidates to speak to clients.

Educate Candidates

Asking candidates to fill out a questionnaire or inviting them to your agency can be a way to learn more about them while making them aware of your organization and the issues that are important to renters. You may also want to report the number of new voters your organization has been able to register. Candidates also learn what issues are important to voters by reading the letters to the editor page of the newspaper. Consider having clients write letters about issues that are important to them; letters can often be published as a response to a story in which candidates have discussed poverty issues.

MOBILIZING VOTERS

Your voter mobilization, or Get Out the Vote (GOTV) plan, can be the most important and rewarding piece of your project. Just registering voters is not enough; it has been consistently shown that voters are much more likely to go to the polls if they are contacted on several occasions and reminded to vote by someone they trust. Further, once someone has voted, he or she is more likely to vote in future elections. Considerable attention should be paid to mobilizing the people you have registered.

Aim for at Least Three Contacts with Each Registered Voter

If possible, contact each potential voter three times between the day she registers and Election Day: a few weeks before the election, a few days before the election, and at least once on Election Day. On Election Day, you may want to contact voters until they have affirmed that they have voted. For example, if someone tells you at noon that she has not yet had a chance to vote, call back at 4 pm to see whether she has been able to get to her local polling location. Make sure to coordinate rides for voters so that they can get to the polls; offering a ride is not offering an illegal incentive to vote. Use your database of registered voters to make contacts.

You should make sure that the voter commits to voting, knows when Election Day is, and knows where her polling place is. Ideally, contacts should be made in person through a knock at the door, but phone calls, emails, and postcards can also work. Not everyone will be home when your canvassers visit, so you may want to create a pre-printed note that can be left on people's doors on Election Day.

Recruit volunteers, whether staff, residents, or community members, to assist in making GOTV contacts. If you have had building or floor captains who have been in regular contact with their voters, they should conduct these mobilization activities to the greatest extent possible.

Again, it is personal contact from someone residents know or trust that will make an impact. Research shows that nonprofit agencies can have an impact on voter turnout in their communities by incorporating engagement efforts such as active tabling and voter pledge cards, which have shown to increase the turnout of low propensity voters by 29%. See *Engaging New Voters: The Impact of Nonprofit Voter Outreach on Client and Community Turnout* for further reading.

Consider Early Vote and Absentee Ballots

Early voting, if available in your state, and absentee voting can facilitate voting by the people your agency serves. Again, your local Board of Elections can provide information on laws in your state. For early voting, consider holding ballot parties where voters gather to go and vote as a group, perhaps after a discussion of affordable housing issues. Where it is allowed, you might also want to send volunteers to gather early voting ballots and submit them to your local clerk's office.

Work the Polls

In addition to recruiting volunteers for your Election Day GOTV efforts, you may also want to encourage other residents to sign up with the county as poll workers. This provides an additional, and often paid, way for low-income renters to participate in the election process.

Host a Polling Location

Some nonprofits or housing providers have increased their turnout rates by asking the county to use their organization's location as a polling place. It is much easier to vote when you only need to go to the lobby! This arrangement also offers community members an opportunity to visit your agency.

Protecting the Right to Vote

Nonprofits can play an important role in making sure that people's rights are protected when they get to the polls. You may want to designate leaders in your voter engagement effort to be poll watchers who spend their day at the polls to record and report instances of voter harassment or unlawful suppression. Poll watchers can help

identify potential issues in your community and can also be on call on Election Day if anyone experiences problems voting.

Capitalizing on Your Project

Once Election Day is over, take a few days to rest. You deserve it! Then, it's time to do a few things: celebrate your accomplishments and honor your volunteers. Evaluate your project and your results and plan what you will do differently next year.

Next, set up appointments for elected officials to meet with the renters or clients you serve to discuss housing issues important to your organization and be prepared with statistics showing the increased voting rates in your community. Now that renters and staff have been energized by being involved in the election process, talk to them about who might be interested in running for local office themselves.

Most importantly, consider your voter engagement project to be an ongoing effort; continue to make registration, education, and mobilization a part of your agency's day-to-day activities.

Our Homes, Our Votes Engagement Plan

Completing a voter engagement plan for your agency will help you assess how best to incorporate voter registration, education, and mobilization into your agency's work. This template presents a menu of activities that your organization may want to consider.

Please let NLIHC know that you are participating! Contact NLIHC's Field Team at 202-662-1530 or outreach@nlihc.org with a description of your project.



WHY PARTICIPATE IN ELECTIONS?

Below are some goals driving organizations' efforts with voter engagement projects. Check those that apply to your organization and add any others.

- Engage residents in civic participation and help them become familiar with how the decisions of elected officials affect their lives.
- Elevate the issue of homelessness and housing scarcity in public debate.
- Educate elected officials on low-income housing issues and on how their decisions affect residents.
- Build influential relationships with elected officials. Help develop residents' leadership skills.
- Assist residents in meeting community service requirements, if applicable. Earn positive press for your program or project.
- Other: _____

LEGALLY SPEAKING

501(c)(3) organizations can, and should, engage in nonpartisan election-related activity, including voter registration, education, and mobilization. 501(c)(3)s cannot in any way support or oppose particular candidates. For detailed information on these issues:

- Contact the Office of the Secretary of State or Board of Elections in your state to learn your state's rules for voter registration drives.
- Look at the *Permissible Activities Checklist* put together by Nonprofit VOTE at: www.nonprofitvote.org/documents/2017/04/nonpartisan-election-activities-501c3-nonprofits.pdf.
- Visit the League of Women Voters at www.vote411.org for the latest information on voting in your state.
- Read and review *Nonprofits, Voting, and Elections* produced by Nonprofit VOTE at: <https://www.nonprofitvote.org/documents/2010/11/nonprofits-voting-and-elections.pdf>.

REGISTERING VOTERS

Setting Goals for Registering Voters

- A. What percentage of your clients will you register? What number? _____
- B. Will your agency also register other low-income members of the community, beyond those served by your programs? _____
- C. How many weeks do you have until the deadline to register voters? _____
- D. How many people must you register on average per week to meet your goal? _____

Assigning Responsibilities

- A. What staff person will ultimately be responsible for meeting registration goals? _____

- B. What resident leaders will have responsibility for meeting registration goals? _____

Preparing to Register Voters

Your local Board of Elections or County Clerk's office can be a valuable source of information as you plan to register clients to vote. You will want to check with them to:

- Learn the registration deadline for the general election in your state.
- Ask whether anyone can register voters in your state or whether a person must first become deputized or meet other requirements.
- Request the voter rolls for your locality. There may be a small charge for this, but it's important; you will use this list to determine which of your residents and clients are already registered and which need to change their official voting address.
- Request enough voter registration forms to meet your registration goals.
- Determine whether there are special requirements before registering voters.
- Determine who will obtain the county voter list and pick up the voter registration forms.

REGISTRATION CHECKLIST

For each section, check the ways in which your agency will register voters. In the space after the activity, list the staff or resident(s) who will carry out the activity and the timeframe for carrying it out.

Fitting Voter Registration into Your Agency's Regular Contact with Residents

- Add voter registration to the client intake process. Ask people directly to register and assist them with completing the form; don't just provide the form.
- Register clients when they come in to receive your services.
- Train all staff and volunteers who work directly with clients to be able to answer questions and assist with registration forms.
- Add a voter registration component to all job training, computer skills, financial literacy, or other classes offered by your agency.

- Other: _____
- Staff or volunteer responsible for organizing these activities: _____

Planning Specific Voter Registration Activities

- Hold a social or other event at which voter registration is an activity.
- Host an event for National Voter Registration Day (September 22, 2020), <http://nationalvoterregistrationday.org/>.
- Other: _____
- Staff or volunteer responsible for organizing these activities: _____

Organizing a Door-To-Door Campaign

- ___ Train residents, staff, and other volunteers who are already registered to go door-to-door to register low-income renters. Use the county voter list to determine who needs to be registered and whose registration needs to be updated.
- ___ Appoint residents as building captains, floor captains, etc. Ensure they are trained on the rules in your state and make them responsible for registration and turnout where they live.
- ___ For locked buildings where you have not recruited a resident captain, approach landlords to ask if they will allow door-to-door registration or a registration table in the lobby.
- ___ Consider offering public recognition to those who register the most new voters or the highest percentage of their area.
- Staff or volunteer responsible for organizing these activities: _____

Reaching Out to the Community

- Have your registrars reach out into the community to register other low-income, homeless, or underrepresented people.
- Provide a voter registration and information table at neighborhood events.
- Make sure everyone on the staff and board is registered.
- Staff or volunteer responsible for organizing these activities: _____

KEEPING RECORDS

Keeping records of the people you register to vote helps both with determining whether you have met your registration goals and with planning Get Out the Vote activities. There is a sample database for recordkeeping at the end of this section.

Where allowable by law, one easy way to gather the information for your list is to collect voter registration forms from new registrants, then photocopy the forms or portions of forms before mailing them in. You can also have new registrants fill out a two-part pledge card. They will keep the half of the card that reminds them of their pledge to vote and you will keep the half with their contact information.

Who will be responsible for keeping records of who becomes registered to vote? _____

EDUCATING CLIENTS AND ELECTED OFFICIALS

- A. Which staff person will ultimately be responsible for meeting education goals?
- B. Which resident leaders will have responsibility for meeting education goals?

Education Checklist

For each section, check the ways in which your agency will educate voters and candidates.

Educating Renters on Voting and Their Rights as Voters

- Educate clients and low-income renters on identification requirements for voter registration and voting in your state, especially if these rules have recently changed.
- Obtain sample ballots from your Board of Elections or County Clerk's office and distribute to residents.
- Arrange for someone from your Board of Elections or County Clerk's office to come to your agency to provide a demonstration of your county's voting machines and explain people's rights as voters.
- Host a discussion on the importance of voting and what can be gained by increasing the percentage of voters who are low-income renters and allies.
- Encourage residents to sign up with the Board of Elections as poll workers.

Educating Voters on the Issues

- Obtain materials on current federal affordable housing issues from NLIHC at <http://nlihc.org/explore-issues>.
- Host a discussion to clarify who your community's elected officials are and the connection between what those officials do and your clients' lives.
- Arrange for clients to attend or watch a candidate debate or public forum.
- Ask all candidates to complete a candidate questionnaire and distribute their answers. Publish the answers on your website, if possible. For information on putting together a questionnaire or hosting a forum, see the *Voter Engagement Resources Library* from the Nonprofit Vote website.
- Other: _____

Educating Candidates

- Include information on your agency when sending candidates your questionnaire.
- Encourage clients to write letters to the editor explaining why affordable housing is an important issue as they consider how they will vote.
- Prepare low-income voters to ask questions at candidate forums or town hall events.
- Arrange for each candidate for office to take a tour of your agency and speak with clients.
- Other: _____

PROTECTING THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Some low-income people, including people experiencing homelessness and ex-offenders, are at a greater risk of being turned away from the polls on Election Day or otherwise being disenfranchised. Many national organizations participate in the non-partisan Election Protection coalition which staffs a voting rights hotline at 866-OUR-VOTE. In addition to the hotline, you can find more information about voting requirements and potential voter suppression issues in your state by visiting www.866ourvote.org/state.

You may also want to contact a local attorney who is experienced in voter protection. He or she can help identify potential local issues and can also be available on Election Day in case anyone experiences problems voting.

Who will be responsible for ensuring that the rights of the people you work with are protected on Election Day?

MOBILIZING VOTERS

Setting Goals for Getting Out the Vote (GOTV)

- A. What is the total number of people your agency plans to register to vote?
- B. How many additional renters are already registered (from the voter list you obtained from your county's Board of Elections)?
- C. What is your total number of potential voters (A+B)?
- D. What percentage of these people would you like to see vote on Election Day?
- E. What is the total number of people you would like to see vote on Election Day?

Reminding People to Vote

- A. Which staff person will ultimately be responsible for meeting mobilization goals?
- B. Which resident leaders will have responsibility for meeting mobilization goals?

PLANNING FOR ABSENTEE BALLOTS AND EARLY VOTING

Absentee ballots can be requested by residents in all states who are unable to get to the polls on Election Day. In some states, there is no reason required for absentee voting and all voters have the option to vote by absentee ballot or to vote before Election Day. Providing your clients with absentee ballot request forms or helping them to take advantage of early voting, if available, is a great way to increase voter turnout.

Voting by absentee ballots generally involves two steps. First, clients fill out forms requesting their ballots. Once they receive their ballots, clients fill them out and return them.

Check with your county's Board of Elections on each of the following questions:

- A. What is the deadline in your state for requesting absentee ballots?
- B. When must ballots be returned to the county?
- C. Does your state allow for no-excuse absentee ballots (residents may vote absentee even if they are able to go to the polls on Election Day)?
- D. Does your state allow for early voting?
- E. Who will be responsible for coordinating absentee ballots and early voting?

MOBILIZATION CHECKLIST

For each section, check the ways in which your agency will mobilize voters and candidates.

The Months and Weeks Before Election Day

- If time allows, request an updated list of registered voters from your Board of Elections to ensure that the voters you registered are included.
- Investigate the possibility of adding a polling place at your agency.
- Download and print GOTV materials, including posters, from www.ourhomes-ourvotes.org.
- Host voting-related events on the first Tuesday of the month to get residents accustomed to participating in civic engagement activities on that day.
- Make first contact with each voter in your database. Call them, thank them for registering, and remind them to vote.
- Plan for Election Day:

Recruit residents or other volunteers who will spend Election Day going door-to-door to get out the vote. Prepare captains to turn out all registered people on their floor or in their building, etc.

Once the deadline for registering new voters has passed, obtain an updated voter registration list from your county. Check against your database and prepare a final list of voters to be mobilized.

One to Two Weeks Before Election Day

- Make second contact with voters in your database. Call them, remind them to vote on Election Day, and provide them with their polling place. Ask whether voters will need a ride to the polls.

- Continue to plan for Election Day:
 - Hold a training session for Election Day volunteers.
 - Print lists of all of your registered clients from your database whose doors will be knocked on when Election Day comes. Print in groups of 20-30 people based on geography and the number of Election Day volunteers.
 - Arrange to provide rides to the polls for those who need them.
 - Plan to provide lunch for your Election Day volunteers.
 - Plan a party for after the polls close
- Other: _____

The Day Before Election Day

- Make your third contact with each voter in your database. Call and ask them to commit to vote the following day. Remind them of the location of their polling place and the times that polls will be open.
- Other: _____

Election Day

- Have volunteers with lists of registered residents knock on the doors of everyone on their list, crossing off the names of those who have voted. If a voter is not home, leave a pre-printed note on the door. Call or knock again until everyone has voted, or until the polls are closed.
- Provide rides to the polls for residents who need them.
- Celebrate! Host a party for voters and volunteers. Watch the election results.
- Other: _____

Post-Election Day

- Thank voters and volunteers and share your success stories.
- Evaluate your program and plan your next project. Continue with registration and education activities.
- Meet with newly elected officials and discuss your priority issues.
- Consider if there are staff or residents who should be encouraged to run for office.
- Other: _____

CONSIDERING RESOURCES

Once you have gone through all of the items in this template you will have a better sense of what resources will be required to implement your voter engagement project. Whether simple or more involved, all voter engagement projects will involve some level of resources. Now that you know what you would like to accomplish, you should identify what funding sources you can access and how you might work with other organizations to leverage resources.

How much funding do you anticipate needing? This funding should cover things like voter databases, supplies, transportation, training, events, etc. _____

What sources of funding can you access? _____

Other organizations may have resources that your organization can access such as meeting space, access to volunteers, or machines for printing materials. Student groups may be interested in registering voters as part of a community service project. A civic group may already be providing rides to the polls and could include your targeted voters in their plans. Remember to partner only with non-partisan, nonprofit organizations. _____

What groups in your area might you partner with, and in what ways? _____

APPENDIX: SAMPLE RECORD KEEPING DATABASE

Just registering voters will not ensure an increase in voter turnout. To have a successful mobilization operation, you must contact your newly registered voters in the weeks and days leading up to the election. To do this effectively, you will need to have a record of who is registered to vote.

The easiest way to keep records is in a database format. There are numerous voter data tools available, and some are quite expensive. In many states, there might be a Civic Engagement Roundtable or other such organization that is providing nonprofits with access to voter lists. This will be for more advanced operations that intend to register and mobilize voters over several election cycles.

Your voter database does not have to be complex or have a lot of fields. Many people find Microsoft Excel and Microsoft Access to be the easiest platforms to use. Your database should include the following fields:

First Name	Last Name	Street Number	Street Name	City	State	Zip Code	Phone	Email	Polling Place
------------	-----------	---------------	-------------	------	-------	----------	-------	-------	---------------

Note that street number and street name are kept as two separate fields. If you plan to knock doors on Election Day, the ability to sort by street will be useful for organizing a door-to-door Election Day outreach drive.

There are a number of ways to compile this data. One way is to enter the data straight from the voter registration card once the new registrant fills it out. Another way is to have the new registrant fill out both sides of a pledge card. They give you one side and keep the other side. Once you have this information recorded you are well on your way towards a successful Get Out the Vote operation.

Best Practices and Lessons Learned: Building Multi-Sector Coalitions to Influence Housing Policy

By Mike Koprowski, Campaign Director
and Chantelle Wilkinson, Housing
Campaign Coordinator

Research clearly demonstrates that housing is inextricably linked to an array of outcomes in other sectors. The consequences of our current housing affordability crisis are spilling over into many other areas of life including education, health, civil rights, economic mobility, food security, criminal justice, and more. These sectors are increasingly recognizing that affordable homes are inextricably linked to their own priorities and concerns. It makes sense, then, that these sectors are growing more ready to join in on advocacy efforts to expand affordable housing for the most vulnerable people. The work to expand affordable housing solutions cannot be done by housing advocates alone. In the face of an unprecedented housing affordability crisis, along with the undeniable, cross-cutting realities of the research, powerful new constituencies are now possible in ways that they have not been before.

ABOUT THE OPPORTUNITY STARTS AT HOME CAMPAIGN

The *Opportunity Starts at Home* campaign launched in March 2018 with the goal of broadening the affordable housing movement into other sectors. The campaign's Steering Committee represents a wide range of leading national organizations that are working shoulder-to-shoulder to advance federal policies that expand affordable housing for the lowest-income renters: NLIHC, National Alliance to End Homelessness, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Children's HealthWatch, Catholic Charities USA, Children's Defense Fund, Community Catalyst, Food Research & Action Center, NAACP, JustLeadershipUSA, National Alliance on Mental Illness, National Association of Community Health Centers, National



**OPPORTUNITY
STARTS AT HOME**

Association of Social Workers, National Education Association, National League of Cities, National LGBTQ Task Force, National Women's Law Center, and UnidosUS. Together, these multi-sector partners are working to advance federal housing policies that: 1) expand rental assistance; 2) expand the supply of deeply affordable housing; and 3) provide emergency assistance to people experiencing unforeseen economic shocks to avert housing instability and homelessness.

The campaign deploys policy analysis, communications, and advocacy to impact opinion leaders, policymakers, and the public. It has full-time dedicated staff at the national level and is leveraging the capacity of participating organizations. Moreover, the national campaign is providing technical assistance to ten state-based organizations to help the organizations build multi-sector coalitions and to support their advocacy efforts to impact federal policy. The ten state-based organizations are: Housing California, Idaho Asset Building Network, Maine Together, Oregon Housing Alliance, Utah Housing Coalition, Coalition on Homelessness and Housing in Ohio, Housing and Community Development Network of New Jersey, Housing Network of Rhode Island, Prosperity Indiana, and Housing Action Illinois.

WHY BUILD MULTI-SECTOR COALITIONS TO ADVANCE HOUSING POLICY?

Enrich Your Content

Multi-sector partners enrich content by adding diversity in expertise. For example, when the campaign began creating a "Fact Sheet" that demonstrated how housing is

connected to health, it relied heavily on the knowledge of its health-sector partners to assist with framing, messaging, and research. The healthcare organizations were aware of powerful research unknown to campaign staff and helped incorporate language and messages that they knew would resonate with healthcare professionals. This type of collaboration is simply not possible if multi-sector voices are not at the table. The same process happened in the development of other fact sheets such as education/housing, civil rights/housing, food security/housing, and more. Having “unusual suspects” in a campaign will also help mainstream communications so that non-housing experts and novices can understand the message.

Pique the Interest of Policymakers

The use of non-housing voices advocating for housing policies will pique the interest of policymakers in ways that traditional housing groups cannot do alone. For example: the national campaign’s Steering Committee sent a letter to Congress advocating for \$50 million for a Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration, designed to help voucher households gain access to high-opportunity neighborhoods. Out of the 18 organizations on the Steering Committee, 16 are not primarily housing organizations. The endorsement of this policy by Children’s HealthWatch sends a clear signal to policymakers that it has implications for child health. Similarly, endorsement by the NAACP highlights implications for racial equity, endorsement by the National Education Association highlights implications for student achievement, and endorsement by the Food Research & Action Center highlights implications for food security. Not only does this grab the attention of policymakers, it also provides housers with new inroads to policymakers. Housing advocates often lament that certain elected officials “just don’t care about housing.” Chances are, though, that policymakers have prioritized an issue in their agenda to which housing is deeply connected. If a policymaker is, for example, primarily concerned with education, then housers can deploy their education partners to help make the case for why

better housing policies will improve educational outcomes. When housers are working alongside educators, doctors, anti-hunger advocates, civil rights attorneys, anti-poverty experts, and faith-based leaders, it enables housers to approach policymakers in new ways.

HOW TO BRING NON-HOUSING PARTNERS TO THE TABLE

Be Armed with Facts and Research

Mountains of research demonstrate how housing is connected to other sectors, but it is often surprising how little of that research is known to other sectors. For example, education professionals may not be aware of the research showing that low-income children in affordable housing score better on cognitive development tests than those in unaffordable housing, or the research showing that local inclusionary zoning policies have been proven to dramatically improve the performance of low-income students and narrow the achievement gap between them and their more affluent peers. Fact sheets will help make the case: provide the hard numbers, the infographics, and the landmark studies showing that success in their own field of work depends on whether people have access to safe, decent, affordable housing. The national campaign’s [Fact Sheets](#) are a great resource.

Stress Mutual Interdependencies

Once the facts are established, stress to prospective non-housing partners that you both need each other to be successful and that their goals are advanced with better housing policies. It is also important to emphasize that you are more likely to be successful if they add their sector’s voice to the mix. The goal is to convince prospective non-housing partners that affordable housing is not simply a “nice to have,” but rather a “need to have.”

Do Your Homework on Their Language

Before you even approach potential non-housing partners, study their work in advance, including their websites, goals, videos, reports, and published works. Learn the language with which they speak and then use their own language when

explaining the importance of housing. The reality is that each sector has its own unique language and chances are high that you will talk past each other if you use language comfortable among housers.

Be Patient and Have Flexible “Entry Points”

Multi-sector work is the long game. Most non-housing organizations are unlikely to pivot overnight to housing issues. It takes persistence. Some organizations have been thinking about the intersections of housing for a while and might be primed to align with housing advocacy efforts quickly, but many will be unsure exactly how they want to approach cross-sector work. Therefore, it is important to have flexible “entry points” through which organizations can participate in advocacy efforts. At the national level, we have created the Roundtable which is different from the Steering Committee. The Roundtable is a lighter time commitment, meeting just three times per year. Participating in the Roundtable does not indicate endorsement of the campaign’s policy goals, but rather a general commitment to ongoing dialogue and engagement. If the commitment you are asking for is too big and too fast, then you run the risk of potential multi-sector partners balking. Many want the space and freedom to learn about the campaign, stay updated on its progress, and occasionally engage in advocacy where it makes sense for them. Even though the Roundtable is a lighter commitment, these types of structures enable advocates to get their foot in the door. Subsequently you can start to build meaningful relationships and formalize regular communication channels, which eventually could blossom into something more robust. It is also important to regularly ask multi-sector partners for feedback about your work; after all, people are more likely to support what they help build.

THE CHALLENGES OF BUILDING MULTI-SECTOR COALITIONS

Building multi-sector coalitions is hard work and time consuming. There are certainly inherent challenges, but they can be navigated successfully.

Bandwidth of Multi-Sector Partners

Organizations that do not specialize in housing will have a myriad of other priority issues and limited bandwidth to expand their focus. They may want to participate and be supportive of your housing work but will have limited capacity to advance your priorities while focusing on their own issues. To overcome this, you must be prepared to shoulder the workload: provide them with the tools and resources in “bite size” pieces, write the first drafts of every call to action, sign-on letter, and fact sheet, and email simple instructions when the time is right to act.

Lack of a Common Language

As mentioned earlier, each sector has its own unique language. For example: housers tend to talk about AMI (Area Median Income), anti-hunger advocates tend to talk about the federal poverty level, and educators often talk about free/reduced priced lunch. Language barriers can be mitigated through consistent dialogue and by deeply researching other sectors to learn how they speak.

Sectors Are Not Monolithic

When building your multi-sector table, it is never as simple as having one seat for education, one seat for health, one seat for hunger, and so on. Just like there are different “camps” within the housing sector, there are also different “camps” in other sectors. For example, in the education sector, there are organizations that are pro-charter schools and anti-charter schools, and they each tap into different types of advocacy within their respective sector. Sectors are diverse within themselves, and these realities must be considered and discussed from the outset.

Lack of Relationships Across Siloes

The staff of housing organizations might not have deep relationships with staff in other sectors. Those in the same sector tend to flock together, which certainly poses a challenge when building cross-sector tables. You may be able to identify a specific organization from another sector that you would like to engage with, but there is often the practical reality of “who do you email first?” This can be time consuming and requires being intentional about building relationships across sectors.

Balancing the Weeds of Housing Policy

When building multi-sector coalitions, you will be bringing in organizations that do not have expertise in housing policy. Non-housing organizations will not know the nuances of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), or Housing Choice Vouchers (they might not even know the acronyms). Yet the whole point of bringing them to the table is to eventually advocate for specific types of housing policy. This poses an inherent challenge: on the one hand, you must make sure that you do not lose them by getting too in the weeds about specific housing

policies. Yet, as a houser, you know well that whether a particular housing policy is effective depends on the details. The devil is indeed in the details, but your partners from other sectors will not necessarily be equipped to discuss those details with you. You may have some multi-sector partners that are ready and willing to dive deep into the weeds of housing policy, but chances are that many will have neither the bandwidth nor interest in becoming housing policy wonks. An effective multi-sector coalition does not seek to make everyone an expert on housing policy, but rather seeks to leverage the respective expertise already in the room. Your multi-sector partners will eventually get to the point where they defer to you as the housing expert and trust your judgment on which housing policies will be most effective. Also, it can be helpful to identify a smaller working group that is reflective of your broader coalition but specializes in day-to-day policy advocacy work, such as identifying prospective legislative champions and coordinating meetings with policymakers.

Working with the Media

By Renee Willis, Vice President for Field and Communications and Lisa Marlow, Manager of Media Relations and Communications, NLIHC

Media relations is the process of working with the media with the goal of informing the public of an organization’s mission, policies, and practices in a positive, consistent, and credible manner. Honing and building strong relationships with the media are important to any organization’s ability to advocate effectively. To successfully share key messages and campaigns, strategize and consider the communication tactics that will be the most useful in ensuring that the right audience is reached, and meaningful allies are secured. Good communication strategies will lead to deeper audience engagement and an increase in media interest.

CAMPAIGN COMMUNICATION TOOLS

Working on a campaign can be labor-intensive. Advocates may work for months, even years, to develop and implement a campaign. A campaign may involve researching, branding/messaging, sharing, and then measuring success. The success of a campaign could be measured by media hits, social media engagement, and/or member/network participation. Think through the tools needed for a higher likelihood of success before deciding which to use to help share your campaign. Tease the campaign for people outside of your network, including the media.

Media Toolkits

Develop a media toolkit and share it with your partners and stakeholders. A media toolkit compiles top-line information about your campaign into one document and can be used as a quick and handy guide for consistent messaging. Partners can quickly refer to the toolkit for source information. Share your toolkit ahead of the launch of your campaign

and provide guidance for its use. A toolkit may include:

- **National & State Talking Points** – Identify between ten and 15 points of interest that can be referenced in a press release and/or in an interview.
- **Frequently Asked Questions** – Review news stories and social media for what people are talking about related to your campaign. Include popular questions and their answers to assist with messaging control.
- **Social Media Suggestions** – Research shows that reporters and stakeholders use social media as a resource for news. Social media is an important communications tool because it is designed to quickly disseminate information and reach wide audiences. Reporters often use Twitter to identify possible news stories, and stakeholders often use LinkedIn to share company updates. Include five or six sample posts for Twitter and Facebook as these are the most popular platforms for reaching audiences relevant to affordable housing issues. Include a hashtag in your samples so that you and others can track discussions about your issue.
- **Images, Graphs, Factsheets, and Infographics** – Posts with images trend at a higher impression and engagement rate than posts without images. Include approximately three images related to your campaign that may involve a “Coming Soon”, “Now Available”, or pithy tagline from your campaign. Also, if any graphs or charts are a part of your campaign, include them in the toolkit with a suggestion to circulate on social media as a teaser. Use factsheets and infographics to help promote snapshots of your message.
- **Testimonies** – Gather quotes from key leaders and influencers about your campaign. Testimonials from outside your organization or network are preferred. Suggest including

a testimonial in a press release or reference one in an interview with the media. This helps to legitimize your campaign as being relevant beyond your network.

- **Press Release Template** – Include a press release sample/template that includes quotes from key state and organization leaders. Quotes from partnering national organizations could be included as well. Reporters tend to copy and paste press releases, so including quotes will help the reporter write the story and highlight your message. Include no more than three quotes in the press release from three different sources.

Interactions with the Media

Interactions with the media often start with a cold call or email to a specific outlet to pitch (sharing relevant key points of your campaign to garner media interest) a story. The first interaction is often quick. Regardless of the type of interaction, reporters usually devote about 30 seconds to listen to or read a pitch. Therefore, your initial pitch must be pithy, precise, and honest.

Pitches are sometimes made on Twitter to generate an organic buzz around a topic. Pitching on Twitter is an effective strategy to increase earned media. This strategy circumvents cold calls or relying on one outlet to show interest in covering your campaign. Pitching on Twitter gets your message out using a platform that you control.

When pitching a story:

- Pitch the right news hook: think about current events and how they relate to the campaign. Ask the questions:
 - Why is this story important right now?
 - What makes the story or the angle unique?
 - Why should anyone care?
 - Is this story the first of its kind?
 - Is the event or development the largest or most comprehensive of its kind?

- Pitch the right person: use tools like [Meltwater](#), [Muck Rack](#), or [Google Alerts](#) to track and identify the right reporter for the right beat.
- Include a Press Release: circulate a press release to all media contacts using tools like email, Meltwater, or a wire service about one week before the campaign starts but pitch the press release to key reporters prior to the wide release. Connect with a few key reporters that you've fostered relationships with or reporters who have recently covered your campaign topic. Share an embargoed copy of a report or highlight new data/research discussed in your campaign. On the date the press release is widely distributed, circulate it on Twitter and tag a few additional key reporters who are active on Twitter.

General Tips for Speaking with the Press

It is important to foster relationships with appropriate media outlets to increase the opportunity for leading the narrative. This may require tracking coverage of your issue on social media and through media hits. Stay aware of a reporter's beat and track reporters who may be new to the affordable housing beat. Shift your communication accordingly and respect a reporter's preferred method of communication. If you are interested in fostering a relationship with a reporter, share relevant new research with that reporter ahead of a wide release.

Media relationships are reciprocal and should generate benefits for both parties. Before initiating any relationship, it will be important to determine your overall goal in reaching out to press and to identify your key messages around ending homelessness and increasing housing affordability. Gather background on your key press contacts to determine if they are the right press contacts for your campaign. Determine if they are currently on the housing beat and if they work for traditional newspapers, online media, television, or radio. If you encounter difficulty generating national press, utilize your local press to generate interest on a national level.

Once you've successfully managed to schedule a phone or in-person interview with a member of the media, be prepared with talking points, citations, and testimonials. Other tips for an interview are:

- Review your main points before the interview: decide on two to three key messages to convey.
- Remember that everything is on the record.
- Steer reporters toward the big picture: this is a systemic problem.
- Learn to pivot.
- Connect local issues to national problems.
 - Share affordable housing challenges specific to your community,
 - Share examples of what life is like for extremely low-income renters in your state, or
 - Use data to emphasize the importance of state or local housing initiatives and funding.
- Make your points brief and simple and avoid jargon.
- It's ok to say, "I don't know."
- Always end the interview by repeating your key messages or the one key takeaway.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The OpEd Project:

<https://www.theopedproject.org/>.

HubSpot *20 PR Tools for Monitoring & Managing Media Relations in 2019*: <https://bit.ly/2EiUOzr>.

Extraordinary PR on Ordinary Budget:

<https://bit.ly/2qauZf3>.

Nonprofit Tech for Good:

<https://nptechforgood.com/>.

Chapter 3: NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND

The National Housing Trust Fund

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Affordable Housing Programs within the Office of Community Planning and Development.

History: The fund was enacted by the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008" on July 30, 2008 and was implemented in May, 2016.

Population Targeted: The target population for the fund is extremely low-income renters.

Funding: In FY19, funding was set at \$248 million. FY20 levels will not be known until May 2020.

See also: The *National Housing Trust Fund: Funding, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Housing Finance Reform* sections of this guide.

The national Housing Trust Fund (HTF) was established as a provision of the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008," which was signed into law by President George W. Bush. The primary purpose of the HTF is to close the gap between the number of extremely low-income renter households and the number of homes renting at prices they can afford. NLIHC interprets the statute as requiring at least 90% of the funds to be used to build, rehabilitate, preserve, or operate rental housing (HUD guidance sets the minimum at 80%). In addition, at least 75% of the funds used for rental housing must benefit extremely low-income households. One hundred percent of all HTF dollars must be used for households with very low income or less.

In the years since enactment of the HTF, the shortage of rental housing that the lowest-income people can afford has only gotten worse. The foreclosure crisis, the recession, and persistent low wages have made millions more at risk of homelessness, including families with children, seniors, people with disabilities, and veterans. The HTF offers the means to prevent and end homelessness if funded at the level advocated by NLIHC.

HISTORY AND ADMINISTRATION

The HTF was created on July 30, 2008 when the president signed into law the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008" (HERA), Public Law 110-289, 12 U.S.C 4588. The statute specified an initial dedicated source of revenue to come from an assessment of 4.2 basis points (0.042%) on the new business of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (this is unrelated to profits). The HTF was to receive 65% of the assessment, and the Capital Magnet Fund (CMF) was to receive 35%. However, due to the financial crisis in September of 2008, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were placed into a conservatorship overseen by the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), which placed a temporary suspension on any assessments for the HTF and CMF.

On December 11, 2014, the FHFA director lifted the temporary suspension of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac set-asides for the HTF and CMF, directing Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to begin setting aside the required 4.2 basis points on January 1, 2015. Sixty days after the close of calendar year 2015, the amounts set aside were to be transferred to HUD for the HTF and to the Department of the Treasury for the CMF.

On April 4, 2016, HUD announced that there was nearly \$174 million for the HTF in calendar year 2016. On May 5, 2016, HUD published a notice in the *Federal Register* indicating how much HTF money each state and the District of Columbia would receive in 2016. The amounts available in subsequent years were \$219 million (2017), \$267 million (2018), and \$248 million (2019).

HUD published proposed regulations to implement the HTF on October 29, 2010. NLIHC and others provided extensive comments on how the regulations could be improved. On January 30, 2015, an HTF Interim Rule was published in the *Federal Register*. HUD explains that after states have gained experience implementing the HTF, HUD will open the interim rule for public comment and possibly amend the rule. According

to HUD's fall 2019 Regulatory Agenda, a notice in the *Federal Register* seeking input is anticipated in June 2020, with a final rule anticipated in January 2021.

The HTF is administered by HUD's Office of Affordable Housing Programs within the Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD). The interim HTF regulations are at 24 CFR part 93. Where the HTF statute did not require specific provisions, HUD modeled the HTF interim rule on the Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) regulations.

NLIHC has an interim report summarizing how states have awarded their 2016 HTF allocations, called *Getting Started*, available at https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF_Getting-Started_2018.pdf. NLIHC will have a similar report regarding 2017 HTF awards in early 2020.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The HTF is principally for the production, rehabilitation, preservation, and operation of rental housing for extremely low-income households (ELI), those with income less than 30% of the area median income (AMI) or with income less than the federal poverty line. It is funded with dedicated sources of revenue on the mandatory side of the federal budget and thus does not compete with existing HUD programs funded by appropriations on the discretionary side of the federal budget.

The HTF is a block grant to states. The funds are to be distributed by formula to states based on four factors that only consider renter household needs. Seventy-five percent of the value of the formula goes to the two factors that reflect the needs of ELI renters because the HTF statute requires the formula to give priority to ELI renters. The other two factors concern the renter needs of very low-income (VLI) households, which are households with income between 31% and 50% of AMI. A state entity administers each state's HTF program and awards HTF to entities to create new affordable housing opportunities. The state designated entity might be the state housing finance agency, a state department of housing or community development, or a

tribally designated housing entity. HUD's list of designated entities is available at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/htf/grantees> (although the staff on that list is not kept up-to-date). NLIHC attempts to keep the key staff of state designated entities up-to-date at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/allocations>.

KEY PROGRAM DETAILS

Funding

As a result of the decision by FHFA to lift the suspension on Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's obligations to fund the HTF and the CMF, the first funds for the HTF became available for distribution to the states in summer 2016. The amount of funding was determined by the volume of the business conducted by Fannie and Freddie in calendar year 2015, which yielded nearly \$174 million of the HTF for 2016. Based on their total business for 2017, 4.2 basis points provided \$219 million for the HTF in 2017, \$267 million in 2018, and \$248 million in 2018. The amount for 2020 will probably be announced around May 2020.

Targeted to Rental Housing

The overview section of the interim rule declares that the HTF program will provide grants to states to increase and preserve the supply of housing with primary attention to rental housing for ELI and VLI households. VLI is generally defined as income between 31% and 50% AMI; the HTF statute adds that for rural areas VLI may also be income less than the federal poverty line. The statute limits the amount of HTF used for homeownership activities to 10%, inferring that at least 90% of a state's annual HTF allocation must be used for rental housing activities. However, the preamble to the interim rule interprets the law differently, asserting that only 80% must be used for rental activities.

Income Targeting

The HTF statute requires that at least 75% of each grant to a state be used for rental housing that benefits ELI households and that no more than 25% may be used to benefit VLI renter

households. For homeowner activities, the statute requires that all assisted homeowners have income less than 50% of AMI. When there is less than \$1 billion for the HTF, the rule requires that 100% of a state's allocation benefit ELI households.

HTF Distribution Formula

To distribute HTF dollars, the statute established a formula based on the number of ELI and VLI households with severe cost burden (households paying more than half of their income for rent and utilities), as well as the shortage of rental properties affordable and available to ELI and VLI households, with priority for ELI households. Small states and the District of Columbia are to receive a minimum of \$3 million. On December 4, 2009, HUD issued a proposed rule, endorsed by NLIHC, describing the factors to be used in the formula.

Responding to the statute's requirement that the formula give priority to ELI households, HUD's interim rule formula assigns 75% of the formula's weight to the two ELI factors. The interim rule adds a provision for instances in which there are not sufficient funds in the HTF to allocate at least \$3 million to each state and the District of Columbia; in such a case, HUD will propose an alternative distribution and publish it for comment in the *Federal Register*.

NLIHC has estimated how much each state would receive based on \$250 million and \$500 million, available at <http://bit.ly/2ilbOyw>. NLIHC has also estimated state allocations when the HTF reaches \$5 billion, available at <http://bit.ly/1m9orp0>.

State Distribution of HTF Money

States are to designate an entity, such as a housing finance agency, housing and community development entity, tribally designated housing entity, or any other instrumentality of the state to receive HTF dollars and administer an HTF program. Each state must distribute its HTF dollars throughout the state according to the state's assessment of priority housing needs as identified in its approved Consolidated Plan (ConPlan). HUD's list of designated entities is available at <https://www.hudexchange.info/>

[programs/htf/grantees](https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/htf/grantees) and more up-to-date staff of these entities is available from NLIHC at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/allocations>. See also the *Consolidated Planning Process* section in Chapter 7 of this guide.

Allocation Plans

The HTF statute requires each state to prepare an Allocation Plan every year showing how it will distribute the funds based on priority housing needs. The interim rule amends the ConPlan regulations by adding HTF-specific Allocation Plan requirements to the ConPlan's Annual Action Plan rule.

The interim regulation gives states the option of passing funds to local governments or other state agencies as subgrantees to administer a portion or all of the state's HTF program and to in turn provide funds to recipients to carry out projects. If a local subgrantee is to administer HTF dollars, then it too must have a local ConPlan containing a local HTF Allocation Plan that is consistent with the state's HTF requirements. Due to the limited amount of funds in the HTF so far, only Alaska and Hawaii opted to use subgrantees.

A recipient is an agency or organization (nonprofit or for-profit) that receives HTF dollars from a state grantee or local subgrantee to carry out an HTF-assisted project as an owner or developer. To be eligible, a recipient must meet four requirements:

- Have the capacity to: own, construct or rehabilitate, and manage and operate an affordable multifamily rental development; or construct or rehabilitate homeownership housing; or provide down payment, closing cost, or interest rate buy-down assistance for homeowners.
- Have the financial capacity and ability to undertake and manage the project.
- Demonstrate familiarity with requirements of federal, state, or local housing programs that will be used in conjunction with HTF money.
- Assure the state that it will comply with all program requirements.

A state's or subgrantee's Allocation Plan must describe the application requirements for recipients, and the criteria that will be used to select applications for funding. The statute requires Allocation Plans to give priority in awarding HTF money to applications based on six factors listed in the statute, including:

- The extent to which rents are affordable, especially for ELI households.
- The length of time rents will remain affordable.
- The project's merit. The interim rule gives as examples housing that serves people with special needs, housing accessible to transit or employment centers, and housing that includes green building and sustainable development elements.

Public Participation

The statute requires public participation in the development of the HTF Allocation Plan. However, the interim rule does not explicitly declare that in order to receive HTF money, states and subgrantees must develop their Allocation Plans using the ConPlan public participation rules. The interim rule merely requires states to submit an HTF Allocation Plan following the ConPlan rule, which does have public participation requirements.

Period of Affordability

The statute does not prescribe how long HTF-assisted units must remain affordable. The interim regulation requires rental units to be affordable for at least 30 years, allowing states and any subgrantees to have longer affordability periods. The 30-year affordability period reflects HUD's prediction that the HTF will be used in conjunction with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs). The HTF campaign had recommended a 50-year affordability period. Twenty-one states addressed longer affordability plans in their draft 2016 HTF Allocation Plans. Of these, three states and the District of Columbia required longer affordability periods (California, 55 years; Maine, 45 years; and the District of Columbia and Maryland, 40 years). The other

states either awarded competitive points or gave priority to projects with longer affordability periods.

Maximum Rent

NLIHC recommended that the regulations adopt the Brooke rule so that ELI households would not pay more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities. However, the interim rule sets a fixed maximum rent, including utilities, at 30% of 30% AMI, or 30% of the federal poverty level, whichever is greater. Consequently, households earning substantially less than 30% of AMI will almost certainly pay more than 30% of their income for rent, unless additional subsidies are available. HUD acknowledged in the preamble to the proposed rule that some tenants will be rent burdened, but that a fixed rent is necessary for financial underwriting purposes.

NLIHC urges advocates to convince their states to have their Allocation Plans require HTF-assisted units have maximum rent set at "the lesser of" 30% of 30% AMI or 30% of the poverty line. This is because in 92% of the counties in the nation in 2016, 30% of the poverty line is greater than 30% of 30% AMI. If 30% of the poverty line is used in these counties, HTF-assisted households will end up cost burdened, paying more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities. Households with income around 20% of AMI (approximately the income of households with Supplemental Security Income) would almost always be severely cost burdened, paying more than 50% of their income. Advocates can find the 2016 values for their states and counties at <http://bit.ly/2bnPRYZ>.

Although NLIHC does not support cost-burdening of HTF-assisted households, underwriting developments with variable Brooke rents (households paying 30% of their actual income) can be very difficult. One possible approach to avoid or minimize factors causing HTF-assisted households to be cost-burdened is to give priority to HTF projects that have a mix of units with fixed rents set at 30% of 30% AMI, 30% of 20% AMI, 30% of 15% AMI, and 30% of 10% AMI.

A volunteer Developer Advisory Group prepared two papers addressing *Funding Strategies for Developing and Operating ELI Housing* and *HTF Operating Assistance Options and Considerations*.

Tenant Protections and Selection

According to the HTF statute, activities must comply with laws relating to tenant protections and tenants' rights to participate in the decision making regarding their homes. The interim rule does not address tenants' rights to participate in decision making. However, the interim rule provides a number of tenant protections, including:

- Owners of HTF-assisted projects may not reject applicants who have vouchers or are using HOME tenant-based rental assistance.
- There must be a lease, generally for one year.
- Owners may only terminate tenancy or refuse to renew a lease for good cause.
- Owners must have and follow certain tenant selection policies. Tenants must be selected from a written waiting list, in chronological order, if practical.
- Eligibility may be limited to or preference may be given to people with disabilities if:
 - The housing also receives funding from federal programs that limit eligibility, or
 - The disability significantly interferes with the disabled person's ability to obtain and keep housing, the disabled person could not obtain or remain in the housing without appropriate supportive services, and the services cannot be provided in non-segregated settings.

The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities has been trying to convince HUD that these preference provisions might cause states to misinterpret the rule to mean that they can only do single-site permanent supportive housing, not integrated supportive housing.

Homeowner Provisions

As provided by the statute, up to 10% of HTF money may be used to produce, rehabilitate, or preserve homeowner housing. HTF money may

also be used to provide assistance with down payments, closing costs, or interest rate buy-downs. As required by the statute, homes must be bought by first-time homebuyers with incomes less than 50% of AMI who have had HUD-certified counseling, and the home must be their principal residence. The affordability period is generally 30 years (see exception below). To date, no state has used HTF for homeowner activities.

Although not in the statute, the interim rule requires the assisted housing to meet the HOME program definition of single-family housing, which includes one- to four-unit residences, condominiums and cooperatives, manufactured homes and lots, or manufactured home lots only. Following the statute and echoing the HOME regulations, the value of an assisted home must not exceed 95% of the median purchase price for the area.

As required by the statute, the interim rule's homeowner resale provisions echo the HOME regulations. If a homeowner unit is sold during the affordability period, the state or subgrantee must ensure that the housing will remain affordable to a reasonable range (as defined by the state or subgrantee) of income-eligible homebuyers. The sale price must provide the original owner a fair return, defined as the owner's original investment plus capital improvements. The interim rule added a recapture alternative for states and subgrantees to use instead of a resale provision. The purpose of a recapture option is to ensure that a state or subgrantee can recoup some or all of its HTF investment. It modifies the affordability period based on the amount of the HTF assistance: 30 years if more than \$50,000, 20 years if between \$30,000 and \$50,000, and 10 years if less than \$30,000.

Lease-Purchase

Mirroring the HOME regulations, the interim rule allows HTF money to help a homebuyer through a lease-purchase arrangement, as long as the home is purchased within 36 months. Also, HTF dollars may be used to buy an existing home with the intent to resell to a homebuyer through lease-

purchase; if the unit is not sold within 42 months, HTF rent affordability provisions apply.

General Eligible Activities

The interim regulation echoes the statute by providing a basic list of eligible activities such as the production, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable rental homes and homes for first-time homebuyers through new construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or acquisition. No more than 10% of a state's annual allocation may be used for homeownership. HTF-assisted units may be in a project that also contains non-HTF-assisted units. Assistance may be in the form of equity investments, loans (including no-interest loans and deferred payment loans), grants, etc. The interim rule limits HTF assistance to permanent housing (use of HTF for transitional housing or emergency shelter is not allowed).

Manufactured Housing

The interim rule allows HTF money to be used to buy or rehabilitate manufactured homes or to purchase the land on which a manufactured home sits. The home must, at the time of project completion, be on land that is owned by the homeowner or on land for which the homeowner has a lease for a period that is greater than or equal to the affordability period.

Timeframe for Demolition or for Acquisition of Vacant Land

Use of HTF money for demolition or for acquiring vacant land is limited to projects for which construction of affordable housing can reasonably be expected to start within one year.

Eligible Project Costs

Eligible project costs include property acquisition, relocation payments, development hard costs such as construction, soft costs associated with financing and development, and refinancing existing debt on rental property if HTF is also used for rehabilitation. Operating costs are also eligible project costs.

Development Hard Costs

Development hard costs are the actual costs of construction or rehabilitation, including

demolition, laundry and community facilities, utility connections, and site improvements, which include onsite roads, sewers, and water connections.

Related Soft Costs

Mirroring the HOME regulations, other soft costs associated with financing and/or development include: architectural and engineering services, origination fees and credit reports, builder's or developer's fees, audits, affirmative marketing and fair housing information to prospective occupants, initial operating deficit reserves to meet any shortfall in project income during the first 18 months of project rent-up, staff and overhead of the state or subgrantee directly related to carrying out the project (such as work specs, inspections, loan processing), impact fees, and costs to meet environmental and historic preservation requirements.

Loan Repayments

HTF may be used to pay principal and interest on construction loans, bridge financing, a guaranteed loan, and others.

Operating Costs and Operating Cost Assistance Reserve

According to the statute, HTF dollars may be used to meet operating costs at HTF-assisted rental housing. The interim rule allows HTF resources to be used to provide operating cost assistance and to establish an operating cost assistance reserve for rental housing acquired, rehabilitated, preserved, or newly constructed with HTF money. The interim rule strictly defines operating costs as insurance, utilities, real property taxes, maintenance, and scheduled payments to a reserve for replacement of major systems (for example, roof, heating and cooling, and elevators). The purpose of an operating cost assistance reserve is to cover inadequate rent income to ensure a project's long-term financial feasibility.

The interim rule caps at one-third of the amount of a state's annual grant that may be used for operating cost assistance and for contributing to an operating cost assistance reserve.

The preamble to the rule explains that HUD established the cap because it views the HTF as primarily a production program meant to add units to the supply of affordable housing for ELI and VLI households. HUD assumes that the HTF will be used in combination with other sources to produce and preserve units, mostly in mixed-income projects.

The preamble indicates that states have discretion in how to allocate operating cost assistance. For example, states may decide to limit each development to the one-third cap, or to raise the cap for developments that need more operating cost assistance while lowering the cap for those that do not need as much, as long as no more than one-third of a state's annual grant is used for operating cost assistance and reserves.

States and subgrantees may provide operating cost assistance to a project for a multiyear period from the same fiscal year HTF grant as long as the funds are spent within five years. An operating cost assistance agreement between a state or subgrantee and a property owner may be renewed throughout the affordability period.

For non-appropriated sources, such as the proceeds from the 4.2 basis point assessments on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac as called for in the HTF statute, the interim rule provides that an operating cost assistance reserve may be funded upfront for HTF-assisted units for the amount estimated to ensure a project's financial feasibility for the entire affordability period. If this amount would exceed the one-third operating cost assistance cap, it could be funded in phases from future non-appropriated HTF grants. This provision can be very helpful for developers of rental homes at rents that ELI households can afford.

HUD anticipates providing guidance about operating cost assistance and reserves sometime in the future. In the meantime, some general thoughts about using the HTF for operating cost assistance were prepared by NLIHC's volunteer Developer Advisory Group, *HTF Operating Assistance Options and Considerations*.

Several states wanted to use HTF for operating assistance in 2016 but found that the interim rule's limited definition of operating costs rendered the option financially infeasible. These states noted that the interim rule's definition did not include components typically considered to be part of operating cost by the development industry, such as property management and personnel costs associated with maintenance. When brought to HUD's attention, HUD indicated a willingness to consider waivers in the future, as well as to modify the rule in its final stage.

Administration and Planning Costs

The statute limits the amount of HTF dollars that may be used for general administration and planning to 10% of each state's annual grant. The interim regulation adds that 10% of any program income (for example, proceeds from the repayment of HTF loans) may also be used for administration and planning. The interim rule also provides that subgrantees may use HTF for administration and planning, but subgrantee use counts toward the state's 10% cap.

General Management, Oversight, and Coordination Costs

HTF may be used for a state's or subgrantee's costs of overall HTF program management, coordination, and monitoring. Examples include staff salaries and related costs necessary to ensure compliance with the regulations and to prepare reports to HUD. Other eligible costs include equipment, office rental, and third-party services such as accounting.

Project-Specific Administration Costs

The staff and overhead expenses of a state or subgrantee directly related to carrying out development projects may also be eligible administration and planning costs. Examples include loan processing, work specs, inspections, housing counseling, and relocation services. As with HOME, staff and overhead costs directly related to carrying out projects (as distinct from the HTF program in general) may instead be charged as project-related soft costs or relocation costs and therefore not subject to the 10% cap.

However, housing counseling must be counted as an administration cost as per the statute.

Other Administration and Planning Costs

- Costs of providing information to residents and community organizations participating in the planning, implementation, or assessment of HTF projects.
- Costs of activities to affirmatively further fair housing.
- Costs of preparing the ConPlan, including hearings and publication costs.
- Costs of complying with other federal requirements regarding non-discrimination, affirmative marketing, lead-based paint, displacement and relocation, conflict of interest, and fund accountability.

Public Housing

In general, the interim regulation prohibits the use of HTF to rehabilitate or construct new public housing. HTF-assisted housing is also ineligible to receive public housing operating assistance during the period of affordability. The interim rule does allow a project to contain both HTF-assisted units and public housing units.

The interim rule allows HTF use for two categories of public housing:

- HTF resources may be used to rehabilitate existing public housing units that are converted under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) to project-based rental assistance. Currently, up to 455,000 public housing units may be converted under RAD.
- HTF resources may be used to rehabilitate or build new public housing as part of the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) and to rehabilitate or build new public housing units that will receive LIHTC assistance. Public housing units constructed with HTF must replace public housing units removed as part of a CNI grant or as part of a mixed-finance development under Section 35 of the “Housing Act of 1937.” The number of replacement units cannot be more than the number of units removed. Public housing

units constructed or rehabilitated with HTF must receive Public Housing Operating Fund assistance and may receive Public Housing Capital Fund assistance.

NLIHC is extremely concerned about these provisions regarding public housing because using HTF to rehabilitate or build new public housing units to replace demolished units will not increase housing opportunities for ELI households, and would result in an overall loss of resources for housing if Congress chooses to reduce appropriated resources for public housing due to the availability of HTF resources.

Ineligible Activities

Although not in the statute, the interim rule prohibits the use of HTF money for a project previously assisted with HTF during the period of affordability, except for the first year after completion. Fees for administering the HTF program are not eligible uses (e.g., servicing or origination fees). However, annual fees may be charged to owners of HTF-assisted rental projects to cover a state’s or subgrantee’s cost of monitoring compliance with income and rent restrictions during the affordability period. The statute expressly prohibits use of HTF dollars for “political activities, lobbying, counseling, traveling, or endorsements of a particular candidate or party.”

HTF Must be Committed Within Two Years

As required by the statute, the interim regulation requires HTF dollars to be committed within 24 months, or HUD will reduce or recapture uncommitted HTF dollars. “Committed” is defined in the interim rule as the state or subgrantee having a legally binding agreement with a recipient owner or developer for a specific local project that can reasonably be expected to begin rehabilitation or construction within 12 months. If HTF is used to acquire standard housing for rent or for homeownership, commitment means the property title will be transferred to a recipient or family within six months. The interim rule adds that HTF money must be spent within five years. [Notice CPD 18-12](#) provides guidance to grantees about the

commitment and expenditure requirements and explains how HUD determines compliance.

Public Accountability

The statute requires each state to submit an annual report to HUD describing activities assisted that year with HTF dollars and demonstrating that the state complied with its annual Allocation Plan. This report must be available to the public. The interim rule requires jurisdictions receiving HTF dollars to submit a performance report according to the ConPlan regulations. The HTF performance report must describe a jurisdiction's HTF program accomplishments and the extent to which the jurisdiction complied with its approved HTF Allocation Plan and all the requirements of the HTF rule.

The interim regulation presents a number of data collection obligations, including actions taken to comply with Section 3 hiring and contracting goals, and the extent to which each racial and ethnic group, as well as single heads of households, have applied for, participated in, or benefitted from the HTF. Although it is still too soon to determine the level of detail that is to be reported, the CPD Integrated Disbursement and Information System's *IDIS Online Reports User Guide*, from August, 2019, suggests that HUD will be collecting a useful amount of detailed information. How accessible this information will be to the public is unknown. NLIHC will be tracking this as more HTF projects are completed and reported on in the future.

In general, records must be kept for five years after project completion. Records regarding individual tenant income verifications, project rents, and project inspections must be kept for the most recent five-year period until five years after the affordability period ends. Similar language applies to homeowner activities. Regarding displacement, records must be kept for five years after all people displaced have received final compensation payments. The public must have access to the records, subject to state and local privacy laws.

INFLUENCING HOW THE NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND IS USED IN YOUR STATE

Advocates are urged to be actively engaged in HTF implementation at the state level, and perhaps also at the local level.

The HTF Allocation Plan

The law requires states to prepare an Allocation Plan every year showing how the state will allot the HTF dollars it will receive in the upcoming year. Action around the HTF Allocation Plan begins at the state level, and could then flow to the local level if a state decides to allocate some or all of the HTF to local subgrantees. The state HTF Allocation Plan is woven into a state's ConPlan, and if there is a local subgrantee, then a local government's HTF Allocation Plan will be woven into a locality's ConPlan.

- For advocates only accustomed to ConPlan advocacy at the local level because they have focused on attempting to influence how their local government allocates local Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) and HOME, the state HTF process will be an important new experience.
- To better ensure that HTF dollars get to a locality in the appropriate amounts and for the appropriate uses, it will be necessary for advocates to learn how to influence their state Allocation Plan and ConPlan.
- Observing most 2017 HTF Allocation Plans, NLIHC found states inserting "HTF-Specific" sections or an HTF-specific appendix to their ConPlan Annual Action Plans that provide a stand-alone HTF presentation. However, these are at the very back of long documents, so advocates will need to do a key word search.
- The statute requires states to give consideration to six priority factors. NLIHC asserts that genuine affordability, length of affordability, and merit features of a proposed project warrant greater relative weight or priority than the other three statutory priority factors. Too many states give disproportionate weight to the statutory factor regarding

the ability of an applicant to obligate HTF funds and carry out projects in a timely manner. NLIHC thinks this factor should be a threshold factor that ought to be a first-cut consideration before weighing affordability, merit, and length of affordability. If an applicant lacks the capacity to obligate funds and carry out a project in timely fashion, it should not make the initial cut. See NLIHC's Model Allocation Plan for ideas, <http://bit.ly/1WqjTOJ>.

Advocates should learn which agency in their state administers the HTF program and get to know the person responsible. Indicate interest in being informed about and participating in the process for planning where and how HTF money will be used. Although HUD's list of state-designated HTF agencies is available at <http://bit.ly/1ONwHwN>, NLIHC has in many cases identified the person at the state level actually doing the day-to-day work and lists that person on the NLIHC HTF webpage at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/allocations>.

Keep in mind that the amount of HTF your state will receive is based on ELI and VLI households spending more than half of their income on rent and utilities (severely cost-burdened), and on the shortage of rental homes that are affordable and available to ELI and VLI households with 75% of the formula's weight assigned to ELI factors. See NLIHC's Gap Analysis for information about each state at <http://nlihc.org/research/gap-report>.

Each year it will be important for advocates to work first at the state level, and then perhaps at the local level to:

- Ensure that the agency responsible for drafting the HTF Allocation Plan writes it to meet the genuine, high-priority housing needs of extremely low-income people.
 - Advocate for HTF-assisted projects that are truly affordable to extremely low-income people, such that they do not pay more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities. The statute offers advocates a handle because it requires funding priority

to be based on the extent to which rents are affordable for ELI households.

- Advocate for HTF-assisted projects that will be affordable to extremely low-income households for as long as possible, aiming for at least 50 years. The statute offers advocates a handle because it requires funding priority to be based on the extent of the duration for which rents will remain affordable.
- Advocate for projects that have features that give them special merit, such as serving households with income less than 15% AMI, or serving people who have disabilities, are homeless, or are re-entering the community from correctional institutions.
- Advocate for the types of projects (like new construction, rehabilitation, and preservation) that are most needed.
- Advocate for the bedroom size mix that is most needed.
- Advocate for the populations to be served that are the ones who most need affordable homes (large families, people with special needs, people who are homeless, formerly incarcerated people, senior citizens).
- Make sure that the public participation obligations are truly met and that the state does not just “go through the motions.”
- Make sure that HTF-assisted projects affirmatively further fair housing.

FORECAST FOR 2020

See the section “National Housing Trust Fund: Funding” in this *Advocates' Guide* for more details.

Contributions to the HTF are at risk if the newly appointed director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency acts to stop contributions to the Housing Trust Fund. The authorizing statute and FHFA policy are aimed at ensuring the financial stability of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (the Enterprises), and both allow FHFA to stop payments to the HTF if the director determines that such contributions undermine the financial

stability of the Enterprises. While the financial operations of the Enterprises are stable, the FHFA director could try to stop payments to the HTF in a political effort to force Congress to enact housing finance reform legislation. This would be unacceptable, given the stability of the Enterprises and the clear need for the HTF.

As in the past, the Trump Administration has proposed eliminating the HTF. Congress could propose to cut or eliminate the HTF or use its funding to fill gaps in the HUD budget, however, this is not likely with the House under Democratic control and most Democratic candidates for president proposing to greatly increase the HTF.

There is an opportunity to greatly expand the HTF through comprehensive housing finance reform legislation. NLIHC will continue to advocate for comprehensive reform, since it offers the best chance of substantial new funding for HTF in the coming years. When Congress does finally tackle housing finance reform, it is critical that low-income housing advocates remain vigilant and protect the gains made in the Johnson-Crapo, Waters, and Delaney-Carney-Himes bills to robustly fund the HTF at a minimum of \$3.5 billion annually.

It is also important that advocates continue to educate their senators and representatives about the HTF and the critical role it plays in serving households with the most acute housing needs.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC's HTF webpage, www.nhtf.org.

NLIHC's interim report on how states have awarded their 2016 HTF allocations, https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF_Getting-Started_2018.pdf.

Information about each state such as key personnel and draft and final HTF Allocation Plans, <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/allocations>.

A five-part series all about the new rules regarding implementation of the NHTF <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/basic-htf-information-nlihc>.

PowerPoint slides highlighting the key features of the NHTF law and regulations, http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF_Getting-to-Know-NHTF_0617.pdf.

Key features of the NHTF law and interim regulations presented in 15 short papers broken down by topics, <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/national-housing-trust-fund/basic-htf-information-nlihc>.

NLIHC Volunteer Developer Advisory Group, http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/NHTF_Developer-Resources.pdf.

The interim regulation, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-01-30/pdf/2015-01642.pdf>.

HUD NHTF webpage, <https://www.hudexchange.info/htf>.

National Housing Trust Fund: Funding

By Sarah Saadian, Vice President of Public Policy, NLIHC

The National Housing Trust Fund (HTF) is the first new federal housing resource in a generation that is exclusively targeted to help build, preserve, rehabilitate, and operate housing affordable to people with the lowest incomes. Since 2016, \$660 million in HTF dollars have been allocated to states. This is an important first step, but far more resources are necessary to meet the current need for affordable housing. NLIHC is committed to working with Congress and the Administration to expand the HTF in order to serve more families with the greatest needs.

ABOUT THE HOUSING TRUST FUND

The HTF was established in July 2008 as part of the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008” (HERA). This law requires Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to set aside 4.2 basis points of their volume of business each year for the national HTF and Capital Magnet Fund (CMF). The HTF is to receive 65% and the CMF 35%. The first \$174 million in HTF dollars were allocated to states in 2016.

The HTF is the only federal housing program exclusively focused on providing states with resources targeted to serve households with the clearest, most acute housing needs. The HTF can be used to address both rental housing and homeownership needs. By law, at least 90% of HTF dollars must be used for the production, preservation, rehabilitation, or operation of affordable rental housing. Up to 10% may be used to support homeownership activities for first-time homebuyers, such as producing, rehabilitating, or preserving owner-occupied housing, as well as providing down payment assistance, closing costs, and interest rate buydowns.

The HTF is the most highly targeted federal rental housing capital and homeownership program. By law, at least 75% of HTF dollars used to support

rental housing must serve extremely low-income households earning no more than 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) or the federal poverty limit. All HTF dollars must benefit households with very low incomes earning no more than 50% of AMI. In comparison, most other federal housing programs can serve families up to 80% of AMI.

The HTF is designed to support local decision making and control. Because the HTF is administered by HUD as a block grant, each state has the flexibility to decide how to best use HTF resources to address its most pressing housing needs. States decide which developments to support.

Moreover, the HTF operates at no cost to the federal government because it is funded outside of the appropriations process. By statute, the initial source of funding for the HTF is a slight fee (0.042%) on Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae activity, 65% of which goes to the HTF.

OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPAND THE HTF

See also: *Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and Housing Finance Reform*

HERA expressly allows Congress to designate other “appropriations, transfers, or credits” to the HTF and CMF, in addition to the assessment on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Securing permanent, dedicated sources of revenue for the HTF is one of NLIHC’s top priorities, whether through an infrastructure spending bill, housing finance reform, or other opportunities.

Infrastructure Bill

Policymakers from both sides of the aisle agree that infrastructure should be a top priority. To maximize this investment’s impact on long-term economic growth, NLIHC strongly believes that any infrastructure package should include resources to increase the supply of affordable housing for families with the lowest incomes, including an expansion of the HTF.

Investing in affordable housing infrastructure, through new construction and preservation, will bolster productivity and economic growth, provide long-term assets that connect low-income families to communities of opportunity, support local job creation and increased incomes, and create inclusive communities.

The connection between affordable housing and infrastructure is clear. Like roads and bridges, affordable housing is a long-term asset that helps communities and families thrive. Without access to affordable housing, investments in transportation and infrastructure will fall short. Increasing the supply of affordable housing—especially in areas connected to good schools, well-paying jobs, healthcare, and transportation—helps families climb the economic ladder and leads to greater community development.

Research shows that the shortage of affordable housing in major metropolitan areas costs the American economy about \$2 trillion a year in lower wages and productivity. The lack of affordable housing acts as a barrier to entry, preventing lower-income households from moving to communities with more economic opportunities. Without the burden of higher housing costs, low-income families would be better able to move to areas with growing local economies where their wages and employment prospects may improve.

House Financial Services Committee Chairwoman Maxine Waters (D-CA) and Senator Kamala Harris (D-CA) introduced the “Housing Is Infrastructure Act” in 2019 to invest in America’s affordable housing infrastructure. The bill would provide \$5 billion for the national Housing Trust Fund, among many other investments.

Housing Finance Reform

Housing finance reform provides an opportunity to increase resources for affordable housing solutions. The bipartisan Johnson-Crapo reform legislation of 2014 included a provision that would increase funding for the national HTF by applying a 10 basis point fee on guaranteed securities in a new mortgage insurance corporation that would replace Fannie Mae and

Freddie Mac. If enacted, this would generate an estimated \$3.5 billion for the national HTF annually, making a significant contribution to ending homelessness and housing poverty in America without having to allocate additional appropriated dollars. The Johnson-Crapo bill’s provision for a 10 basis point fee for affordable housing programs should be included in any housing finance reform legislation considered by Congress, although it is unclear whether there is enough political will to move comprehensive reforms forward.

Funding for the HTF is at risk under a new Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) director. NLIHC strongly opposes any actions by FHFA to stop funding for the HTF. Fannie and Freddie have now returned far more to the Treasury than they received in federal assistance during the housing collapse of 2008.

Other Legislation

Several bills have been introduced to greatly expand the HTF.

Senators Elizabeth Warren (D-MA), Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY), and Ed Markey (D-MA), along with Reps. Cedric Richmond (D-LA), Elijah Cummings (D-MD), Barbara Lee (D-CA), and Gwen Moore (D-WI) introduced the “American Housing and Economic Mobility Act.” If enacted, this ambitious proposal would help end housing poverty and homelessness in America by directly addressing the underlying cause of the affordable housing crisis, the severe shortage of affordable rental homes for people with the lowest incomes, through a robust investment of nearly \$45 billion annually in the national Housing Trust Fund.

Rep. Waters (D-CA) introduced the “Ending Homelessness Act” to invest more than \$13 billion over five years, including \$1 billion annually for the national Housing Trust Fund, to address the shortage of affordable housing and to combat homelessness.

Senator Hirono (D-HI) also introduced legislation to provide resources at the scale necessary to end homelessness and housing poverty. Her bill would fully fund rental assistance for all eligible households, invest \$40 billion annually in the

HTF, and provide robust resources for homeless assistance grants.

At the time of writing, 15 presidential candidates have released housing platforms. Of these fourteen use the HTF as the primary way to address the nation's housing challenges, with investments ranging from \$7 billion annually to \$148 billion annually.

HOW ADVOCATES CAN TAKE ACTION

Advocates should be actively engaged in the process of HTF implementation in their states to ensure that the initial rounds of funding are successful.

ON HOUSING FINANCE REFORM

With respect to the potential housing finance reform proposals, advocates should urge their legislators to:

- Oppose any legislation that would eliminate or prohibit funding for the HTF.
- Support legislation that provides a robust source of funding for the HTF similar to the Johnson-Crapo bill.
- Support housing finance reform legislation that assures access to the market for all creditworthy borrowers as well as assuring compliance with federal fair housing laws.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Housing Trust Fund: www.NHTF.org

Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and Housing Finance Reform

By Sarah Saadian, Vice President of Public Policy, NLIHC

See Also: For related information, refer to the *National Housing Trust Fund: Funding* section of this guide.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the two federally chartered companies that provide a secondary market for residential mortgages, have been in conservatorship since September 7, 2008 when the foreclosure crisis precipitated a global financial meltdown. Much to the dismay of many, the companies remain under the control of the federal government because Congress cannot agree on the future housing finance system.

The “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008” (HERA) established an independent agency, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA), to serve both as a regulator and to significantly strengthen federal oversight of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. HERA gave the FHFA the power to take the companies into conservatorship if need be. HERA also created the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF) and the Capital Magnet Fund (CMF).

Because Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac provide the dedicated source of funding for the HTF, their status and viability are of particular interest to low-income housing advocates. NLIHC supports housing finance legislation that would provide significant new funding for the HTF.

WHAT ARE FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC?

The Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) are government sponsored enterprises, known as GSEs. Congress established the GSEs to provide liquidity and create a secondary market for both single-family (one to four units) and multifamily (five or more units) residential mortgages.

Although Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac were created at different times and for different purposes, they have had effectively identical charters and responsibilities since 1992. Prior to September 7, 2008, when they were placed in conservatorship, they were privately owned and operated corporations.

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac do not provide mortgage loans directly to individual borrowers. Rather, they facilitate the secondary mortgage market by buying loans from banks, savings institutions, and other mortgage originators. Lenders then use the sale proceeds to engage in further mortgage lending. For the most part, the GSEs purchase single-family, 30-year fixed rate conventional mortgages that are not insured by the federal government. They also play a major role in financing the multifamily housing market.

The GSEs either hold the mortgages they purchase in their portfolios or package them into mortgage-backed securities (MBSs), which are sold to investors. When the GSEs securitize a mortgage, they are guaranteeing that those investors receive timely payment of principal and interest. The GSEs charge mortgage lenders a guarantee fee (g-fee), generally in the form of monthly payments, to cover projected credit losses if a borrower defaults over the life of the loan.

The GSEs raise money in the capital markets to fund their activities. Their incomes come from the difference between the interest they receive on the mortgages they hold and the interest they pay on their debt, and from g-fees and income earned on non-mortgage investments.

Single-Family Mortgages

Single-family mortgages must meet certain criteria set by the GSEs to be packaged and sold as securities. As a result, the two GSEs set the lending standards for the conventional, conforming loan single-family mortgage market. This standardization increases the liquidity of

mortgages meeting the GSE guidelines, thereby decreasing the interest rates on these mortgages and lowering costs for homebuyers.

Generally, the GSEs provide support for 30-year fixed-rate mortgages on single-family homes. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac can only purchase mortgages with principal balances equal to or less than the conforming loan limit established annually by FHFA. The limit may also be adjusted to account for the size of a property.

Multifamily Mortgages

The GSEs also purchase mortgages on multifamily properties. These mortgages are generally held in portfolio, but they can be securitized and sold to investors. In the past, the GSEs have also played a significant role in supporting the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit market.

Housing Goals

As GSEs, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are required to achieve social goals as well assure safety and soundness in the housing finance system. In exchange for a once-implicit, now explicit, federal guarantee, Congress has required that the GSEs meet statutorily-based “housing goals” to help assure affordable homes in the U.S. The GSEs are required to purchase a certain number of mortgages on properties with specific characteristics to ensure that low- and moderate-income, underserved, and special affordable markets are served. FHFA updates these goals periodically.

Substantial partisan disagreement remains over the affordable housing goals and the role of the federal government in the housing market. Progressives believe the goals are necessary to ensure that people with low incomes and people of color have access to mortgage markets. Conservatives believe that the goals caused the GSEs to participate in overly risky business practices that triggered the foreclosure crisis.

It is important to note that the multifamily side of the GSEs’ business did not sustain losses during the crisis; unfortunately, the GSE multifamily goals did not lead to the expansion of rental

housing affordable to families with extremely low incomes.

Duty-to-Serve

HERA also established a “duty-to-serve” for the GSEs, which requires them to lead the industry in developing loan products and flexible underwriting guidelines for manufactured housing, affordable housing preservation, and rural markets. FHFA published its final rule in December 2016, which outlines the GSEs’ duty-to-serve.

The final rule requires the GSEs to submit plans for improving the “distribution and availability of mortgage financing in a safe and sound manner for residential properties that serve very low-, low-, and moderate-income families.” Each GSE is required to submit to FHFA a three-year duty-to-serve plan, detailing the activities and objectives it will use to meet the rule’s requirements. The final rule gives the GSEs duty-to-serve credit for eligible activities that facilitate a secondary market for residential mortgages that originated in underserved markets. The GSEs also receive duty-to-serve credit for qualifying activities that promote residential economic diversity in underserved markets. The rule establishes the manner in which the GSEs would be evaluated for their efforts. FHFA is required to report evaluation findings to Congress annually.

At the end of 2017, FHFA approved the GSEs’ first underserved market plans. In their plans, the GSEs indicated that they would pursue additional activities to support inclusionary housing programs, the preservation and lasting affordability of rental properties, and economic integration.

FANNIE MAE, FREDDIE MAC, AND THE HOUSING TRUST FUND

In HERA, Congress established that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would serve as the initial sources of funding for the HTF and the CMF. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are required to set aside an amount equal to 4.2 basis points for each dollar of total new business purchases. Note that the assessment is on their volume of

business, not their profits. Of these amounts, 65% is to go to the HTF and 35% is to go to the CMF.

Lawmakers reasoned that requiring Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to set aside funds for the HTF was part of the GSEs' mission responsibilities included in their charters. In addition to their affordable housing goals, which could be met through the regular course of business, funding the HTF allowed the GSEs to support housing that extremely low-income renters could afford, an activity that is not possible through any of their business product.

HERA allows FHFA to temporarily suspend the requirement that the GSEs fund the HTF and the CMF under circumstances related to threats to their financial health. In November 2008, at the height of the financial crisis, the FHFA director suspended this obligation before the GSEs even began setting aside funds. In 2014, FHFA Director Mel Watt lifted the suspension and directed both companies to begin setting aside the required amount starting on January 1, 2015. Since 2016, \$660 million in HTF dollars have been allocated to states. This is an important start, but more HTF resources are needed.

FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC IN CONSERVATORSHIP

Before the financial crisis, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac had never received any federal funds to support their operations. However, both companies incurred huge financial losses because of the foreclosure crisis. This prompted Congress to place the companies in conservatorship under the FHFA. Today, FHFA has all the authority of each company's directors, officers, and shareholders. Until the conservatorship ends, FHFA operates the companies through appointed management in each company. During conservatorship the GSEs remain critically important to the housing finance system by providing liquidity for new mortgages, helping to resolve the mortgage crisis, and supporting the multifamily market.

Under an agreement between the Department of the Treasury and FHFA, the GSEs together were allowed to draw up to \$200 billion to stay afloat,

which bolstered the U.S. housing market. In exchange, the U.S. government became the owner of the companies' preferred stock.

In 2012, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac returned to profitability, and began to make dividend payments to the Treasury. Under the conditions of the conservatorship agreement between Treasury and FHFA, all of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's profits outside of a \$3 billion buffer were "swept" into the U.S. Treasury. Under FHFA director Mark Calabria, the GSEs are now permitted to retain a combined \$45 billion worth of earnings. The GSEs' dividend payments now far exceed the \$188 billion drawdown.

In the last few years, there have been several federal lawsuits in which investors who have speculated on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac stock are trying to end the government sweep of the GSEs' profits. Hedge funds have taken a gamble on investing in Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shares with the hope that the courts would strike down the conservatorship agreement. The investors argue that the agreement violates their rights as shareholders, as they have been barred from receiving company dividends. Some lawsuits have already been thrown out of court, while others are pending.

Hedge funds and some civil rights and consumer advocacy groups have been pushing the Trump Administration and FHFA to recapitalize and release the GSEs from conservatorship. They have authored several proposals, some that would provide funding for the HTF. Although the hedge funds stand to reap financial gains through "recap and release," the civil rights and consumer advocacy organizations argue that the indefinite conservatorship has created uncertainty in the mortgage market, leading mortgages lenders to tighten their credit standards in a way that disproportionately impacts racial minority homebuyers. They also contend that without recap and release, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's financial health will deteriorate, jeopardizing their obligation to contribute to the HTF.

However, recap and release will not necessarily increase affordable lending and does not

move Congress any closer to passing housing finance reform legislation, which promises to generate billions of new dollars for rental housing affordable to families with extremely low incomes.

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM PROPOSALS

Almost a decade after the financial crisis, policy makers are still grappling with how to reform the housing finance market. Although some would like to nationalize the housing finance system and others would like to privatize it, most agree that a hybrid system of private capital backed by federal mortgage insurance is the preferred approach. Because of these philosophical differences, members of Congress have reached a stalemate in pushing legislative proposals forward. Although many Members of Congress and numerous analysts and pundits have wanted to end the conservatorships, wind down Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and establish a new model for the secondary mortgage market, all efforts to do so to date have been unsuccessful.

There was considerable legislative activity on housing finance reform in the 113th Congress (2013-2014), even though no legislation was considered by either the full House or Senate. The greatest progress was made in the Senate.

Efforts to reform the housing finance system will continue in 2020.

Johnson-Crapo

In 2013, Senators Bob Corker (R-TN) and Mark Warner (D-VA) introduced the “Housing Finance Reform and Taxpayer Protection Act” (S. 1217), which laid out a plan to wind down Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and replace them with a Federal Mortgage Insurance Corporation (FMIC), modeled after the Federal Depository Insurance Corporation. The FMIC would have offered an explicit government guarantee, purchased and securitized single and multifamily mortgage portfolios, and provided regulatory oversight of the Federal Home Loan Banks. The bill would have assessed a 5-10 basis point user fee on all guaranteed securities that would be used to fund

the HTF, the CMF, and a new Market Access Fund (MAF). The bill would have abolished affordable housing goals.

The Corker-Warner bill provided the framework for legislation subsequently offered by Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Chair Tim Johnson (D-SD) and Ranking Member Mike Crapo (R-ID) that was introduced in the spring of 2014. The Johnson-Crapo measure would have replaced the GSEs with a new FMIC. To be eligible for reinsurance under the FMIC, any security must have first secured private capital in a 10% minimum first loss position. The bill also established a new securitization platform to create a standardized security to be used for all securities guaranteed by the new system. The securitization platform would have been regulated by the FMIC.

The bill included a 10 basis point user fee to fund the HTF, the CMF, and the new MAF. The fee was projected to generate \$5 billion a year, and 75% of the funds would go to the HTF. Even though the bill also got rid of the affordable housing goals, it included a new flex fee or market incentive to encourage mortgage guarantors and aggregators to do business in underserved areas.

The Johnson-Crapo bill also provided for a secondary market for multifamily housing. It allowed for the Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac multifamily activities to be spun off from the new system established by the bill. The bill would have required that at least 60% of the multifamily units securitized must be affordable for low-income households (80% AMI or less). The bill would have also created a pilot program to promote small (50 or fewer units) multifamily development.

The Johnson-Crapo bill was voted out of the Senate Banking Committee on May 15, 2014 by a bipartisan vote of 13-9. The Obama Administration fully endorsed the bill but the bill was criticized by the right and the left for doing too much or not enough to assure access to mortgages to all creditworthy borrowers, and was never taken up by the full Senate.

Delaney-Carney-Himes

Representatives John Delaney (D-MD), John Carney (D-DE), and Jim Himes (D-CT) introduced the “Partnership to Strengthen Homeownership Act” (H.R. 5055) in 2014, which would have wound down Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac over a five-year period and created a mortgage insurance program run through the Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae). Ginnie Mae would become a stand-alone agency, no longer part of HUD. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac would eventually be sold off as private institutions without any government support.

The bill would have provided a full government guarantee on qualifying mortgage securities backed by mortgages that meet certain eligibility criteria. As proposed, private capital would have had a minimum 5% first-loss risk position. The remaining risk would have been split between Ginnie Mae and private reinsurers, with private capital covering at least 10% of losses. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac’s multifamily activities would have been spun off and privatized and received a government guarantee through Ginnie Mae.

In return for insuring securities, Ginnie Mae would have charged a fee of 10 basis points on the total principal balance of insured mortgages. The bill would apply 75% of this fee revenue to the HTF, 15% to the CMF, and 10% to the MAF. This is identical to how the Johnson-Crapo and Waters (below) bills treat the HTF. However, unlike other the other bills, this measure would have added Federal Housing Administration (FHA), Department of Agriculture (USDA), and Veterans Affairs (VA) mortgages in the determining the base upon which the 10 basis point fee is assessed, generating an additional \$1 billion.

“Housing Opportunities Move the Economy (HOME) Forward Act”

Congresswoman Maxine Waters (D-CA) released draft housing finance reform legislation, the “Housing Opportunities Move the Economy (HOME) Forward Act,” in 2014. The measure would have wound down Fannie Mae and Freddie

Mac over a five-year period and replaced them with a newly created lender-owned cooperative, the Mortgage Securities Cooperative (MSC). The MSC would have been the only entity that could issue government guaranteed securities and would have been lender-capitalized based on mortgage volume. The bill would have also created a new regulator, the National Mortgage Finance Administration. Under the bill, private capital would have to have been in a first loss position to reduce taxpayer risk.

The “HOME Forward Act” would have preserved Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac’s multifamily business and transferred it to a new multifamily platform at the MSC. The bill also assessed a 10 basis point user fee to fund the HTF, the CMF, and the MAF. The bill was never introduced.

“Protecting American Taxpayers and Homeowners (PATH) Act”

Former Congressman Jeb Hensarling (R-TX) introduced the “Protecting American Taxpayers and Homeowners (PATH) Act” (H.R. 2767) in 2013. The bill called for a five-year phase out of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. As part of this wind-down, the bill would have repealed the authorization of the current affordable housing goals, as well as the HTF and CMF. The bill would have established a new non-government, non-profit National Mortgage Market Utility (Utility) that would have been regulated by FHFA and required to think of and develop common best practice standards for the private origination, servicing, pooling, and securitizing of mortgages. The Utility would have also operated a publicly accessible securitization outlet to match loan originators with investors. The Utility would not have been allowed to originate, service, or guarantee any mortgage or MBS.

The bill would have also made changes to FHA, including making it a separate agency, no longer part of HUD. The bill would have limited FHA’s activities to first-time homebuyers with any income and low and moderate-income borrowers and would have lowered the FHA conforming loan limit for high-cost areas. The bill was voted out of the Financial Services Committee on

July 23, 2013, by a partisan vote of 30-27. Two Republicans and all Democrats opposed the bill. The bill was not taken up by the full House and was blocked by then Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH). It was opposed by virtually every segment of the housing industry.

“Bipartisan Housing Finance Reform Act of 2018”

Representatives Hensarling, Delaney, and Himes released draft legislation to reform the nation’s housing finance system in 2018. This proposal provided an affordability fee that could contribute to an overall increase in funding dedicated to affordable housing. While NLIHC appreciated the authors’ stated commitment to “substantial funding in support of existing programs that contribute to the development of the supply of affordable housing options for low-income individuals and communities, such as the Housing Trust Fund and the Capital Magnet Fund,” we were concerned with the lack of details about the size of the fee and the uses for the funds generated. While the draft bill provided few details on how much funding would be provided to the HTF, the authors specifically identified the HTF as a possible recipient of such funds. Moreover, the bill was unclear about the size of the assessment. NLIHC opposes the draft bill’s suggestion that dedicated funds be on budget, and instead NLIHC urges lawmakers to ensure that HTF funding remains separate from the appropriations process.

Funding for the HTF must be part of a broader commitment to ensuring access and affordability throughout the housing market. The draft legislation, however, would repeal the system’s current affordable housing goals without providing anything in its place. This is unacceptable; housing finance reform must include enforceable and measurable mechanisms to ensure that access to credit is enjoyed by all segments of the housing market.

HOUSING FINANCE REFORM IN THE 116TH CONGRESS

NLIHC will continue to advocate for comprehensive reform, since it offers the best chance of substantial new funding for HTF in the coming years. When Congress does finally tackle housing finance reform, it is critical that low-income housing advocates remain vigilant and protect the gains made in the Johnson-Crapo, Waters, and Delaney-Carney-Himes bills to robustly fund the HTF.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac play important roles in both the single-family and the affordable multifamily markets. These functions, as well as the contributions to the HTF, need to be part of any future secondary market. The HTF must be retained and funded in any future housing finance system.

With respect to the potential housing finance reform proposals, advocates should urge their legislators to:

- Oppose any legislation that would eliminate or prohibit funding for the HTF.
- Support legislation that provides robust funding for the HTF similar to the Johnson-Crapo and Waters and Delaney-Carney-Himes bills.
- Support housing finance reform legislation that assures access to the market for all creditworthy borrowers, as well as assuring compliance with federal fair housing laws.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Federal Housing Finance Agency, www.fhfa.gov.

Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, www.fanniemae.com.

Federal National Mortgage Association, www.freddiemac.com.

Chapter 4:

RENTAL

HOUSING

PROGRAMS FOR

THE LOWEST

INCOME

HOUSEHOLDS

Housing Choice Vouchers

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) as well as approximately 2,200 state and local public housing agencies (PHAs).

Year Started: 1974

Population Targeted: Seventy-five percent of all new voucher households must have extremely low incomes (less than 30% of the area median income, AMI, or the federal poverty line, whichever is higher); the remaining 25% of new vouchers can be distributed to residents with incomes up to 80% of AMI.

Funding: FY20 was \$21.5 billion for contract renewals plus \$1.98 billion for PHAs to administer the program.

Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) help people with the lowest incomes afford housing in the private housing market by paying landlords the difference between what a household can afford to pay for rent and the rent itself, up to a reasonable amount. The HCV program is HUD's largest rental assistance program, assisting approximately 2.3 million households.

See Also: For related information, see the *Project-Based Vouchers*, *Tenant Protection Vouchers*, *Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH)*, *Family Unification Program (FUP)*, and *Non-Elderly Disabled (NED) Vouchers* sections of this guide.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Federal tenant-based rental assistance was established as part of a major restructuring of federal housing assistance for low-income families in 1974. President Richard Nixon supported the creation of the tenant-based Section 8 program as an alternative to the government's involvement in producing affordable multifamily apartments. In recent decades, the program has had broad bipartisan support. It grew incrementally between 1974 and

1996, the first year when no new, incremental vouchers were appropriated. Since then, Congress has authorized HUD to award more than 700,000 additional vouchers, but about half of these have simply replaced public housing or other federally subsidized housing that has been demolished or is no longer assisted.

Since FY08, Congress has appropriated funding for a small number of incremental vouchers (new vouchers that are not replacements for other assisted housing) each year, with no more than about 17,000 for special populations, mostly for homeless veterans under the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program. In FY19 Congress appropriated \$40 million for new Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) vouchers and \$20 million for new Family Unification Program (FUP) vouchers to serve youth aging out of foster care, for a total of 7,600 new vouchers.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Today, about 2.3 million households have HUD Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs), also called Section 8 tenant-based rental assistance. Of voucher households, 75% have extremely low incomes (less than 30% of the area median income, AMI, or the federal poverty level, whichever is greater), 36% have a head of household who has a disability, and 27% are elderly. The national average income of a voucher household is \$14,863. Thirty percent of the households have wage income as their major source of income, while only 3% have welfare income.

Housing vouchers are one of the major federal programs intended to bridge the gap between the cost of housing and the incomes of low-wage earners, people on limited fixed incomes, and other low-income people. The Housing Choice Voucher Program offers assisted households the option to use vouchers to help pay rent at privately owned apartments of their choice. A household can even use a voucher to help buy a

home. PHAs may also choose to attach a portion of their vouchers to particular properties (project-based vouchers, PBVs), see *Vouchers: Project-Based Vouchers* in this guide.

The HCV program has deep income-targeting requirements. Since 1998, 75% of all new voucher households must have extremely low incomes, at or less than 30% of AMI. The remaining 25% of new vouchers can be distributed to residents with incomes up to 80% of AMI.

HUD has annual contracts with about 2,200 PHAs to administer vouchers, about 800 of which only administer the HCV program (these do not have any public housing units). Funding provided by Congress is distributed to these PHAs by HUD based on the number of vouchers in use in the previous year, the cost of vouchers, an increase for inflation, as well as other adjustments. However, when Congress appropriates less than needed, each PHA's funding is reduced on a prorated basis.

To receive a voucher, residents put their names on local PHA waiting lists. The HCV program, like all HUD affordable housing programs, is not an entitlement program. Many more people need and qualify for vouchers than actually receive them. Only one in four households eligible for housing vouchers receives any form of federal rental assistance. The success of the existing voucher program and any expansion with new vouchers depends on annual appropriations.

Local PHAs distribute vouchers to qualified families who have 60 days to conduct their own housing search to identify private apartments with rents within the PHA's rent payment standards. Generally, landlords are not required to rent to a household with a voucher; consequently, many households have difficulty finding a place to rent with their vouchers. Housing assisted with the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit, HOME, or national Housing Trust Fund programs must rent to an otherwise qualifying household that has a voucher. In addition, some states and local governments have source-of-income laws that prohibit landlords

from discriminating against households with vouchers.

The amount of the housing voucher subsidy is capped at a payment standard set by the PHA, which must be between 90% and 110% of HUD's Fair Market Rent (FMR), the rent in the metropolitan area for a modest apartment. HUD sets FMRs annually. Nationally, the average voucher household pays \$379 a month for rent and utilities. Often, the payment standard is not sufficient to cover the rent in areas that have better schools, lower crime, and greater access to employment opportunities, often called high opportunity areas. In hot real estate markets where all rents are high, households with a voucher often find it difficult to use their voucher because households with higher incomes can afford to offer landlords higher rents.

A PHA may request HUD Field Office approval of an exception payment standard up to 120% of the FMR for a designated part of the FMR area. In addition, an exception payment greater than 120% of the FMR may need to be approved by the PIH Assistant Secretary. For either, a PHA must demonstrate that the exception payment is necessary to help households find homes outside areas of high poverty, or because households have trouble finding homes within the time limit allowed to search for a landlord who will accept a voucher.

As a result of recent legislation, the "Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act" (HOTMA; see below), PHAs may establish an exception payment standard of up to 120% of the FMR as a reasonable accommodation for a person with a disability, without having to get HUD approval. PHAs may seek HUD approval for an exception payment standard greater than 120% of FMR as a reasonable accommodation.

Also due to HOTMA, PHAs have the option to hold voucher households harmless from rent increases when FMRs decline. PHAs can do this by continuing to use the payment standard based on the FMR prior to the new, higher FMR.

Once a household selects an apartment, the PHA must inspect it to ensure that it meets HUD's

housing quality standards (HQS). Generally, voucher program participants pay 30% of their adjusted income toward rent and utilities. The value of the voucher, the PHA's payment standard, then makes up the difference between the tenant's rent payment and rent charged by the owner. Tenants renting units that have contract rents greater than the payment standard pay 30% of their income plus the difference between the payment standard and the actual rent (up to 40% of adjusted income for new and relocating voucher holders). After one year in an apartment, a household can choose to pay more than 40% of its income toward rent.

Housing vouchers are portable, meaning households can use them to move nearly anywhere in the country where there is a functioning voucher program; use is not limited to the jurisdiction of the PHA that originally issued the voucher. A PHA is allowed to impose some restrictions on portability during the first year if a household did not live in the PHA's jurisdiction when it applied for assistance. However, portability has been restricted or disallowed by some PHAs due to alleged inadequate funding. Recent HUD guidance requires approval of the local HUD office before a PHA may prohibit a family from using a voucher to move to a new unit due to insufficient funding.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY CHANGES

Statutory Changes

On July 29, 2016, President Obama signed into law the "Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act" (HOTMA). This law made some changes to the Housing Choice Voucher and public housing programs. Highlights of the HCV changes include:

Income Determination and Recertification:

- Rent must be based on an applicant's estimated income for the upcoming year.
- For residents already assisted, rents must be based on a household's income from the prior year.

- A household may request an income review any time its income or deductions are estimated to decrease by 10%.
- A PHA must review a household's income any time that income with deductions are estimated to increase by 10%, except any increase in earned income cannot be considered until the next annual recertification.
- Income Deductions and Exclusions:
 - The Earned Income Disregard (EID) was eliminated, no longer disregarding certain increases in earned income for residents who had been unemployed or receiving welfare.
 - The deduction for elderly and disabled households increased from \$400 to \$525 with annual adjustments for inflation.
 - The deduction for medical care, attendant care, and auxiliary aid expenses for elderly and disabled households will apply to expenses that exceeded 10% of income as opposed to 3% of income before HOTMA.
 - The dependent deduction remains at \$480 but will be indexed to inflation.
 - HUD must establish hardship exemptions in regulation for households that would not be able to pay rent due to hardship. These regulations must be made in consultation with tenant organizations and industry participants.
 - Any expenses related to aid and attendants for veterans are excluded from income.
 - Any income of a full-time student who is a dependent is excluded from income, as are any scholarship funds used for tuition and books.
- Physical Inspections:
 - HOTMA provides PHAs with two options for initial inspections:

HOTMA allows a household to move into a unit and begin making housing assistance payments to the owner if the unit does not

meet HQS, as long as the deficiencies are not life-threatening. However, the PHA must withhold payments to the owner if the unit does not meet HQS standards 30 days after the household first occupies the unit. If an initial inspection identifies non-life-threatening (NLT) deficiencies, a PHA must provide a list of the deficiencies to the household and offer the household an opportunity to decline a lease without jeopardizing its voucher. The PHA must also notify the household that if the owner fails to correct the NLT deficiencies within the time period specified by the PHA, the PHA will terminate the HAP contract and the family will have to move to another unit. If the household declines the unit, the PHA must inform the household of how much search time they have remaining to find another unit. In addition, the PHA must suspend (stop the clock) of the initial or any extended term of the voucher (to search for another unit) from the date the household submitted the request for PHA approval of the tenancy until the date the PHA notifies the household in writing whether the request has been approved or denied.

Alternatively, PHAs may allow a household to move into a unit before the PHA conducts its own HQS inspection, as long as the unit passed a comparable, alternative inspection within the previous 24 months. Implementing guidance published in 2017 still requires a PHA to conduct its own inspection within 15 days.

- Enforcement of Housing Quality Standards HQS deficiencies that are life-threatening must be fixed within 24 hours and HQS conditions that are not life-threatening must be fixed within 30 days. The PHA may withhold assistance during this time (HOTMA places into law the 24-hour and 30-day time periods that already existed in regulation). If an owner fails to make the non-life-threatening corrections within 30 days, the PHA must withhold any further

HAP payments until those conditions are addressed and the unit meets HQS. A PHA may withhold payments up to 180 days. Once a unit is found to be in compliance, a PHA may reimburse the owner for the period during which payments were withheld.

If an owner fails to make the non-life-threatening corrections after 30 days (or life-threatening violations within 24 hours), the PHA must abate assistance, notifying the household and owner of the abatement and that the household must move if the unit is not brought into HQS compliance within 60 days after the end of the first 30-day period. The owner cannot terminate the household's tenancy during the abatement, but the household may terminate its tenancy if it chooses. The household must have at least 90 days to find another unit to rent. If the household cannot find another unit, then the PHA must give the household the option of moving into a public housing unit. The PHA may provide relocation assistance to the household, including reimbursement for reasonable moving expenses and security deposits, using up to two months of any rental assistance amounts withheld or abated.

- Payment Standard for Reasonable Accommodation:
 - PHAs may establish an exception payment standard of up to 120% of the FMR as a reasonable accommodation for a person with a disability, without having to get HUD approval.
 - PHAs may seek HUD approval for an exception payment standard greater than 120% of FMR as a reasonable accommodation.
- PHAs have the option to hold voucher households harmless from rent increases when FMRs decline. PHAs can do this by continuing to use the payment standard based on the FMR prior to the new, higher FMR.

- Project Based Vouchers:
 - PHAs may choose to project-base up to 20% of their authorized HCVs (removing the previous PBV cap of 20% of a PHA’s HCV dollar allocation).
 - PHAs may project-base an additional 10% of their authorized HCVs to provide units for people who are homeless, disabled, elderly, or veterans, as well as to provide units in areas where vouchers are difficult to use (census tracts with a poverty rate less than 20%).
 - A project may not have more than 25% of its units or 25 units, whichever is greater, assisted with PBVs. Prior to HOTMA, the PBV cap was 25% of units.

The 25%/ 25 unit cap does not apply to units exclusively for elderly households or households eligible for supportive services. Prior to HOTMA, the exceptions to the 25% cap applied to households comprised of elderly or disabled people and households receiving supportive services. For projects where vouchers are difficult to use (census tracts with poverty rates less than 20%), the cap is raised to 40%.

- The maximum term of initial PBV contracts and subsequent extensions increased from 15 years to 20 years. A PHA may agree to extend a HAP contract for an additional 20 years, but only for a maximum of 40 years according to implementation guidance. However, informally HUD staff have conveyed to NLIHC that the guidance is indeed confusing; HUD staff agree that an owner could renew a HAP contract after 40 years.
- If the owner does not renew a PBV contract, a household may choose to remain in the project with voucher assistance; however, the household must pay any amount by which the rent exceeds the PHA’s payment standard.
- Vouchers may be used to make monthly payments to purchase a manufactured home,

and to pay for property taxes and insurance, tenant-paid utilities, and rent charged for the land upon which the manufactured home sits, including management and maintenance charges.

Proposed Regulatory Changes

On September 17, 2019, HUD proposed HOTMA implementation regulations echoing HOTMA’s income examination, income calculation, elderly or disabled deduction, childcare deduction and hardship provisions, and healthcare deduction and hardship provisions. In addition, HUD proposed HOTMA asset limitation provisions, proposing that households be ineligible if net household assets are greater than \$100,000 (adjusted for inflation each year) or if the household owns real property suitable for occupancy; to allow a PHA to determine net assets based on a household’s certification that their net family assets are less than \$50,000 (adjusted for inflation each year); to revise the definition of “net family assets” by eliminating a number of previously included items such as the value of necessary “personal property” (like a car); and to allow PHAs to choose to not enforce the asset limit.

ADDITIONAL REGULATORY CHANGES

- A “streamlining rule” was published on March 8, 2016. Key HCV provisions include the following options for PHAs:
 - PHAs have the option of conducting a streamlined income determination for any household member who has a fixed source of income (such as Supplemental Security Income). If that person or household with a fixed income also has a non-fixed source of income, the non-fixed source of income is still subject to third-party verification. Upon admission to the voucher program, third-party verification of all income amounts will be required for all household members. A full income reexamination and redetermination must be performed every three years. In between those three years, a streamlined

income determination must be conducted by applying a verified cost-of-living adjustment or current rate of interest to the previously verified or adjusted income amount.

- PHAs have the option of providing utility reimbursements on a quarterly basis to voucher households if the amounts due are \$45 or less. PHAs can continue to provide utility reimbursements monthly if they choose to do so. If a PHA opts to make payments on a quarterly basis, the PHA must establish a hardship policy for tenants if less frequent reimbursement will create a financial hardship.
- The rule implements the “FY14 Appropriations Act” provision authorizing PHAs to inspect voucher units every other year, rather than annually, and to use inspections conducted by other programs like the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program.
- Small Area FMRs (also referred to as SAFMRs) must be used by 24 designated metropolitan areas to administer their voucher program. SAFMRs reflect rents for U.S. Postal ZIP Codes, while traditional FMRs reflect a single rent standard for an entire metropolitan region. The intent is to provide voucher payment standards that are more in line with neighborhood-scale rental markets, resulting in lower subsidies in neighborhoods with lower rents and concentrations of voucher holders, and relatively higher subsidies in neighborhoods with higher rents and greater opportunities. A goal of SAFMRs is to help households use vouchers in areas of higher opportunity and lower poverty, thereby reducing voucher concentrations high poverty areas.

In a surprise move without public notice, on August 11, 2017 HUD suspended the obligation of PHAs to implement SAFMRs for two years in all but one of the 24 metropolitan areas (the Dallas metro area was still required to comply under a 2011 legal settlement).

Fair housing advocates sued HUD, and a court issued a preliminary injunction against HUD. Early in 2018, HUD issued guidance requiring PHAs in those 24 metro areas to begin using SAFMRs by April 1, 2018.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Each PHA’s eligibility for renewal funding is based on the cost of vouchers in use in the prior year. For FY20 both houses of Congress proposed adequate funding to renew all existing vouchers; the House proposed \$21.4 billion while the Senate proposed \$21.5 billion. The Trump Administration proposed only \$20.1 billion. The final enacted appropriation for FY20 is \$21.5 billion for contract renewals.

President Trump’s FY20 budget proposal again included so-called rent reforms that would have placed serious financial burdens on voucher households. For example, non-elderly and non-disabled households would pay 35% of their gross income (up from 30% of their adjusted income). Elderly and disabled households would pay 30% of gross income (not adjusted income). The proposal would also allow PHAs to impose work requirements. Congress has not taken steps to adopt these provisions, but the president has proposed them again for FY21.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should encourage members of the House and Senate to:

- Fully fund the renewal of all vouchers.
- Oppose burdensome and costly time limits and work requirements for people receiving federal housing assistance.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080, <https://www.cbpp.org/topics/housing>

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, <http://nhlp.org/resourcecenter?tid=121>

Technical Assistance Collaborative, *Section 8 Made Simple*, <http://bit.ly/2hWKzYa>

NLIHC's Summary of September 17, 2019 proposed HOTMA implementation regulations, <https://bit.ly/2kr70dt>

HUD's Housing Choice Voucher homepage, <http://bit.ly/2ijlWUs>

HUD's Non-Elderly Disabled webpage, <http://bit.ly/2ifnv9I>

HUD's VASH webpage, <http://bit.ly/2h5yHRr>

HUD's Family Unification Program (FUP) webpage, <https://bit.ly/38CuBMw>

Project-Based Vouchers

By Barbara Sard, former Vice President for Housing Policy, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)

Year the Current Version Started: 2001

Number of Persons/Households Served: About 170,000 households (could rise to more than 500,000)

Population Targeted: Extremely low- and low-income households

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Housing Choice Vouchers* and *Public Housing Agency Plan* sections of this guide.

Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) may project-base up to 20% of their authorized Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) and up to 30% if the additional units contain certain types of households or are located in specific areas. The term project-based means that the assistance is linked to a particular property, as opposed to tenant-based vouchers, which move with the family. More than 500,000 vouchers could be project-based nationwide under this expanded authority, but only about 170,000 units had project-based voucher (PBV) assistance in 2017 (most recent data available). About 680 of the approximately 2,150 PHAs that administer HCVs operate PBV programs.

PBVs are an important tool to provide supportive housing for individuals with disabilities or others who need services to live stably in their own homes. PBVs can also help PHAs in tight housing markets utilize all of their vouchers by making it unnecessary for some families to search for units they can rent with their vouchers. Another benefit of PBVs is that they can encourage the production or preservation of affordable housing, since owners of properties with PBVs receive financial security from the long-term contracts they sign with PHAs. This is particularly important in higher cost areas, where PBV rules may allow

higher subsidies than tenant-based vouchers.

ADMINISTRATION

PBVs are administered by PHAs that decide to include this option as part of their HCV programs and are overseen by PIH.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The current PBV program was created by Congress in October 2000 as part of the FY01 appropriations bill for HUD and other agencies [Section 232 of Pub.L. 106-377, revising section 8(o)(13) of the "U.S. Housing Act," 42 U.S.C. §1437f(o)(13)]. The PBV program replaced the project-based certificate program, which was rarely used because it was cumbersome (e.g., HUD approval was required for each individual transaction), did not allow long-term financial commitments by PHAs, was limited to new development or rehabilitation, and did not provide incentives for owners to commit units to the program.

In addition to addressing weaknesses of the prior program, Congress included a novel feature, the "resident choice" requirement. This guarantees that a family with PBV assistance that wishes to move after one year will receive the next available tenant-based voucher. The project-based subsidy stays with the unit to assist another eligible family. This requirement helps ensure that PBV recipients remain able to choose the areas in which they live. Congress also included statutory requirements to promote mixed-income housing and to deconcentrate poverty.

HUD issued a notice on January 16, 2001 making most of the statutory changes immediately effective but did not issue final rules fully implementing the statute until 2005. Congress made several amendments to the statute in 2008 as part of the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act" (HERA), notably extending the maximum contract period from 10 to 15 years in order to correspond to the initial affordability period for

the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program and making contract extensions more flexible. Effective July 2014, HUD revised the PBV rule to incorporate the HERA amendments and make some additional changes.

In section 106 of the “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2016” (HOTMA, a/k/a H.R. 3700), which the president signed into law on July 29, 2016 (Pub.L. 114-201), Congress made substantial changes to the PBV program. By *Federal Register* notice published January 18, 2017, HUD made most of these changes effective in 90 days (i.e., April 18, 2017). HUD issued technical corrections to the January notice in July 2017 and consolidated all PBV policy guidance in PIH 2017-21, October 30, 2017. In July 2019, HUD issued revised forms for the PBV program that comply with these HOTMA changes. Implementation of the remaining provisions will require the issuance of new regulations. Properties selected to receive PBVs prior to April 18, 2017 will be subject to the pre-HOTMA requirements, unless the PHA and owner agree to the HOTMA changes. This article reflects the HOTMA changes currently in effect.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

A PHA may initiate a PBV program by including the following in its PHA Plan: the projected number of units to be project-based, their general locations, and how project-basing would be consistent with the needs and goals identified in the Plan. A PHA must include in its HCV Administrative Plan details about how it will select properties in which to project-base vouchers, how it will maintain waiting lists, and what, if any, supportive services will be offered to PBV residents. No HUD approval is required, but HUD requires PHAs to submit certain information to the local HUD office prior to selecting properties to receive PBV contracts.

Vouchers may be project-based in existing housing as well as in newly constructed or rehabilitated units but cannot be used in transitional housing. Use in existing housing permits a more streamlined process. The locations where PBVs are used must be consistent

with the goal of deconcentrating poverty and expanding housing and economic opportunity, but agencies have substantial discretion to make this judgment so long as they consider certain HUD-specified factors. PHAs must use a competitive process to select properties, or rely on a competition conducted by another entity such as the process used by the state to allocate LIHTCs, except if project-basing is part of an initiative to improve, develop, or replace a public housing property or site and the PHA has an ownership interest in or control of the property.

HOTMA increased the share of vouchers that agencies could project-base by shifting the measure from 20% of voucher funding to 20% of authorized vouchers, which likely is a higher level. In addition, HOTMA allows an agency to project-base an additional 10% of its vouchers, up to a total of 30%, in units that:

1. House individuals and families meeting the McKinney homelessness definition.
2. House veterans.
3. Provide supportive housing to persons with disabilities or elderly people.
4. Are located in areas where the poverty rate is 20% or less, based on census data at the time of the PBV contract.

Former public housing or other federally assisted or rent-restricted housing, including units converted to project-based vouchers (PBVs) as part of the Rental Assistance Demonstration, generally do not count toward this cap.

In general, PBVs can be attached to no more than the greater of 25% of the units in a project or 25 units in order to achieve a mix of incomes, although there are several exceptions to this requirement. The limitation does not apply to projects that were previously federally assisted or rent restricted. In projects located in census tracts where the poverty rate does not exceed 20%, the PBV limit is increased to 40% of the project’s units. Units housing seniors, or whose non-elderly residents (including, but not limited to, people with disabilities) are eligible for supportive services that are made available

to the assisted tenants in the project, are not subject to the income-mixing limitation (prior to HOTMA, residents had to receive services—not just be eligible for them—in order for the units they occupied to be eligible for the supportive services exception). By requiring owners to attract unsubsidized tenants for a majority of the units, the requirement imposes market discipline in place of direct HUD oversight. The resident choice feature described above also is intended to promote market discipline, as owners' costs will increase if there is a great deal of turnover in their units.

Units receiving PBV assistance, like other HCV units, must meet HUD's housing quality standards before initial occupancy. HOTMA provides some new flexibility to speed initial occupancy where units have been approved under a comparable alternative inspection method or where defects are not life-threatening and are fixed within 30 days. Where tenants remain in place, PHAs may inspect only a sample of PBV units in a property biannually rather than each assisted unit, reducing administrative costs.

With a PBV, a family typically pays 30% of its adjusted income on housing, and the voucher covers the difference between that amount and the unit rent plus the PHA's allowance for tenant-paid utilities. As in the tenant-based voucher program, the unit rent must not exceed the rents for comparable unassisted units in the area. However, there are three important differences in rent policy in PBV units:

1. There is no risk that families will have to pay more than 30% of its income if the rent is above the agency's payment standard.
2. The unit rent is not limited by the PHA's payment standard but may be any reasonable amount up to 110% of the applicable Fair Market Rent (FMR) or HUD-approved exception payment standard. This flexibility on unit rents applies even in the case of units that receive HOME Program funds, where rents usually are capped at 100% of the HUD FMR. Special and more flexible rent rules apply in LIHTC units.

3. In metro areas where HUD sets FMRs at the ZIP code level (Small Area FMRs) rather than metro-wide, or at PHAs that choose to adopt Small Area FMRs, the metro-wide FMRs continue to apply to PBV projects unless the PHA and owner agree to set rents based on the Small Area FMRs, which could expand use of PBVs in higher-cost neighborhoods.

PHAs may reduce allowable unit rents below market based on the property's receipt of other government subsidies. This could be an important tool to stretch voucher funding to assist more units that receive additional capital subsidies through the national Housing Trust Fund.

PHAs must maintain the waiting list for PBV units and refer applicants to owners with anticipated vacancies for selection. PHAs can maintain the PBV waitlist as part of their full voucher waitlist, or maintain a separate PBV waitlist, or even maintain separate waitlists for different properties. To minimize the risk to owners of losing income due to a PHA's failure to promptly refer applicants, PHAs can pay the rent on vacant units for up to 60 days.

PHAs may use different preferences for their PBV waiting list, or the lists for individual PBV properties, than those used for the regular tenant-based list. This may include a preference based on eligibility for services offered in conjunction with a property, which may include disability-specific services funded by Medicaid. Applicants for regular tenant-based vouchers must be notified of the right to apply for PBVs and retain their place on the tenant-based list if they decline to apply for PBV units or are rejected by a PBV owner. Such notice need not be provided directly to everyone on the tenant-based waiting list at the time the project-based list is established; PHAs may use the same procedures used to notify the community that the waiting list will be opened.

HOTMA makes PBVs more flexible in other ways. The maximum term of the initial contract or any extension is increased to 20 years, and PHAs may project-base vouchers provided under the Family

Unification or HUD-VASH programs. PHAs and owners can modify HUD's form PBV contracts to adjust to local circumstances and to add units to existing contracts.

PHAs are bound by the PBV contract with an owner and may refer applicants to vacant units in order to reduce costs. If Congress drastically reduces or eliminates funding for the HCV program making it impossible to avoid terminating vouchers, PHAs could terminate PBV contracts, but otherwise funding for PBV units is more secure than for other vouchers.

Families admitted to PBV units count for purposes of determining a PHA's compliance with the HCV program's targeting requirement that 75% or more of the families admitted annually have extremely low incomes. Targeting compliance is measured for a PHA's entire HCV program, not just at the project level.

HUD's rules now make clear that owners may evict a family from a PBV unit only for good cause (in contrast, families may be evicted from units assisted by tenant-based vouchers when their leases expire, without cause, unless state laws are more stringent). In addition, if a PBV contract is terminated or expires without extension, families have a right to use tenant-based voucher assistance to remain in the unit or move to other housing of their choice.

FUNDING

PBVs are funded as part of the overall Tenant-based Rental Assistance account. PHAs use a portion of their HCV funding for PBVs if they decide to offer the program. The formula Congress directs HUD to use to allocate annual HCV renewal funding provides additional funding to agencies that had to hold back some vouchers in order to have them available for use as project-based assistance in new or rehabilitated properties.

FORECAST FOR 2020

HUD announced plans to issue proposed rules to implement the remaining HOTMA PBV changes in March 2020. These additional rules could encourage more PHAs to take advantage of the expanded authority and increased flexibility HOTMA provides. Perceived funding uncertainty for the HCV program, however, may deter PHAs from making long-term PBV commitments.

Statutory Changes

Further statutory changes are unlikely.

Regulatory Changes

HUD is likely to propose new regulations early in 2020 to implement HOTMA policy changes that are not already effective and to incorporate other HOTMA changes already in effect into HUD rules. These policy changes include defining areas where vouchers are difficult to use differently than the initial guidance (which uses a poverty rate of 20% or less for this concept). Such a new definition could expand the types of households or areas that qualify a PHA to use more PBVs overall and within individual projects allowing owner-managed, site-based waiting lists, authorizing the use of an operating cost adjustment factor to adjust PBV contract rents, streamlining environmental review requirements for existing housing, and allowing PHAs to enter into a contract for a property under construction.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080, www.cbpp.org.

A "policy basic" on PBVs is at <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/policy-basics-project-based-vouchers>.

Information on housing policy and funding is at <http://bit.ly/1d2pkIR>.

Tenant Protection Vouchers

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing, and Office of Multifamily Housing Programs

Year Program Started: 1996 for prepayments; 1999 for opt outs

Population Targeted: Low-income tenants of HUD’s various project-based housing assistance programs

Funding: FY20 funding is \$75 million, down from \$85 million in FY19.

See Also: The *Housing Choice Voucher Program* and *Project-Based Rental Assistance* sections of this guide.

Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs) may be provided to low-income residents of project-based HUD-assisted housing when there is a change in the status of their assisted housing that will cause residents to lose their home (for example, public housing demolition) or render their home unaffordable (for example, an owner “opting out” of a Section 8 contract). HUD calls such changes “housing conversion actions” or “eligibility events.” There are two types of TPVs, regular tenant-based Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) and tenant-based Enhanced Vouchers (EVs). Both types are administered by a local public housing agency (PHA). The amount of funding available for TPVs is determined by HUD estimates of need in the upcoming year and congressional appropriations.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Residents are eligible for either HCVs or EVs, depending upon which housing program assisted the development in which they are living, as well as certain circumstances for some of the programs. The “FY19 Appropriations Act” continued the policy of limiting TPVs to units that have been occupied during the previous two years. Notice PIH 2019-08 follows the letter of the act, an improvement over previous years,

when HUD stated that due to inadequate funding, TPVs would only be awarded for units occupied at the time a PHA or private owner applied for them, or when HUD approved demolition or disposition of public housing. The “FY19 Appropriations Act” also continued a provision first introduced by the “FY15 Appropriations Act,” prohibiting TPVs to be reissued when the initial family with the TPV no longer uses it, except as a “replacement voucher.”

REPLACEMENT AND RELOCATION TENANT PROTECTION VOUCHERS

Since FY15, Congress has prohibited a TPV to be reissued when a household no longer uses it, unless that TPV was a replacement voucher. In short, replacement TPVs are made available as a result of a public housing or HUD-assisted multifamily action that reduces the number of HUD-assisted units in a community. Replacement TPVs not only assist the household affected by the loss of the HUD-assisted unit, but also make up for the loss of the HUD-assisted housing in the community. After an initial household no longer needs the replacement TPV, a PHA may reissue the TPV to households on its waiting list or project-base that TPV. “Relocation TPVs” are provided when HUD-assisted housing units are not permanently lost, for example when residents are temporarily relocated while waiting to return to redeveloped public housing. Such a TPV cannot be reissued once the household returns to the redeveloped property.

Regular Tenant Protection Vouchers

Traditional HCVs are provided to residents to enable them to find alternative affordable homes when:

- Public housing is demolished, sold (a “disposition”), or undergoes a mandatory conversion to HCVs.
- A project-based Section 8 contract has been terminated or not renewed by HUD at a private, multifamily property (for example if

the owner continuously fails to maintain the property in suitable condition).

- Private housing with a HUD-subsidized mortgage undergoes foreclosure.
- A Rent Supplement Payments Program (Rent Supp) or a Rental Assistance Payment Program (RAP) contract expires, underlying mortgage is prepaid, or HUD terminates the contract.
- Certain Section 202 Direct Loans are prepaid.

TPVs issued as regular HCVs follow all of the basic rules and procedures of non-TPV HCVs.

Enhanced Vouchers

EVs are provided to tenants living in properties with private, project-based assistance when an “eligibility event” takes place, as defined in Section 8(t)(2) of the “Housing Act of 1937.” The most typical “eligibility event” is when a project-based Section 8 contract expires, and the owner decides not to renew the contract and “opts out.” Prepayment of certain unrestricted HUD-insured mortgages (generally Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) projects) is another type of eligibility event.

There are several other situations triggering an eligibility event, depending on the program initially providing assistance. HUD must provide EVs for opt outs and qualifying mortgage prepayments; however, HUD has discretion regarding TPVs for other circumstances such as Rent Supp or RAP contract terminations, or Section 202 Direct Loan prepayments.

Special Features of Enhanced Vouchers

EVs have two special features that make them “enhanced” for residents:

1. Right to Remain: A household receiving an EV has the right to remain in their previously assisted home, and the owner must accept the EV as long as the home:
 - a. Continues to be used by the owner as a rental property; that is, unless the owner converts the property to a condominium, a cooperative, or some other private use (legal services

advocates assert that this qualification in HUD guidance is contrary to statute).

- b. Meets HUD’s “reasonable rent” criteria, with rent comparable to unassisted units in the development or in the private market.
- c. Meets HUD’s Housing Quality Standards.

Instead of accepting an EV, a household may move right away with a regular HCV. A household accepting an EV may choose to move later, but then their EV converts to a regular HCV.

1. Higher Voucher Payment Standard: an EV will pay the difference between a tenant’s required contribution toward rent and the new market-based rent charged by the owner after the housing conversion action, even if that new rent is greater than the PHA’s basic voucher payment standard. A PHA’s regular voucher payment standard is between 90% and 110% of the Fair Market Rent (FMR). EV rents must still meet the regular voucher program’s rent reasonableness requirement; rents must be reasonable in comparison to rents charged for comparable housing in the private, unassisted market (and ought to be compared with any unassisted units in the property undergoing a conversion action). EV payment standards must be adjusted in response to future rent increases.

In most cases a household will continue to pay 30% of their income toward rent and utilities. However, the statute has a minimum rent requirement calling for households to continue to pay toward rent at least the same amount they were paying for rent on the date of the housing conversion action, even if it is more than 30% of their income. If, in the future, a household’s income declines by 15%, the minimum rent must be recalculated to be 30% of income or the percentage of income the household was paying on the date of the conversion event, whichever is greater. Notice PIH 2019-12 (May 23, 2019) changed the policy for instances in which a household’s income increases to an amount

such that the dollar value of the EV minimum rent established by the percentage of income calculation is more than the original (pre-15% income decline) EV minimum rent. In such instances, the household's EV minimum rent reverts to the EV minimum rent at the time of the eligibility event.

Mortgage Prepayment Eligibility Events Under Section 8(t) of the "Housing Act"

When an owner prepays an FHA-insured loan, under certain conditions EVs may be provided to tenants in units not covered by rental assistance contracts. However, EVs may not be provided to unassisted tenants if the mortgage matures.

If a mortgage may be prepaid without prior HUD approval, then EVs must be offered to income-eligible tenants living in units not covered by a rental assistance contract. Section 229(l) of the "Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990" (often referred to as LIHPRHA) spells out the various types of such mortgages.

Some properties that received preservation assistance under the "Emergency Low-Income Housing Preservation Act" (often referred to as ELIHPA) may have mortgages that meet the criteria of Section 229(l). For such properties, HUD may provide EVs to income-eligible tenants not currently assisted by a rental assistance contract when the mortgage is prepaid. However, HUD may not provide EVs if after mortgage prepayment the property still has an unexpired Use Agreement. A Use Agreement is a contract between HUD and a property owner that binds the owner to specific requirements such as income-eligibility of tenants and maximum rents that are less than market-rate. Some HUD programs use Regulatory Agreements which have similar requirements.

Set-Aside for TPVs at Certain Properties

The "FY19 Appropriations Act" continued the provision setting aside \$5 million of the \$85 million appropriated for tenant protection vouchers for low-income households in low-vacancy areas that may have to pay more than 30% of their income for rent. Each year HUD has

issued a notice providing guidance; the latest is Notice PIH 2019-01/Notice H 2019-02. Beginning with that Notice, HUD will no longer issue a Notice each year; instead Notice PIH 2019-01/Notice H 2019-02 will continue to be applicable unless Congress changes the terms of the set-aside. The FY19 Notice applies to the \$5 million appropriated for FY18 and funds remaining from previous years.

To be eligible for this set-aside, one of two triggering events must have taken place:

1. The maturity of a HUD-insured, HUD-held, or Section 202 loan that would have required HUD permission prior to loan prepayment. These include Section 236, Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate (BMIR), and Section 202 Direct Loans.
2. The expiration of affordability restrictions accompanying a mortgage or preservation program administered by HUD. There are two groups of such properties:
 - a. Properties with matured Section 236 insured or HUD-held mortgages, Section 221(d)(3) BMIR insured or HUD-held mortgages, or Section 202 Direct loans for which permission from HUD is not required prior to mortgage prepayment, but the underlying affordability restrictions expired with the maturity of the mortgages.
 - b. Properties with stand-alone "Affordability Restrictions" that expired in FY18 or in the five years prior to the owner's submission. To be eligible, the project with the expired affordability restriction must not, at the time of the request for assistance, have an active Section 236 insured or HUD-held mortgages, Section 221(d)(3) BMIR insured or HUD-held mortgages, or Section 202 Direct loans.

Prior to 2018 there was a third possible trigger: the expiration of a rental assistance contract for which the tenants are not eligible for enhanced voucher or tenant protection assistance under existing law. These included properties with

a RAP contract that expired before FY12, or a property with a Rent Supp contract that expired before FY20.

A project must be in a HUD-identified low-vacancy area. HUD will update a list of low-vacancy areas each year. The 2018 joint Notice provided many more counties on HUD's list of low-vacancy areas than in previous years because HUD decided to select counties with public housing and multifamily-assisted properties that had occupancy rates greater than or equal to 90%. Previous Notices used a county's overall vacancy rate, which included non-assisted rental housing. Advocates had long urged HUD to revise the way it determined low-vacancy areas because many otherwise eligible properties were not allowed to apply for TPV assistance.

To determine whether a household might become rent-burdened (pay more than 30% of household income for rent and utilities), the 2019 Notice (as was the case for the first time with the 2018 Notice) requires owners to divide the 2018 Small Area FMR (SAFMR) in metropolitan areas or FMR in non-metro areas by a household's adjusted income. In the past, the numerator (a proxy for market rents) was HUD's most current low-income limit for a metro area.

Other key provisions that have applied to the set-aside in previous years provided in the joint 2019 Notice include:

- As with previous Notices, only owners may request TPV assistance. Advocates have urged HUD to allow residents to request TPV assistance if an owner is not responsive. Also, like previous Notices, the new one requires owners to notify residents. Starting with the 2018 Notice, owners must also notify any legitimate resident organizations. However, the Notice does not require owners of projects approaching an expiration of restrictions to provide residents a one-year advance notice, as advocates have urged.
- As in the past, applications will be accepted on a rolling basis; however, unlike previous Notices the funds will be not available until any set-aside funds are exhausted. This is an

improvement advocates have long sought. In prior years set-aside funds not awarded were no longer available at the end of the relevant fiscal year. Because HUD failed to issue Notices in a timely fashion, significant sums were left unused. For example, for FY16 the Notice was issued on August 18, two months before the end of the fiscal year. As in the past, owners must indicate their preference for either enhanced vouchers or project-based vouchers (PBVs). Owners must state whether they are willing to accept the alternative form of assistance if the PIH Field Office is unable to find a PHA willing to administer the owner's preferred assistance type. For example, if an owner prefers PBVs, the application will have to specify whether the owner consents to enhanced vouchers if the PIH Field Office is unable to find a PHA to administer PBV assistance.

The National Housing Law Project (NHLP) identified, as of May 2016, approximately 32,300 unassisted units in 314 properties in 45 states that were at risk of mortgage maturity or the expiration of use restrictions or assistance. Of this total, more than 16,800 unassisted units in 150 properties were at risk and eligible for tenant protections. An additional 15,700 unassisted units in 164 properties were also at risk but were not eligible for TPVs because they were not located in HUD-defined low-vacancy areas.

FUNDING

The amount of funding available for TVPs should be determined by HUD estimates of need in the upcoming year and congressional appropriations.

President Trump proposed \$130 million for FY20, while the House proposed \$150 million and the Senate proposed only \$75 million. The dramatic increase proposed by the administration reflects its intention to reduce the number of public housing units by facilitating demolition and voluntary conversion to vouchers. The final FY20 appropriation is \$75 million.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should tell members of Congress to support funding sufficient to cover all TPVs that might be needed due to housing conversion actions so that low-income households are not displaced from their homes as a result of steep rent increases when a private HUD-assisted property leaves a HUD program, or to ensure that low-income households have tenant-based assistance to be able to afford rent elsewhere when they lose their homes due to public housing demolition, disposition, or mandatory or voluntary conversion to vouchers.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

HUD Fact Sheet: PHAs are now required to issue this to residents when owners of private, HUD-assisted housing decide to no longer participate in the HUD program, <http://bit.ly/2vYkeBL>.

Notice PIH 2019-09 is at: <https://bit.ly/35hV28o>.

The joint Notice H- 2019-02/PIH 2019-01 is at: <https://bit.ly/2qTI3e4>.

Family Unification Program (FUP) Vouchers

By Ruth White, Executive Director,
National Center for Housing and Child
Welfare

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public
and Indian Housing (PIH)

Year Started: 1990

Number of Persons/Households Served:

Nearly 40,000 households currently hold
Housing Choice Vouchers through the Family
Unification Program (FUP).

Population Targeted: Homeless or precariously
housed families in danger of losing children
to foster care or that are unable to regain
custody primarily due to housing problems
and youth aging out of foster care who are at
risk of homelessness.

Funding: In November 2019, HUD issued
\$20 million in funding for FUP. Congress
appropriated \$25 million for FY2020, and
FUP remains an eligible use of HUD's Tenant
Protection Fund.

See Also: For related information, refer to the
Housing Choice Voucher Program, *Tenant
Protection Vouchers*, and *HUD-Funded Service
Coordination Programs* sections of this guide.

HUD's FUP is a federal housing program
aimed at keeping homeless families
together and safe and preventing
homelessness among young adults (as old as 24)
who have spent time in foster care after the age of
16. HUD provides FUP Housing Choice Vouchers
to public housing authorities (PHAs) who must
work in partnership with public child welfare
agencies in order to select eligible participants
for the program. These vouchers can be used
to prevent children from entering foster care, to
reunite foster children with their parents, and to
help ease the transition to adulthood for older
former foster youth. In 2016, Congress initiated
an extensive program to allow PHAs to couple FUP
youth vouchers with HUD's Family Self Sufficiency
Program (FSS). Through the most recent NOFA,

HUD encourages PHAs to engage families in FSS
as well.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

FUP was signed into law in 1990 by President
George H. W. Bush. The program was created
as a part of the Tenant Protection Fund within
the "Cranston-Gonzalez Affordable Housing
Act of 1990." FUP is designed to address the
housing-related needs of children in the foster
care system. According to HHS, more than
27,000 children enter foster care each year
because their families lack access to safe, decent,
and affordable housing. FUP is also a valuable
housing resource to many of the 25,000 youth
who age out of foster care each year, nearly a
quarter of whom experience homelessness
within a year of leaving the system. Despite the
obvious impact of America's affordable housing
crisis on foster children, child welfare workers
seldom have access to the housing resources or
supportive services necessary to prevent and
end homelessness among vulnerable families
and youth. FUP is one of the few cross-systems
partnerships that communities can draw upon
to keep families together and safe and ease the
transition to adulthood for young adults.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

FUP is administered at the local level through
a partnership between PHAs and public
child welfare agencies. PHAs interested in
administering FUP Vouchers must sign a
memorandum of understanding (MOU) with
their partner agency in order to apply to HUD in
response to a Notice of Funding Availability. FUP
Vouchers are awarded through a competitive
process. Depending on the size of the PHA,
communities can receive a maximum of 100, 50,
or 25 vouchers. Communities are encouraged to
apply only for the number of vouchers that can
be leased up quickly, meaning that both families
and youth have been identified and landlords have
been recruited for the program.

PHAs receiving an allocation of FUP Vouchers then administer vouchers to families and youth who have been certified as eligible for FUP by the local public child welfare agency. The most recent HUD announcement regarding FUP emphasizes the importance of ensuring that families in the homeless assistance system that are involved with child welfare are aware of available FUP Vouchers. In an effort to ensure that these families are included in FUP, HUD required the local Continuum of Care (CoC) leader to sign the FUP MOU and encourages the participating FUP partners to meet regularly with the local CoC groups.

FUP Vouchers work in the same way as a typical Housing Choice Voucher and are subject to the same eligibility rules. The child welfare agency is required to help FUP clients gather the necessary Section 8 paperwork, find suitable housing, and to maintain their housing through aftercare services. If a child welfare agency elects to refer a young person aging out of foster care with a FUP Voucher, the child welfare agency must offer educational and training vouchers, independent living programs, counseling, and employment assistance. The housing subsidies available to youth under this program are limited to 36 months. FUP youth who participate in HUD's Family Self-Sufficiency Program may keep their voucher for up to five years.

Eligible families include those who are in imminent danger of losing their children to foster care primarily due to housing problems and those who are unable to regain custody of their children primarily due to housing problems. Eligible youth include those who were in foster care any time after the age of 14 and are currently between the ages of 14 and 24 (have not reached their 25th birthday) and are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Unlike families, youth can only participate in FUP for 36 months.

FUNDING

Each year between 1992 and 2001, HUD awarded an average of 3,560 FUP Vouchers to public housing agencies. Unfortunately, from FY02 to FY07, HUD used its rescission authority to avoid

funding FUP. Funding for FUP was re-established by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development in 2009 and since then, FUP has received widespread support and a consistent investment of roughly \$20 million annually. In fact, Congress increased the funding for FUP in FY2020 to \$25 million along with language that synchronizes vouchers for youth with foster care emancipation in order to eliminate homelessness for youth leaving care. Vouchers for youth continue to be time-limited to three years, thus HUD incentivizes communities (particularly local child welfare agencies) to provide housing stability services to youth for the life of the voucher to help move youth towards self-sufficiency.

FORECAST FOR 2020

There is growing interagency support for FUP at the federal level in Congress and within the administration. Leadership in authorizing and appropriations committees have expressed a high level of confidence and support for FUP and it is likely that FUP will continue to receive steady funding as well as serve as a blueprint for similar interagency housing collaboration.

An important development in the evolution of FUP is an increasing interest in synchronizing FUP vouchers with emancipation in order to eliminate homelessness among youth leaving foster care. Congressional appropriators included language in the "FY2020 Appropriations Act" that allows \$10 million of the FUP funding to be awarded non-competitively so that a portion of the FUP vouchers can be issued "on demand" in such a manner that child welfare agencies can properly time the voucher request with a young adult's emancipation from foster care.

HUD also requires that the local Continuum of Care leader sign the FUP Memorandum of Understanding along with the PHA and PCWA directors. This is to ensure that young people who have been failed by the child welfare system and end up homeless are identified and referred by the local CoC. However, in 2020 the intent is to prevent foster care alumni from entering the homeless services sector overall.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

The most successful FUP partnerships require cross-training, single points of contact (liaisons) within each partner agency, and ongoing communication. HUD requires that FUP sites have regular communication, liaisons, and other elements to support their partnership and provide case management and other supportive services to FUP households. FUP sites must include ongoing, intensive case management provided by the local child welfare agency or through a contract funded by the child welfare system. HUD underscores the importance of child welfare partners taking part in landlord recruitment, housing training for frontline staff, and regular communication with the PHA point of contact. Finally, HUD encourages PHAs to enroll FUP households in the FSS program because this adds an extra layer of supportive services and helps ensure that FUP households will successfully maintain permanent housing and reduce the amount of subsidy paid by the government over time.

HUD offers the tools and training necessary to implement and operate a FUP partnership on its [website](#) free of charge. The FUP tools offered on the HUD website are designed to share resources and information in an effort to prevent

and end family and youth homelessness. PHAs administering FUP nationwide demonstrate an extraordinary commitment to at-risk populations and the ability to match existing services to Section 8 vouchers in order to successfully serve hard-to-house families and youth leaving foster care.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should help legislators understand that housing is a vital tool for promoting family unification, easing the transition to adulthood for foster youth, and achieving significant cost savings. Advocates can inform their elected officials that when a FUP Voucher is used to reunify a family and subsidizes a two-bedroom unit, the community saves an average of \$32,458 per family in annual foster care costs. Furthermore, supportive housing for young adults is a tenth of the cost of more restrictive placements like juvenile justice or residential treatment. This cost-benefit information is an excellent way to help legislators understand the importance of new funding for the FUP.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Center for Housing & Child Welfare, 301-699-0151, www.nchcw.org.

Foster Youth to Independence Initiative

By Ruth White, Executive Director,
National Center for Housing and Child
Welfare

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public
and Indian Housing (PIH)

Year Started: 2019

Number of Persons/Households Served:

Since the Foster Youth to Independence (FYI) Initiative was implemented on July 26, 2019, nearly 250 youth have received time-limited Housing Choice Vouchers and supportive services to support their efforts toward self-sufficiency. The application for FYI is a “rolling” application which means that public housing agencies (PHAs) can access the program as needed (up to 25 vouchers annually per PHA) when youth age out of foster care in their communities.

Population Targeted: Current and former foster youth between the ages of 18 to 25 who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Funding: On July 26, 2019, HUD issued notice PIH 2019-20 (HA), inviting certain PHAs to apply for vouchers from HUD's Tenant Protection Fund. While HUD did not specify a maximum for FYI funding nationally, no PHA can receive more than 25 FYI vouchers.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Housing Choice Voucher Program*, *Tenant Protection Vouchers*, and *HUD-Funded Service Coordination Programs* sections of this guide.

HUD's FYI Initiative is a new way of administering an existing program, the Family Unification Program (FUP) for youth. FYI is aimed at synchronizing FUP vouchers with emancipation from foster care in order to prevent youth from experiencing homelessness. FYI vouchers are drawn from HUD's Tenant Protection Voucher fund; hence the name “FYI TPVs.” FYI TPVs are provided to PHAs that agree to work in partnership with public child welfare

agencies to select eligible participants for the program and provide supportive services.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Since 2014, the Fostering Stable Housing (FSHO) Coalition, a group of current and former foster youth led by ACTION Ohio in partnership with the National Center for Housing and Child Welfare (NCHCW), has worked with HUD career staff to devise a plan to close the gaps through which youth leaving foster care fall into homelessness and human trafficking. Each year, 19,000 young people emancipate from foster care and enter adulthood alone, having not been adopted nor reunified with their parents. As they struggle to gain economic footing in their communities without the support of extended family, nearly 25% experience homelessness upon emancipation.

In 2018, the FSHO Coalition determined that best way to prevent homelessness was to synchronize HUD's existing, time-limited FUP vouchers for youth with emancipation and eliminate geographic disparities. To do this, the FSHO Coalition recommended to HUD that they tap the flexible, on-demand nature of the TPVs for which FUP was already an eligible use and which can be distributed all over the country in a flexible, somewhat on-demand manner. The FSHO Coalition delivered this proposal directly to Sec. Carson and his leadership team on March 4, 2019, at which time Sec. Carson directed his staff to vet the proposal's legality and viability. HUD determined within weeks that the proposal was indeed viable, named the proposal the “Foster Youth to Independence Initiative,” and composed the details of a notice for PHAs. On July 26, 2019, HUD issued an invitation to PHAs with contracts to administer Housing Choice Vouchers (that do not already administer FUP) to apply for FYI, thus making FUP for youth available nationwide. The first vouchers were awarded on October 31, 2019 and HUD continues to accept applications on a rolling basis.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Like FUP, FYI is administered at the local level through a partnership between public housing authorities (PHAs) and public child welfare agencies (PCWAs). In order to apply, sites must identify at least one eligible youth and sign a memorandum of understanding or a letter of agreement outlining their commitment to the success of FYI, the youth served by FYI, and the roles their organizations will play in this regard. Sites can apply for up to 25 FYI TPV vouchers annually.

The PCWA must agree to provide a host of independent living services either directly or through a contract. The PCWA also must agree to identify eligible youth and certify that the young person is at least 18 years old and not more than 24 years old (has not reached his/her 25th birthday), that he/she left foster care at age 16 or older, and that the young person is homeless or at risk of homelessness. Communities are also encouraged to involve their local homeless service providers in locating eligible youth who are currently homeless but have lost touch with the child welfare system.

To select youth, PCWA staff should monitor a young person's housing needs as they move along the continuum of foster care services. When a young person approaches emancipation and it is clear that the young person is at risk of homelessness and is interested in the stability of renting their own apartment, they should consider a referral to FYI. If it is the case that a young person will not be able to afford to rent an apartment without a government subsidy, then the PCWA staff will notify the FYI point of contact at the local PHA about three months prior to emancipation (in most states this is just before age 21) to let them know that the young person is eligible for and interested in a FUP voucher.

PCWAs should also begin to forecast and predict how many young people will need vouchers within their caseload so that they can request vouchers in batches from their local PHA.

HUD offers all the tools and training necessary to implement and operate an FYI partnership

on their [website](#) free of charge. In fact, HUD's tools are an excellent formula generally for all community partnerships aimed at preventing youth homelessness beyond FYI.

FUNDING

FYI draws vouchers from HUD's Tenant Protection Vouchers. This is possible because youth are eligible for the Family Unification Program, which was offered as an original purpose of the Tenant Protection Voucher fund when it was established in 1990. The TPV received only \$75 million in the "FY2020 Appropriations Act." This was significantly less than the \$150 million that advocates were hoping for. That said, HUD did not limit the amount of resources that can be drawn from the TPV for FYI, but because FYI is targeted to a small population of youth, NCHCW estimates that FYI will not exceed 2,000 vouchers annually, or roughly \$20 million. Advocates must encourage congressional appropriators to continue to allow FUP to be an eligible use of the Tenant Protection Fund. In fact, the first allotment awarded on October 31, 2019 was just \$1.7 million.

FORECAST FOR 2020

There is growing interagency support for improving access to FUP for youth leaving foster care. In fact, the House passed "The Fostering Stable Housing Opportunities Act" (HR 4300) by voice vote in November 2019. HR 4300 will permanently authorize the FYI approach to administering FUP for youth. This legislation also encourages self-sufficiency by extending the time-limit from 36 months to 60 months for youth who voluntarily enroll in self-sufficiency programs. Advocates should reach out to the Senate and encourage them to move the companion bill, S. 2803, this year.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

FYI is intended to prevent homelessness among youth leaving foster care, but it certainly is not intended to replace child welfare resources. Therefore, it is important to point out that child welfare agencies nationwide have access

to flexible child welfare resources, including entitlement funding through Title IV-E of the “Social Security Act” to provide housing and independent living services for youth through the age of 21 aimed at preparing youth to avoid homelessness. Funding for independent living services and non-recurring housing expenses is available through the age of 23 under the “Chafee Independent Living Act.” Community leaders must encourage child welfare agencies to provide a platform for economic success for youth while they are under the care and custody of the state in order to reduce the need for current and former foster youth to tap homeless services.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates can help legislators understand that housing is a vital tool for easing the transition to adulthood for foster youth. Advocates can inform their elected officials that when a Housing Choice Voucher is used to prevent homelessness, the cost of that voucher is a tenth of the cost of residential treatment or a juvenile justice placement. The “Fostering Stable Housing Opportunities Act” (S. 2803) currently in the Senate will permanently authorize the distribution process and the access to supportive services outlined in FYI. Please ask your senator to co-sponsor S. 2803.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Center for Housing & Child Welfare, 301-699-0151, www.nchcw.org.

Mainstream and Non-Elderly Disabled (NED) Vouchers

By Lisa Sloane, Senior Policy Advisor,
Technical Assistance Collaborative

Administering Agency: HUD’s Office of Housing Choice Vouchers (HCV) within the Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)

Number of Persons/Households Served: Until 2018, non-elderly persons with disabilities (NED) vouchers served almost 55,000 households under the combined Mainstream and NED programs.

Year Started: Since 1997, Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) have been awarded under different special purpose voucher program types to serve NED.

Population Targeted: A household composed of one or more non-elderly persons with disabilities, which may include additional household members who are not non-elderly persons with disabilities. Non-elderly persons are defined as persons between ages 18 and 61. Whether the qualifying person with a disability must be the head of household or spouse depends on the program and Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

Funding: The Consolidated Appropriations Acts of 2017-2019 made approximately \$500 million available for new Mainstream voucher assistance, the first funding for new Mainstream vouchers since 2005. In 2018 and 2019, HUD awarded a combined \$230 million for over 27,000 new vouchers to 435 PHAs. \$270 million remains to be awarded for new vouchers. The FY20 appropriation provides funds for renewals but not for any new vouchers (above what was provided in the FY18 and FY19 appropriation).

HISTORY

Before 1992, federal housing statutes defined “elderly” to include people with disabilities. As a result, many (but not all) properties built primarily to serve elders, such as the Section 202 program, also had requirements to serve people with disabilities. Depending on the HUD program and NOFA under which a property was funded, the occupancy policy might have included a requirement to set-aside 10% of their units for people with mobility impairments (including younger people with disabilities), a set-aside to serve non-elderly people with disabilities, or the policy might have provided non-elders with equal access to all the units.

The occupancy policies that resulted in elder and non-elders living together became controversial in the late 1980s and early 1990s. In response to this controversy, Congress passed Title VI of the “Housing and Community Development Act of 1992,” which allowed public housing agencies and certain types of HUD-assisted properties to change their occupancy policies. The law allowed public housing agencies to designate buildings or parts of buildings as elderly-only or disabled-only; PHAs had to develop and receive HUD approval for a Designated Housing Plan before such a designation could be made. The law also allowed some HUD-assisted housing providers to house only elders and others to reduce the number of non-elderly applicants admitted.

Between 1996 and 2009, Congress appropriated voucher funding to compensate for the housing lost to younger people with disabilities as a result of the 1992 law. These funds were appropriated through a variety of programs; the specific programs are described in the next section of this article. Note that many of these NED vouchers are called Frelinghuysen vouchers because then House Appropriations Chair Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-NJ) advocated for their funding.

One of these programs is the Mainstream Voucher Program. Between 1996 and 2002, Congress allowed HUD to reallocate up to 25% of funding for the development of new supportive housing units for non-elderly people with disabilities toward tenant-based rental assistance. During this period, approximately 15,000 incremental vouchers were given out to public housing agencies (PHAs) for this targeted population under the 811 Mainstream Program.

The Consolidated Appropriations Acts of 2017-2019 made approximately \$500 million available for new Mainstream voucher assistance, the first funding for new Mainstream vouchers since 2005. In 2018 and 2019, HUD awarded a combined \$230 million in funding for over 27,000 new vouchers to 435 PHAs. \$270 million remains to be awarded for new vouchers. Only PHAs that administer Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) assistance and non-profits that already administer HCV Mainstream assistance were eligible to apply. In awarding voucher funding, HUD provided points for applications that included partnerships between housing and services/disability organizations, especially those that targeted housing assistance to assist people with disabilities who are transitioning out of institutional or other segregated settings, at risk of institutionalization, homeless or at risk of becoming homeless, or were previously homeless and now participate in a permanent supportive housing or rapid rehousing program (“move-on”).

HUD has an additional \$270 million available to award. One or more additional NOFAs are expected to be issued in 2020.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Mainstream and NED Voucher Programs are a component of the HCV program. Congress appropriated NED vouchers under a variety of different appropriations and HUD allocated funds under differing program NOFAs. Although different programs have differing target sub-populations, all target non-elderly people with disabilities and all operate under the HCV regulations and guidance, with slight modifications as provided in the original NOFA

or subsequent Notices. Upon turnover, these vouchers must be issued to non-elderly disabled families from the PHA’s HCV waiting list.

The following describes the specific NED programs administered by PHAs:

- NED Category 1 vouchers enable non-elderly persons or families with disabilities to access affordable housing on the private market.
- NED Category 2 vouchers enable non-elderly persons with disabilities currently residing in nursing homes or other healthcare institutions to transition into the community.
- Designated Housing Vouchers enable non-elderly disabled families, who would have been eligible for a public housing unit if occupancy of the unit or entire project had not been restricted to elderly families only through an approved Designated Housing Plan, to receive rental assistance. These vouchers may also assist non-elderly disabled families living in a designated unit/project/building to move from that project if they so choose. The family does not have to be listed on the PHA’s voucher waiting list. Instead, they may be admitted to the program as a special admission. Once the impacted families have been served, the PHA may begin issuing these vouchers to non-elderly disabled families from their HCV waiting list.
- Certain Developments Vouchers enable non-elderly families with a person with disabilities who do not currently receive housing assistance in certain developments where owners establish preferences for, or restrict occupancy to, elderly families to obtain affordable housing. These are HUD assisted private properties funded as those under the Section 8 new construction or Section 202 programs. Once the impacted families have been served, the PHA may issue vouchers to non-elderly disabled families from their HCV waiting list.
- Mainstream Housing Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities Vouchers enable non-elderly disabled families on the PHA’s waiting list to receive a voucher.

- Project Access Pilot Program (formerly Access Housing 2000) provides vouchers to selected PHAs that partnered with State Medicaid agencies to assist non-elderly disabled persons transition from nursing homes and other institutions into the community.

FUNDING

The Consolidated Appropriations Acts of 2017-2019 made approximately \$500 million available for new Mainstream voucher assistance, the first funding for new Mainstream vouchers since 2005. In 2018 and 2019, HUD awarded a combined \$230 million in funding for over 27,000 new vouchers to 435 PHAs. \$270 million remains to be awarded for new vouchers; at least one NOFA is anticipated in 2020.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The FY20 enacted appropriation is \$229 million which covers renewal of existing vouchers but does not include any funding for new vouchers. However, as noted above, funding from previous appropriations remains and is expected to be allocated via a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process in the spring of 2020.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates are encouraged to contact their members of Congress with the message that people with disabilities continue to be the poorest people in the nation. TAC's publication *Priced Out* reported that nearly five million non-elderly adults with significant and long-term disabilities have Supplemental Security Income levels equal to only 20% of AMI and cannot afford housing without housing assistance. Because of this housing crisis, many of the most marginalized people with disabilities live unnecessarily in costly nursing homes, in seriously substandard facilities that may violate the "Americans with Disabilities Act," or are homeless. Mainstream and other NED vouchers can help the government reach its goals of ending homelessness and minimizing the number of persons living in costly institutions. Advocates should encourage their members of Congress to continue to increase

funding for NED vouchers in order to address these critical public policy issues.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Technical Assistance Collaborative, 617-266-5657, www.tacinc.org. TAC's Mainstream and NED voucher database by state can be found at <http://www.tacinc.org/knowledge-resources/vouchers-database/>.

Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Housing Task Force http://www.c-c-d.org/rubriques.php?rub=taskforce.php&id_task=8.

HUD's NED web page https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/ned.

HUD's Mainstream Voucher Program https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/programs/hcv/mainstream.

Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) Vouchers

By Kathryn Monet, Chief Executive Officer, National Coalition for Homeless Veterans

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA)

Year Started: Formally in 1992; most active since 2008

Number of Persons/Households Served: More than 170,000 veterans since 2008

Population Targeted: Homeless veterans meeting VA health care eligibility, with a focus on chronic homelessness

Funding: \$40 million in FY20 in HUD-VASH vouchers with case management through the VA.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Housing Choice Voucher Program, Veterans Housing, Homeless Assistance Programs*, and *Interagency Council on Homelessness* sections of this guide.

INTRODUCTION

The HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program (HUD-VASH) combines Housing Choice Voucher rental assistance for homeless veterans with case management and clinical services provided by the VA. It is a key program in the effort to end veteran homelessness. To date, this program has helped more than 170,000 homeless veterans, many of whom were chronically homeless, achieve housing stability.

HUD has awarded more than 100,000 HUD-VASH Vouchers through FY19. Nationwide, more than 300 public housing authorities (PHAs) participate in the program. In recent years, Congress created a set-aside pilot program to encourage HUD-VASH Vouchers to be used on tribal lands, thereby filling an important gap in our service delivery system. Additionally, HUD has released

a series of project-based competitions to help spur development of new affordable housing units in high-cost markets with limited affordable housing stock.

The HUD-VASH program is jointly administered by the VA and HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH). The vouchers are allocated to local PHAs, although veteran referrals usually come from the nearest VA Medical Center (VAMC). Administration of HUD-VASH is conducted by the PHA and clinical services are provided by the VAMC, or the contracted VAMC case-management provider.

HISTORY

As of January 2019, HUD estimates that 37,085 veterans were homeless. This number represents a 50% decline in veteran homelessness since 2010. Major declines in veteran homelessness have occurred among the unsheltered population thanks in large part to the HUD-VASH program and national efforts to end chronic homelessness for all people, including veterans.

Congress began funding these special purpose vouchers in earnest in the "Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008" (Public Law 110-161) with an allocation of \$75 million for approximately 10,000 vouchers. Since FY08, Congress has allocated \$75 million to HUD for approximately 10,000 new vouchers each year, with the exception of a \$50 million award in FY11, a \$60 million award in FY16, and \$40 million awards in FY17, FY18, and FY19.

In the early 2000s, advocates approximated that 60,000 chronically homeless veterans were in need of the comprehensive services offered through a HUD-VASH Voucher. These advocates encouraged Congress and the administration to set this as a target for the number of vouchers on the street. This target has since been revised upwards, as additional target populations beyond veterans experiencing chronic homelessness

have received assistance through HUD-VASH due to high need and limited alternative options. Of the 14,345 unsheltered homeless veterans, many chronically homelessness veterans still need this vital resource.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

HUD-VASH is a cornerstone in the efforts to end veteran homelessness, providing a particularly effective resource because it combines both housing and services into one housing-first oriented resource. PHAs are required to register their interest in vouchers with HUD, in consultation with their local VA medical center, in order to be considered for vouchers. When vouchers become available in a community, VA personnel, in consultation with community partners, determine which veterans are clinically eligible for and in need of the program before making referrals to local PHAs which then must verify eligibility based on HUD regulations.

Veterans who receive HUD-VASH Vouchers rent privately owned housing and generally contribute up to 30% of their income toward rent. VA case managers foster a therapeutic relationship with veterans and act as liaisons with landlords, PHAs, and community-based service providers. In some instances, these case management services are contracted through service providers who have already established relationships with participating veterans. When a veteran no longer needs the program's supports or has exceeded its income limits, these vouchers become available for the next qualifying veteran. By providing a stable environment with wrap-around services, veterans and their families are able to regain control of their lives and ultimately reintegrate into society.

As additional target populations have been identified for HUD-VASH, the need for this resource has grown. These target populations include homeless female veterans, homeless veterans with dependent children, and homeless veterans with significant disabling and co-occurring conditions. In 2014, some 71% of veterans admitted to the HUD-VASH program met chronic homeless criteria and 91% of

allocated vouchers resulted in permanent housing placement. Targeting of HUD-VASH to chronically homeless veterans has led to dramatically positive results: lease-up rates have improved and the time it takes to lease up vouchers has dropped significantly across the country. Improved staffing of HUD-VASH case management at VAMCs has also contributed to better voucher execution at the local level.

Project-Based Vouchers (PBV) are needed for services-enriched multifamily developments in areas with a large concentration of chronically homeless veterans and in high-cost, low-vacancy markets. PHAs may designate a portion of their total HUD-VASH allocation as project-based vouchers based on local need. HUD has established PBV set-asides to competitively award several thousand project-based HUD-VASH Vouchers, most recently in November 2016, when HUD awarded \$18.5 million to 39 local public housing agencies for approximately 2,100 veterans experiencing homelessness. These recent PBV awards were concentrated in high-need areas, including throughout the state of California.

ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS AND VOUCHER ALLOCATION

To be eligible, a veteran must:

- Be VA-health care eligible,
- Meet the definition of homelessness as defined by the “McKinney Homeless Assistance Act” as amended by S. 896, the “Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009”, and
- Be in need of case-management services for serious mental illness, substance use disorder, or physical disability.

Veterans with high vulnerability are prioritized, but veterans must be able to complete activities of daily living and live independently in their community. Although the program follows a Housing First orientation, case management is a requirement of participation in HUD-VASH.

After determining which areas of the country have the highest number of homeless veterans, the VA Central Office identifies VA facilities in the corresponding communities. HUD then selects PHAs near the identified VA facilities by considering the PHAs' administrative performance and sends the PHAs invitations to apply for the vouchers. There is at least one site in each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

The allocation for HUD-VASH Vouchers has been a collaborative, data-driven effort conducted by HUD and VA. Three major data sources help drive local allocations, including: HUD's point-in-time data, performance data from both PHAs and VAMCs, and data from the VAMCs on their contacts with homeless veterans. In some communities, HUD-VASH staff work with the local Continuum of Care through the coordinated intake process to ensure that veterans who have high needs profiles on the By-Name List are connected to HUD-VASH.

FUNDING

In FY08 through FY10, and FY12 through FY15, HUD was awarded \$75 million for 10,000 vouchers, and VA was awarded case-management dollars to match those vouchers. In FY11, \$50 million was provided for approximately 7,500 vouchers. In FY16, HUD was awarded \$60 million for 8,000 new vouchers. In FY17, 18, and 19, HUD was awarded an additional \$40 million for 5,500 new vouchers annually. HUD-VASH voucher renewals are lumped into the general Section 8 tenant-based rental assistance account, and Congress has provided sufficient funding in recent years to renew all HUD-VASH Vouchers.

VA has distributed its case-management funding to its Medical Centers as special purpose funds to ensure that each area has sufficient staffing to support the vouchers allocated to it. In 2017, VA proposed to change the way funding was allocated such that it would be distributed through the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation Model it uses for general health care funding. This could impact the amount of funding available at each VAMC to case manage

veterans in HUD-VASH. VA backed off of the idea but as a result of the attempt to siphon funds elsewhere, Congress took two key actions in the explanatory report accompanying the bill. The first provision directed VA to provide a new budgetary projection for case management of all its vouchers to end the one year delay between voucher creation and case-management funding provision. The second requires VA to propose any conversion of special purpose funding to general purpose funding in an annual budget submission for congressional consideration.

FORECAST FOR 2020

HUD-VASH Vouchers are an incredibly important resource in ending veteran homelessness. Congress should continue to provide adequate funding in the tenant-based Section 8 account to renew all existing HUD-VASH Vouchers, as well as continue to provide new HUD-VASH Vouchers to house all chronically homeless veterans.

VA must ensure that case-management funding follows the vouchers by maintaining the special purpose designation as it distributes funds to Medical Centers.

Additionally, Congress should enact H.R. 2398 to expand eligibility for HUD-VASH to veterans with OTH discharges. VA and local service providers have identified additional priority groups for service through HUD-VASH. The VA has set a target of 65% of HUD-VASH Voucher recipients being chronically homeless, with the remaining 35% of vouchers being available for other vulnerable high-priority groups including veterans with families, women, and Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom/Operation New Dawn (or 9/11 veterans). As we move to end all homelessness, starting with veterans, through the Federal Strategic Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness, Congress and the administration, along with interested community partners and homeless advocates, will need to reassess what resources are needed to end homelessness for both the chronically homeless as well as other homeless veterans with high needs.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Continue working with the VA to increase referrals and coordinate targets for the HUD-VASH program so the most in need veterans are connected to this vital resource. Expand efforts to find additional resources for move-in costs, including but beyond resources through the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program. Encourage your local VAMC to get creative with HUD-VASH staffing and to include peer support services and housing navigators. Work with PHAs to support landlord outreach and engagement to improve lease-up rates and time. Encourage your PHA to apply for Extraordinary Administrative Fees, when available, to help with these types of outreach and engagement efforts. Evaluate the need for contracted case management in your area. Evaluate if, due to exceptionally expensive or tight rental markets, your local PHA should consider project-basing additional HUD-VASH Vouchers.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates may find success in discussing the need for resources to end veterans' homelessness with policymakers who have previously been found to be difficult to approach for support on more broad affordable housing and homelessness issues. The administration has continued to cite the successes of the HUD-VASH program in its communications around data on veteran homelessness.

Advocates should speak to senators and representatives, particularly if they are on the Appropriations or Veterans Affairs Committees, and urge them to provide \$75 million for 10,000 new HUD-VASH Vouchers to help end homelessness among veterans while fully funding all existing vouchers through the regular Section 8 account.

Advocates should highlight the role that case management plays in housing stability for these veterans, and should urge members of Congress to hold VA accountable for maintaining the special purpose designation to ensure each VAMC has sufficient funding and staffing to provide appropriate levels of case management for these veterans.

Advocates should also highlight to Congress how well HUD-VASH works with the other veteran homelessness relief programs, including SSVF and the Grant and Per Diem Program. Data regarding the prevalence of homeless veterans is available in HUD's Annual Homeless Assessment Report, through the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, or from the National Center on Homelessness Among Veterans.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, 202-546-1969, www.nchv.org.

Corporation for Supportive Housing, 212-986-2966, www.csh.org.

National Alliance to End Homelessness, 202-638-1526, www.endhomelessness.org.

National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

Public Housing

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing

Year Started: 1937

Number of Persons/Households Served: 1 million households, 2 million residents

Population Targeted: All households must have incomes less than 80% of the area median income (AMI); at least 40% of new admissions in any year must have extremely low incomes, incomes less than 30% of AMI, or the federal poverty level, whichever is greater.

Funding: FY20 funding is \$7.4 billion (\$2.9 billion for the capital fund and \$4.5 billion for the operating fund).

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Rental Assistance Demonstration*, *Public Housing Repositioning*, and *Public Housing Agency Plan* sections of this guide.

The nation's 1 million units of public housing, serving 2 million residents, are administered by a network of more than 3,000 local public housing agencies (PHAs), with funding from residents' rents and congressional appropriations to HUD. Additional public housing has not been built in decades. Advocates are focused primarily on preserving the remaining public housing stock.

Public housing encounters many recurring challenges. For instance, PHAs face significant federal funding shortfalls each year, as they have for decades. In addition, policies such as demolition, disposition, and the former HOPE VI program resulted in the loss of public housing units—approximately 10,000 units each year according to HUD estimates. There are persistent calls for deregulation of public housing through the expansion of the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration and other efforts that can reduce affordability, deep income targeting, resident participation, and program accountability, all aspects of public housing that make it an

essential housing resource for many of the lowest-income people.

HUD's two tools to address the aging public housing stock are the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI) renovation program that addresses both public housing and broader neighborhood improvements, and the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) designed to leverage private dollars to improve public housing properties while converting them to project-based rental assistance.

HISTORY

The "Housing Act of 1937" established the public housing program. President Nixon declared a moratorium on public housing in 1974, shifting the nation's housing assistance mechanism to the then-new Section 8 programs (both new construction and certificate programs) intended to engage the private sector. Federal funds for adding to the public housing stock were last appropriated in 1994, but little public housing has been built since the early 1980s.

In 1995, Congress stopped requiring that demolished public housing units be replaced on a unit-by-unit, one-for-one basis. In 1998, the "Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act" changed various other aspects of public housing, including public housing's two main funding streams, the operating and capital subsidies. Federal law capped the number of public housing units at the number each PHA operated as of October 1, 1999 (the Faircloth cap).

Today, units are being lost through demolition and disposition (sale) of units, mandatory and voluntary conversion of public housing to voucher assistance, and the cumulative impact of decades of underfunding and neglect on once-viable public housing units. HUD officials regularly state that more than 10,000 units of public housing leave the affordable housing inventory each year.

According to HUD testimony, between the mid-1990s and 2010, approximately 200,000 public housing units had been demolished; upwards of 50,000 were replaced with new public housing units, and another 57,000 former public housing families were given vouchers instead of a public housing replacement unit. Another almost 50,000 units of non-public housing were incorporated into these new developments, but they serve households with incomes higher than those of the displaced households and do not provide rental assistance like that provided by the public housing program.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

There are approximately 1 million public housing units. According to HUD, of the families served by public housing, 33% of household heads are elderly, 31% are non-elderly disabled, and 38% are families with children. The average annual income of a public housing household is \$15,183. Of all public housing households, 72% are extremely low-income and 19% are very low-income. Fully 76% of public housing households have incomes less than \$20,000 a year. Fifty-six percent of the households have Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security, or pension income. Thirty-four percent have wage income, while 29% receive some form of welfare assistance.

The demand for public housing far exceeds the supply. In many large cities, households may remain on waiting lists for decades. Like all HUD rental assistance programs, public housing is not an entitlement program; rather, its size is determined by annual appropriations and is not based on the number of households that qualify for assistance.

NLIHC's report *Housing Spotlight: The Long Wait for a Home* is about public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) waiting lists. An NLIHC survey of PHAs indicated that public housing waiting lists had a median wait time of nine months and 25% of them had a wait time of at least 1.5 years. Public housing waiting lists had an average size of 834 households.

Eligibility and Rent

Access to public housing is means-tested. All public housing households must be low-income, have income less than 80% of the area median income (AMI), and at least 40% of new admissions in any year must have extremely low incomes, defined as income less than 30% of AMI or the federal poverty level adjusted for family size, whichever is greater. The FY14 HUD appropriations act expanded the definition of "extremely low-income" for HUD's rental assistance programs by including families with incomes less than the poverty level, particularly to better serve poor households in rural areas. PHAs can also establish local preferences for certain populations, such as elderly people, people with disabilities, veterans, full-time workers, domestic violence victims, or people who are homeless or who are at risk of becoming homeless.

As in other federal housing assistance programs, residents of public housing pay the highest of: (1) 30% of their monthly adjusted income; (2) 10% of their monthly gross income; (3) their welfare shelter allowance; or (4) a PHA-established minimum rent of up to \$50. The average public housing household pays \$336 per month toward rent and utilities. Public housing operating and capital subsidies provided by Congress and administered by HUD contribute the balance of what PHAs receive to operate and maintain their public housing units.

With tenant rent payments and HUD subsidies, PHAs are responsible for maintaining the housing, collecting rents, managing waiting lists, and other activities related to the operation and management of the housing. Most PHAs also administer the Housing Choice Voucher Program.

Most PHAs are required to complete five-year PHA Plans, along with annual updates, which detail many aspects of their housing programs including waiting list preferences, grievance procedures, plans for capital improvements, minimum rent requirements, and community service requirements. These PHA Plans represent a key way for public housing residents, voucher

holders, and community stakeholders to participate in the PHA's planning process.

Public Housing Capital Fund and Operating Fund

PHAs receive two annual, formula-based grants from congressional appropriations to HUD: the operating fund and the capital fund. The \$4.65 billion appropriated for the public housing operating subsidy in FY19 left PHAs with about 90% of known operating cost needs during the first quarter of the calendar year and up to 97% for the rest of the year. The \$2.78 billion appropriated for the public housing capital subsidy in FY19 further increased PHAs' capital needs backlog. In 2010, PHAs had a \$26 billion capital needs backlog, which was estimated to grow by \$3.4 billion each year. Public housing associations estimate that there is approximately a \$70 billion capital needs backlog in FY19.

The public housing operating fund is designed to make up the balance between what residents pay in rent and what it actually costs to operate public housing. Major operating costs include routine and preventative maintenance, a portion of utilities, management, PHA employee salaries and benefits, supportive services, resident participation support, insurance, and security. Since 2008, HUD's operating formula system, called "Asset Management," has determined an agency's operating subsidy on a property-by-property basis, rather than on the previous overall PHA basis.

The capital fund can be used for a variety of purposes, including modernization, demolition, and replacement housing. Up to 20% can also be used to make management improvements. The annual capital needs accrual amount makes clear that annual appropriations for the capital fund are woefully insufficient to keep pace with the program's needs. A statutory change in 2016 (HOTMA, see "Statutory and Regulatory Changes Made in 2016" below) now allows a PHA to transfer up to 20% of its operating fund appropriation for eligible capital fund uses.

Demolition and Disposition

Since 1983, HUD has authorized PHAs to apply for permission to demolish or dispose of (sell) public housing units. This policy was made infinitely more damaging in 1995 when Congress suspended the requirement that housing agencies replace, on a one-for-one basis, any public housing lost through demolition or disposition. In 2016, HUD reported a net loss of more than 139,000 public housing units due to demolition or disposition since 2000.

Demolition Improvements from 2012 Removed by the current administration

In 2012, after prodding from advocates, HUD clarified and strengthened its guidance (Notice PIH 2012-7) regarding demolition and disposition in an effort to curb the decades-long sale and needless destruction of the public housing stock. This guidance clarified the demolition and disposition process in a number of ways. For example, the guidance unequivocally stated that a proposed demolition or disposition must be identified in the PHA Plan or in a significant amendment to the PHA Plan, and that PHAs must comply with the existing regulations' strict resident-consultation requirements for the PHA Plan process, the demolition or disposition application process, and the redevelopment plan. That guidance also reminded PHAs that HUD's Section 3 requirement to provide employment, training and economic opportunities to residents applied to properties in the demolition and disposition process. The review criteria for demolition applications had to meet clear HUD standards, and no demolition or disposition was permissible prior to HUD's approval, including any phase of the resident relocation process.

In 2018, the Trump administration eliminated these modest improvements to HUD's demolition/ disposition guidance that advocates helped HUD draft in 2012 (and replaced it with Notice PIH 2018-04 in order to make it far easier to demolish public housing, and to do so without resident input and protections. In addition, the administration withdrew proposed regulation changes drafted in 2014 that would

have reinforced those modest improvements. All of this is a part of the administration's "repositioning" of public housing through demolition and voluntary conversion to vouchers. Its goal was to reposition 105,000 public housing units in FY19 alone by streamlining the demolition application and approval process. See the *Public Housing Repositioning* section of this guide for more.

Rental Assistance Demonstration

As part of its FY12 HUD appropriations act, Congress authorized the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), which allowed HUD to approve the conversion of up to 60,000 public housing and Moderate Rehabilitation Program units into either project-based Section 8 rental assistance contracts (PBRA) or project-based vouchers (PBV) by September 2015. Since then, Congress has increased the cap three times, first to 185,000 units, then to 225,000, and now to 455,000 units by September 30, 2024. The authorizing legislation contains several provisions intended to protect public housing residents whose homes are converted to PBRA or PBV through RAD.

The Obama and Trump administrations, along with many developer-oriented organizations, have urged Congress to allow all 1 million public housing units to undergo RAD conversion even though the demonstration is still in its early stages. Many residents whose public housing properties have been approved for RAD complain that PHAs, developers, and HUD have not provided adequate information, causing many to doubt that resident protections in the authorizing legislation will be honored by PHAs and developers or monitored by HUD. The National Housing Law Project sent a letter to HUD Secretary Carson listing numerous problems residents have experienced, such as illegal and inadequate resident relocation practices, unlawful resident re-screening practices, and impediments to resident organizing. See the separate RAD article in this *Advocates' Guide* for more information.

Choice Neighborhoods Initiative

The Choice Neighborhoods Initiative (CNI), created in FY10, was HUD's successor to the HOPE VI Program. Like HOPE VI, CNI focuses on severely distressed public housing properties, but CNI expands HOPE VI's reach to include HUD-assisted, private housing properties and entire neighborhoods. Although unauthorized, CNI has been funded through annual appropriations bills and administered according to the details of HUD Notices of Fund Availability (NOFAs). CNI was funded at \$65 million in both FY10 and FY11, \$120 million in FY12, \$114 million in FY13, \$90 million in FY14, \$80 million in FY15, \$125 million in FY16, \$138 million in FY17, and \$150 million in FY18 and FY19. HUD proposed eliminating CNI in FY19 and FY20, but the House proposed \$150 million for CNI in FY19 and \$300 million in FY20 while the Senate proposed \$100 million for both years.

HUD states that CNI has three goals:

1. **Housing:** Replace distressed public and HUD-assisted private housing with mixed-income housing that is responsive to the needs of the surrounding neighborhood.
2. **People:** Improve educational outcomes and intergenerational mobility for youth with services and supports.
3. **Neighborhood:** Create the conditions necessary for public and private reinvestment in distressed neighborhoods to offer the kinds of amenities and assets, including safety, good schools, and commercial activity, that are important to families' choices about their community.

In addition to PHAs, grantees can include HUD-assisted private housing owners, local governments, nonprofits, and for-profit developers. The CNI Program awards both large implementation grants and smaller planning grants. CNI planning grants are to assist communities in developing a comprehensive neighborhood revitalization plan, called a transformation plan, and in building the community-wide support necessary for that plan

to be implemented. Eighty-five planning grants totaling more than \$38 million were awarded through FY18 with four more amounting to \$5 million awarded for FY19.

CNI implementation grants are intended primarily to help transform severely distressed public housing and HUD-assisted private housing developments through rehabilitation, demolition, and new construction. HUD also requires applicants to prepare a more comprehensive plan to address other aspects of neighborhood distress such as violent crime, failing schools, and capital disinvestment. Funds can also be used for supportive services and improvements to the surrounding community, such as developing community facilities and addressing vacant, blighted properties. HUD works closely with the Department of Education to align CNI's educational investments and outcomes with those of the Promise Neighborhoods Program. Thirty implementation grants totaling \$862 million have been awarded through 2018. Applications for FY19 implementation grants were being accepted until November 4, 2019; awards had not been announced by the time this *Advocates' Guide* went to press.

Although each NOFA has been different, key constant features include:

- One-for-one replacement of all public and private HUD-assisted units.
- Each resident who wishes to return to the improved development may do so.
- Residents who are relocated during redevelopment must be tracked until the transformed housing is fully occupied.
- Existing residents must have access to the benefits of the improved neighborhood.
- Resident involvement must be continuous, from the beginning of the planning process through implementation and management of the grant.

Moving to Work

A key public housing issue is the MTW demonstration that provides a limited number of

housing agencies flexibility from most statutory and regulatory requirements. Because this demonstration program has not been evaluated, and the potential for harm to residents and the long-term health of the PHAs are at stake, NLIHC has long held that the MTW demonstration is not ready for expansion or permanent authorization. Various legislative vehicles have sought to maintain and expand the current MTW program. Today, there are 39 PHAs in the MTW demonstration. The MTW contracts for each of these 39 PHAs were set to expire in 2018, but in 2016 HUD extended all of them to 2028.

The FY16 funding bill for HUD expanded the MTW demonstration by a total of 100 PHAs over the course of a seven-year period. Of the 100 new PHA MTW sites, no fewer than 50 PHAs must administer up to 1,000 combined public housing and voucher units, no fewer than 47 must administer between 1,001 and 6,000 combined units, and no more than three can administer between 6,001 and 27,000 combined units. PHAs will be added to the MTW demonstration by cohort, each of which will be overseen by a research advisory committee to ensure the demonstrations are evaluated with rigorous research protocols. Each year's cohort of MTW sites will be directed by HUD to test one specific policy change.

The four cohorts are:

- "MTW Flexibilities" will involve 30 PHAs that have a combination of 1,000 or fewer public housing units and vouchers. This cohort will evaluate the overall effects of MTW flexibility on the PHA and its residents. HUD will compare outcomes related to MTW's three statutory objectives between the MTW PHAs and PHAs assigned to a control group. Applicant PHAs will be assigned by lottery to be MTW PHAs, waitlist PHAs, or control group PHAs.
- "Rent Reform" will involve 10 PHAs testing "rent reform" ideas designed to "increase resident self-sufficiency and reduce PHA administrative burdens." Only PHAs with a combination of at least 1,000 non-elderly and

non-disabled public housing residents and voucher households will be eligible. Each PHA will implement one alternative rent policy.

- “Work Requirements” will be evaluated. Detailed information about this cohort is not available yet.
- “Landlord Incentives” will explore ways to increase and sustain landlord participation in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

In January of 2017, HUD issued a draft MTW Operations Notice for public comment. It proposed three categories of statutory and regulatory waivers that MTW agencies could pursue:

1. General waivers available without review by HUD to all MTW expansion agencies.
2. Conditional waivers available if approved by HUD. Conditional waivers are expected to have a greater and more direct impact on households.
3. Cohort-specific waivers available only to MTW agencies implementing a specific cohort policy change.

NLIHC’s letter conveyed strong opposition to the inclusion of work requirements, time limits, and major changes to rent policies among possible conditional waivers. Because such policies have the potential to cause substantial harm to residents in the form of severe cost burdens, housing instability, and perhaps homelessness, those policies should only be allowed as cohort-specific waivers subject to the most rigorous evaluation required by the MTW expansion statute.

On October 11, 2018, HUD issued a revised Operations Notice for public comment. It was far worse than the previous draft. The revised proposed Operations Notice would allow a PHA to impose a potentially harmful work requirement, time limit, and burdensome rent “MTW Waiver” without securing HUD approval and without the rigorous evaluation called for by the statute. NLIHC’s formal comment letter stated that such waivers should only be allowed as part of a rigorous cohort evaluation. As of the

date this *Advocates’ Guide* went to press, a final Operations Notice was not published. NLIHC anticipates that it will be published early 2020.

STATUTORY AND REGULATORY CHANGES MADE SINCE 2016

HOTMA Changes

On July 29, 2016, President Obama signed into law the “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act” (HOTMA). This law made some changes to the public housing and voucher programs. The major public housing changes are:

- For residents already assisted, rents must be based on a household’s income from the prior year. For applicants for assistance, rent must be based on estimated income for the upcoming year.
- A household may request an income review any time its income or deductions are estimated to decrease by 10%.
- A PHA must review a household’s income any time that income with deductions are estimated to increase by 10%, except that any increase in earned income cannot be considered until the next annual recertification.
- The Earned Income Disregard, which disregarded certain increases in earned income for residents who had been unemployed or receiving welfare, was eliminated.
- When determining income:
 - The deduction for elderly and disabled households increased to \$525 (up from \$400) with annual adjustments for inflation.
 - The deduction for elderly and disabled households for medical care, as well as for attendant care and auxiliary aid expenses for disabled members of the household, used to be for such expenses that exceeded 3% of income. HOTMA limits the deduction for such expenses to those that exceed 10% of income.

- The dependent deduction remains at \$480 but will be indexed to inflation.
- HUD must establish hardship exemptions in regulation for households that would not be able to pay rent due to hardship. These regulations must be made in consultation with tenant organizations and industry participants.
- Any expenses related to aid and attendants for veterans are excluded from income.
- Any income of a full-time student who is a dependent is excluded from income, as are any scholarship funds used for tuition and books.
- If a household’s income exceeds 120% of AMI for two consecutive years, the PHA must either:
 - Terminate the household’s tenancy within six months of the household’s second income determination, or
 - Charge a monthly rent equal to the greater of the Fair Market Rent or the amount of the monthly operating and capital subsidy provided to the household’s unit.
- A PHA may transfer up to 20% of its operating fund appropriation for eligible capital fund uses.
- PHAs may establish replacement reserves using capital funds and other sources, including operating funds (up to the 20% cap), as long as the PHA Plan provides for such use of operating funds.

HUD issued a final rule on July 26, 2018 implementing the 120% over-income limit. HUD issued Notice PIH 2018 implementing HOTMA’s minimum heating standards. On September 17, 2019, HUD proposed HOTMA implementation regulations basically echoing HOTMA’s income examination, income calculation, elderly or disabled deduction, child-care deduction and hardship provisions, and healthcare deduction and hardship provisions. In addition, HUD proposed HOTMA asset limitation provisions, proposing households be ineligible if net household assets are greater than \$100,000

(adjusted for inflation each year) or if the household owns real property suitable for occupancy, to allow a PHA to determine net assets based on a household’s certification that their net family assets are less than \$50,000 (adjusted for inflation each year), to revise the definition of “net family assets” by eliminating a number of previously included items such as the value of necessary “personal property” (like a car), and to allow PHA to choose to not enforce the asset limit.

Streamlining Rule

A “streamlining rule” was published on March 8, 2016. Key public housing provisions include:

- PHAs have the option of conducting a streamlined income determination for any household member who has a fixed source of income (such as SSI). If that person or household with a fixed income also has a non-fixed source of income, the non-fixed source of income is still subject to third-party verification. Upon admission to public housing, third-party verification of all income amounts will be required for all household members. A full income reexamination and redetermination must be performed every three years. In between those three years, a streamlined income determination must be conducted by applying a verified cost of living adjustment or current rate of interest to the previously verified or adjusted income amount.
- PHAs have the option of providing utility reimbursements on a quarterly basis to public housing residents if the amounts due were \$45 or less. PHAs can continue to provide utility reimbursements monthly if they so choose. If a PHA opts to make payments on a quarterly basis, the PHA must establish a hardship policy for tenants if less frequent reimbursement will create a financial hardship.
- Public housing households may now self-certify that they are complying with the community-service requirement. PHAs are required to review a sample of self-

certifications and validate their accuracy with third-party verification procedures currently in place.

- Many of the requirements relating to the process for obtaining a grievance hearing and the procedures governing the hearing were eliminated.

Smoke Free Public Housing

A “smoke free” rule was published on December 5, 2016. PHAs must design and implement a policy prohibiting the use of prohibited tobacco products in all public housing living units and interior areas (including but not limited to hallways, rental and administrative offices, community centers, daycare centers, laundry centers, and similar structures), as well as at outdoor areas within 25 feet of public housing and administrative office buildings (collectively referred to as “restricted areas”) in which public housing is located. PHAs may, but are not required to, further limit smoking to outdoor designated smoking areas on the grounds of the public housing or administrative office buildings in order to accommodate residents who smoke. These areas must be outside of any restricted areas and may include partially enclosed structures. PHAs had until August 2018 to develop and implement their smoke-free policy.

FUNDING

For FY20 the capital fund received \$2.87 billion and the operating fund received \$4.55 billion, for a total of \$7.42 billion. In FY19, the capital fund received \$2.775 billion and the operating fund received \$4.653 billion, for a total of \$7.4 billion, a slight increase above \$7.34 in FY18 and a helpful increase above \$6.34 billion from FY16 and FY17.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Subsidy funding for public housing has been woefully insufficient for many years to meet the need of the nation’s 1 million public housing units. Without adequate funds, more units will go into irretrievable disrepair, potentially leading to greater homelessness. In 2020, funding will

continue to be a major issue.

President Trump’s proposed FY20 budget would have eliminated the public housing capital fund and drastically reduced the operating fund’s formula-based grants to a mere \$2.86 billion. The administration stated that it expected local and state governments to fill in the budget vacuum left by the federal government. However, the House spending package included \$2.86 billion for the capital fund and \$4.75 billion for the operating fund. The Senate approved \$2.86 billion for the capital fund and \$4.65 billion for the operating fund. Ultimately the final FY20 appropriation approve \$2.87 billion for the capital fund and \$4.55 billion for the operating fund, for a total of \$7.42 billion.

President Trump’s proposed FY19 budget would have “repositioned,” public housing, speeding up HUD’s retreat from providing public housing. In FY19 alone, HUD aimed to remove 105,000 public housing units from the inventory. One way of doing that is to make it administratively easier to demolish public housing, and by establishing a new \$30 million competitive demolition grant program. HUD would also encourage PHAs to voluntarily convert public housing to vouchers.

President Trump’s FY20 budget proposal included so-called “rent reforms” that would have placed serious financial burdens on public housing residents. For example, non-elderly and non-disabled households would pay 35% of their gross income (up from 30% of their adjusted income). Elderly and disabled households would pay 30% of gross income (not adjusted income). The proposal would have allowed PHAs to use alternative rent structures, such as tiered rents and stepped rents (effectively time limits). The proposal would also have imposed uniform work requirements. Congress has not taken steps to adopt these provisions, but the president has proposed them again for FY21.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should ask members of Congress to:

- Maintain funding for the public housing operating funds and increase resources to the capital funds.
- Support public housing as one way to end all types of homelessness.
- Oppose burdensome and costly time limits and work requirements for people receiving federal housing assistance.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

NLIHC's *Housing Spotlight: The Long Wait for a Home*, <http://bit.ly/2dGp2CU>.

NLIHC's Summary of September 17, 2019 proposed HOTMA implementation regulations, <https://bit.ly/2kr70dt>.

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, <http://nhlp.org/resourcecenter?tid=34>.

Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080, <http://www.cbpp.org/topics/housing>.

HUD's Public Housing homepage, <http://bit.ly/2hULSJy>.

HUD's HOTMA homepage, <https://bit.ly/2AVgHoX>.

HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration homepage, <http://bit.ly/2ht2w2C>.

HUD's Moving to Work demonstration homepage, <http://bit.ly/2i0tmwC>.

HUD's Moving to Work expansion page, <https://bit.ly/2E7AYJN>.

HUD's Choice Neighborhoods homepage, <http://bit.ly/2hURgwh>.

HUD's Smoke Free homepage, <https://bit.ly/2LMYQg9>.

Rental Assistance Demonstration

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs

Year Started: 2012

Number of Persons/Households Served:

Initially, 60,000 public housing units were allowed to convert, and this was expanded to 185,000 units in FY15, 225,000 units in FY17, and 455,000 units in FY18. As of December 1, 2019 127,000 public housing units converted under RAD, and another 34,000 units in the Rent Supp and RAP programs were preserved through RAD.

Funding: No FY20 funding

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Public Housing, Project-Based Rental Assistance, Project-Based Vouchers, and Public Housing Agency Plan* sections of this guide.

As part of the “FY12 HUD Appropriations Act,” Congress authorized the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) to help preserve and improve low-income housing. RAD allows public housing agencies (PHAs) and owners of private, HUD-assisted housing to leverage Section 8 rental assistance contracts in order to raise private debt and equity for capital improvements. RAD has two components: the first pertains to public housing and the Moderate Rehabilitation (Mod Rehab) Program and the second pertains to the Rent Supplement (Rent Supp), Rental Assistance Program (RAP), McKinney-Vento Single Room Occupancy (SRO), and Section 202 Project Rental Assistance Contract (PRAC) programs, as well as the Mod Rehab Program.

HISTORY

Throughout 2010 and 2011, HUD consulted with public housing resident leaders through the Resident Engagement Group (REG). HUD sought to create a demonstration program that would bring in non-federal resources to address

insufficient congressional funding for the public housing Capital Fund. HUD also wanted to avoid the many harmful effects the HOPE VI program had on residents. Over time, HUD presented three proposals to the REG, and each time the REG would point out a resident-oriented problem. In response, HUD went back to the drawing board to present a modified proposal. The final proposal, the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), addressed all of the REG's concerns.

Congress authorized RAD through the “FY12 HUD Appropriations Act” to help preserve and improve low-income housing. HUD published PIH Notice 2012-32 implementing RAD on July 26, 2012. A set of revisions were made on July 2, 2013, with technical corrections on February 4, 2014, and significant revisions on June 15, 2015, and again on January 12, 2017 (Notice PIH-2012-32/H-2017-03 REV3). Still more significant revisions were published on September 5, 2019 (Notice H-2019-09/PIH-2019-23 REV4).

The “FY14 Appropriations Act” extended the time for second component conversions to December 31, 2014, from September 30, 2013, and the “FY15 Appropriations Act” removed the second component deadline altogether. The “FY15 Appropriations Act” raised the number of public housing units that could convert under the first component from 60,000 to 185,000 and extended the first component deadline to September 30, 2018. The “FY15 Appropriations Act” made several other changes that are explained in the rest of this article. The “FY17 Appropriations Act” further raised the cap to 225,000 units by September 30, 2020. The “FY18 Appropriations Act” continued to raise the demonstration's cap to 455,000 unit with a deadline of September 30, 2024.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The intent of RAD is to help preserve and improve HUD-assisted low-income housing by enabling PHAs and owners of private, HUD-assisted housing to leverage Section 8 rental assistance

contracts to raise private debt and equity for capital improvements. RAD has two components. RAD does not provide any new federal funds for public housing. There are no RAD regulations, but RAD conversions must comply with a formal RAD Notice, PIH Notice 2012-32. The current Notice is [H-2019-09/PIH 2019-23 \(REV4\)](#).

Key Features of the First Component

Since the “FY18 Appropriations Act,” up to 455,000 units of public housing and Mod Rehab Program units are allowed to compete for permission to convert their existing federal assistance to project-based Housing Choice Vouchers (PBVs) or to Section 8 project-based rental assistance (PBRA) by September 30, 2024. Because the “FY18 Appropriations Act” expanded the number of units that could be converted far beyond the FY17 cap of 225,000 units, HUD eliminated the RAD wait list. In its place, HUD posted an “Applications Under Review” list.

This article will focus on the public housing first component. However, a brief presentation of the key features of the second component precedes a deeper discussion of the first component.

Key Features of the Second Component

The second RAD component allows owners of properties previously assisted through the Rent Supplement (Rent Supp), Rental Assistance Program (RAP), Moderate Rehabilitation (Mod Rehab), McKinney-Vento Single Room Occupancy (SRO), and Section 202 PRAC programs to convert to long-term Section 8 contracts—either project-based vouchers (PBVs) or project-based rental assistance (PBRA). There is no limit to the number of units that may be converted under the second component and there is no competitive selection process for it. The “FY15 Appropriations Act” permanently extended the ability to convert under the second component. The “FY15 Appropriations Act” also allowed projects assisted under the McKinney-Vento Single Room Occupancy (SRO) program to apply for RAD conversion. The “FY18 Appropriations Act” added the Section 202 PRAC program for elderly housing. As of December 1, 2018, more than 34,000 private, HUD-assisted multifamily units completed conversion.

Owners of properties with program contracts that have not expired or terminated can enter into a 20-year PBV housing assistance payment (HAP) contract with a public housing agency (PHA) or enter into a 20-year PBRA HAP contract administered by HUD’s Office of Multifamily Housing Programs. Owners with contracts that have already expired or terminated and whose residents started receiving tenant protection vouchers (TPVs) on or after October 1, 2006 may only enter into a 20-year PBV HAP contract with a PHA (before April, 2017, PBV contracts had a maximum term of 15 years).

Owners must notify residents of an intent to convert, follow resident participation, and adhere to the resident protection provisions as described below pertaining to the first component.

Summary of the First Component

This section focuses on the first component’s public housing provisions. RAD is a voluntary demonstration program. There is no new funding for RAD. Once converted under RAD, the amount of the public housing Capital Fund and Operating Fund a specific development has been receiving is used instead as PBV or PBRA.

PHAs considering RAD can choose to convert public housing units to one of two types of long-term, project-based Section 8 rental assistance contracts:

1. Project-based vouchers (PBV). These are Housing Choice Vouchers that are tied to specific buildings; they do not move with tenants as regular “tenant-based” vouchers do. If public housing units are converted to PBV, the initial contract must be for 20 years (prior to April 2017 the maximum was 20 years) and must always be renewed. HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) would continue to oversee the units. Most of the current PBV rules (24 CFR 983) would apply.
2. Project-based rental assistance (PBRA). If units are converted to PBRA, the initial contract must be for 20 years and must always be renewed. HUD’s Office of Multifamily Programs would take over monitoring. Most of

the current PBRA rules (24 CFR 880 to 886) would apply.

Voluntarily converting some public housing to Section 8 might be good because Congress continues to underfund public housing. That underfunding leads to deteriorating buildings and the loss of units through demolition. HUD has estimated that 10,000 public housing units are lost each year. If a long-term rental assistance contract is tied to a property, private institutions might be more willing to lend money for critical building repairs. Congress is more likely to provide adequate funding for existing Section 8 contracts than for public housing. Therefore, some units that were public housing before conversion are more likely to remain available and affordable to people with extremely low and very low incomes because of the long-term Section 8 contract.

Resident Protections and Rights

The statute and the Notice implementing the statute spell out a number of protections and rights for residents, including:

- **Displacement:** Permanent involuntary displacement of current residents may not occur as a result of a project's conversion. If a household does not want to transition to PBV or PBRA, they may move to other public housing if an appropriate unit is available.
- **Tenant Rent:** Existing PBV and PBRA rules limit resident rent payment to 30% of income, or minimum rent, whichever is higher. Any rent increase of 10% or \$25, whichever is greater, solely due to conversion is phased in over three to five years.
- **Rescreening:** Current residents cannot be rescreened.
- **Right to Return:** Residents temporarily relocated while rehabilitation is conducted have a right to return.
- **Renewing the Lease:** PHAs must renew a resident's lease, unless there is "good cause" not to.

- **Grievance Process:** The RAD statute requires tenants of converted properties to have the same grievance and lease termination rights they had under Section 6 of the "Housing Act of 1937." For instance, PHAs must notify a resident of the PHA's reason for a proposed adverse action and of their right to an informal hearing assisted by a resident representative.

Advocates express concerns that HUD has not adequately implemented this statutory requirement. The public housing regulations have long-established processes that residents could use to question a PHA's actions or failure to take action regarding a lease or any PHA regulation that adversely affects a resident's rights, welfare, or status. HUD's RAD provisions restrict residents' grievance rights because instead of using the well-developed public housing grievance process, residents will only have the limited grievance rights under either the PBV regulations or the PBRA regulations.

RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT

Resident Notices and Meetings

Before submitting a RAD application to HUD, the PHA must notify residents and resident organizations of a project proposed for conversion. The PHA is not required to notify the Resident Advisory Board (RAB) or residents of other developments. Since January 2017, as outlined in Notice H 2016-17/PIH 2016-17, the form of notice must be a written RAD Information Notice (RIN) that indicates, among other things:

- The PHA's intention to convert the units through RAD,
- A general description of the conversion (rehab, new construction, etc.),
- Resident relocation protections if relocation is involved, and
- Residents' rights under RAD (including the right to remain in the project after conversion, the right to return to the project if there is temporary relocation, the right to relocation

benefits, and the right to not be re-screened upon returning).

In addition, a General Information Notice (GIN) must be provided informing each resident about Uniform Relocation Act (URA) protections if URA is triggered.

- After a RIN is issued, the PHA must conduct at least two meetings with residents of projects proposed for conversion. Since January 2017, at these meetings the PHA must:
 - Discuss conversion plans,
 - Give residents a chance to comment,
 - Describe all RAD resident rights (including the right to remain in the project after conversion, the right to return to the project if there is temporary relocation, the right to relocation benefits, and the right to not be re-screened upon returning), and
 - Explain:
 - Any change in the number of units or unit sizes or any other change that might make it difficult for a household to re-occupy the property;
 - Any units that have been vacant for more than 24 months will be demolished (see “One-for-One Replacement” below);
 - Any plans to partner with an entity other than an affiliate or instrumentality of the PHA, and if so, whether such a partner will have a general partner or managing member ownership interest in the proposed project owner; and
 - Any transfer of assistance to another property, meaning residents would have to permanently move to another location.

After these meetings the PHA must write responses to residents’ comments.

After a RAD application has received preliminary HUD approval, called a “CHAP” (Commitment to enter into a Housing Assistance Payment contract) but before the PHA requests a “Concept Call” with HUD, the PHA must have at least one meeting with residents to discuss updated conversion plans and ask for feedback regarding

the proposed improvements. The PHA must prepare comprehensive written responses to comments made by residents at this meeting.

The Concept Call is something new, first required after September 5, 2019. It requires a PHA to request a call with HUD before submitting a “Financing Plan,” to show that the plan is far enough along for HUD review. A Financing Plan is a document demonstrating that the project can be physically and financially sustained for the term of the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contract.

After the Concept Call and before submitting a Financing Plan, a PHA must have at least one more meeting with residents to discuss updated conversion plans and the anticipated Financing Plan. The PHA must prepare comprehensive written responses to comments made by residents at this meeting.

After HUD has issued a RAD Conversion Commitment (RCC), the PHA must notify residents that the RAD has been approved. The notice must include: the anticipated timing of the conversion; the anticipated duration of the rehab or new construction; the revised terms of the lease and house rules; any anticipated relocation; and opportunities to and procedures for residents to exercise the RAD “choice mobility” option (discussed below).

More meetings with residents are required to discuss any substantial change to the conversion plans, including:

- A substantial change in the scope of work;
- A substantial change in utility allowances;
- A change in the number of units or unit sizes of assisted units or any other change that might make it difficult for a household to re-occupy the property;
- Any units that have been vacant for more than 24 months that will be demolished (see “One-for-One Replacement” below);
- Plans to partner with an entity other than an affiliate or instrumentality of the PHA, and if so, whether such a partner will have a general

partner or managing member ownership interest in the proposed project owner; and

- The introduction or abandonment of a transfer of assistance to another property or major change in the location to which assistance would be transferred.

A PHA must carry out the PHA Plan Significant Amendment process if the change involves a transfer of assistance, change in the number of assisted units, or change in eligibility or preferences for new applicants (see Significant Amendment below).

All meetings “should” be conducted in a place and at a time that fosters resident participation.

All communications and meetings must be accessible. At a minimum, a PHA must use:

- Effective means of communication for people with hearing, visual, and other communication-related disabilities.
- Hold meetings in places physically accessible for people with disabilities.
- Provide meaningful access to its programs and activities for people who have a limited ability to read, speak, or understand English.

These meetings are separate from the Significant Amendment process (see below), which does not have to take place until about five months after preliminary approval.

Significant Amendment to the PHA Plan

RAD conversion is a Significant Amendment to the PHA Plan. However, HUD does not require a Significant Amendment process to begin until late in the conversion process, which could be as late as five months after HUD has issued a preliminary approval (CHAP) for RAD conversion of a specific development. The Significant Amendment process starts too late in the process because when submitting the required RAD Financing Plan, HUD requires a PHA to have a letter from HUD approving a Significant Amendment. A Financing Plan is a document submitted to HUD demonstrating that the PHA has secured all necessary private financing needed to sustain the project for the term of

the HAP contract. Financing Plans are due six months after HUD has issued a CHAP.

Consequently, RAB involvement and the PHA-wide notice, broad public outreach, and public hearing required by the Significant Amendment regulations will not take place until the conversion application process is too far along. Rather than engage all PHA residents before an application for RAD conversion is submitted, the public engagement process is only required to take place close to the time when a PHA has all of its financing and construction plans approved and is ready to proceed.

A RAD conversion Significant Amendment must describe the units to be converted, including the number of units, the number of units by bedroom size, and type of units (e.g., family, elderly, etc.). It must also indicate any waiting list preferences and indicate any change in the number of units or units with different numbers of bedrooms, as well as any change in policies regarding eligibility, admission, selection, and occupancy of units.

\$25 Per Unit for Resident Participation

Whether a property is converted to PBV or PBRA, each year the PHA must provide \$25 per occupied unit at the property for resident participation; of this amount, at least \$15 per unit must be provided to the legitimate resident organization for resident education, organizing around tenancy issues, or training. If there is no legitimate resident organization, residents and PHAs are encouraged to form one. The PHA may use the remaining \$10 per unit for resident participation activities; however, some PHAs distribute the entire \$25 per unit to the resident organization.

Resident Organizing

Residents have the right to establish and operate a resident organization. If a property is converted to PBRA, then the current multifamily program’s resident participation provisions apply the so-called “Section 245” provisions. If a property is converted to PBV, instead of using public housing’s so-called “Section 964” provisions, the Notice requires resident participation provisions similar to those of Section 245. For example,

PHAs/owners must recognize legitimate resident organizations and allow resident organizers to help residents establish and operate resident organizations. Resident organizers must be allowed to distribute leaflets and post information on bulletin boards, contact residents, help residents participate in the organization's activities, hold regular meetings on site, and respond to a PHA's request to increase rent, reduce utility allowances, or make major capital additions.

Properties converted to PBRA are no longer required to meet PHA Plan requirements.

In addition, PBRA residents can no longer be on the RAB, be a PHA commissioner, or be on a jurisdiction-wide resident council unless the PHA voluntarily agrees.

ONE-FOR-ONE REPLACEMENT

Although the Notice does not use the term "one-for-one replacement," HUD's informal material says there will be one-for-one replacement. However, there are exceptions. PHAs can reduce the number of assisted units by up to 5% or five units, whichever is greater, without seeking HUD approval. HUD calls this the *de minimus* exception. Furthermore, RAD does not count against the 5% or five unit *de minimus* any unit that has been vacant for two or more years; any reconfigured units, such as efficiency units made into one-bedroom units; or, any units converted to use for social services. Consequently, the loss of units can be greater than 5%.

A PHA must demonstrate that any reduction of units better serves residents; will not result in involuntary permanent displacement; and will not discriminate. If a PHA proposes changes that will result in, for example, fewer three-bedroom units, the PHA must demonstrate that it will not result in involuntary displacement or discrimination.

CHOICE MOBILITY

HUD states that one of the major objectives of RAD is to test the extent to which residents have greater housing choice after conversion. PHAs

must provide all residents of converted units with the option to move with a regular Housing Choice Voucher (HCV). For PBV conversions, after one year of residency, a tenant can request an HCV and one must be provided if available; if a voucher is not available, the resident gets priority on the waiting list. If because of RAD, a PHA's total number of PBV units (regular PBVs and RAD PBVs) is greater than 20% of the PHA's authorized number of HCVs, the PHA would not be required to provide more than 75% of its turnover HCVs in any single year to residents of RAD projects.

For PBRA, a resident has the right to move with an HCV, if one is available, after two years. A PHA could limit Choice-Mobility moves in a PBRA property to one-third of the PHA's turnover vouchers, or to 15% of the assisted units in a property.

Relocations and Civil Rights Review Guidance

HUD issued Notice H 2016-17/PIH 2016-17 on November 10, 2016, providing guidance regarding fair housing and civil rights as well as resident relocation statutory and regulatory requirements under RAD.

RELOCATION PROVISIONS

Regarding relocation provisions, there were a number of new features, several of which in response to advocates. The Notice requires PHAs or project owners to prepare a written relocation plan for all transactions that involve permanent relocation or that involve temporary relocation expected to be more than 12 months.

Notices

For any temporary or permanent relocation, residents must receive a RAD Information Notice (RIN) before the first required resident meetings to tell residents that the PHA intends to convert through RAD, and to describe project plans (such as new construction or rehabilitation) and residents' rights under RAD. In addition, residents must receive a General Information Notice (GIN) within 30 days after a CHAP is issued. The GIN must inform residents that they might be displaced, and if so that they will receive relocation assistance and 90 days' advance notice

before having to move. Owners must provide a Notification of Return to the Covered Project indicating: a date or estimated date of return, whether the PHA or some other entity will be responsible for managing the return, that out-of-pocket expenses will be covered, that the PHA or another entity will give residents 90 days' advance notice of return, and options available to residents who decide not to return.

Temporary Relocation

For moves within the same building or complex, or for moves elsewhere for **one year or less**, the PHA must give residents 30 days' notice and reimburse residents for out-of-pocket expenses.

If temporary relocation is expected to be for **more than one year**, the PHA must give residents 90 days' notice and offer residents the choice of: temporary housing and reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses related to the temporary relocation, or permanent relocation assistance and payments at "Uniform Relocation Act" levels. Residents must have at least 30 days to decide between permanent and temporary relocation assistance. A PHA cannot use any tactics to pressure residents to give up their right to return or to accept permanent relocation assistance and payments.

PHAs must maintain a "Resident Log" that tracks resident status through to completion of rehabilitation or new construction, including re-occupancy after relocation. The Resident Log must have detailed data regarding each household that will be relocated, including the address of temporary housing and key dates of notices and moves. Unfortunately, HUD will not make a redacted or aggregate summary of the Resident Log available to advocates wishing to monitor the relocation process.

Permanent Relocation

If proposed plans for a project would prevent a resident from returning to the RAD project, the resident must be given an opportunity to comment and/or object to such plans. If the resident objects to such plans, the PHA must alter the project plans to accommodate the resident in the converted project.

If a resident voluntarily agrees to permanent relocation, the PHA must obtain informed written consent from the resident that also confirms that the resident agrees to end the right to return and that confirms that the resident understands permanent relocation assistance and payments will be provided consistent with the "Uniform Relocation Act." Replacement housing options for residents who voluntarily relocate permanently include providing other public housing, a project-based voucher, a regular tenant-based voucher, and homeownership housing.

Fair Housing and Civil Rights Provisions

Notice H 2016-17/PIH 2016-17 provides:

- An outline of conditions under which HUD will conduct a front-end review to determine whether the site is in an area of minority concentration relative to the site's housing market area,
- Guidance on the concepts of "area of minority concentration" and "housing market area" that are reviewed when determining whether a site is in an area of minority concentration, and
- Information about what HUD will consider and what PHAs should provide evidence of in order for a proposed site to meet exceptions that permit new construction in an area of minority concentration. This includes:
 - An explanation of the presumptions necessary for meeting the "sufficient comparable opportunities" exception, and
 - A description of the factors that HUD may consider in evaluating the "overriding housing needs" exception.

WHO WILL OWN THE CONVERTED PROPERTIES?

Many residents worry about their developments becoming "privatized." Theoretically, this potential problem is covered by the RAD statute requiring ownership or control by a public or nonprofit entity. However, legal services attorneys worry that there could be loopholes. Legal services attorneys recommend that if the PHA

doesn't directly keep ownership that it at least has a long-term ground lease that ensures direct control.

The June 15, 2015, revision of the RAD Notice (PIH-2012-32 REV-2) refined the meaning of "ownership and control" of post-conversion projects. This improvement has the potential to address concern expressed by many residents that their public housing homes could be privatized after RAD conversion.

For conversions that do not involve the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), a public or nonprofit entity must meet one of the following:

- Hold fee simple interest in the real property (holding title to the land and any improvements, such as buildings).
- Have direct or indirect legal authority to direct the financial and legal interests of the project owner (through a contract, partnership share or agreement of an equity partnership, voting rights, or other means).
- Own 51% or more of the general partner interests in a limited partnership, or own 51% or more of the managing member interests in an LLC.

As of January 19, 2017, due to the REV 3 Notice:

- Lease the ground to a project owner.
- Own a lesser percentage of the general partner or managing member interests and hold certain control rights approved by HUD.
- Own 51% or more of all ownership interests in a limited partnership or LLC and hold certain control rights approved by HUD.

HUD may allow ownership of a project to be transferred to a LIHTC entity controlled by a for-profit entity to enable the use of LIHTC assistance, but only if HUD determines that the PHA preserves sufficient interest in the property. Preservation of a PHA's sufficient interest in a project using LIHTCs could include:

- The PHA, or an affiliate under its sole control, being the sole general partner or managing member.

- The PHA retaining fee ownership, leasing the real estate to the LIHTC entity as part of a long-term ground lease.
- The PHA retaining control over project leasing, such as exclusively maintaining and administering the wait list for the project, including performing eligibility determinations that comply with the PHA Plan.
- The PHA entering into a Control Agreement by which the PHA retains consent rights over certain acts of the owner (for example, disposition of the project, leasing, selecting the management agent, setting the operating budget, and making withdrawals from the reserves), and retaining certain rights over the project, such as administering the waiting list.

Whether or not the property is owned by an LIHTC entity, the National Housing Law Project asserts that only two options will preserve the long-term affordability of a property:

- The PHA or an affiliate under its sole control is the general partner or managing member.
- The PHA retains fee ownership and leases the real estate through a long-term ground lease.

If there is a foreclosure, then ownership or control of the property will go first to a public entity, and if there is not a public entity willing to own the property, then to a private entity that could be a for-profit.

Legal services attorneys recommend the PHA or its affiliate be the general partner, and/or the PHA continue to own the land and have a long-term ground lease with the owner.

Limits on PBVs per Development

For projects that closed after January 19, 2017 there is no limit on the number of PBVs that can be attached to a property.

For projects that closed before changes were made on January 19, 2017, RAD limits to 50% the number of units in a public housing development that can be converted to PBVs. However, the 50% cap can be exceeded if the other units are "exception units," those occupied by an elderly

head of household or spouse, a disabled head of household or spouse, or a household with at least one member participating in a supportive service program.

A public housing household whose development is converted cannot be involuntarily displaced as a result of this 50% cap. In other words, any household living in a development at the time of RAD conversion that does not meet one of the exception criteria (e.g., elderly, disabled, supportive service) and does not want to move, cannot be terminated from PBV and cannot be required to move, even if they cause the development to exceed the 50% PBV + exception unit cap. However, once one of those original households (non-elderly, non-disabled, non-supportive services) leaves, causing the property to exceed the 50% PBV + exception unit cap, that unit can only be assisted with PBV if it is rented to a household that meets one of the three exception categories (supportive services, elderly, or disabled). What this means is that some PHAs might urge half of the households to move to other developments, if available, but a resident's decision to relocate must be voluntary. It could also mean that for a development to be able to continue to use PBVs after current residents leave exception units, some developments might change in character. For example, a development mostly occupied by families might become 50% to 100% elderly.

MIXING RAD AND "SECTION 18" DISPOSITION

A new provision was added on July 2, 2018 and added to the RAD Notice REV-4 (September 5, 2019). Up to 25% of the public housing units at a RAD project may be "disposed" (sold or transferred) under Option (c) of the "Section 18" Disposition regulations options: the disposition is in the "best interest of residents and the PHA". These units must be substantially rehabbed or be newly constructed. The PHA must show that disposition is necessary to so that all of the units in a development can use PBVs. HUD will provide Tenant Protection Vouchers that will convert to PBVs for these units.

A PHA may not provide different relocation rights and benefits to residents of a project on the basis of whether they live in a RAD unit or a Section 18 unit. All RAD resident protection provisions must apply to residents of Section 18 units, including: resident notice and meeting requirements, right to return, no rescreening, no denial based on income eligibility or income targeting, relocation assistance, grievance and lease provisions, right to establish and operate a resident organization, and \$25 per unit to be used for resident participation activities.

HUD will not approve a RAD conversion that would include disposition under Section 18 regulations option (b) or (c) if the Section 18 units would not be replaced one-for-one. Option (b) is disposition that will allow a PHA to buy, rehab, or build other properties that will be "more efficient or effective".

The PBV HAP contract may be renewed as many times as necessary in order to keep the PBV units in the RAD project affordable.

SECTION 3 APPLIES

Section 3 preferences for resident training, employment, and contracting opportunities have always been required until a public housing development had completed RAD conversion.

The September 2019 Notice (REV-4) elaborated on the earlier notices by stating that pre-development conversion costs remain subject to regular Section 3 public housing provisions. After RAD Closing (which takes place before final conversion), any housing rehabilitation or new construction that is not funded by a HUD program (such as HUD's HOME or CDBG programs) is subject to the Section 3 provisions for housing and community development activities (meaning priority to low-income residents in the project's neighborhood) except that first priority for employment and other economic opportunities must be given to residents of public housing or Section 8-assisted housing.

RAD continues to avoid extending RAD employment opportunities after conversion for PHA staff who had performed various tasks at the

public housing development, such a central office employee, painters, grounds crews, etc.

FUNDING

RAD does not have any appropriated funds.

OTHER KEY FEATURES IN REV 4

Projects Needing Significant Renovations No Longer Prioritized

Notice REV4 deletes the priority categories for approving RAD applications. Instead HUD will accept applications on a first-come, first-served basis. This formalizes actual HUD practice in which HUD approved RAD applications that entailed little or no rehabilitation for 27% of completed RAD conversions and 36% of projects undergoing rehabilitation, according to the Government Accountability Office. The original intent of RAD was to address Congress' underfunding of public housing capital needs that resulted in accelerated deterioration of properties. The appropriations act establishing RAD stated that the purpose is to "preserve and improve" public housing. The initial RAD Notice and each subsequent revision reiterated this intent and added that the goal is to "address immediate and long-term capital needs."

RAD Projects in Opportunity Zones

HUD will provide extra rent revenue of up to \$100 per unit per month to a public housing project located in an Opportunity Zone that converts to Section 8 project-based rental assistance (PBRA)—not Project-Based Vouchers (PBV)—provided the project needs extra revenue to be financially viable. The RAD conversion must entail either new construction or substantial rehabilitation. HUD will approve requests on a first-come-first-served basis. A HUD FAQ defines "substantial rehabilitation" and describes how HUD will determine whether an infusion of additional rent revenue is necessary.

FORECAST FOR 2020

HUD requested \$100 million for targeted expansion of RAD to public housing properties that cannot feasibly convert because their

combined public housing capital and operating funds are not enough. HUD estimates that \$100 million would enable an additional 35,000 units to convert that would not otherwise be financially feasible for conversion.

The Trump Administration also proposed two harmful amendments:

- Eliminating the cap on the number of public housing units that could be converted.
- Eliminating the deadline for public housing conversions.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

For residents of developments given preliminary or final RAD approval, make sure that the PHA or private, HUD-assisted housing owner is complying with all resident participation and protection provisions. Once HUD issues a formal RAD Conversion Commitment, the PHA must notify each household that the conversion has been approved, inform households of the specific rehabilitation or construction plan, and describe any impact conversion will have on them.

Be on the lookout for any substantial change in a conversion plan. A substantial change includes: a change in the number of assisted units, a major change in the scope of work, a transfer of assistance to a different property or owner, or a change in the eligibility or preferences for people applying to live at the property. If there is a substantial change in the conversion plan, the PHA must have additional meetings with the residents of the converting property and carry out the PHA Plan Significant Amendment process with the RAB, all PHA residents, and hold a public hearing.

For public housing residents at PHAs with RAD projects that are still in process or for those with projects on the Applications Under Review list, seek commitments from the PHA and any developers working with the PHA to keep residents fully informed throughout the process. Reports from residents at PHAs indicate that their PHAs, developers, and local HUD offices do not provide residents with sufficient information. Make sure to fully understand the differences

between PBVs and PBRAs so that you can influence best option.

Contact HUD's Office of Recapitalization with problems; see https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/housing/mfh/hsgmfbus/aboutahp.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Tell members of Congress not to lift the cap on the number of public housing units that may convert until this “demonstration” has convincingly shown that HUD will rigorously monitor PHA and owner compliance with all tenant protections written into the RAD statute. Ask members of Congress to ensure that HUD, as required by statute, prepares, conducts, and publishes a detailed assessment of the impact of conversion on public housing residents to ensure that further conversions do not adversely impact residents. Such an assessment should ask whether residents had a genuine role during and after conversion, were evicted just prior to conversion, were able to remain after conversion if that is what they wanted or were not inappropriately re-screened. An assessment should also determine whether Section 6 resident protections, such as grievance procedures, were fully honored and whether residents of converted properties were to participate on resident councils and RABs. Was there compliance with the one-for-one replacement requirement? Are PHAs truly owning or controlling converted properties? Are conversions to PBRA consuming too many scarce tenant protection vouchers at the expense of other tenant protection voucher needs?

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

NLIHC's RAD: *Key Features for Public Housing Residents*,

<https://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/RAD-Outline-Updated-0518.pdf>.

National Housing Law Project's RAD resource webpage, <http://nhlp.org/RAD>.

HUD's RAD website, <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/RAD>.

RAD Notice 2012-32 REV4, https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/Housing/documents/H-2019-09-PIH-2019-23_RAD_Notice%20Rev4_20190905.pdf.

RAD Fair Housing, Civil Rights, and Relocation Notice 2016-17,

https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/16-17hsgn_16-17pihn.pdf.

Repositioning of Public Housing

Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH)

Year Started: The term “repositioning” was introduced November 13, 2018, although components have been available for many years.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Public Housing, Rental Assistance Demonstration*, and *PHA Plan* sections of this guide.

HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) [sent a letter](#) to public housing agency (PHA) executive directors dated November 13, 2018. The term “repositioning” was used to describe HUD’s intent to remove itself from public housing program administration. HUD’s immediate goal was to “reposition” 105,000 public housing units before September 30, 2019.

Because Congress has failed to provide adequate appropriations for the public housing Capital Fund for many years, there is about a \$70 billion backlog in capital needs. HUD points to that backlog as the reason to provide PHAs with “additional flexibilities” so that PHAs can “reposition” public housing. Unfortunately, the Trump Administration has proposed zeroing out money for the public housing Capital Fund.

Public housing can be “repositioned” via:

1. The Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD)
2. Demolishing or disposing of (selling) public housing
3. Voluntary conversion of public housing to vouchers

While these are already available to PHAs, repositioning is meant to make things easier. Each strategy is discussed below.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION (RAD)

Beginnings

Throughout 2010 and 2011, HUD consulted with public housing resident leaders through the Resident Engagement Group (REG) to bring in non-federal resources to compensate for insufficient congressional funding of the public housing Capital Fund. HUD also wanted to avoid the many harmful effects of the HOPE VI program. Over time, HUD presented three proposals to the REG, and each time the REG would point out a resident-oriented problem. In response, HUD went back to the drawing board to present a modified proposal. The final proposal, the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), addressed all of the REG’s concerns.

Congress authorized the creation of RAD as part of the fiscal year 2012 HUD appropriations act to help preserve and improve low-income housing. RAD does not provide any new federal funds for public housing and there are no RAD regulations, but RAD conversions must comply with a formal RAD Notice, PIH Notice 2012-32. The current Notice is [H-2019-09/PIH 2019-23 \(REV4\)](#).

What is RAD?

RAD allows PHAs to convert public housing units to either Project-Based Vouchers (PBVs) or to Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA). Both are forms of project-based Section 8 rental contracts. At first only 60,000 units would be converted under the “demonstration,” but Congress approved increases to the cap three times so that currently, 455,000 public housing units are being converted to PBVs or PBRAs. Both the Obama and Trump administrations have sought to remove the cap and allow all public housing units to convert to RAD. So far, the cap remains at 455,000 units. Once converted under RAD, the amount of public housing Capital Fund and Operating Fund formerly received by a specific development is used instead as PBV or PBRA.

PBVs are Housing Choice Vouchers tied to specific buildings; they do not move with tenants like regular “tenant-based” vouchers. If public housing units are converted to PBV, the initial contract must be for 15 years (20 years for projects pre-approved in 2017) and must always be renewed. PIH continues to oversee the units and most of the current PBV rules (24 CFR 983) apply. If units are converted to PBRA, the initial contract must be for 20 years, must always be renewed, and HUD’s Office of Multifamily Programs takes over monitoring. Most of the current PBRA rules (24 CFR 880 to 886) apply.

More details are in the *Rental Assistance Demonstration* section of this guide.

Might Converting Some Public Housing to Section 8 Be Desirable?

Converting some public housing to Section 8 might be helpful since Congress continues to underfund public housing, resulting in deteriorating buildings and the loss of units through demolition. Congress is more likely to provide adequate funding for existing Section 8 contracts than for public housing, and if a long-term rental assistance contract is tied to a property, private institutions may be more willing to lend money for critical building repairs. Therefore, some units that were public housing before conversion are more likely to remain available and affordable to people with extremely low and very low incomes because of the long-term Section 8 contract.

What Are the Resident Protections that the REG Secured in RAD?

Both the language in the appropriations act and HUD’s formal rules for RAD include all the protections sought by the REG. However, it is up to residents to try to get HUD, PHAs, developers, and owners to comply.

Displacement. Permanent involuntary displacement of current residents cannot take place. If a household does not want to transition to PBV or PBRA, they may move to other public housing if an appropriate unit is available.

Right to Return. Residents temporarily relocated while rehabilitation is conducted have a right to return.

Rescreening. Current residents cannot be rescreened.

Tenant Rent. Existing PBV and PBRA rules limit resident rent payment to 30% of income, or minimum rent, whichever is higher. Any rent increase of 10% or \$25 (whichever is greater) due to conversion is phased in over three to five years.

Good Cause Eviction. An owner must renew a resident’s lease unless there is “good cause” not to.

Grievance Process. The RAD statute requires tenants to have the grievance and lease termination rights described under Section 6 of the “Housing Act of 1937.” For instance, PHAs must notify a resident of the reason for a proposed adverse action and of their right to an informal hearing assisted by a resident representative. Advocates think that HUD has not adequately implemented this statutory requirement.

Other Resident-Oriented Provisions the REG Secured in RAD

The \$25 per Unit for Tenant Participation

Remains. Whether a property is converted to PBV or PBRA, the owner must provide \$25 per unit annually for resident participation. Of this amount, at least \$15 per unit must be provided to any “legitimate resident organization” to be used for resident education, organizing around tenancy issues, or training activities. The PHA may use the remaining \$10 per unit for resident participation activities.

Resident Participation Rights. Residents have the right to establish and operate a resident organization. If a property is converted to PBRA, then the current Section 8 Multifamily program’s “Section 245” resident participation provisions apply.

If a property is converted to PBV, instead of using public housing’s “Section 964”

provisions, the RAD Notice requires resident participation provisions similar to those of Section 245 used by the Section 8 Multifamily program. For example, PHAs must recognize legitimate resident organizations and allow residents to establish and operate resident organizations. Resident organizers must be allowed to distribute leaflets and post information on bulletin boards, contact residents, help residents participate in the organization's activities, hold regular meetings, and respond to an owner's request to increase rent, reduce utility allowances, or make major capital additions.

One-for-One Replacement. Although the RAD Notice does not use the term “one-for-one replacement,” HUD’s informal material describes one-for-one replacement. However, there are exceptions. PHAs can reduce the number of assisted units by up to 5% or by five units, whichever is greater, without seeking HUD approval. HUD calls this the “de minimus” exception. However, RAD does not count against the 5%/five unit de minimus, so units that have been vacant for two or more years; any reconfigured units, such as combining two efficiency units into a one-bedroom unit; or any units converted to use by social services do not count toward the de minimus. Consequently, the loss of units can be greater than 5%.

Two Additional Key Features of RAD

Resident Participation Features. The RAD Notice requires PHAs to provide residents with various information notices and at least four meetings with residents at different stages of the RAD process. Details are presented in the *Rental Assistance Demonstration* section of this guide.

Temporary or Permanent Relocation. Relocation requirements are described in separate HUD guidance, [Notice H 2016-17/PIH-2016-17](#). Details are presented in the *Rental Assistance Demonstration* section of this guide.

DEMOLITION/DISPOSITION

Background

Since 1983, HUD has authorized PHAs to apply for permission to demolish or dispose of (sell) public housing units under Section 18 of the Housing Act. In 1995, Congress ended the requirement that PHAs replace, on a one-for-one basis, public housing lost through demolition or disposition. In 2016, HUD reported a net loss of more than 139,000 public housing units due to demolition or disposition since 2000, not including all of the public housing units lost as a result of HOPE VI.

A PHA must apply to HUD’s [Special Applications Center \(SAC\)](#) to demolish or dispose of public housing. The application must certify that the PHA has described the demolition or disposition in its Annual PHA Plan and that the description in the application is identical. Advocates should challenge an application that is significantly different. PHAs should not re-rent units when they turn over while HUD is considering an application. The information in this article is primarily from the regulations [24 CFR 970](#).

In 2018, the new Administration eliminated a 2012 HUD Notice that included modest improvements suggested by advocates. The 2012 Notice served as a reminder to residents, the public, and PHAs of PHAs’ obligations to resident involvement and the role of the PHA Plan regarding demolition/disposition. The replacement, [Notice PIH 2018-04](#), downplays the role of resident consultation to make it easier to demolish public housing.

In addition, the new Administration withdrew proposed regulation changes drafted in 2014 that would have reinforced the modest improvements in the 2012 Notice and required PHAs to submit more detailed justifications for demolition or disposition. All of this was a part of the new Administration’s goal of “repositioning” 105,000 public housing units before September 2019.

Resident Participation

A PHA must prepare a demo/dispo application “in consultation” with tenants and any tenant

organization at a project, as well as with any PHA-wide tenant organization and the Resident Advisory Board (RAB). The application ([form HUD-52860](#)) must include any written comments made by residents, resident organizations, or the RAB and indicate in writing how the PHA responded to comments. HUD can deny an application if tenants, resident councils, or RABs were not consulted, so residents should challenge an application if they were not consulted or if the “consultation” was grossly inadequate.

Demolition Applications

Is the Public Housing Obsolete? PHAs must certify that a development is “obsolete,” either physically or in terms of location, and therefore no longer suitable as housing.

Physically obsolete means that there are structural deficiencies that cannot be corrected at a reasonable cost. Structural deficiencies include settlement of floors, severe erosion, and deficiencies in major systems such as the plumbing, electrical, heating and cooling, roofs, doors, and windows. “Reasonable” cost is defined as less than 62.5% of total development costs for buildings with elevators and 57.14% for other buildings. To show that a development is physically obsolete, a PHA must submit a detailed scope of work that should describe the major systems needing repair or replacement, the need to remove lead-based paint or asbestos hazards, or the need to make accessibility improvements (the last sentence is based on Notice PIH 2018-04).

An obsolete location means that the surrounding neighborhood is too deteriorated or has shifted from residential to commercial or industrial use. It can also mean environmental conditions make it unsuitable for residents.

“Other factors” can also be considered, like things that “seriously affect the marketability or usefulness” of the development.

“De Minimus” Demolition. PHAs don’t have to apply to HUD to demolish fewer than five units or 5% of all units over a five-year period. The units being demolished must either be beyond repair or make room for services such as a childcare facility, laundry, or community center.

Disposition Applications

A PHA must certify that keeping the development is not in the best interest of residents or the PHA for one of three reasons:

1. Conditions in the surrounding area, such as commercial or industrial activity, have a negative impact on the health and safety of residents or have a negative impact on the PHA’s operation of the project. A negative impact on the PHA’s operation of a project could mean a lack of demand for the units. If so, the PHA would have to show high long-term vacancy rates due to factors such as declining population in the area or due to the property being located in an isolated area cut off from transportation and access to community amenities such as stores and schools. This example of a negative impact is from Notice PIH 2018-04.
2. Sale or transfer of the property will allow the PHA to buy, develop, or rehab other properties that can be more efficiently operated as low-income housing. For example, the replacement units should be energy efficient; in better locations for transportation, jobs, or schools; or reduce racial or ethnic concentrations of poverty.
3. Sale of the property is “appropriate” for reasons consistent with the PHA’s goals, the PHA Plan, and the purpose of the Public Housing Act (a vague option). Notice PIH 2018-04 provides five examples: units are obsolete (echoing the Demolition rule), the PHA has 50 or fewer public housing units, the public housing is scattered across multiple locations, the replacement units are on site and have improved efficiency because they are newly constructed, modernized, or a RAD conversion that has 75% of the units converted under RAD and up to 25% of the

units converted to vouchers via Section 18 (see the *Rental Assistance Demonstration* section of this guide).

Resident Relocation Provisions

The demolition or disposition application must have a relocation plan that states:

- Demolition or disposition cannot start until all residents are relocated.
- Residents will receive 90 days' advance notice before being relocated.
- Each household must be offered comparable housing that meets housing quality standards (HQS) and that is in an area that is not less desirable.
- Residents' actual relocation expenses will be reimbursed (but the "Uniform Relocation Act", URA, does not apply).

VOLUNTARY CONVERSION TO VOUCHERS

A PHA may convert any public housing development to vouchers under Section 22 of the "Housing Act of 1937." Voluntary conversion is a two-step process. First a PHA must send HUD a "conversion *assessment*" and then it must send a "conversion *plan*." A special HUD office is in charge, the [Special Applications Center, SAC](#). The regulations for voluntary conversions are [24 CFR 972](#).

Section 33 is about "required" conversions of public housing that has high vacancy rates and would be too expensive to repair over the long run. This section does not discuss Section 33 required conversions because it is not a part of repositioning.

Conversion Assessment

The first step a PHA must take to voluntarily convert public housing to vouchers is to conduct an assessment that is sent to HUD as part of a PHA's next Annual PHA Plan, except for two categories of PHAs:

- So-called "Qualified PHAs" do not have to submit a conversion assessment with their PHA Plan but they do eventually have to

submit one to HUD. These are PHAs with 550 or fewer public housing units and/or vouchers combined. There are about 2,700 Qualified PHAs.

- As of April 1, 2019, so-called "small PHAs" – those with fewer than 250 public units that want to convert all their units – do not have to conduct an assessment.

For the remaining PHAs, their conversion assessment must address five factors:

- 1. Cost.** What is the cost of providing vouchers compared to the cost of keeping units as public housing for the remainder of the property's useful life?
- 2. Market Value.** What is the market value *before rehabilitation* if kept as public housing compared to conversion to vouchers and what is the market value *after rehabilitation* if kept as public housing compared to conversion to vouchers?
- 3. Rental Market Conditions.** Will residents be able to use a voucher? A PHA must consider:
 - a. The availability of decent, safe, and sanitary homes renting at or less than the PHA's voucher payment standard.
 - b. The recent rate of households' ability to rent a home with a voucher. Many landlords will not accept a voucher.
 - c. Residents' characteristics that might affect their ability to find and use a voucher; for example, homes accessible to people with a disability, or availability of homes large enough for families.
- 4. Neighborhood Impact.** How would conversion impact the availability of affordable housing in the neighborhood and what effect would conversion have on the concentration of poverty in the neighborhood?
- 5. Future Use of the Property.** How will the property be used after conversion?

Three Conditions for HUD Approval of Conversion Assessment

The assessment must show that converting to vouchers:

1. Will not cost more than continuing to use the development as public housing.
2. Will principally benefit the residents, the PHA, and the community. The PHA must consider the availability of landlords willing to accept vouchers, as well as access to schools, jobs, and transportation. The PHA must hold at least one public meeting with residents and the resident council, at which the PHA explains the regulations and provides draft copies of the conversion assessment. Residents must be given time to submit comments. The assessment sent to HUD must summarize residents' comments and the PHA's responses.
3. Will not have a harmful impact on the availability of affordable housing.

Conversion Plan

The second step is for the PHA to prepare a conversion plan that has six parts:

1. Description of the conversion and future use of the property.
2. Analysis of the impact on the community.
3. Explanation showing how the conversion plan is consistent with the assessment.
4. Summary of resident comments during plan development and the PHA's response.
5. Explanation of how the conversion assessment met the three conditions needed for HUD approval (as listed above).
6. Relocation plan that:
 1. Indicates the number of households to be relocated by bedroom size and by the number of accessible units.
 2. Lists relocation resources needed, including:
 - a. The number of vouchers the PHA will request from HUD. HUD will give the

PHA priority for "tenant protection vouchers" (see the *Tenant Protection Vouchers* section of this guide).

- b. Public housing units available elsewhere.
 - c. The amount of money needed to pay residents' relocation costs.
4. Includes a relocation schedule.
 5. Provides for a written notice to residents at least 90 days before displacement. The notice must inform residents that:
 - a. The development will no longer be used as public housing and that they might be displaced.
 - b. ii. They will be offered comparable housing that could have tenant-based or project-based assistance, or other housing assisted by the PHA.
 - c. iii. The replacement housing offered will be affordable, decent, safe, and sanitary, and chosen by the household to the extent possible.
 - d. iv. If residents will be assisted with vouchers, the vouchers will be available at least 90 days before displacement.
 - e. v. Relocation and/or mobility counselling might be provided.
 - f. vi. Residents may choose to remain at the property with a voucher if the property is used for housing after the conversion.

Resident Participation

The conversion plan must be sent to HUD as part of a PHA's next Annual PHA Plan within one year after sending the conversion assessment. The conversion plan can be sent as a Significant Amendment to an Annual PHA Plan. A PHA can send the plan and assessment with the same Annual PHA Plan.

In addition to the public participation requirements for the Annual PHA Plan, a PHA must hold at least one meeting about the conversion plan with residents and resident council of the affected development. At the

meeting the PHA must explain the regulations and provide draft copies of the conversion plan. In addition, residents must have time to submit comments, and the PHA must summarize resident comments and the PHA's responses.

Conditions Needed for HUD Approval of Conversion Plan

A PHA cannot start converting until HUD approves a conversion plan. Conversion plan approval is separate from HUD approval of an Annual PHA Plan. HUD will provide a PHA with a preliminary response within 90 days. HUD will not approve a conversion plan if the plan is “plainly inconsistent” with the conversion assessment, there is information or data that contradicts the conversion assessment, or the conversion plan is incomplete or fails to meet the requirements of the regulation.

FUNDING

There is no specific funding for RAD, demolition or disposition, or voluntary conversion to vouchers. However, HUD must estimate how much it should request from Congress for Tenant Protection Vouchers for demolition or disposition. The Trump administration requested but did not receive congressional approval for \$100 million for RAD projects that needed extra funding to make conversion possible, nor was \$30 million granted to pay for demolitions.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The Trump administration will likely expand its efforts to reposition even more public housing units in 2020. It has also proposed extra funds for RAD and demolition in its budget proposal for FY 2021.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Do not raise the number of public housing units that can convert under RAD beyond the current cap of 455,000 units because RAD has yet to demonstrate HUD's ability to monitor and enforce resident protections. Work to reverse the features of Notice PIH 2018-04 that made it far too easy to gain demolition/disposition approval from SAC, especially without more resident involvement.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, <https://nlihc.org>.

NLIHC's public housing webpage, <https://bit.ly/2SOZ3Kn>.

The November 13, 2018 HUD Repositioning Letter, <https://bit.ly/2OMTr0Y>.

HUD's Repositioning webpage, <https://bit.ly/2S4Ur5V>.

RAD Notice H 2019-09/PIH 2019-23, <https://bit.ly/2EumOCS>.

The RAD Relocation Notice H 2016-17/PIH-2016-17, <https://bit.ly/2YZVYvS>.

HUD's Special Applications Center (SAC) website is at: <https://bit.ly/36JBkCI>.

HUD's Demolition/Disposition webpage, <https://bit.ly/2POS6JC>.

HUD's Public Housing Conversion webpage, <https://bit.ly/2YVFPrC>.

Moving to Work Demonstration & Expansion

By Will Fischer, Senior Policy Analyst,
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

The Moving to Work Demonstration (MTW) is a deregulation initiative that gives participating housing agencies very broad flexibility in how they administer the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs. Some agencies have used MTW to implement promising alternative policies, but the demonstration has also allowed agencies to put in place policies that pose serious risks to low-income families (including time limits, work requirements, and large rent increases) and to shift funds out of the voucher program in a manner that results in many fewer families receiving housing assistance.

BACKGROUND

In 1996, Congress established MTW with three statutory goals: reducing costs and increasing cost-effectiveness, providing incentives for self-sufficiency, and increasing housing choices for low-income families. HUD was initially authorized to admit up to 30 agencies, and Congress increased that limit to 39 by 2011. The 39 agencies in MTW today are only a small share of the nearly 4,000 agencies that administer public housing and/or vouchers but because they are disproportionately large, they account for 12% of the nation's vouchers and public housing units. The MTW agencies operate under agreements that allow them to continue to participate in the demonstration through 2028 (and could be extended beyond that date, as HUD has usually done when MTW agreements approached expiration). In 2015, Congress directed HUD to increase the number of agencies in MTW from 39 to 139 and HUD is currently implementing that expansion.

Under MTW, HUD can waive nearly all provisions of the “United States Housing Act of 1937” (as it has been amended over the years) and the accompanying regulations. This includes most

of the main rules and standards governing vouchers and public housing, but there are some exceptions. For example, the MTW statute prohibits waivers of 1937 act provisions governing public housing demolition and disposition and requirements to pay workers fair wages. In addition, protections under the “Fair Housing Act” and other laws outside the 1937 act cannot be waived. MTW agencies are also permitted to shift voucher and public housing funds to purposes other than those for which they were originally appropriated, and HUD has established special formulas to set voucher and (in some cases) public housing operating subsidy funding levels at MTW agencies.

The law establishing MTW set certain requirements that agencies must meet in carrying out MTW, including serving the same number of low-income families as they would without MTW funding flexibility, serving a mix of families by size comparable to the mix they would have served if they weren't in MTW, ensuring that 75% of the families they assist have incomes at or below 50% of area median income, ensuring that assisted units meet housing quality standards, and establishing a reasonable rent policy. In practice, HUD's enforcement of these requirements has been highly permissive. For example, agencies have been allowed to implement policies that serve many thousands fewer families than they could if they used funds for their original purpose. Agencies have also been found to charge poor families rent well above what they could reasonably be expected to afford.

WAIVERS OF KEY TENANT PROTECTIONS

One set of concerns about MTW is that it has allowed waivers of policies that protect low-income families and make rental assistance effective. For example, MTW agencies are permitted to raise rents above those permitted under the Brooke Rule (which generally caps rent

and utility payments at 30% of a household's adjusted income). All MTW agencies have modified rent rules in some manner and the majority have raised "minimum rents" or instituted other policy changes that charge families with little or no income more—sometimes hundreds of dollars a month more—than they would under the regular rules.

MTW agencies have also implemented a number of other policies that risk exposing families to hardship or limiting their access to opportunity. A 2018 analysis found that nine agencies had instituted work requirements and a 2014 study found that eight had placed time limits on assistance. A significant number of agencies have also imposed restrictions on the right of voucher holders to move to a community of their choice.

These risky policies are particularly problematic because (with very limited exceptions) HUD has not required that they be rigorously evaluated, or even that the impact on affected families be monitored. For example, a [report](#) by the Urban Institute concluded that "although some MTW agencies have been implementing work requirement policies for more than a decade, no systematic evaluation or attempt has been made to analyze what the impact has been on residents' work engagement, incomes, or housing instability or on agency administrative costs." A report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) similarly found that due to limitations in HUD's monitoring and evaluation process, it cannot assess how MTW's rent and work-requirement policies affect low-income tenants.

DIVERSION OF VOUCHER FUNDS AND REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF FAMILIES ASSISTED

Another major adverse effect of MTW is that it has caused many fewer families to receive rental assistance than could be assisted with available funds. MTW allows agencies to divert money out of their voucher programs and provides voucher funds through block grant formulas that, unlike the regular formula used at non-MTW agencies, provides no incentive for agencies to put funds to use assisting needy families. From 2014 to

2018, MTW agencies shifted about \$530 million a year in voucher funds (19% of their total) to other purposes or left the funds unspent and provided vouchers to 55,000 fewer families annually as a result. MTW agencies use diverted funds to provide housing assistance to about 10,000 families through local programs, but that still leaves a large net cut in the number of families assisted.

Agencies have used funds shifted out of the voucher program for a variety of purposes, including supplementing their administrative budgets, maintaining or renovating public housing, and developing affordable housing. Federal policymakers should provide more adequate funding for these purposes directly but allowing agencies to divert voucher funds is the wrong way to address them, for several reasons.

Leaving families without vouchers exposes them to serious hardship. Vouchers sharply reduce overcrowding and housing instability and are by far the most effective way to cut homelessness among families with children. Vouchers can also allow families to move to less poverty-stricken neighborhoods, which raises children's earnings and educational achievement later in life.

Agencies have generally sought to allocate transferred funds to potentially beneficial purposes, but the funds often do less to help low-income people than they would if they were used for vouchers. A 2017 report commissioned by housing agencies was able to show only modest evidence of benefits in areas where diverted funds have been used and none that came close to offsetting the sharp reduction in the number of families with rental assistance. Moreover, some MTW agencies have used funds in ways that have little or no benefit for low-income people, such as paying unusually high staff salaries, accumulating large amounts of unspent voucher funds, and otherwise wasting or misusing funds.

In addition, diverting voucher funds risks laying the groundwork for deep cuts to voucher funding that would leave fewer total resources for low-income housing, particularly if MTW is expanded further. If the number of agencies diverting

voucher funds were to grow substantially, policymakers could reduce voucher funding and claim that agencies could implement the cuts by postponing redevelopment projects or scaling back administrative budgets, rather than by cutting rental assistance for vulnerable families. The experience of other low-income programs that, like MTW, allocate federal funds as block grants that recipients can use for a wide variety of purposes demonstrates the risk that this approach could lead to deep funding cuts. From 2000 to 2017, combined inflation-adjusted funding for the 13 major housing, health, and social services block grants fell by 27%, and housing block grants were among the hardest hit. If MTW block granting led to similar reductions in voucher and public housing funding, rental assistance for hundreds of thousands of families would be lost.

MTW EXPANSION

Under the MTW expansion that Congress enacted in 2015, HUD must admit 100 agencies within seven years. Of those agencies, at least 50 must have no more than 1,000 combined public housing and voucher units, at least 47 must have 1,001-6000 units, and the remaining three can have no more than 27,000 units each.

Congress directed HUD to carry out the expansion in a manner that places a greater emphasis on research than MTW has in the past. HUD must direct each cohort of agencies admitted to the demonstration to test one specific policy change chosen in consultation with a research advisory committee and must ensure that the policies are rigorously evaluated. HUD has announced that it plans to select four cohorts and has already begun soliciting applications for 50 agencies (all of which must have 1,000 or fewer units) to participate in a cohort testing the overall effects of MTW flexibility and about 10 agencies to participate in a cohort testing rent policy changes (such as tiered and stepped rents). Under the remaining two cohorts, agencies will test work requirements and incentives for landlords to participate in the voucher program.

The Obama administration proposed an operations notice establishing the rules governing expansion agencies in January 2016. That notice would have made significant reforms to limit the expansion's adverse consequences. For example, the proposal would have required agencies admitted under the expansion to use 90% of their voucher subsidy funds for vouchers, which would have tightly limited the loss of rental assistance from diversion of funds, and required agencies seeking to implement work requirements, time limits, and major rent increases to seek special approval from HUD. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), NLIHC, and other advocates urged HUD to strengthen these reforms further and to more tightly limit policies that pose risks to vulnerable families. The Trump administration, however, moved in the opposite direction, dropping most of the reforms when it proposed a new version of the operations notice in October 2018. HUD is expected to publish the final version of the notice in early 2020.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Will Fischer, *New Report Reinforces Concerns About HUD's Moving to Work Demonstration*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, October 30, 2017, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/new-report-reinforces-concerns-about-huds-moving-to-work-demonstration>.

HUD Moving to Work webpage, <https://www.hud.gov/mtw>.

Diane K. Levy, Leiha Edmonds, and Jasmine Simington, *Work Requirements in Housing Authorities: Experiences to Date and Knowledge Gaps*, Urban Institute, <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/work-requirements-housing-authorities>.

David Reich, Isaac Shapiro, Chloe Cho, and Richard Kogan, *Block-Granting Low-Income Programs Leads to Large Funding Declines Over Time, History Shows*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, February 22, 2017, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/federal-budget/block-granting-low-income-programs-leads-to-large-funding-declines-over-time>.

U.S. Government Accountability Office,
*Improvements Needed to Better Monitor the Moving
to Work Demonstration, Including Effects on Tenants*,
January 2018, <https://www.gao.gov/products/>
[GAO-18-150](https://www.gao.gov/products/).

Project-Based Rental Assistance

By Ellen Lurie Hoffman, Federal Policy Director, National Housing Trust

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs and Office of Recapitalization

Years Started: 1961 – Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate (BMIR); 1963 – USDA Section 515; 1965 – Section 101 Rent Supplement; 1968 – Section 236; 1974 – Project-Based Section 8, and Rental Assistance Payments Program; 1978 – Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Program.

Number of Persons/Households Served: 1.2 million

Population Targeted: Extremely low- to moderate-income households

Funding: 12.6 billion in FY20

See Also: For related information, refer to the *USDA Rural Rental Housing Programs*, *Tenant Protection Vouchers*, and *Project-Based Vouchers* sections of this guide.

Project-based housing is a category of federally assisted housing produced through a public-private partnership to build and maintain affordable rental housing for low-income households. HUD has provided private owners of multifamily housing either a long-term project-based rental assistance contract, a subsidized mortgage, or in some cases both, in order to make units affordable. Project-based assistance is fixed to a property.

This stock of affordable housing is in danger of being permanently lost as a result of owners opting out, physical deterioration of properties, and maturing mortgages ending use restrictions. When owners opt out of the HUD project-based assistance program, they may convert their properties to market-rate rental buildings or condominiums.

HISTORY AND PROGRAM SUMMARY

From 1965 to the mid-1980s, HUD played an essential role in creating affordable rental homes by providing financial incentives such as below-market interest rate loans, interest rate subsidies, and project-based Section 8 contracts. Currently, no additional units are being produced through these programs.

Initially, project-based assistance was provided through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) in the form of a mortgage subsidy. Mortgage subsidies reduced the cost of developing rental housing, and in return, HUD required owners to agree to use restrictions that limit contract rents and limit occupancy to households meeting program income limits. These programs did not provide the direct rental assistance needed in order to be affordable to extremely low- or very low-income households.

The Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate (BMIR) mortgage insurance program, created by the “National Housing Act of 1961,” enabled HUD to purchase below-market loans made by private lenders. In 1968, the Section 221(d)(3) BMIR program was replaced by the Section 236 program which combined FHA mortgage insurance on private loans with an interest rate subsidy to effectively lower the mortgage interest rate to 1%. Owners of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR and Section 236 properties were required to make units available to low- and moderate-income families at HUD-approved rents for the term of their 40-year mortgages. More than 600,000 units of affordable housing were built under those two programs. Some, but not all, subsidized mortgage properties also have project-based rental assistance from the Section 8 program.

In 1974, Section 236 was replaced by the Section 8 New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation program, now known as the project-based Section 8 program. HUD entered into 20- to 40-year contracts with private owners

to serve low-income tenants. More than 800,000 units were developed from 1974 to 1983, when authorization for new construction was repealed.

There are three other smaller programs that still have units associated with them and those programs are sometimes referred to as “orphan” programs. In addition to mortgage subsidies, HUD provided rental assistance payments to owners for some tenants of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR, and Section 236 insured properties through several programs.

The Section 101 Rent Supplement Program (Rent Supp) was authorized by the “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965.” Many of those properties received Loan Management Set-Aside (LMSA) Section 8 contracts due to rapidly rising operating costs in the mid-1970s. The last two Rent Supp contracts covering 140 units both converted to long-term project-based rental assistance contracts under the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) in 2018.

Some Section 236 properties were provided additional rental assistance through the Rental Assistance Payments (RAP) program, authorized by the “Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.” RAP payments were made to owners on behalf of very low-income tenants unable to afford basic rent with 30% of their income. RAP reduces tenant payment for rent to 10% of gross income, 30% of adjusted income, or the designated portion of welfare assistance; whichever is greater. Most RAP contracts converted to Section 8 LMSA contracts, while the rest converted under RAD. There are no RAP contracts remaining, with the last having converted in late 2019. Another form of rental assistance is the Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation (Mod Rehab) program, designed in 1978 to stimulate moderate levels of rehabilitation to preserve affordable housing. Mod Rehab provides project-based rental assistance for low- and very low-income residents, but unlike other project-based Section 8 programs, the agreement is between the owner and a local public housing agency (PHA). Like project-based Section 8, residents pay 30% of

adjusted income for rent, while rental assistance pays the balance. The program was repealed in 1991 and no new projects are authorized for development. There are approximately 9,000 Mod Rehab units and 7,000 Mod Rehab SRO units remaining.

The Office of Rural Development at the U.S. Department of Agriculture administers two rental housing programs, Section 515 (the Rural Rental Housing Program) and Section 521 (the Rural Rental Assistance Program). The Section 515 program provided subsidized mortgage loans that developed more than 550,000 rental units for very low- to moderate-income households. Started in 1963, budget cuts reduced production dramatically after 1979. The stock of Section 515 units has been dwindling due to mortgage prepayment and deteriorating physical conditions. The Section 521 program is a project-based subsidy available for Section 515 projects (as well as Section 514/516 farm worker projects) that subsidizes the difference between the contract rent and a tenant rent payment of 30% of income.

ISSUE SUMMARY

Today, more than 1.2 million households live in homes with project-based rental assistance. Sixty-four percent of these households are headed by someone who is disabled or elderly and the average household income is less than \$13,000. Another 175,000 households live in homes with one of the other forms of project-based assistance, but without rental assistance.

For project-based Section 8 rental assistance, HUD enters into Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) contracts with owners. These contracts can be renewed in one-, five-, or 20-year increments. However, funding for the contracts is provided 12 months at a time. Tenants pay 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent and utilities, and HUD pays the owner the difference between the contract rent and the tenant’s portion. The average monthly subsidy per unit in 2018 was \$813. New residents in project-based Section 8 units can have incomes of no more than 80% of

the area median income (AMI), with 40% of new admissions required to have incomes below 30% of AMI.

New residents of Section 221(d)(3) BMIR properties can have incomes up to 95% of AMI, although those in Section 236 properties can have incomes up to 80% of AMI, though the median annual household income for residents of these properties is between \$11,000 and \$12,000. Since no new units are being constructed, the challenge today is ensuring that federally assisted affordable housing is not permanently lost, either through physical deterioration, or as a result of properties being converted to non-affordable uses, such as high-rent units or condominiums, when a HUD-subsidized mortgage is either prepaid or matures or when an owner decides not to renew an expiring project-based Section 8 contract.

There are several specific conversion risks for rental housing with project-based assistance:

Mortgage Prepayment

Although Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) BMIR mortgages originally had 40-year terms, program regulations allowed most for-profit owners to prepay their mortgages after 20 years. By prepaying, in most cases owners may terminate income and rent restrictions and any Section 8 rent subsidy. Owners must give tenants at least 150 days' advance notice of an intention to prepay. Upon prepayment, tenants are eligible for Tenant Protection Vouchers (TPVs), or in some cases an enhanced voucher, that allows a tenant to either remain in the property or find new affordable rental housing with the voucher assistance.

Maturing Mortgages

Tens of thousands of low-income families face escalating rents if affordability protections are not extended for properties with maturing Section 236 and Section 221(d)(3) BMIR mortgages. Residents living in apartments with affordability protections but without project-based Section 8 contracts do not currently qualify for enhanced vouchers or other rental assistance when the HUD-subsidized mortgage expires. The National

Housing Preservation Database identifies more than 11,563 unassisted units in 60 properties in 22 states at risk of mortgage maturity or the expiration of use restrictions or assistance between FY20 and FY25 (tenants remain eligible despite the expiration of restrictions prior to FY15, subject to owner application).

Expiring Project-Based Section 8 Assistance Contracts

When project-based Section 8 contracts expire, owners may choose to opt out of their contracts, enabling them to increase rents to market levels or to convert units to market-rate condominiums, thereby rendering apartments unaffordable to lower-income tenants. Owners must give tenants one-year advance notice of intent to opt out. Most tenants will receive enhanced vouchers to enable them to remain in their homes. According to the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University, of the approximately 1.28 million active Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) units, more than 352,000 units (28%) are at risk of losing their affordability status according to calculations from the National Housing Preservation Database.

Enhanced Vouchers

Special voucher assistance is provided to tenants who would otherwise be displaced due to rising rents or condo conversion if an owner prepays a Section 221(d)(3) BMIR or Section 236 mortgage, or if an owner opts out of a project-based Section 8 contract. HUD is required by statute to provide enhanced tenant-based vouchers to tenants in such properties to enable them to afford to remain in their homes. Enhanced vouchers pay the difference between 30% of the tenant's income and the new rent, even if that rent is higher than the PHA's payment standard. Tenants have a right to remain in their apartments after conversion to market rents and owners must accept enhanced vouchers. If a tenant with an enhanced voucher moves to another property, the enhanced voucher converts to a regular voucher and the unit they occupied is unfortunately no longer affordable to any lower-income household.

Mark-to-Market and Mark-Up-to-Market

Some FHA-insured properties with expiring project-based Section 8 contracts have rents that exceed market rents. Upon contract renewal, HUD is required to reduce rents to market level, creating a cash crunch for those properties and potentially putting their FHA-insured mortgages at risk of default. To address this problem, Congress enacted the Mark-to-Market Program in 1997. Owners of eligible properties must either go through the Mark-to-Market Program or opt out. In the Mark-to-Market Program, an owner has two options:

- Choose to have the mortgage restructured to be able to afford to operate and maintain the property with lower market rents. In exchange for this mortgage restructuring, an owner agrees to accept Section 8 rent subsidies for an additional 30 years.
- Choose to renew the Section 8 contract for one year with Section 8 rents reduced to market without undergoing a mortgage restructuring.

HUD is also able to raise contract rents to market levels upon contract renewal for properties in high-cost areas through the Mark-Up-to-Market Program. Contract renewals of at least five years are required in Mark-Up-to-Market, which provides a needed incentive for owners to renew their participation in the Section 8 program when private-sector rents are high. These contract renewals also provide a source of revenue for capital improvements.

Troubled Properties

HUD multifamily properties may be at risk when a property is in poor financial or physical condition. An owner in default on a HUD-assisted mortgage could result in termination of the Section 8 subsidy through HUD's foreclosure and property disposition process. Since 2005, however, Congress has used appropriations acts to renew the so-called Schumer Amendment. The provision requires HUD to maintain a project-based Section 8 contract at foreclosure or disposition sale as long as the property is in viable condition. If not viable, HUD can, after

consulting tenants, transfer the Section 8 subsidy to another property.

Another risk is that HUD may terminate a Section 8 contract mid-term or refuse to renew the Section 8 contract if there is a serious violation of the terms of the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment contract. Appropriations act provisions since FY06 have allowed HUD to transfer project-based assistance, debt, and use restrictions from properties that are physically obsolete or not financially viable to another project. Residents must be notified and consulted.

Provisions of the "Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2019"

The "FY19 Consolidated Appropriations Act" had five key provisions affecting project-based programs:

1. A \$5 million set-aside was allocated within the public housing TPV account to provide TPVs or enhanced vouchers to at-risk tenants living in buildings with expiring HUD-insured mortgages (e.g., Rent Supp) or expiring RAP contracts that do not qualify tenants for enhanced vouchers. Tenants would have to be in jeopardy of paying more than 30% of income for rent in properties located in low-vacancy areas. These vouchers could also be project-based.
2. The Schumer Amendment was renewed for FY19, generally requiring HUD to preserve project-based contracts on troubled properties before or during the foreclosure process, canceling HUD's prior policy of automatically terminating contracts. This provision also required HUD to notify tenants and obtain their consent before HUD abates a contract and relocates tenants for major health and safety threats.
3. Section 8 transfer authority is renewed, allowing HUD to transfer a Section 8 contract, debt, and use restrictions from a financially troubled or physically obsolete building to another building or buildings. This provision allows transfers to be completed in phases and permits the number of units in the receiving property to be fewer than in the

original if those units were unoccupied and the reconfiguration is justified by current market conditions.

4. The act reauthorized a requirement that property owners receiving housing assistance payments must comply with Uniform Physical Condition Standards and state and local standards regarding the physical condition of a property. The act reiterated the regulatory and contractual obligation that owners receiving housing assistance payments must maintain decent, safe, and sanitary conditions. HUD is directed to provide quarterly reports to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on PBRA properties that receive deficient or unsatisfactory scores and include HUD's plans to remedy the deficiencies.

As of publication, Congress had passed a Continuing Resolution (CR) funding all federal programs at FY19 levels through December 20, 2019.

HUD PRESERVATION ACTION

In 2019, HUD encouraged the preservation of the existing multifamily housing stock through several regulatory actions. First, HUD announced \$5 million available for TPV awards for FY19 to public housing agencies under the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program. Of note, the Department resumed its practice of making TPVs available for units that were occupied within the past 24 months.

HUD also announced a demonstration to assess the National Standards for the Physical Inspection of Real Estate (NSPIRE) and released a notice for public comment to assess the national standards for this initiative. NSPIRE is intended to improve resident health and safety in public and assisted housing, while reducing regulatory burden. The demonstration will include approximately 4,500 properties nationally and will evaluate all aspects of the Real Estate Assessment Center's physical inspection processes.

In addition, HUD's Office of Asset Management and Portfolio Oversight (OAMPO) issued a memo clarifying owners' responsibilities to notify residents in advance of physical inspections, make final inspection documents available for review and comment, and implement new house rules. HUD provided guidance on sharing responses to tenant complaints and encouraged tenants to report false certifications of completed repairs or exigent health and safety findings. HUD also released a Notice reducing the owner notification period before a physical inspection to 14 days, followed by guidance on the steps a field office must take when an assisted property receives a score of zero because an owner and/or management agent failed to allow the Department to perform a physical inspection based on the new 14-day notification period.

HUD also published a Notice and related Mortgagee Letter expanding the use of the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) pilot program into New Construction and Substantial Rehabilitation loan products under Sections 221(d)(4) and 220, to facilitate faster and more efficient processing for low-risk, LIHTC transactions by eliminating redundant reviews, supporting the preservation of critically needed affordable multifamily housing.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Preservation of affordable rental housing is usually undertaken by mission-driven developers, often regional or national nonprofits. The most successful local efforts include early identification of properties at risk of conversion, as well as active partnerships with tenants, local HUD officials, state and local housing officials, and lenders and investors with a shared commitment to preserving affordable rental housing.

Subsidized multifamily rental housing can be at risk of leaving the affordable housing stock for any number of reasons, such as an owner's intent to prepay a subsidized mortgage or not renew a project-based rental subsidy contract, or uninhabitable living conditions prompting a HUD foreclosure.

Having a local database of subsidized multifamily rental housing is an essential tool for preserving assisted housing in a community because it provides an inventory of properties available to low-income households, their location, and factors threatening the affordability of each project.

Many projects benefit from multiple layers of subsidy. HUD makes data on specific affordable housing programs available to the public, but nowhere does HUD combine these files into one database that counts each subsidized project only once and associates it with all the subsidies that make it affordable to low-income households. NLIHC has a publication that spells out how to create an easy-to-use database: see Chapter 5 of *The Preservation Guide*, available at: <http://nlihc.org/library/other/preservation/guides/2010>.

NLIHC and the Public and Affordable Housing Research Corporation created the National Housing Preservation Database, a tool for preserving the nation's affordable rental housing. It provides integrated information on all housing subsidies for each federally subsidized project. It also enables advocates and researchers to easily quantify the supply of federally assisted affordable housing in any geographic area, while at the same time establishing a baseline of subsidized affordable units against which future levels can be measured. The database is available at: <http://www.preservationdatabase.org>.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should urge legislators to provide sufficient funding to renew all project-based rental assistance contracts for a full 12 months in FY21. If Congress moves forward with another long-term CR, explain that an anomaly will be needed to fully fund all project-based rental assistance contracts for the entire year, given necessary adjustments to rental contracts.

Members of Congress also should be asked to support preservation features of the RAD program and improvements to the project-based voucher program to allow housing authorities, developers, and owners to preserve the existing housing stock. In addition, advocates should urge

reintroduction of broad legislation to preserve assisted housing that would:

- Provide grants and loans to for-profit and nonprofit housing sponsors to help ensure that properties can be recapitalized and kept affordable.
- Allow owners to request project-based assistance in lieu of enhanced vouchers.
- Protect the rights of states to enact preservation and tenant protection laws that will not be preempted by federal law.
- Ensure that data needed to preserve housing are publicly available and regularly updated and allow for the creation of a single database for all federally assisted properties based on a unique identifier for each property.
- Authorize rural housing preservation programs for Rural Development Section 515 properties.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

National Housing Trust, 202-333-8931, www.nhtinc.org.

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, www.nhlp.org.

National Alliance of HUD Tenants, 617-267-9564, www.saveourhomes.org.

HUD Notice H 2013-3, <http://1.usa.gov/VAXMZ6>.

Section 202: Supportive Housing for the Elderly

By Linda Couch, Vice President, Housing Policy, LeadingAge

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Housing's Office of Housing Assistance and Grant Administration

Year Started: 1959

Number of Persons/Households Served:
400,000 households

Population Targeted: People over the age of 62 with very low incomes (below 50% of area median income). Some pre-1990 Section 202 properties are eligible for occupancy by non-elderly, very low-income persons with disabilities.

Funding: \$793 million in FY20, including \$90 million for new Section 202 homes, and \$100 million to renew existing service coordinator grants.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Services for Residents of Low-Income Housing* section of this guide.

The Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program provides funding to nonprofit organizations that develop and operate housing for seniors with very low incomes. In its FY20 HUD appropriations bill, Congress included \$90 million in the 202 account for the construction and operation of new Section 202 homes. Between FY12 and FY16, Congress did not provide any funding for new Section 202 homes. Funds provided by Congress for the Section 202 account are used primarily to renew underlying rental assistance contracts and existing contracts for on-site service coordinators. In the FY18 HUD funding bill, Congress provided authority for Section 202 communities with Project Rental Assistance Contracts ("202/PRACs") to participate in HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration to facilitate the preservation of these homes. HUD issued guidelines for this "RAD for PRAC"

authority in September 2019.

Key Issues:

- New construction and rental assistance need to address the insufficient supply of affordable housing for very low-income seniors.
- Service Coordinators, in only half of Section 202 communities, should be in all affordable housing communities serving older adults.
- Ensuring full funding to meet annual renewal needs of Section 202 rental assistance provided by PRAC and Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance.
- Successful implementation of the expansion of the Rental Assistance Demonstration for Section 202 communities with Project Rental Assistance Contracts.
- Extension of HUD's three-year Integrated Wellness in Supportive Housing demonstration at 40 Section 202 communities, which will otherwise sunset in September 2020.
- Increasing homelessness among older adults.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The Section 202 program was established under the "Housing Act of 1959." Enacted to allow seniors to age in their community by providing assistance with housing and supportive services, the program has gone through various programmatic iterations during its lifetime. Prior to 1974, Section 202 funds were 3% loans that may or may not have had either Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance or rent supplement assistance for all or some of the units. Between 1974 and 1990, Section 202 funds were provided as loans and subsidized by project-based Section 8 contracts. Until the creation of the Section 811 program in 1990, the Section 202 program funded housing for both seniors and people with disabilities. In 1991 the Section 202 program

was converted to a capital advance grant with a Project Rental Assistance Contract for operational expenses, known as Section 202 PRAC. There are more than 400,000 Section 202 units built since the “Housing Act of 1959” serving very low-income seniors.

The 202 program allows seniors to age in place and avoid unnecessary, unwanted, and much costlier institutionalization. With 38% of existing Section 202 tenants being frail or near-frail, requiring assistance with basic activities of daily living, and thus being at high risk of institutionalization, Section 202 residents have access to community-based services and support to keep living independently and age in place in their community.

According to HUD’s *2017 Worst Case Housing Needs Report*, only 34% of income-eligible seniors receive the rental assistance they qualify for today. The Joint Center projects that the number of over-65 households will grow from 29.6 million in 2015 to 49.6 million in 2035. With each passing day, senior households grow older, become more likely to be single renters, are increasingly likely to have disabilities related to mobility and self-care, and often have lower incomes than ever before.

HUD’s 2017 *Worst Case Housing Needs* report to Congress also noted that older adult households made up 66% of the overall 382,000 household increase of worst case housing needs households identified in the report between 2013 and 2015.

The need for affordable housing is also demonstrated by the rise in homelessness among older adults. According to HUD’s *2017 Annual Homeless Assessment Report (AHAR): Part 2*, the share of people experiencing homelessness who are older adults almost doubled, from 4.1% to 8%, between 2007 and 2017. The Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University’s *Housing America’s Older Adults 2019* reports that 5 million older adult households aged 65 and over are severely cost burdened, spending more than half of their incomes on housing.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly program provides funds to nonprofit organizations, known as sponsors, to develop and operate senior housing. Many Section 202 project sponsors are faith-based or fraternal organizations.

Section 202 tenants generally must be at least 62 years old and have incomes less than 50% of the area median income (AMI) qualifying them as very low-income. Some facilities have a percentage of units designed to be accessible to non-elderly persons with mobility impairments or may serve other targeted disabilities. In 2018, the average annual household income for Section 202 households was \$12,589.

The Section 202 PRAC has two main components: a capital advance that covers expenses related to housing construction, and operating assistance that supports a building’s ongoing operating costs. Both the capital and operating funding streams are allocated to nonprofits on a competitive basis, through a HUD Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA).

Capital Funding

The first component of the Section 202 program provides capital advance funds to nonprofits for the construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of supportive housing for seniors. These funds are often augmented by the HOME program and by Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) debt and equity to either build additional units or supplement the capital advance as gap financing in so-called mixed-finance transactions.

Given the current and growing need for affordable senior housing, Congress must greatly expand its commitment to senior housing.

Operating Funding

The second program component provides rental assistance in the form of PRACs to subsidize the operating expenses of these developments. Residents pay rent equal to 30% of their adjusted income, and the PRAC makes up the difference between rental income and operating expenses.

In addition to the core components of the Section 202 program, HUD administers three complementary programs that have been established by Congress to help meet the needs of seniors aging in place:

1. A Service Coordinators grant program to fund staff in Section 202 buildings to help residents to age in place. According to the Government Accountability Office, about half of Section 202 properties have a Service Coordinator funded as part of the Section 202 appropriation or through HUD grants. Service Coordinators assess residents' needs, identify and link residents to services, and monitor the delivery of services. The older Section 202 properties are eligible for grant funding, while the Section 202/PRAC properties may include the cost of service coordinators in their operating budgets if funds are available.
2. The Supportive Services Demonstration/ Integrated Wellness in Supportive Housing demonstration in HUD-assisted multifamily housing, a \$15 million demonstration at 40 Section 202 communities to help their low-income senior tenants to age in their own homes and delay or avoid the need for nursing home care.
3. Senior Preservation Rental Assistance Contract (SPRAC), which was created to provide rental assistance for the pre-1974 Section 202 properties, has its renewals funded out of the project-based assistance account.

FUNDING

In FY20, Congress appropriated \$793 million for Section 202, providing \$90 million for new construction. This amount also funded the renewal of Service Coordinators and Project Rental Assistance Contracts. In FY19 and FY20, Congress provided \$10 million each year for a new home modification program to help older adults age in place. HUD is working to establish this new program, which Congress has stipulated can only assist older adult homeowners despite the fact that more than 20% of older adults are renters.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Congress is once again likely to ignore the deep funding cuts and damaging programmatic changes to HUD's rental assistance programs that the Trump administration will request for FY21. Fiscal year 2021 will be the last year of the ten-year-old "Budget Control Act" spending caps. While this is good news, the budget agreement from the summer of 2019 provides barely an increase for overall nondefense discretionary spending for FY21 compared to FY20.

New Section 202 Units

Advocates are asking Congress for at least \$600 million in new Section 202 construction/operating funds. This amount is in line with historic funding of this critical program prior to the program being zeroed out after FY11. Advocates will also work to address the capital repair needs of Section 202 homes with new funding for capital repair grants within the Section 202 account.

Support Services Coordination in Housing for Older Adults

In the FY20 HUD funding bill, Congress provided \$500,000 for HUD to collaborate with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services on how Medicare and Medicaid funds can be used to support programs that use affordable senior housing as a platform for coordinating health, wellness, and supportive services and programs to help older adults remain healthy, age in their community, and reduce their use of costly health care services. Advocates will also work to identify financing for prevention and wellness services in HUD-assisted housing.

Advocates will push to continue funding for all existing Service Coordinators and expand Service Coordinator funding to all federally-assisted communities.

Advocates will also urge extension of the three-year Integrated Wellness in Supportive Housing (IWISH) demonstration. The IWISH demonstration, which is testing how HUD-assisted older adults can be supported to live safely and independently in their homes and

communities, is set to sunset on September 30, 2020. The demonstration is built on research on housing-based service models and best practices from service coordination in HUD-assisted housing. Congress should extend this demonstration for two years. Programming that has been ramped up to full capacity is at risk of winding down equally as rapidly as hired staff and partnerships must look for new opportunities. Given the significant investment in the demonstration and the unanimous research pointing to the demonstration's ultimate success, the IWISH demonstration should be extended from its current sunset of September 30, 2020 to September 30, 2022.

RAD for PRAC

After Congress's authorization in 2018 to expand HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration for Section 202 communities with Project Rental Assistance Contracts (dubbed "RAD for PRAC"), HUD officially issued implementing guidance in September 2019. There are 125,000 apartment homes within HUD's 202/PRAC portfolio. These owners are assessing their capital needs and whether RAD for PRAC makes sense for them as a preservation tool. Unlike Section 8-funded communities, PRAC communities cannot take on debt. This left many aging 202/PRACs financially unprepared to preserve themselves for future households. Getting the right rent levels upon conversion, ensuring service coordination is robust, and retaining nonprofit ownership over the long haul are critical components of RAD for PRAC.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates concerned with senior housing issues should encourage their members of Congress to take the following actions:

- Support at least \$600 million for new Section 202 homes.
- Support funding for all Section 202 renewals; two-thirds of Section 202 communities receives Section 8 project-Based Rental Assistance as their operating subsidy, the other third receives Project Rental Assistance

Contracts as their operating subsidy. Each must be fully funded and administered in a manner that does not disrupt communities and residents.

- Provide sufficient funding for the Section 202 Service Coordinator program to fund all existing grant renewals.
- Expand funding (budget-based and grants), so all HUD-assisted platforms can have Service Coordinators.
- Congress, HUD, and HHS must identify financing for prevention and wellness services in HUD-assisted housing.
- Congress should extend the IWISH demonstration for two years.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Linda Couch, Vice President, Housing Policy, LeadingAge, lcouch@leadingage.org, www.leadingage.org.

Section 811: Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities Program

By Gina Schaak, Senior Associate, and Lisa Sloane, Senior Policy Advisor, Technical Assistance Collaborative

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Asset Management and Portfolio Oversight

Year Started: 1992 (prior to this, Section 811 was part of the Section 202 program)

Numbers of Persons/Households Served:

The 811 Capital Advance Program serves an estimated 28,000 households over 2,390 properties. Funding to date for the 811 Project Rental Assistance (PRA) program is expected to produce an estimated 5,900 units.

Population Targeted: Persons ages 18–61 who are extremely or very low-income and have significant and long-term disabilities.

Funding: The FY20 budget includes \$202 million to fund existing Section 811 units but no funding for new units.

See Also: For related information, reference the *Olmstead Implementation* section of this guide.

The Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities is a federal program that assists the lowest-income people with significant and long-term disabilities in living independently in the community by providing affordable housing linked with voluntary services and supports. Congress passed significant reforms to the Section 811 program in 2010 including the creation of the Project Rental Assistance (PRA) Program. The PRA Program is intended to identify, stimulate, and support innovative state-level partnerships and strategies to substantially increase integrated permanent supportive housing opportunities.

HISTORY

Over the past two decades, the Section 811 program created new supportive housing units primarily through the development of group

homes and independent living projects under regulations and guidelines developed in the early 1990s. Since that time, judicial decisions have affirmed important community integration mandates in the “Americans with Disabilities Act” (ADA), and national disability housing and services policies have evolved significantly to emphasize consumer choice, Medicaid-financed community-based services, and integrated housing opportunities. For many years, the Section 811 program did not keep pace with these improvements in disability policy. Demand for the program steadily declined, while the cost per unit from Section 811’s capital-intensive model increased. In 2007, with less than 1,000 new units of Section 811 housing produced annually, national disability advocates began a successful three-year legislative campaign to reform and reinvigorate this important program. The “Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2010,” the Section 811 reform legislation signed into law by President Barack Obama in early 2011, honors the memory of Frank Melville, who was the first chair of the Melville Charitable Trust and a national leader in the supportive housing movement.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Section 811 program includes several components, two of which currently receive HUD funding: Capital Advance/Project Rental Assistance Contract (PRAC), which includes a new multi-family integrated housing option, and the Project Rental Assistance (PRA) Program.

Section 811 Capital Advance/PRAC: Only 501(c)(3) nonprofits are eligible to apply for the S. 811 Capital Advance/PRAC program. HUD provides funding for capital costs as well as PRAC to cover annual operating costs. An estimated 28,000 units were funded from 1992 to 2010. In November 2019, HUD issued a NOFA for \$75 million for the Section 811 Capital Advance/

PRAC projects with funds from HUD FY18 and FY19 Appropriations. This was the first Capital Advance/PRAC NOFA since 2010. Highlights of this NOFA include:

- **Leveraging:** Applicants were highly encouraged to leverage other sources of funds to support the development of the Section 811 units.
- **Partnership:** Heightened focus on sustained partnerships between the applicant and key stakeholders that provide a foundation for implementing housing-related services and supports.
- **Site Control:** All proposals must provide evidence of site control.
- **Types of housing:** Eligible housing types are limited to integrated housing (units within a multifamily property), group homes and condominiums. The number of units set aside for persons with disabilities within a condominium or multifamily property including supportive housing for persons with disabilities or to which any occupancy preference for persons with disabilities applies, may not exceed 25% of the total number of dwelling units.
- **Delegated processing.** Delegated processing will be made available for multifamily projects that consist of a combination of capital advance and other sources. This option is not available for any project that is a group home.

Section 811 Project Rental Assistance (PRA):

Only state housing agencies are eligible to apply for the PRA program. The PRA program provides funds for project-based rental assistance where the capital is provided through other local, state or federal programs; PRA funds cannot be used for capital.

In May 2012, HUD published the first Section 811 PRA NOFA. This NOFA resulted in Cooperative Agreements with 12 states totaling \$98 million for the development of an estimated 2,300 units. In March 2014, HUD published the second NOFA for the Section 811 PRA Program, awarding \$150 million to 24 states. Twenty-seven states are now

administering the program, with more than 5,900 units anticipated. States have demonstrated a high degree of interest in the PRA Program; 43 of the states plus the District of Columbia submitted applications in response to the NOFAs.

In November 2019, HUD issued a NOFA for \$37 million; national advocates were disappointed that the majority of new FY18/FY19 funding was allocated to the capital advance program. The desired outcomes of the NOFA include:

- Facilitating and sustaining effective and successful partnerships between state housing and state health and human service/Medicaid agencies to provide permanent housing with the availability of supportive services for extremely low-income persons with disabilities;
- Discovering replicable approaches to providing housing with access to appropriate services for persons with disabilities;
- Identifying innovative ways of using and leveraging Section 811 PRA funds;
- Substantially increasing integrated affordable rental housing units for persons with disabilities within existing, new, or rehabilitated multifamily properties with a mix of incomes and disability status; and
- Creating more efficient and effective uses of housing and health care resources.

Additional information about the program is available at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/811-pra/>.

FUNDING

In November 2019, HUD published NOFAs for both the PRA Program (\$37 million) and the Capital Advance Program (\$75 million). Awards are not expected until Spring 2020. This was the first funding for new PRA units since HUD's FY13 PRA NOFA, and for new Capital Advance/PRAC units since HUD's FY10 Capital Advance/PRAC NOFA.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The FY20 spending bill provided \$202 million to fund existing Section 811 units but no funding for new units. The president's budget proposal for FY21 included \$252 million, which would allow for some new construction.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Advocates in states receiving Section 811 PRA funds from the FY12 and FY13 competitions should work with state officials to support the implementation of the demonstration. Advocates in states that did not apply for or receive funds in FY12 or FY13 should educate state leaders, local agencies, and organizations on the new PRA option to encourage a successful application for funds in future rounds. At the state level, activities should focus on state housing agencies, state Medicaid, and state health and human service agencies. Nonprofit and for-profit developers that frequently use federal LIHTC and HOME funds should also be made aware of this new opportunity to provide affordable and supportive housing for people with disabilities. The program website is available at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/811-pra/success-stories/> and provides several videos and stories from tenants in Louisiana, Maryland, Washington State, and Massachusetts that can be used to educate stakeholders, including developers and property managers, about the program.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates are encouraged to contact their members of Congress with the message that people with disabilities continue to be the poorest people in the nation. The Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC)'s publication *Priced Out* describes how nearly five million non-elderly adults with significant and long-term disabilities have Supplemental Security Income levels equal to only 20% of AMI and cannot afford housing in the community without federal housing assistance. Because of this housing crisis, many of the most vulnerable people with disabilities live unnecessarily in costly nursing homes, in seriously substandard facilities that may violate

the ADA, or are homeless. The Section 811 PRA Program can help the government reach its goals of ending homelessness and minimizing the number of persons living in costly institutions.

Affordable housing advocates are encouraged to support this request. These funds will provide states with the flexibility to create new and more cost-effective permanent supportive housing options to help highly vulnerable people with disabilities live successfully in the community with supports, while also reducing reliance on expensive and unnecessarily restrictive settings.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Technical Assistance Collaborative, 617-266-5657, www.tacinc.org.

USDA Rural Rental Housing Programs

By Leslie R. Strauss, Senior Housing Analyst, Housing Assistance Council

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

Year Started: Section 515 – 1963; Section 514 – 1962; Section 516 – 1966; Section 521 – 1978; Multifamily Housing Preservation and Revitalization (MPR) – 2006; Section 542 – 2006; Section 538 – 1996

Number of Households Served: Section 515 – 533,000; Section 514/516 – 30,000; Section 521 – currently 267,000; Section 542 – currently 6,559; Section 538 – 45,000

Population Targeted: Section 515 – very low-, low-, and moderate-income households; Section 514/516 – farm workers; Section 538 – households with incomes below 115% of area median

Funding: Section 515 – \$40 million; Section 514 – \$28 million; Section 516 – \$10 million; Section 521 – \$1.375 billion; MPR – \$28 million; Section 542 – \$32 million; Section 538 – \$230 million

The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Rural Development (RD) arm runs several rental housing programs (and homeownership programs) through its Rural Housing Service. USDA makes loans to developers of rental housing for elderly persons and families through the Section 515 program and for farm workers through the Section 514 program (usually used in combination with Section 516 grants). USDA RD provides project-based rental assistance to some of the properties it finances through the Section 521 Rental Assistance (RA) program. The Section 538 program guarantees loans made by banks to develop rental housing for tenants with incomes up to 115% of area median income; almost all Section 538 properties also use Low-Income Housing Tax Credit financing. USDA RD also offers several tools to preserve the affordability of USDA-financed rentals.

The programs face serious problems, however. Production of new units for the lowest income tenants has greatly decreased, and many existing units are deteriorating physically or are in danger of leaving the affordable housing stock.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

In operation since the 1960s, the Section 515 Rural Rental Housing program and the Section 514/516 Farm Labor Housing program have provided essential, decent housing for the lowest income rural residents. Section 521 Rental Assistance is available for some units in Section 515 and 514/516 housing, to keep rents at or under 30% of tenant incomes.

Although dramatic improvements have been made in rural housing quality over the last few decades, problems persist. Many of rural America's 65 million residents experience acute housing problems that are often overlooked while public attention is focused on big-city housing issues. Farm workers, especially those who move from place to place to find work, suffer some of the worst, yet least visible, housing conditions in the country.

Nearly 30% of rural households experience at least one major housing problem, such as high cost, physical deficiencies, or overcrowding. These problems are found throughout rural America but are particularly pervasive among several geographic areas and populations, such as the Lower Mississippi Delta, the southern Black Belt, the colonies along the U.S.-Mexico border, Central Appalachia, and among Native Americans and farm workers.

Forty-seven percent of rural renters are cost burdened, paying more than 30% of their income for their housing and nearly half of them pay more than 50% of their income for housing. More than half of the rural households living with multiple problems, such as affordability, physical inadequacies, or overcrowding, are renters.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Under the Section 515 program, USDA RD makes direct loans to developers to finance affordable multifamily rental housing for very low-income, low-income, and moderate-income families, for elderly people, and for persons with disabilities. Section 515 loans have an interest rate of 1%, amortized over 50 years, to finance modest rental or cooperatively-owned housing.

The Section 514 farm worker housing program also makes direct loans; they have a 1% interest rate for 33-year terms. Some Section 514 borrowers, such as nonprofits, are also eligible for Section 516 grants.

Sections 515 and 514/516 funds and Section 538 loan guarantees can be used for new construction as well as for the rehabilitation of existing properties. Funds may also be used to buy and improve land, and to provide necessary facilities such as water and waste disposal systems. However, no new rental properties have been developed under Section 515 since 2011; the program's entire appropriation for the last several years has been used to preserve existing units.

Very low-, low-, and moderate-income households are eligible to live in Section 515-financed housing. Section 514/516 tenants must receive a substantial portion of their incomes from farm labor. Residents' incomes average about \$13,181 per year. The vast majority (92%) of Section 515 tenants have incomes less than 50% of area median income. More than half of the assisted households are headed by elderly people or people with disabilities. Section 538 units are available for tenants with incomes up to 115% of area median. USDA does not compile data on the incomes of Section 538 residents.

Section 514/516 loans are made available on a competitive basis each year, using a national Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA). After FY12 USDA has not issued NOFAs for Section 515 loans; instead, it has used all of its Section 515 funds for preservation purposes. Applications for Section 538 guarantees are accepted year-round.

Preservation

To avoid losing affordable housing, preservation of existing affordable units is essential. Three factors pose challenges for preserving units in developments with owners who are still making payments on Section 515 or 514 mortgages.

First, many Section 515 and 514 mortgages are nearing the end of their terms. Almost 900 properties (containing 21,400 units) will be able to pay off their mortgages by 2027, and the pace of mortgage maturities will increase starting in 2028. Since USDA Section 521 Rental Assistance (RA) is available only while USDA financing is in place, when a USDA mortgage is fully paid off the property also loses its RA. The USDA can offer Section 542 vouchers for tenants when a mortgage is prepaid, but not when a mortgage matures. Advocates are exploring ways to protect tenants when USDA mortgages mature. Possibilities include offering new or amortized USDA mortgages so that RA can continue; providing vouchers; or "decoupling" RA from USDA mortgages so RA can continue even when a mortgage has been paid in full.

Second, many Section 515 properties are aging and must be preserved against physical deterioration. In 2016, USDA released a Comprehensive Property Assessment (CPA) updating a 2004 study. The new CPA reviewed Section 515 rental properties, off-farm Section 514/516 farmworker housing properties, those with loans guaranteed under the Section 538 program, and those that have used the MPR preservation program. The study concluded that over the course of the next 20 years, \$5.6 billion will be needed in addition to existing capital reserves simply to cover capital costs.

Third, every year some property owners request permission to prepay their mortgages by paying them off before their terms end and thus remove government affordability requirements. Owners seek to prepay for varying reasons, including: the expiration of tax benefits; the burden of increased servicing requirements; the desire of some small project owners to retire; and, in some rural areas, an increase in vacancies due to out-migration.

As is the case for owners of HUD multifamily projects, Section 515 owners' ability to prepay is restricted by federal law. The details vary depending on when a loan was approved but, in all cases, USDA is either permitted or required to offer owners incentives not to prepay and in exchange the property continues to be restricted to low-income occupancy for 20 years. Incentives offered to owners include equity loans, increases in the rate of return on investment, reduced interest rates, and additional Section 521 Rental Assistance. In some cases, an owner who rejects the offered incentives must offer the project for sale to a nonprofit or public agency. If an owner does prepay, tenants become eligible for Section 542 vouchers.

For the last few years, USDA RD has funneled most of its preservation efforts through its Multifamily Housing Preservation and Revitalization (MPR) demonstration program. MPR offers several possible types of assistance to owners or purchasers of Section 515 and Section 514/516 properties. The most commonly used assistance is debt deferral, although other possibilities include grants, loans, and soft-second loans.

Other preservation tools include Section 542 tenant vouchers, which can be provided to tenants who face higher rents when their buildings leave the Section 515 program because of mortgage prepayments. For several years, ending in FY11, Congress also funded a Preservation Revolving Loan Fund program, which used intermediaries to make loans to owners or purchasers who sought to preserve rural rental properties.

New Demand for Farmworker Housing

In FY18, legislation changed the Section 514/516 program in a potentially significant way: it made farmworkers from other countries, who come to the U.S. with temporary H-2A visas, eligible for Section 514/516 housing. The H-2A program requires employers to provide housing for their workers, so employers are likely to want to use Section 514/516 units. In some parts of the country not all units are fully used, so this change

could make better use of those properties. In other places, however, demand already exceeds supply and expanding eligibility will increase housing shortages. It is also possible that employers will apply for Section 514 loans (they are generally not eligible for Section 516 grants) to construct "on farm" housing on their own property for their workers, and it is not clear how USDA would weigh those applications against requests from nonprofits for funds to develop "off farm" units. It is still too early to determine what the results of H-2A eligibility will be.

FUNDING

The Section 515 program, which received about \$115 million in annual appropriations in the early 2000s and has been cut repeatedly, was funded at \$40 million in both FY19 and FY20. Section 514 received \$28.9 million in FY16, \$23.9 million in FY17, \$23 million in FY18, \$27.5 million in FY19, and \$28 million in FY20. Section 516 was funded at \$8.3 million each year from FY14 through FY18 and at \$10 million in FY19 and FY20.

The MPR preservation program received \$22 million each year from FY16 through FY18, \$24.5 million in FY19, and \$28 million in FY20. Demand far exceeds the available funds: by the end of calendar year 2019, MPR had a backlog of approved preservation projects needing at least \$70 million.

The Preservation Revolving Loan Fund has not been funded since FY11.

The Section 521 RA program was funded at \$1.331 billion in FY19 and \$1.375 billion in FY20.

The cost of the Section 542 voucher program is now rising every year as increasing numbers of tenants are eligible for vouchers. The program has used slightly more than its appropriation each year for the last few years, with the additional dollars being drawn from the already inadequate MPR funding pool. USDA used just over \$22 million for vouchers in FY17, then nearly \$26.7 million in FY18 and \$28.6 million in FY19. The program's appropriation for FY20 is \$32 million.

Changes to reduce RA costs and to improve USDA's rental housing preservation process can be made by USDA without legislative changes by Congress. Making vouchers available for tenants in properties with expiring mortgages, or decoupling RA from USDA mortgages, does require congressional action. Over the next five years and beyond, RA costs may fall as USDA mortgages expire, but there will be corresponding increases in costs for alternatives such as USDA vouchers, HUD vouchers, or assistance to those who become homeless.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Maintaining funding levels for the rural housing programs, like other non-defense discretionary programs, is likely to be a challenge in 2020. The administration has not demonstrated support for rural housing as its FY19 budget called for the elimination of the Section 515, 514/516, and MPR programs. The previous USDA Under Secretary for Rural Development was replaced by an assistant to the secretary, a position with far less authority in the department. Congress required the under-secretary position to be reinstated, but the Administration has not yet nominated anyone to fill it.

It is also possible that Congress might consider moving the USDA rural housing programs to HUD, a change that has been suggested in the past because housing is a minor part of the Department of Agriculture. Although that is true, it is equally true that rural places are a minor part of HUD's housing programs. In addition, HUD does not have a field office structure as extensive as USDA's, nor does HUD have recent experience operating direct loan programs, several of which are included among the rural programs.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Activity related to USDA's Section 515 program now focuses on the preservation of existing units. Preservation means either renovating a property or keeping it affordable for low-income tenants, or both. Local rural housing organizations can help with preservation in both senses by helping owners who want to leave the program (including

those whose mortgages are expiring) find ways to do so without changing the nature of their properties. Often, this means purchasing the property and refinancing to obtain sufficient proceeds to update and rehabilitate it. As more Section 515 mortgages mature every year, nonprofit purchases of these properties are increasingly recognized as the best way to save them.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak with their members of Congress and urge them to:

- Support passage in the Senate of H.R. 3620, the Strategy and Investment in Rural Housing Preservation Act, which passed the House on September 10, 2019. Also support S. 2567, the Rural Housing Preservation Act, which was introduced by Sen. Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH) in September 2019. If neither bill passes in the 116th Congress, support reintroducing them in 2021.
- Maintain funding for all USDA rural housing programs (do not reduce funding for other programs, especially MPR, in order to shift funds to Section 542 vouchers).
- Continue to provide enough funding to renew all Section 521 RA contracts and all Section 542 vouchers.
- Work with USDA RD to find positive ways to reduce Section 521 costs through energy efficiency measures, refinancing USDA mortgages, and reducing administrative costs.
- Expand eligibility for USDA Section 542 vouchers so tenants can use them when USDA mortgages expire, and Section 521 RA becomes unavailable.
- Ensure that a well-qualified under secretary of Rural Development is nominated and appointed at USDA to keep the housing programs (along with RD's business and utilities programs) at the same level of departmental priority as other USDA functions.

- Reject any proposals to move the rural housing programs from USDA to HUD.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Housing Assistance Council, 202-842-8600,
www.ruralhome.org

National Housing Law Project, 510-251-9400,
<https://www.nhlp.org/resources/saving-rural-rental-homes/>

U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural
Development, <https://www.rd.usda.gov/>

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

By Russell L. Bennett, National AIDS Housing Coalition

Administering Agency: Office of HIV/AIDS Housing (OHH) in HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD)

Year Started: 1990

Number of Persons/Households Served: 52,834 households receive housing assistance; additional households are served by housing related supportive services.

Population Targeted: Low-income people with HIV/AIDS and their families

Funding: \$410 million in FY20

The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program provides funding to eligible jurisdictions to address the housing needs of persons living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

HOPWA was created by the "AIDS Housing Opportunities Act," a part of the "Cranston-Gonzales National Affordable Housing Act of 1990," to provide housing assistance and related supportive services for low-income people living with HIV/AIDS and their families.

There is a perception in America that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is under control, but AIDS remains an active crisis. According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), there are an estimated 38,000 new HIV infections each year. At the same time, there are more than 1.2 million people living with HIV/AIDS in the United States, and one out of eight is unaware of their status.

For people living with HIV/AIDS, housing is healthcare. For low-income people struggling to manage their HIV/AIDS care, housing is an essential cornerstone of health and stability. According to the CDC, an estimated 47% of those

living with HIV have household incomes at or below the federal poverty level. Subsequently, as many as half of all people living with HIV/AIDS will need housing assistance at some point during their illness. Stable housing, like the housing provided by HOPWA, leads to better health outcomes, including viral suppression, for those living with HIV. An individual who is virally suppressed cannot transmit the HIV virus to another person, thereby ensuring the health of their entire community. For many low-income individuals and families, short-term assistance with rent, mortgage, or utility costs will provide the support necessary to remain healthy and in stable housing. But for others, more intensive supportive services are needed.

The HOPWA program is a homelessness prevention program designed to provide housing assistance and related supportive services for low-income people living with HIV/AIDS and their families. The program also facilitates community efforts to develop comprehensive strategies to address HIV/AIDS housing needs and assists communities with creating housing strategies to prevent individuals from becoming homeless or unstably housed.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

As a supportive housing program, HOPWA helps ensure that people living with HIV/AIDS can access and maintain adherence to necessary medical care and other services by assisting them with stable housing and related support services.

Eligibility for HOPWA assistance is limited to low-income individuals with HIV/AIDS and their families. The vast majority of individuals receiving HOPWA housing assistance (76%) are extremely low-income, earning 29% of the area median income (AMI) or less. Of the 5,114 homeless individuals newly receiving HOPWA during FY19, 10% were veterans and 47% were chronically homeless. Ninety-five percent of

HOPWA households have a housing plan, and 95% have contact with a primary care provider. Of the households served by HOPWA supportive housing programs, 96% achieve housing stability.

HOPWA consists of two grant-making programs, and 90% of the funds are distributed as formula grants to states and localities to serve the metropolitan area in which they are located. The formula for this distribution is based on population size and the number of people living with HIV/AIDS in the metropolitan area as confirmed by the CDC, as well as poverty rates and housing costs.

During the 2019 program year, HOPWA formula grants totaling \$353.7 million were awarded to grantees within 140 eligible areas. These grantees represent 41 states and Puerto Rico. These formula funds can be used for a wide range of housing, social services, program planning, and development costs including but not limited to the acquisition, rehabilitation, or new construction of housing units, costs for facility operations, rental assistance, and short-term payments to prevent homelessness.

The other 10% of HOPWA funds are distributed through a competitive process to states and localities that do not qualify for a formula allocation or to states, localities, or nonprofit organizations that propose projects of national significance. During FY19, HUD awarded \$25 million to renew 25 competitive grants in 16 states. In the competitive program, grantees can distribute funds to projects that provide housing assistance and supportive services to persons living with HIV and their families.

FUNDING

HOPWA remains sorely underfunded relative to the immense need for safe housing for persons with HIV/AIDS. HOPWA would need an estimated \$1.12 billion to serve all people living with HIV/AIDS in need of housing assistance. Additionally, the passage of the “Housing Opportunities Through Modernization Act” (HOTMA) in July 2016 updated the HOPWA formula from cumulative AIDS cases to living HIV/AIDS cases and includes both housing costs and poverty

factors. The five-year phase in of the new formula provides for annual caps on gains and losses during the phase-in (P.L. 114-201; 7.29.16). To ensure that families remain in stable housing during the transition, the National AIDS Housing Coalition (NAHC) continues to recommend increases to the HOPWA program. Since 2016, the HOPWA program appropriation has been increased to ensure the stability of housing programs throughout the country. For FY19, HOPWA was funded at \$393 million and at \$410 million in FY20. The FY20 funding represents the highest increase in the HOPWA appropriation to date and an \$80 million increase over the FY15 appropriation.

FORECAST FOR 2020 AND BEYOND

The current fiscal year (FY20) marks the fourth year of the hold-harmless of the new HOPWA formula-based on the HOTMA. Without sustained increases in HOPWA funding in FY21 (last year of stop loss) and FY22 (full implementation), many HOPWA jurisdictions will lose funding and potentially housing units as they adjust to the new formula. The potential for housing displacement or even homelessness among persons living with HIV is real. Even with the success of the last five years in increasing funding for the program, each year poses new and significant challenges. The NAHC will continue to advocate for increased funding for the HOPWA program to ensure that new dollars are available to preserve existing housing units and to expand housing efforts to improve access to care and improvements in health outcomes among persons living with HIV.

As the next two fiscal years are critically important to stabilizing local housing programs, HIV housing providers should join these efforts to continue to ensure the availability of housing resources and an increase in HOPWA appropriation. Additionally, local advocates and providers should work with their local jurisdictions to plan not only for the potential increase in resources but also decreases resulting from the full implementation of the formula

planned for FY22. Shifts in the local allocations determined by the formula and the national HOPWA appropriation require planning for potential systems changes to ensure that housing continuums remain connected to necessary health and support services to achieve optimal health. Housing is a critical intervention to end the HIV epidemic, and the HOPWA program continues to be the foundation for a system of care that links healthcare and an array of other affordable housing and services.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National AIDS Housing Coalition, 202-377-0333,
www.nationalaidshousing.org

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Programs

By Mindy Mitchell, Senior Technical Assistance Specialist, National Alliance to End Homelessness

Administering Agency: HUD’s Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs within the Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD).

Year Started: 1987

Number of Persons/Households Served:

Total year-round capacity to provide beds for 399,439 people experiencing homelessness, plus 499,620 formerly homeless people now in permanent housing.

Population Targeted: People experiencing or at risk of homelessness.

Funding: \$2.777 billion in FY20

See Also: For additional information, refer to the *Continuum of Care Planning* and *Federal Surplus Property to Address Homelessness* sections of this guide.

The McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs are a set of federal programs created by the “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.” This article refers to two programs administered by HUD: Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) and the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program. In 2009, Congress passed the “Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act,” which significantly improves HUD’s McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Congress enacted the “Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act in 1987” in response to the homelessness crisis that had emerged in the 1980s. In 2000, the act was renamed as the “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.” For many years the programs did not undergo any comprehensive overhaul despite improved

understanding of homelessness, its causes, and its solutions. In May 2009, Congress passed the “HEARTH Act,” which was intended to consolidate separate homelessness programs at HUD and to make the system of homeless assistance more performance-based. Since then, HUD has issued a series of regulations.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

HUD’s McKinney-Vento programs provide outreach, shelter, transitional housing, supportive services, short- and medium-term rent subsidies, and permanent housing for people experiencing homelessness and in some cases for people at risk of homelessness. Funding is distributed by formula to jurisdictions for the ESG Program and competitively for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program.

ESG Program

The Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program is a formula grant to states and to larger cities and counties to fund rapid re-housing, homelessness prevention programs, and emergency shelters for people experiencing homelessness. People are eligible for prevention or re-housing assistance if they are homeless or at risk of homelessness. Being at risk of homelessness means an individual or family has a total income below 30% of area median income and are losing their housing, doubled up, living in motels, or living in other precarious housing situations. In recent years, the total amount for ESG is specified by Congress in the appropriations act.

CoC Program

Prior to the “HEARTH Act,” there were three competitive CoC programs, and grants under these legacy programs still exist:

- The Supportive Housing Program, which funded transitional housing, permanent supportive housing, and supportive services.

- The Shelter Plus Care Program, which funded rental assistance in permanent supportive housing for people experiencing homelessness with disabilities.
- The Moderate Rehabilitation/Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Program, which funded operating assistance in SRO buildings.

A unique feature of HUD’s CoC program is the application process. Applicants in a community, including local governments, nonprofit providers, advocates, people experiencing homelessness, and other stakeholders organize into a CoC and submit a joint application to HUD for their project requests. The entire application is scored, and specific projects are funded in the order that they are prioritized by the community in the application. The “HEARTH Act” combines the three legacy programs into a single CoC program that includes the same eligible activities as the previous programs.

The entity that submits the application for funding is known as a Collaborative Applicant.

Changes made by the “HEARTH Act” and implementing regulations to the competitive CoC program include the following:

- The selection criteria include performance measures for reducing the duration of homelessness, reducing the number of people who become homeless, and reducing the number of people who re-experience homelessness after they exit the program.
- Incentives include creating new rapid re-housing projects for families and individuals experiencing homelessness and new permanent supportive housing for those experiencing chronic homelessness.
- The match is simplified to 25% for all activities. Leasing projects will continue to have no match requirement.
- A new rural program is created that would provide rural areas with more flexibility and increase funding to rural areas (this program has not yet been funded by appropriations).
- More funding is available for administrative

costs. For CoC projects, up to 10% is allowed and 3% is allowed for the Collaborative Applicant.

In addition to HUD’s homeless assistance grants, several other programs are authorized by the “McKinney-Vento Act”:

- The Education for Homeless Children and Youth (EHCY) Program, administered by the U.S. Department of Education, provides grants to schools to aid in the identification of children experiencing homelessness and provide services to help them succeed in school. EHCY also requires schools to make accommodations to improve the stability of homeless children’s education.
- Title V Surplus Properties, which requires that federal surplus property be offered to nonprofit organizations for the purpose of assisting people experiencing homelessness.
- The Interagency Council on Homelessness, an independent agency within the federal executive branch, coordinates the federal response to homelessness and is charged with creating a federal plan to end homelessness.

FUNDING

The McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs received \$1.901 billion for both FY11 and FY12, \$1.933 billion (after sequestration) for FY13, \$2.105 billion for FY14, \$2.135 billion for FY15, \$2.25 billion for FY 16, \$2.383 billion for FY17, \$2.513 billion for FY18, and \$2.636 billion for FY19. For FY20, the “Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020” provided \$2.777 billion for the programs. As of this writing there are no proposed House or Senate appropriations bills for FY21.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Since 2007, HUD’s homeless assistance programs have helped communities reduce homelessness. However, given skyrocketing rents across the country and a recent rise in unsheltered homelessness in some communities, strong funding for the HUD homelessness programs is necessary to avoid increases in homelessness

and to get more people off the streets and into permanent housing.

HUD's implementation of the "HEARTH Act" will continue to increasingly reward communities that do the best job of using their funding efficiently to re-house as many people experiencing homelessness as possible and to effectively support them in avoiding a return to homelessness. This will in turn help build even further support in Congress.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

The best way to maximize the impact of McKinney-Vento funding in a community is to participate in the local CoC process and to work to use resources for the most effective programs.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should ask their members of Congress to support increases in HUD's homeless assistance programs to allow more progress toward reducing the number of people experiencing homelessness. Specifically, advocates should communicate the following points:

- HUD's McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Grants are successful and have helped drive reductions in homelessness across the country. These grants support critical housing

and service supports to thousands of the most vulnerable, hard-working Americans. Without these grants and the support of Congress to date, much of our country's progress on homelessness would not have been possible.

- Continued federal funding is critical to community efforts to end homelessness, and the FY20 funding amount is simply not enough to keep up with the rising need around the country driven by increasing rents.
- Congress should help their communities' efforts to end homelessness by supporting an approximately ten percent increase in McKinney-Vento funding to reach \$3.1 billion in funding for HUD's McKinney-Vento programs in the FY21 appropriations.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Alliance to End Homelessness, 202-638-1526, www.endhomelessness.org.

Corporation for Supportive Housing, 212-986-2966, www.csh.org.

Homeless Assistance: Federal Surplus Property to Address Homelessness

By Tristia Bauman, Senior Attorney,
National Law Center on Homelessness &
Poverty

Administering Agencies: HUD, Health and Human Services (HHS), General Services Administration (GSA)

Year Program Started: 1987

Number of Persons/Households Served: More than 2 million each year

Populations Targeted: Homeless persons

Funding: The Title V program does not receive an appropriation.

See Also: For further information, reference the *McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Programs* section of this Guide.

Title V of the “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987” (Title V) grants nonprofit groups, state agencies, and local governments a right of first refusal to land and real property no longer needed by the federal government. This largely untapped resource gives service providers access to valuable assets that may be used to provide housing and/or services to homeless people at no charge to the service provider.

Homeless service providers, community development organizations, and local government agencies have used Title V properties in a variety of ways to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness in their communities. To date, over 500 buildings in at least 30 states and the District of Columbia have been transferred to nonprofit organizations and local governments under Title V to provide emergency shelter, job training, and even permanent housing to homeless people.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The “McKinney-Vento Act” was first passed in 1987. Title V was included in the law in recognition of the fact that homeless service providers working to end homelessness often cannot afford real property to provide needed homeless programming, while the federal government has property that it no longer needs. Title V originally included properties on newly closed military bases. In 1994, the law was amended to provide a separate process for ensuring that a portion of Base Realignment and Closure properties are used to provide affordable housing and prevent homelessness. In 2016, Title V was amended by the “Federal Assets Sale and Transfer Act of 2016” (H.R. 4465), which made several improvements to the law, including making explicit that the provision of permanent housing is an eligible use for properties transferred under the Title V program.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Screening

Landholding agencies report the status of their real estate holdings to HUD on a quarterly basis. HUD screens unutilized, underutilized, excess, and surplus properties to determine whether they are suitable for homeless services organizations. All such suitable properties are published online at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/title-v/suitability-listing> on a weekly basis. Properties that are listed as suitable and available may be conveyed via deed or lease at no charge to nonprofit groups, state agencies, and local governments following successful application to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

Expression of Interest

When a homeless service provider identifies a property of interest, it has 30 days to submit a written expression of interest to HHS. This is

simply a brief letter identifying the group, the property of interest, and a brief description of the proposed use. Once HHS receives this letter, it provides the nonprofit or public agency with a full application.

Application

Groups have 75 days to complete an initial application. Unlike the short expression of interest letter, the application is detailed and requires information about the services that will be offered, the need for such services, and the ability of the applicant to offer such services. Once HHS receives the completed initial application, the agency has 10 days to make an approval or disapproval determination. If an initial application is approved by HHS, the applicant has an additional 45 days to set forth a reasonable plan to finance the approved program. HHS has 15 days after receipt of the full application to make a final determination.

FUNDING

The Title V program does not receive an appropriation.

FORECAST FOR 2020

There is no pending legislation that would affect the Title V program as amended by the “Fixing America’s Transportation Act (FAST) of 2016.”

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

To successfully apply for Title V property, an applicant must be financially stable and have a firm and workable plan to use the property that is to be acquired. It should be noted that the application timeline is short, so applicants must be prepared to act quickly when a suitable property becomes available.

The National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty published a toolkit to assist homeless service providers with completing successful applications for property under Title V. The toolkit, *Public Property/Public Need: A Toolkit for Using Vacant Federal Property to End Homelessness*, is available at <https://www.nlchp.org/documents/Public-Property-Public-Need>.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should meet with their members of Congress with the message that Title V is a no-cost way to advance the national goal of ending homelessness and ask the government to improve its efforts to make local governments and nonprofit agencies aware of the program. Also, advocates should meet with their members of Congress to urge that the government improve compliance with the Title V program and ensure that suitable properties no longer needed by the federal government are quickly conveyed to local homeless service providers.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For information about how to search and successfully apply for surplus federal properties, contact the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty, 202-638-2535, www.nlchp.org.

Rental Housing Programs for the Lowest-Income Households: Renters' Tax Credit

By Will Fischer, Senior Policy Analyst,
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

The federal government provided about \$80 billion in housing tax benefits in fiscal year 2019, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT). However, more than four-fifths of that amount went toward tax subsidies for homeowners (these JCT figures do not count substantial added federal tax benefits from the deduction of state and local property taxes). Moreover, these subsidies mainly benefit higher-income homeowners, even though low-income renters are much more likely to struggle to afford housing. Policymakers could help rebalance housing tax policy and address pressing needs for affordable housing by establishing a tax credit to help low-income renters afford housing.

Federal rental assistance programs like Housing Choice Vouchers and public housing are highly effective at making rent affordable to the lowest-income families, but only reach about one in four eligible households due to inadequate funding. Caps on domestic discretionary appropriations, the budget category that includes federal rental assistance, will make it very difficult to expand these programs enough to address the unmet need for assistance. A renters' credit would be funded through the tax code, so it would not be subject to spending caps. As a result, the renters' credit offers an important opportunity in a challenging budget and political environment to help more of the nation's most vulnerable families and individuals keep a roof over their heads.

A renters' credit would also complement the existing Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC), which effectively supports affordable housing development but rarely reduces rents to levels that extremely low-income families can afford unless they also have a voucher or other rental assistance.

RENTERS' CREDIT DESIGN OPTIONS

A renters' credit could be designed in several different ways. A credit could be claimed directly by an eligible tenant on his or her tax return or by the owner of a rental unit in exchange for reducing the tenant's rent. A tenant-claimed credit would be simpler in some respects, but it would also pose major challenges. For a tenant-claimed credit to reach the poorest families it would need to be refundable; that is, the federal government would have to make payments to cover the amount of the credit that exceeds the household's tax liability. However, this approach could make the enactment of the credit significantly more difficult politically. A renters' credit would be far more effective if it were provided on a monthly basis, since low-income families pay rent every month, and it would be difficult to deliver a tenant-claimed renters' credit on a monthly basis since the Internal Revenue Service does not currently make monthly refund payments under the individual income tax.

An owner-claimed credit, by contrast, would not need to be refundable (especially if the owner were permitted to transfer the credit to an outside investor or lender). It would be straightforward to provide monthly rent reductions through an owner-claimed credit. The owner would be required to reduce the family's rent each month and the credit would be delivered by lowering the owner's required quarterly estimated tax payments.

In addition, a renters' credit could be an entitlement for all eligible renters or a capped credit that would be allocated by states (just as states allocate LIHTC to selected developments). An uncapped entitlement renters' credit would have the advantage of reducing housing costs for all or nearly all low-income renters. However, in a tight budget environment it would be

difficult to obtain the tens of billions of dollars needed to fund an entitlement credit with per-household benefits large enough to make housing affordable to even the lowest-income families. On the other hand, if an entitlement credit were kept small because of budget constraints, it would not be sufficient to enable extremely low-income households to afford decent housing and consequently would be much less effective in reducing homelessness, evictions, and other housing-related hardship. A state-administered credit allocated to a limited number of extremely low-income families could provide sufficient help to enable those families to afford housing at a more modest overall cost.

A state-administered capped credit would have other advantages as well. It would give states rental assistance resources that they could coordinate with other state-administered low-income programs in a way that would be difficult under existing rental assistance programs (which are mainly locally administered). For example, states could use the renters' credit to make LIHTC developments affordable to poor households, help families participating in state Temporary Assistance for Needy Families programs for whom lack of stable housing is a barrier to work, provide supportive housing to families at risk of having their children placed in foster care, and enable Medicaid-eligible elderly people or people with disabilities to live in service-enriched developments rather than nursing homes or other institutions. States would also be well positioned to use renters' credits to help poor families access low poverty neighborhoods with good schools and low crime or help them remain in neighborhoods where higher-income households are moving in and low-income residents are at risk of displacement.

RENTERS' CREDIT PROPOSALS

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) has proposed the establishment of a capped state-administered renters' credit. Under the CBPP proposal, states would receive an amount of credits each year set by a federal formula. States would allocate the credits to developments

to make housing affordable to extremely low-income families. Families in units assisted by the renters' credit would pay 30% of their income for rent and utilities. The owner would receive a federal tax credit based on the rent reductions it provides and could opt to pass the credit on to an outside investor or lender who provides resources to keep rent prices in the development low. If such a credit were capped so that it had a fully phased-in cost of \$7 billion a year, it could enable about 780,000 extremely low-income families to live in decent, stable, affordable homes.

In 2016, the University of California at Berkeley's Turner Center for Housing Innovation issued a report presenting three renters' tax credit options. One of these would provide a tenant-claimed entitlement credit sufficient to reduce all renters' housing costs by up to 30% of their incomes, at an estimated cost of \$76 billion per year. The second would provide a shallower tenant-claimed entitlement credit at an annual cost of \$41 billion. The third is a "composite option" that would include a \$5 billion capped, owner-claimed credit for extremely low-income families similar to that proposed by CBPP, and a smaller tenant-claimed credit for other renters costing \$38 billion.

The idea of a federal renters' credit has received growing attention in recent years. The Bipartisan Policy Center, Center for American Progress, Urban Institute, Enterprise Community Partners, Center for Global Policy Solutions, Prosperity Now, Mortgage Bankers Association, National Low Income Housing Coalition, and others have highlighted a renters' credit as a promising strategy to address poverty, homelessness, and high rent burdens. Legislation to establish a renters' credit has been introduced in the last four sessions of Congress. For example, Representative Barbara Lee's (D-CA) 2017 "Pathways Out of Poverty Act" proposed a capped, state-administered renters' credit, and Senator Dean Heller's (R-NV) 2018 "Seniors Affordable Housing Tax Credit Act" proposed a similar credit targeted toward elderly households. In addition, during 2019 Senators Cory Booker (D-NJ) and Kamala Harris (D-CA) and Representatives Danny

Davis (D-IL) and James Clyburn (D-SC) each introduced bills to establish a tenant-claimed credit for all income-eligible renters with high cost burdens.

STATE RENTERS' CREDITS

Renters' tax credits can be instituted at the state as well as the federal levels. More than 20 states provide tax credits to help renters afford housing. Most of these credits are provided as part of a "circuit breaker" tax credit designed to provide relief from property tax burdens (circuit breakers often include benefits for renters in addition to homeowners, since renters pay for property taxes indirectly through higher rent). State renters' and circuit breaker credits are usually shallow, rarely providing more than a few hundred dollars per year.

Advocates should work at the state level to establish credits to help renters afford housing. In states where credits already exist, advocates should seek to improve them by increasing the amount, making credits refundable (if they are not already), and providing credits through periodic payments rather than in a single lump sum.

FORECAST FOR 2020

In 2020, a federal renters' credit could be incorporated into tax legislation to better match federal housing tax benefits to the most pressing housing needs or into an infrastructure package to support the development of housing affordable to the lowest-income families. Even if the credit is not enacted during the current Congress, ensuring that it is part of the debate could increase the chances that it will be enacted in the future.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities renters' credit webpage, <http://www.cbpp.org/topics/renters-credit>.

Carol Galante, Carolina Reid, and Nathaniel Decker, *The FAIR Tax Credit: A Proposal for a Federal Assistance in Rental Credit to Support Low-Income Renters*, Turner Center for Housing Innovation, University of California, Berkeley, October 7, 2016, <http://turnercenter.berkeley.edu/fair-tax-credit>.

Aidan Davis, *State Tax Codes as Poverty Fighting Tools: 2019 Update on Four Key Policies in All 50 States*, Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, September 2019, <https://itep.org/state-tax-codes-as-poverty-fighting-tools/>.

Chapter 5: ADDITIONAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

Federal Housing Administration

By Melissa Stegman, Senior Policy Counsel and Mike Calhoun, President, Center for Responsible Lending

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insures mortgages made by lenders, and in doing so, helps provide single-family housing and multifamily housing for low- and moderate-income families. The FHA was established in 1934 under the “National Housing Act” to expand homeownership for working class Americans, broaden the availability of mortgages, protect lending institutions, and stimulate home construction. In 1965, the FHA was consolidated into HUD’s Office of Housing. FHA is now the largest part of HUD. The FHA Commissioner reports directly to the HUD Secretary.

The FHA provides mortgage insurance to lenders on both single-family dwellings (one to four units) and multifamily dwellings (five units or more). HUD’s single-family programs include mortgage insurance on loans to purchase new or existing homes, condominiums, manufactured housing, houses needing rehabilitation, and for reverse equity mortgages to elderly homeowners. HUD’s multifamily programs provide mortgage insurance to HUD-approved lenders to facilitate the construction, substantial rehabilitation, purchase, and refinancing of multifamily housing projects.

FHA programs do not lend money directly, but instead insure private loans made by FHA-approved lenders. When a loan defaults, lenders make a claim to the FHA, triggering an FHA payment to the lender for the claim amount. The FHA consists of two insurance funds supported by premium, fee, and interest income, congressional appropriations if necessary, and other miscellaneous sources.

HISTORY

The FHA was created as an essential component of New Deal legislation in order to rescue the home building and finance industries that had crashed during the Great Depression. Upon its founding, FHA played a critical role in alleviating the homeownership crisis in the United States. However, it also played a major role in institutionalizing and perpetuating segregation in the housing market through its practice of denying mortgages based on race and ethnicity. From its inception in 1934, FHA explicitly practiced a policy of redlining by refusing to insure mortgages in or near African American neighborhoods. FHA relied upon color-coded metropolitan maps to indicate where it was considered safe to insure mortgages. These maps denoted risky areas in red; areas that included African Americans or where African Americans lived nearby. In FHA’s 1936 Underwriting Manual, numerous provisions indicated that “inharmonious” racial groups should not live in the same communities. Moreover, FHA subsidized the mass-production of subdivisions where builders included a requirement that no homes be sold to African Americans. Housing discrimination became unlawful in 1968 with passage of the “Fair Housing Act,” but much of the damage had been done. The FHA subsidized the cost of homeownership for whites and enabled whites to build wealth through home equity, while denying African Americans the same opportunity. FHA’s investment in homeownership opportunity for white families is the foundation of today’s racial wealth gap where white families have ten times the wealth of African Americans and eight times the wealth of Latinos.

Role of FHA

The FHA plays a key countercyclical role in the mortgage market and FHA’s market share varies with economic conditions and other factors. For instance, in the aftermath of the financial crisis

and the contraction in available mortgage credit, FHA insured a much higher share of single-family mortgages, increasing from approximately 3% in 2005 to a peak of 21% in 2009. FHA's market share has decreased since that time, but it remains higher than it was in the early 2000s, currently at approximately 17%.

FHA insurance allows borrowers to purchase a home with a lower down payment than is often available in the conventional market. FHA borrowers are required to make a minimum down payment of 3.5%.

FHA-insured mortgages also play an important role in providing access to homeownership for first-time homebuyers, low- to moderate-income homebuyers, and homebuyers of modest wealth. Furthermore, FHA is a key source of affordable home loans for families of color, providing nearly half of all home purchase loans for these borrowers, including upper income families of color. This is a key policy issue. It is critical to support FHA, while also advocating for the conventional mortgage market, particularly the government sponsored enterprises (GSEs), to do more to serve communities of color and lower-wealth borrowers.

Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund

The Mutual Mortgage Insurance (MMI) Fund is a federal insurance fund that pays claims on losses from FHA-insured home mortgages. This includes forward as well as reverse mortgages, also known as Home Equity Conversion Mortgages (HECM). The MMI Fund has a statutory capital ratio requirement of 2%. The fund receives upfront and annual premiums collected from borrowers, as well as net proceeds from the sale of foreclosed homes. Each year, the MMI Fund pays out claims to lenders and covers administrative costs without federal subsidies. Under FHA's authorizing statute, all of FHA's revenue must go to the MMI Fund and cannot be used to support operations.

Borrowers pay a premium for FHA insurance. For single-family loans, this premium consists of an upfront amount collected at the time the mortgage is closed and an annual premium that

varies with the loan-to-value ratio and length of the mortgage. The annual premium is collected with the monthly mortgage payments. Currently, a borrower must pay the annual premium for the life of the loan. The premium does not end once the outstanding principal balance reaches 78% of the original principal balance. This contrasts with private mortgage insurance coverage in the conventional market.

Furthermore, FHA insures loans in amounts under set loan limits. The "National Housing Act," as amended by the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008," sets single-family forward loan limits at 115% of median house prices, subject to a floor and a ceiling on the limits. FHA calculates the limits by metropolitan statistical area (MSA) and county. These limits are updated each year and are influenced by the conventional loan limits set by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. FHA loan limits in 2019 ranged from \$314,827 to \$726,525, depending on geographic location. The mortgage amount also cannot exceed 100% of the property's appraised value.

Additionally, a unique characteristic of FHA loans is that they are assumable. In other words, the outstanding mortgage and its terms can be transferred to a new buyer. This feature may become more important if interest rates rise in the future. For FHA loans after December 14, 1989, the original lender must review and approve the creditworthiness of the buyer.

Special Risk Insurance and General Insurance Funds

In addition to the MMI Fund, FHA operates a Special Risk Insurance and General Insurance Fund, which insure loans used for the development, construction, rehabilitation, purchase, and refinancing of multifamily rental housing, nursing home facilities, and hospitals. Unlike the MMI Fund, this insurance requires subsidies from the federal budget.

Mortgagee Review Board

The Mortgagee Review Board is authorized to take administrative action against FHA-approved lenders that are not in compliance with FHA lending requirements. The Board can impose

civil money penalties, probation, suspension, and issue letters of reprimand. For serious violations, the Board can withdraw a lender's FHA approval so the lender cannot participate in FHA programs. The Board can also enter into settlement agreements with lenders to bring them into compliance.

Manufactured Housing

FHA provides insurance for the purchase or refinancing of a manufactured home, a loan on a developed lot on which a manufactured home will be placed, or a manufactured home and lot in combination. The home must be used as the principal residence of the borrower.

Ginnie Mae

The Government National Mortgage Association (Ginnie Mae), is a self-financing, wholly owned government corporation within HUD. Ginnie Mae guarantees the timely payment of principal and interest on privately issued securities backed by FHA, the HUD Office of Public and Indian Housing, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Housing Service mortgages, thereby enabling a constant flow of capital for mortgage loans. Ginnie Mae securities carry the full faith and credit guaranty of the United States government. Ginnie Mae does not insure lenders against borrower credit risk; it also does not buy or sell loans or issue mortgage-backed securities (MBS). Rather, lending institutions originate eligible loans, pool them into securities, and issue Ginnie Mae MBS.

FORECAST FOR 2020

According to HUD's [FY2019 annual report to Congress](#) on the financial status of the MMI Fund, the capital ratio for FY2019 was 4.84%, the highest level since FY2007. Still, there is discussion about constricting access to credit for FHA borrowers, including potentially introducing a risk-based pricing system. FHA pools risks consistent with its role as a government mortgage insurer. Moving to a risk-based pricing system would disrupt the cross-subsidy and greatly increase the cost of credit for those with less

wealth for a down payment or lower FICO scores, pricing out many of the creditworthy borrowers FHA currently serves. In addition, some have called for further targeting of FHA's programs.

Furthermore, despite FHA's financial success, it is operating with an antiquated technology system. The mainframe system is more than 40 years old and runs an obsolete programming language. FHA's origination system has in a single year broken down 73 times, with outages lasting as long as five days. Because of the problematic computer systems, FHA relies heavily on paper records. These paper systems create slow and ineffective processes that harm borrowers, including borrowers seeking loan modifications to save their homes. There are continuing efforts to commit federal appropriations to help FHA upgrade its systems.

Housing Finance Reform

Although much of the policy discussion regarding the future of housing finance reform has centered on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, FHA and Ginnie Mae are integral components of the housing finance system. On March 27, 2019, the president issued a memorandum directing the Secretary of Treasury and the Secretary of HUD to develop a plan for administrative and legislative housing reforms. Along with Treasury, HUD released its [plan](#) on September 5, 2019. One of the major themes is that FHA and the Federal Housing Finance Agency should coordinate to ensure that the GSEs and FHA serve defined roles within the marketplace.

The majority of HUD's recommendations may be achieved administratively and do not require legislation. However, there is concern that the administration may limit the effectiveness of FHA and create permanent market bifurcation despite federal fair lending requirements. Advocates should continue to monitor various issues and potential changes, including:

- Changes to the structure of FHA (e.g., reconstituting it as an autonomous government corporation);
- Increases to the 2% capital ratio for the MMI Fund;

- Technology funding to upgrade FHA’s antiquated systems;
- Instituting risk-based pricing for single-family borrowers;
- Changes to upfront or annual premiums;
- Changes to down payment assistance programs;
- Altering FHA’s footprint, such as limiting cash-out refinances, conventional-to-FHA refinances, and loans to FHA repeat borrowers;
- PACE loans;
- FHA servicing and loss mitigation; and
- The Distressed Asset Stabilization Program (DASP).

“False Claims Act” Reform

FHA recently reformed its lender and loan-level certifications as well as created a Defect Taxonomy, which categorizes loan defects of various severities with remedies. These changes are intended to clarify lender liability for loan defects in the origination process and assuage lender concerns about “False Claims Act” liability for minor errors. In addition, on October 28, 2019, HUD and the Department of Justice entered into a memorandum of understanding regarding the use of the “False Claims Act” against participants in FHA single family mortgage insurance programs. Advocates should monitor potential changes to FHA’s quality control processes (including to the Defect Taxonomy), Mortgagee Review Board administrative actions, and any potential “False Claims Act” cases.

HOME Investment Partnerships Program

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD)

Year Started: 1990

Population Targeted: Households with incomes less than 80% of area median income (AMI); when used to assist renters, 90% of a jurisdiction's HOME-assisted rental units must be occupied by households with incomes less than 60% AMI.

Funding: FY20 funding is \$1.35 billion, an increase from FY19 funding of \$1.25 billion.

The HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program is a federal block grant intended to expand the supply of decent, affordable housing for lower-income people.

HISTORY

The HOME Program was authorized in 1990 as part of the "Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act."

PROGRAM SUMMARY

HOME is a federal block grant to about 640 participating jurisdictions (PJs), which are states and certain localities that use the funds to provide affordable housing to low- and moderate-income households. States and localities use the funds for a variety of homeownership and rental activities. In general, all HOME money must benefit people with low or moderate incomes, tenant rents must generally be capped at a fixed percentage of the AMI, and units must be occupied by income-eligible households for a set period. The HOME Program regulations are at 24 CFR Part 92. Numerous changes to the HOME regulations were finalized on July 24, 2013. NLIHC has a [summary of key changes](#).

Eligible Activities

HOME dollars can be used as a grant or a loan to meet a variety of development costs such as: buying existing housing or vacant land for

affordable housing; building new housing; rehabilitating existing housing; demolishing structures to make way for affordable housing; relocation; making site improvements; and paying soft costs, such as engineering plans, attorneys' fees, title search, and fair housing services. HOME can also be used to help people purchase or rehabilitate a home by offering loans, loan guarantees, or down payment assistance. Tenants can be given grants for security deposits and rental assistance so that they pay no more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities. Although tenant-based rental assistance agreements are limited to two-year terms, they can be renewed without limit.

PJs may spend no more than 10% of their HOME dollars for overall program planning and administration, but there is no limit on the use of HOME funds for project-specific administrative costs. Among other limitations, PJs cannot spend HOME dollars on public or assisted housing modernization, operation, or preservation, because public housing has its own separate funding accounts.

Community Housing Development Organizations

At least 15% of a participating jurisdiction's HOME funds are set aside exclusively to be spent on housing that is developed, sponsored, or owned by Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs). Up to 10% of this CHDO set-aside can be used to provide loans for project-specific technical assistance and site control, such as feasibility studies and consultants, as well as for seed money to cover pre-construction costs, such as architectural plans and zoning approval. Until recently, if a PJ failed to commit any portion of the minimum 15% CHDO set-aside within two years, the PJ and its low-income residents would lose that amount of money. However, the FY19 and FY20 appropriations acts suspended the two-year deadline to commit CHDO set-aside funds. Consequently, a PJ can choose to not use some or all of the 15% CHDO set-aside and use those untapped CHDO funds for other HOME-eligible

uses after two years. This temporary suspension of the two-year commitment rule could make it easier for other nonprofits to access more HOME dollars; or, it could simply enable a PJ to avoid funding of such community-based nonprofits for other developers. The FY19 and FY20 appropriations acts also suspended the two-year commitment rule for non-CHDO funds.

Up to 5% of a PJ's HOME funds can be given to CHDOs for operating expenses; this amount is separate and apart from the minimum 15% CHDO set-aside and does not count against a PJ's 10% cap on administrative uses.

Any nonprofit can receive a HOME grant or loan to carry out any eligible activity, but not every nonprofit is a CHDO. As of 2013, in order to be considered a CHDO, a nonprofit that is a developer or sponsor must have paid employees on staff who have housing development experience. However, nonprofits seeking to keep or obtain CHDO status can do so while allowing those that own rental housing to operate even if the nonprofit does not have development expertise. The 2013 HOME regulation amendments introduced other changes that might make it more difficult for existing small and rural CHDOs to continue.

The HOME statute requires a CHDO to be accountable to low-income community residents through significant representation on the organization's governing board. However, the regulations merely require that one-third of a CHDO's board members be elected representatives of low-income neighborhood organizations, residents of low-income neighborhoods, or other low-income community residents. Since a low-income neighborhood can be one where only 51% of the residents have incomes less than 80% of AMI, it is possible that more affluent people with very different priorities could be on a CHDO board. Also, because the regulations allow community to be defined as broadly as an entire city, county, or metropolitan area, it is possible to construct a CHDO that is not accountable to low-income residents in a HOME project's neighborhood.

Formula Allocation

A formula based on six factors reflecting measures of poverty and the condition and supply of the rental housing stock determines which local jurisdictions are PJs. Jurisdictions that do not meet the formula's threshold can get together with neighboring jurisdictions to form a consortium in order to get HOME funding.

Each year, the formula distributes 60% of the HOME dollars appropriated by Congress to local governments and consortia; the remaining 40% is allocated to states. Local PJs are eligible for an allocation of at least \$500,000 (\$335,000 in years when Congress appropriates less than \$1.5 billion). Each state receives the greater of its formula allocation or \$3 million. The state share is intended for small cities, towns, and rural areas not receiving HOME money directly from HUD. Every HOME dollar must be matched by 25 cents of state, local, or private contributions, which can be cash (but not Community Development Block Grant funding), bond financing proceeds, donated materials, labor, property, or other noncash contributions.

Beneficiaries

When HOME is used to assist renters, at least 90% of the PJ's HOME-assisted rental units must be occupied by households with incomes less than 60% of AMI; the remaining 10% of the rental units can benefit those with incomes up to 80% of AMI, known as low-income households. If a rental project has five or more HOME-assisted units, at least 20% of the HOME-assisted units must be occupied by households with incomes less than 50% of AMI, known as very low-income households. When HOME is used to assist people who are homeowners or who will become homeowners, all of that money must be used for housing occupied by households with incomes less than 80% of AMI. These are minimum standards required by law. Advocates should work to convince their PJ or state to improve HOME's targeting to people with extremely low incomes, those with incomes less than 30% of AMI.

Affordability

Maximum rents that may be charged to assisted households are not based on a household's actual income. Instead, maximum rents are, with one exception, based on a fixed amount. To qualify as affordable rental housing, rent may be no greater than the lower of the fair market rent (FMR) or 30% of the adjusted income of a hypothetical household with an annual income of 65% of AMI. In projects with five or more HOME-assisted units in which at least 20% of the HOME-assisted units must be occupied by households with very low incomes, rent is considered affordable if it is less than 30% of the income of a hypothetical household with an annual income at 50% of AMI, or less than 30% of their adjusted income. Actual rent limit figures are posted on the HUD Exchange HOME program webpage.

Newly constructed rental projects must remain affordable for 20 years. Existing rental housing that is either purchased or rehabilitated must remain affordable for 15 years if more than \$40,000 is spent per unit, 10 years if between \$15,000 and \$40,000 is spent per unit, and five years if less than \$15,000 is spent per unit.

Homeowner-assisted units are considered affordable if, in general, the value of the home after assistance is less than 95% of the median area purchase price. Homeowner units must remain affordable for the same periods mentioned above. PJs must have resale or recapture provisions. A resale provision is intended to ensure continued benefit to low-income households during the affordability period by requiring purchase by an income-eligible household if an original homeowner sells before the end of the affordability period. A recapture provision must ensure that all or a portion of HOME assistance is recouped if an owner sells or is foreclosed upon during the affordability period.

As of the close of FY19 on September 30, 2019, HOME has delivered 1,311,924 completed physical units and provided another 325,979 tenant-based rental assistance contracts since 1992. Out of the 1,311,924 physical units, 40%

(521,805) were rental units, 19% (252,297) were homeowner rehabilitation and/or new construction units, and 41% (537,019) were homebuyer units.

At the time of initial occupancy, households with incomes less than 30% of AMI occupied 44% of the physical rental units, but only 17% of all 1,311,924 physical units. Households with incomes less than 30% of the AMI occupied 30% of the homeowner units, and 5.7% of the homebuyer units. Twenty-six percent of the rental units have had households assisted with Housing Choice Vouchers. In addition, 79% of the tenant-based rental assistance units were occupied by extremely low-income people.

FORECAST FOR 2020

For FY20, the Trump administration proposed eliminating HOME, although the House proposed \$1.75 billion and the Senate proposed \$1.25 billion. The final FY20 appropriation was \$1.35 billion. The administration has again proposed eliminating HOME in FY21.

The administration's fall 2019 Regulatory Agenda indicated it would be proposing several changes to the HOME program regulations regarding property standards applicable to acquisition and rehabilitation projects, along with unspecified provisions pertaining to CHDOs. It would also implement certain HOME statutory changes made in recent appropriations acts relating to community land trusts, notice requirements for tenant evictions, and allowable gross rent for units occupied by voucher households. The proposed rule would also facilitate use of HOME in Opportunity Zones by extending the deadline for the sale of HOME-assisted homebuyer units and for occupancy of HOME-assisted rental units.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

At the local level advocates will want to continue to be actively involved in the Consolidated Plan's Annual Action Plan public participation process in order to influence the type of housing, location, and beneficiaries of HOME dollars.

Advocates can best influence how HOME dollars

are allocated if they know how a jurisdiction has spent its previous allocations. To monitor their local PJ's accomplishments, advocates can access several useful reports on the [HOME page](#) of HUD's Exchange website.

- The monthly [Open Activities Report](#) lists each HOME project in a PJ that is still “open,” indicating tenure type (renter or homeowner), type of activity (such as rehabilitation, acquisition, or new construction), ZIP code, number of units, and amount budgeted and spent.
- The [Vacant Unit Report](#) identifies units marked vacant in HUD's reporting system.
- [SNAPSHOT](#) is a quarterly cumulative report that shows, in the aggregate, percentages by income category, race, household size, and household type of beneficiaries each by activity type (rental, homeowner, homebuyer, tenant-based rental assistance), as well as the number of units completed for each type of housing.
- [Dashboard Reports](#) are quarterly reports intended to provide a quick overview of a jurisdiction's use of HOME dollars. Using charts and graphs, Dashboard Reports show:
 - Cumulative HOME dollars received, and percentages disbursed, committed, and uncommitted.
 - Cumulative number of units completed, and percentages of rental, homeowner rehab, and homebuyer units.
 - Net number of units completed in the most recent quarter, with percentages of rental, homeowner rehab, and homebuyer units.
 - Cumulative number and the last quarter's net new number of tenant-based rental assistance units.
 - Race and ethnicity percentages among rental, homeowner rehab, and homebuyer projects.
 - Average total development cost per unit for rental, homeowner rehab, and homebuyer projects.

- Income range, family size, and household type breakouts for rental, homeowner, and homebuyer activities.
- The [National Production Report](#) offers cumulative information since 1992.

New in 2018, HUD posted three frequently requested ad hoc reports about HOME investments and units by state and by congressional district:

- [HOME Units Completed within LIHTC Projects by State](#) provides the number of HOME units completed within Low-Income Housing Tax Credit projects by state since 2010. The report also provides a breakdown of overall HOME funds disbursed for LIHTC projects and the average amount of HOME funds disbursed per LIHTC project.
- [HOME Units Completed by State](#) provides the number of HOME units completed since 1992 by state. The report also provides a breakdown of completed HOME units by tenure type and the amount of HOME funds committed and disbursed.
- [HOME Units Completed by Congressional District](#) provides the number of HOME units completed since 1992 by congressional district. The report also provides a breakdown of completed HOME units by tenure type and the amount of HOME funds committed and disbursed.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The major responsibility of advocates is to continue pushing for increased federal appropriations. Advocates should ask Members of Congress to fully fund the HOME program at \$1.750 billion.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Low Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

HUD's [HOME program website](#), 202-708-2470.

Most HOME program information has migrated to HUD Exchange, <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/home>.

Housing Bonds

By Glenn Gallo, Legislative and Policy Associate, National Council of State Housing Agencies

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of the Treasury

Year Started: 1954

Number of Households Served: In 2018, state HFAs financed 57,073 mortgages for low- and moderate-income borrowers through Mortgage Revenue Bonds (MRBs), provided tax relief to 27,487 homebuyers through Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs), and built 47,033 affordable rental units through multifamily bonds.

Population Targeted: Low- and moderate-income homebuyers and renters

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Low-Income Housing Tax Credits* and *HOME Investment Partnerships Program* sections of this guide.

Housing bonds are used to finance low-interest mortgages for low- and moderate-income homebuyers, as well as for the acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation of multifamily housing for low-income renters. Investors purchase housing bonds at low interest rates because the income from them is tax free. The interest savings made possible by the tax exemption is passed on to homebuyers and renters in reduced housing costs.

Last Congress, thanks in part to advocacy by state and local housing finance agencies (HFAs), other private activity bond issuers, and their partners, Congress preserved the exemption for housing and other private activity bonds in tax reform (through the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act,” H.R. 1). The National Council of State Housing Agencies and others are now working with lawmakers to continue to protect housing bonds and strengthen them.

HISTORY

Private activity bonds (PABs) were established under the Tax Code of 1954. These bonds were known as Industrial Development Bonds until the “Tax Reform Act of 1986” and other legislation changed their name.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

PABs, a category that includes housing bonds, are distinct from other tax-exempt bonds because they are issued for activities that involve private entities, as opposed to governmental bonds, for wholly governmental activities. The private activities must fulfill public purposes, and each private activity bond issuer must hold public hearings to demonstrate such public purposes. In addition to housing, PABs are issued for student loans, infrastructure, and redevelopment activities.

State and local HFAs have authority under the Internal Revenue Code to issue housing bonds to support affordable housing activities in their states. Issuing bonds is a way for HFAs to access private capital markets to help support affordable housing activities. HFAs sell the tax-exempt bonds to individual and corporate investors who are willing to purchase bonds paying lower than market interest rates because of the bonds’ tax-exempt status. This interest savings is passed on through private lenders to support housing purchase and development.

There are two main types of housing bonds: Mortgage Revenue Bonds (MRBs), which finance single-family home purchases for qualified low-income homebuyers, and multifamily housing bonds, which finance the acquisition, construction, and rehabilitation of multifamily developments for low-income renters.

Mortgage Revenue Bonds

Proceeds from MRBs finance below-market rate mortgages to support the purchase of single-family homes. By lowering mortgage interest

rates, MRBs make homeownership affordable for families who would not be able to qualify for market rate loans. HFAs often combine MRBs with down payment assistance that allows home purchases by families and individuals who would not otherwise be able to buy homes.

Congress limits MRB mortgages to first-time homebuyers who earn no more than the greater of area or statewide median income in most areas and up to 140% of the applicable median income in targeted areas. Families of three or more in non-targeted areas can earn up to 115% of the greater of area or statewide median income. Congress also limits the price of homes purchased with MRB mortgages to 90% of the average area purchase price in most areas and up to 110% of the average area purchase price in targeted areas.

HFAs also use their MRB authority to issue Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCCs), which provide a non-refundable federal income tax credit of up to \$2,000 for part of the mortgage interest qualified homebuyers pay each year. The MCC program is a flexible subsidy source that can be adjusted depending on the incomes of different homebuyers. It provides a relatively constant level of benefit to first-time homebuyers regardless of the difference between market and MRB rates.

Interested borrowers should contact their state or local HFA for information on obtaining an MRB loan or an MCC.

Multifamily Bonds

Multifamily bonds provide funding for affordable rental housing development that reaches income groups that the market might not otherwise serve. Multifamily housing bonds finance the acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of affordable rental housing. Multifamily housing developments with bond financing must set aside at least 40% of their apartments for families with incomes of 60% of area median income (AMI) or less, or 20% for families with incomes of 50% of AMI or less. The income-restricted apartments financed by those bonds must remain affordable for at least 15 years.

States increasingly combine multifamily bonds with other resources, including Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) program funds, to serve even lower-income families for longer periods of time than the law requires. Rental developments that use tax-exempt bond financing to pay more than 50% of their total development costs are eligible to receive 4% housing credits from outside the state-allocated housing credit cap. In addition, many multifamily bonds finance special needs housing, such as housing for formerly homeless people, veterans housing, transitional housing, senior housing, assisted living housing, housing for persons with disabilities, workforce housing, housing for persons with AIDS, migrant worker housing, and rural housing.

ISSUE SUMMARY

The Council of Development Finance Agencies (CDFA) reported in 2019 that state and local agencies issued more than \$7.4 billion in MRBs and \$14.7 billion in multifamily bonds in 2018.

In 2018, the most recent year for which data are available, state HFAs issued nearly \$8 billion in MRBs and supported the purchase of 57,073 homes nationwide. Some bond issuance was used to raise proceeds that were saved for use in future years and to refund prior-year bonds. States issued just over \$8 billion in multifamily bonds in 2018 to finance more than 47,033 affordable rental homes, which was a significant increase from prior years, indicating a trend that is likely to continue.

Housing bonds have been a success in providing lower-income Americans an opportunity they might not otherwise have to own a decent and affordable home and to access quality rental opportunities. Using MRBs, HFAs have made homeownership possible for more than 3.25 million low- and moderate-income families. In 2018, 68% of MRB borrowers earned less than AMI. The median MRB borrower income was \$47,619, three-quarters of the national median income.

HFAs have also provided over 322,000 lower- and moderate-income homeowners critical tax relief through the MCC program. Seventy percent of all MCC borrowers in 2018 earned less than AMI.

Multifamily bonds also boost the productivity of the LIHTC program. Affordable rental housing sponsors may obtain 4% housing credits from outside the state credit authority cap if 50% or more of the development is financed using housing bonds. HFAs have financed an additional 1 million affordable rental apartments with multifamily bonds. Over 50% of all annual LIHTC rental home production includes housing bond financing. HFAs have used the LIHTC to produce more than 3 million rental homes for families earning 60% of AMI or less. They add another 120,000 LIHTC apartments every year.

FUNDING

By law, the annual state issuance of PABs, including MRBs and multifamily bonds, is capped by each state's population and indexed to inflation. The 2020 state cap is \$105 per capita, with a per-state minimum of \$321,775.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Despite their enormous success, housing bonds were in grave danger of being eliminated via tax reform. The U.S. House of Representatives eliminated the exemption for housing bonds and other PABs issued after 2017 in its original tax reform legislation, which passed in November. The House-passed legislation also rescinded the MCC program.

Fortunately, thanks to the advocacy of state and local HFAs, their partners, and other PAB issuers, both the tax reform legislation initially passed by the Senate and the final tax reform bill maintained the exemption for PABs and continued MCCs, preserving HFAs' ability to support affordable housing opportunities.

Now that Congress is done with comprehensive tax reform for the foreseeable future, there is an opportunity to advance a number of critical reforms that will strengthen housing bonds. These small but significant changes will make

housing bonds more efficient and effective at minimal cost to taxpayers.

At the same time, the fact that the House's original tax reform bill repealed PABs and MCCs underscores the need for advocates to remain vigilant in efforts to protect housing bonds.

While legislative action is unlikely during an election year, lawmakers from both parties continue to discuss developing legislation to address our nation's infrastructure needs. Advocates must help legislators understand that housing is a key component of our nation's infrastructure and housing bonds should be preserved and strengthened in infrastructure legislation.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should continue to educate legislators about the importance of housing bonds and ask them to preserve the tax exemption for private activity housing bonds and other municipal bonds. Advocates should ask legislators to express their support for the tax exemption for all municipal and PABs, including housing bonds, directly to the leaders of the Senate Finance Committee or House Ways and Means Committee. Remind legislators that housing bonds and other PABs are necessary to promote much needed infrastructure improvements and address unmet housing needs.

Advocates should also ask legislators to strengthen the housing bond program with targeted improvements. These enhancements include:

- Repealing the housing bonds purchase price limit,
- Allowing housing bonds to be used to support loan refinancing,
- Increasing the MRB home improvement loan limit to reflect the increased costs of construction since the limit was first established in 1980, and
- Strengthening the MCC program.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Council of State Housing Agencies, 202-624-7710, www.ncsha.org

The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

By Olivia Wein, Staff Attorney, National Consumer Law Center

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Office of Community Services within the Administration for Children and Families

Year Program Started: 1981

Number of Persons/Households Served: An estimated 5.4 million families receive Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) assistance, which includes heating grants, cooling grants, and crisis assistance.

Population Targeted: Low-income households (below 150% of the poverty threshold or 60% of the state median income) who cannot afford to keep their homes at safe temperatures; particularly households with frail elderly, members with disabilities, or very young children.

LIHEAP is a targeted block grant program aimed at helping struggling families pay their heating and cooling bills. States have flexibility in setting eligibility criteria, benefit amounts, how much to direct to energy crisis situations where the health of the household is in jeopardy, as well as other program components. The main challenge for LIHEAP is securing adequate annual appropriations and challenging expected assertions in the Administration's proposed budget for FY21 that LIHEAP does not demonstrate strong performance and should be zeroed out (as was stated in the president's proposed budget for FY20).

HISTORY

LIHEAP was created in response to rising energy prices in the 1970s and the decreasing purchasing power of low-income households. In 1980, low-income energy assistance was part of the "Crude Oil Windfall Profit Act," Public Law 96-

223, and LIHEAP was authorized in the "Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981," Public Law 97-35. Since then, LIHEAP has been reauthorized several times, targeting the assistance within the pool of eligible households, adding new program components, and expanding authorization levels for funding.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The regular LIHEAP program is a federal block grant program to the states that helps low-income families meet the costs of heating and cooling their homes. LIHEAP is intended to "assist low-income households, particularly those with the lowest incomes, that pay a high proportion of household income for home energy, primarily in meeting their home energy needs" (42 U.S.C. § 8621(a)). States are to target assistance to households with the lowest incomes and highest energy needs (i.e., those who pay a large percentage of their income on home energy), and to households with populations vulnerable to extreme heat or cold. These are households with very young children, individuals with disabilities, and the frail elderly. The LIHEAP program focuses on home energy, which is defined as a source of heating or cooling in residential dwellings.

In order to receive LIHEAP funds, states must submit an annual application (state plan) to the Secretary of HHS. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, numerous tribes, and territories participate in the LIHEAP program. In the majority of states, LIHEAP is administered by the state social services agency. In many states, the state agency contracts with local providers, such as community action agencies, to handle intake.

Although states have a great deal of flexibility in designing their programs each year, the vast majority of states' LIHEAP grants are used to provide bill payment assistance to eligible low-income households to help with heating and cooling costs. LIHEAP benefits cover all forms of

residential heating or cooling fuels. This includes a range of fuels from natural gas and electricity for heating or cooling, to home heating oil, propane, kerosene, and wood. Assistance is often in the form of a vendor payment or two-party check (the customer and the utility).

States also have the flexibility to set their program's eligibility criteria in the annual state LIHEAP plan based on income eligibility. The maximum eligibility for LIHEAP is 150% of poverty or 60% of state median income. States are prohibited from setting income eligibility below 110% of the poverty level. States can also rely on participation in another means-tested program to determine eligibility. Low-income households are eligible for LIHEAP through participation in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Supplemental Security Income, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (also known as food stamps) and certain needs-tested veterans' benefits.

There are several additional components to LIHEAP:

- **Crisis grants:** Each fiscal year, states must reserve a reasonable amount of their regular LIHEAP block grant until March 15 for individual crisis intervention grants. States have the discretion to define what constitutes a crisis for this component. Common definitions include an imminent shut-off, empty heating fuel tank, or broken furnace. The state crisis intervention funds must be made available to a household within 18 hours if the household is in a life-threatening situation, and within 48 hours under other circumstances. The state crisis intervention component is different from the LIHEAP emergency contingency funds that are at the discretion of the president to release.
- **Low-cost weatherization or other home energy-related repairs:** States may use up to 15% of their annual LIHEAP block grant (or 25% with a waiver) for low-cost residential weatherization or other home energy-related repair. In about 30 states, the same agency administers LIHEAP and the Department of

Energy's low-income weatherization program.

- **Self-sufficiency:** States can use up to 5% of their block grant to provide services to encourage and enable households to reduce their home energy needs through activities such as needs assessments, counseling, and assistance with energy vendors.
- **LIHEAP emergency contingency fund:** The LIHEAP emergency contingency fund is subsidized separately from the regular LIHEAP block grant. The president can release LIHEAP emergency contingency funds to help meet low-income home energy needs arising from a natural disaster, a significant increase in the cost of home energy, or other emergency. Unfortunately, Congress has not appropriated funds for the LIHEAP emergency contingency fund since FY11.

According to HHS data for FY17, LIHEAP provided essential energy assistance to 5.4 million households, including heating and cooling bill payment assistance and crisis assistance.

FUNDING

The "Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94) that was signed into law on December 20, 2019 includes funding for FY20 LIHEAP. LIHEAP received a \$50 million increase from FY 2019 and is funded at \$3.74 billion. On November 1, 2019, \$3.32 billion was released to the states. Thus, there remains approximately 10% of the states' funds to be released.

The high-water mark for LIHEAP funding was in FY09 and FY10 when LIHEAP was funded at a total of \$5.1 billion: \$4.509 billion through the regular formula and \$590 million through the LIHEAP emergency contingency fund. The authorized funding level for LIHEAP is \$5.1 billion for the regular block grant program and \$600 million in LIHEAP emergency contingency funds.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The U.S. Energy Information Administration's Winter Fuels Outlook (October 2019) predicts that households heating with natural gas

will spend approximately \$580 this winter; households heating with heating oil will spend an average of \$1,501 this winter and households heating with electricity will spend about \$1,162 on their electric bills this winter. We expect strong demand for LIHEAP assistance, but the program is only able to serve about 20% of eligible households. As we near the next budget cycle, the immediate concern for LIHEAP advocates is to secure, at a minimum, level FY21 funding for the program. The main threat to this effort is the perilous FY21 appropriations negotiations that could result in cuts to many essential human needs programs. The administration has proposed discontinuing LIHEAP in FY21 as it did in its prior three budget proposals.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Advocates should become involved in the development of their state's annual LIHEAP program. LIHEAP state plans are required to be made available to the public in a manner that facilitates meaningful review and comment, and states are required to hold public hearings on the LIHEAP plan. The plans will set out eligibility criteria and benefit amounts, as well as other aspects of the program, such as the percentage of the state's LIHEAP grant requested in each quarter.

Please note that some tribes receive LIHEAP grants directly through the federal agency (as opposed to the state). Each state's LIHEAP office is listed at <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/liheap-state-and-territory-contact-listing>.

Advocates should also become familiar with the other energy assistance programs and utility consumer protections. In addition to LIHEAP, some states and some utilities have separate low-income energy assistance programs. For a list of some of the additional assistance programs, see <https://liheapch.acf.hhs.gov/dereg.htm> or contact the consumer protection division of a state's utility commission.

Advocates should also become familiar with certain utility rules. For utilities regulated by the state utility commission (generally private investor-owned utilities), the commission website

should have a link to rules regarding: customer shut-offs (for example, a winter shut-off rule, an extreme temperature rule, or a severe illness shut-off protection rule); payment plans; special protections for low-income or LIHEAP customers; and deposits and reconnection fees. Staff in the consumer protection division of the utility commission may be able to help find the relevant rules. For municipal utilities or cooperatives, the rules will reside with the municipality or the co-op. For links to the state utility commissions, visit: <https://www.naruc.org/about-naruc/regulatory-commissions/>.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should meet with their members of Congress to share the following messages:

- LIHEAP is a critical safety net program aimed at helping vulnerable households afford residential energy.
- There is significant need in the member's district (provide, for example, the number of clients seeking help with their utility bills, newspaper clips, or data regarding the number of households being disconnected).
- The current funding level will not be sufficient to meet the record high levels of applications.
- Supporters of LIHEAP should visit the LIHEAP Action Day website of the National Energy and Utility Affordability Coalition (www.NEUAC.org) and sign on to letters to Congress regarding LIHEAP funding. The NEUAC website also contains state-by-state, one-page fact sheets with helpful statistics tailored to each state.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

For advocates seeking more information about LIHEAP program design, the LIHEAP Clearinghouse is a wealth of information regarding the various ways states have designed their LIHEAP programs. View at: <https://liheapch.acf.hhs.gov/>.

The LIHEAP Clearinghouse tracks states'

supplemental energy assistance activities (listed as “State Leveraging under State Programs in the menu on the homepage). View at: <https://liheapch.acf.hhs.gov/state-leveraging>.

For information about advocacy regarding LIHEAP funding:

The National Energy Assistance Directors’ Association’s website provides information on LIHEAP funding needs and current funding levels. View at: www.neada.org.

The National Energy and Utility Affordability Coalition is an organization of utility, nonprofit, and anti-poverty organizations focused on the energy needs of low-income consumers. View at: <http://www.neuac.org/>

The Campaign for Home Energy Assistance has helpful fact sheets for advocates that describe the need for increased LIHEAP funding as well as local assistance programs. View at: www.liheap.org.

Low-Income Housing Tax Credits

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: Internal Revenue Service (IRS) of the Department of the Treasury

Year Started: 1986

Number of Households Served: 47,511 lower-income households in 2017, the latest data available.

Population Targeted: Households with income either less than 60% of area median income (AMI) or 50% AMI.

Funding: Joint Committee on Taxation estimates \$9 billion for 2020, growing to \$10.2 billion for 2023.

The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit program (LIHTC) finances the construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to lower-income households. The LIHTC program encourages private investment by providing a tax credit: a dollar-for-dollar reduction in federal taxes owed on other income. Although the LIHTC program is federal, each state has an independent agency, generally called a housing finance agency (HFA) that decides how to allocate the state's share of federal housing tax credits within a framework formed by the Internal Revenue Code.

HISTORY

The LIHTC program was created by the "Tax Reform Act of 1986" and is codified at Section 42 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. 42, so tax credit projects are sometimes referred to as Section 42 projects. The IRS provides additional guidance through revenue rulings, technical advice memorandums, notices, private letter rulings, and other means.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The LIHTC program finances the construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of housing affordable to lower-income households. LIHTC

can be used to support a variety of projects: multifamily or single-family housing, new construction or rehabilitation, special needs housing for elderly people or people with disabilities, and permanent supportive housing for homeless families and individuals. Although the LIHTC program is federal, each state has an independent housing finance agency (HFA) that decides how to allocate the state's share of LIHTC, which is based on each state's population.

LIHTC is designed to encourage corporations and private individuals to invest cash in housing affordable to lower-income people; those with income less than 60% of AMI or 50% AMI. LIHTC provides this encouragement by providing a tax credit to the investor over the course of a 10-year "credit period": a dollar-for-dollar reduction in federal taxes owed on other income. The cash that investors put up, called equity, is used along with other resources such as the HOME Investment Partnerships program (HOME) or the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF) to build new affordable housing or to make substantial repairs to existing affordable housing. LIHTC is not meant to provide 100% financing. The infusion of equity reduces the amount of money a developer must borrow and pay interest on, thereby reducing the rent level that needs to be charged.

A report by researchers from the Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy at New York University was published in *Housing Policy Debate* in May 2013. The researchers used tenant-level data from 18 states representing 40% of all LIHTC units. The report found that LIHTC recipients tend to have higher incomes than households assisted by other federal rental assistance programs. Although 45% of the households had income less than 30% AMI and were "extremely low income" (ELI), approximately 70% of those ELI households also had other forms of rental assistance, such as vouchers. For the 30% of ELI LIHTC households who did not have rental assistance, 86% paid more than 30% of their income for rent and

utilities and therefore suffered a “cost burden;” 58% endured “severe cost burden,” paying more than 50% of their income for rent and utilities.

PROGRAM BENEFICIARIES

LIHTC Units

Until 2018, when applying to an HFA for tax credits, a developer had two lower-income unit set-aside options and had to stick with the chosen option during a required lower-income occupancy period. Income averaging was introduced in 2018 by the “Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.”

The traditional two lower-income unit set-aside choices are:

- Ensuring that at least 20% of the units are rent-restricted and occupied by households with income less than 50% of AMI.
- Ensuring that at least 40% of the units are rent-restricted and occupied by households with income less than 60% of AMI.

Tax credits are available only for rental units that meet one of the above rent-restricted minimums (20/50 or 40/60). With these minimums it is possible for LIHTC projects to have a mix of units occupied by people of lower, moderate, and middle incomes. These are minimums; projects can have higher percentages of rent-restricted units occupied by lower-income people. In fact, the more rent-restricted lower-income units in a project, the greater the amount of tax credits provided. New developments should balance considerations of the need for more units with the value of mixed-income developments and with concerns about undue concentrations of lower-income households in certain neighborhoods.

The FY18 appropriations act added a third option: income averaging. This allows developers who choose the income averaging option to commit at least 40% of the units in a property to have an average designated income limit of no more than 60% AMI, with rents set at a fixed amount of 30% of a unit’s designated income limit. The developer decides the mix of designated income limits. The designated income limits may be in 10%

increments from 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, up to 80% of AMI. A unit can only be occupied by a household with income equal to or less than the unit’s designated income with the rent for that unit fixed at 30% of the designated income limit (except any units designated 10% AMI units will be counted as 20% AMI units for income averaging). For example, if a unit is designated at 20% AMI, the household’s income must be equal to or less than 20% AMI and the maximum rent is capped at 30% of 20% AMI. If a unit is designated at 80% AMI, the household’s income must be equal to or less than 80% AMI and the maximum rent is capped at 30% of 80% AMI.

The purpose of the new income averaging option is to enable developers to offset lower rents for extremely low-income households by charging higher rents to households with income greater than the more traditional 60% AMI level. Advocates have some initial concerns about this new option, as discussed in the “Issues and Concerns” section of this article.

LIHTC RENTS

Rent-restricted units have fixed maximum gross rents, including allowance for utilities, that are equal to or less than the rent charged to a hypothetical tenant paying 30% of either 50% of AMI or 60% of AMI, whichever option the developer has chosen. Tenants may have to pay rent up to that fixed maximum tax credit rent even if it is greater than 30% of their income. In other words, the maximum rent a tenant pays is not based on 30% of the tenant’s income; rather it is based on 30% of the fixed AMI level (50% or 60%).

Consequently, lower-income residents of tax credit projects might be rent-burdened, meaning they pay more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities. Or, LIHTC projects might simply not be financially available to extremely low-income households (those with income less than 30% of AMI) or very low-income households (those with income less than 50% of AMI) because rents charged are not affordable to them. HUD’s tenant-based or project-based vouchers or U.S.

Department of Agriculture Rural Development Section 521 Rental Assistance is often needed to fill the gap between 30% of a resident's actual income and the tax credit rent.

LOWER-INCOME OCCUPANCY PERIOD

The law requires units to be rent-restricted and occupied by income-eligible households for at least 15 years, called the “compliance period,” with an “extended use period” of at least another 15 years for a total of 30 years. Some states require low-income housing commitments greater than 30 years or provide incentives for projects that voluntarily agree to longer commitments. Where states do not mandate longer restricted-use periods, an owner may submit a request to the HFA to sell a project or convert it to market rate during year 14 of the 15-year compliance period. The HFA then has one year to find a buyer willing to maintain the rent restrictions for the balance of the 30-year period. If the property cannot be sold to such a “preservation purchaser,” then the owner's obligation to maintain rent-restricted units is removed and lower-income tenants receive enhanced vouchers enabling them to remain in their units for three years. This Year 15 option is called the Qualified Contract (QC) and is discussed in the “Issues and Concerns section of this article.”

HFAs must monitor projects for compliance with the income and rent restriction requirements. The IRS can recapture tax credits if a project fails to comply, or if there are housing code or fair housing violations. However, the extent to which HFAs monitor compliance after the 10-year credit period and following 5-year recapture period is not clear (see the “Issues and Concerns” section of this article).

PROGRAM STRUCTURE

Although LIHTC is a federal program, each state has an HFA that decides how to award tax credits to projects. There are two levels of tax credit, 9% and 4% (discussed further below). The 9% tax credits are allocated to states by the U.S.

Treasury Department based on a state's per-capita population. In 2020, each state received \$2.81 per capita, with small states receiving a minimum of \$3.21 million. Each year the IRS adjusts the amount per state based on inflation and the latest population estimate. Because there is a fixed amount of 9% tax credits, they are very competitive. However, there is no direct limit on the amount of 4% tax credits an HFA can award. Instead, the 4% tax credit amount a state can award is indirectly limited by the amount of a state's Private Activity Bond (PAB) volume cap, which seldom is a problem. The 4% tax credit can only be used in conjunction with a tax-exempt private activity bond. Each HFA must have a qualified allocation plan (QAP) that sets out the state's priorities and eligibility criteria for awarding LIHTC, as well as tax-exempt bonds and any state-level tax credits. More about QAPs is presented later in this article. Developers apply to an HFA and compete for LIHTC allocations. The law requires that a minimum of 10% of an HFA's total LIHTC be set aside for nonprofits.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS

Once awarded tax credits, a developer then sells them to investors, usually to a group of investors pulled together by someone called a syndicator. Syndicators sometimes pool several tax credit projects together and sell investors shares in the pool. The equity that the investors provide, along with other resources such as conventional mortgages, state loans, and funds from the HOME and HTF programs, is used by the developer to construct or substantially rehabilitate affordable housing.

The developer and investors form a “limited partnership” in which the developer is the “general partner” and the investors are “limited partners.” The general partner owns very little of the project (maybe as little as 1%) yet has a very active role in construction or rehab and day-to-day operation of the completed project. The limited partners own most of the project (maybe up to 99%) but play a passive role; they are involved only to take advantage of the reduction in their annual federal tax obligations.

9% AND 4% TAX CREDITS

There are two levels of tax credit, 9% and 4%, formally known as the “applicable percentages.” Projects can combine 9% and 4% tax credits. For example, buildings can be bought with 4% tax credits and then substantially rehabilitated with 9% tax credits. Instead of 9% and 4%, tax credits are sometimes referred to by the net present value they are intended to yield, either 70% or 30%. That is, in the case of a 9% tax credit, the stream of tax credits over the 10-year credit period has a value today equal to 70% of the eligible development costs.

The 9% tax credit is available for new construction and substantial rehabilitation projects that do not have other federal funds. Federal funds include loans and bonds with below market-rate interest. Rehabilitation is “substantial” if the greater of a minimum amount is spent on each rent-restricted lower-income unit or 10% is spent on the “eligible basis” (described below) during a 24-month period. Each year the IRS issues a revised minimum substantial rehab amount; for 2020 the amount is \$7,100.

The 4% tax credit is available for three types of activities:

- Acquisition of existing buildings for substantial rehabilitation.
- New construction or substantial rehabilitation subsidized with other federal funds. Projects are financed with tax-exempt Private Activity Bonds (PABs). Every year, states are allowed to issue a set amount, known as the “volume cap,” of tax-exempt bonds for a variety of economic development purposes. In 2020 the PAB volume cap is \$105 per capita, with a small state minimum of \$3.22 million.

In recent years, the figures 9% and 4% were only approximate rates. IRS computed actual rates monthly based on Treasury Department interest rates, or “appropriate percentage.” For any given project, the real tax credit rate was set the month a binding commitment was made between an HFA and developer, or the month a finished

project was first occupied or “placed in service.” This applicable percentage is applied to the “qualified basis” (described below) to determine the investors’ tax credit each year for 10 years (the “credit period”).

For 9% projects, the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008” (HERA) established a fixed 9% value for projects placed in service between July 30, 2008 and January 1, 2014. The “American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012” allowed any project receiving a LIHTC allocation before January 1, 2014 to qualify for the fixed 9% tax credit. There was no congressional action in FY13 or FY14 renewing a fixed 9% tax credit value. Although the “FY15 Appropriations Act” provided a fixed 9% minimum, it only extended the rate through December 31, 2014, providing virtually no benefit because most HFAs had already made their 2014 allocations and the vast majority of projects had closed using the floating rate. Therefore, the applicable percentage continued to float. For example, the 9% applicable percentage was 7.55% for December 2017.

Finally, on December 18, 2015, the president signed into law a broad tax extenders bill, the “Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes Act of 2015,” which, among many other tax provisions, made the fixed 9% applicable percentage permanent for new buildings placed in service after July 30, 2008. However, the statute did not establish a fixed 4% applicable percentage rate. The 4% tax credit continues to float, with an applicable percentage rate of 3.19% for December 2019.

DETERMINING THE AMOUNT OF TAX CREDITS FOR A PROJECT

The amount of tax credit a project can receive, and therefore how much equity it can attract, depends on several factors. First, the “eligible basis” must be determined by considering costs such as building acquisition, construction, soil tests, engineering costs, and utility hookups. Land acquisition and permanent financing costs are not counted toward the eligible basis. The eligible basis is usually reduced by the amount of any federal funds helping to finance a project.

TABLE 1		
Total development costs	\$5,000,000	
	Land acquisition	\$1,000,000
	Construction	\$3,400,000
	Site Improvements	\$ 535,000
	Engineering	\$ 40,000
	Eligible Soft Costs	\$ 25,000
Eligible Basis: Total Development Cost – Land Acquisition = \$4,000,000		
Qualified Basis: Eligible Basis x Applicable Fraction (\$4,000,000 x .40) = \$1,600,000		
Annual Tax Credit: Qualified Basis x Tax Credit Rate (\$1,600,000 x .09) = \$144,000		
Total Amount of Tax Credits: \$144,000 x 10 years = \$1,440,000		

The eligible basis of a project can get a 30% increase, or “basis boost,” if the project is located in a census tract designated by HUD as a low-income tract (a Qualified Census Tract, or QCT) or a high-cost area (a Difficult to Develop Area, or DDA). QCTs are census tracts with a poverty rate of 25% or in which 50% of the households have income less than 60% of AMI. LIHTC projects in QCTs must contribute to a concerted community revitalization plan. The aggregate population in census tracts designated as QCTs in a metropolitan area cannot exceed 20% of the metropolitan area’s population. DDAs are areas in which construction, land, and utility costs are high relative to incomes. All DDAs in metropolitan areas taken together may not contain more than 20% of the aggregate population of all metropolitan areas. HERA expanded the use of the 30% basis boost to projects not located in QCTs or DDAs if an HFA determines that an increase in the credit amount is necessary for the project to be financially feasible.

Next, the “applicable fraction” must be determined. This is a measure of rent-restricted lower-income units in a project. There are two possible percentages: the ratio of lower-income units to all units (the “unit fraction”), or the ratio of square feet in the lower-income units to the project’s total square feet (the “floor space fraction”). The lowest percentage is the applicable fraction. The applicable fraction agreed to by the developer and IRS at the time a building is first

occupied (“placed in service”) is the minimum that must be maintained during the entire affordability period (“compliance period”).

The “qualified basis” is the eligible basis multiplied by the applicable fraction. The amount of annual tax credits a project can get is the qualified basis multiplied by the tax credit rate (9% or 4%). The amount of tax credits available to a project is divided among the limited partners based on each limited partner’s share of the equity investment. Investors receive their share of the tax credit each year over the 10-year “credit period.”

A Simple Example

HUD’s HOME Program website gave simple example:

Project will construct 70 units, 40% of them are income and rent restricted.

There are no other federal funds.

The example in Table 1 continues, noting that a limited partnership will buy the tax credits at \$0.75 for every dollar of future tax benefit (the tax credit “price”). Thus, the limited partnership will invest \$1,080,000 (\$1,440,000 x .75) in the project today for a 10-year stream of future tax benefits amounting to \$1,440,000.

QUALIFIED ALLOCATION PLAN

The statute authorizing the LIHTC program requires each agency that allocates federal LIHTCs, (usually HFAs), to have a Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP). Each state has an HFA and there are also a few local HFAs. The QAP sets out a state's eligibility criteria and priorities for awarding federal LIHTCs to housing properties. In some states, the QAP also sets out threshold criteria for non-competitive 4% tax credits, any state LIHTC, and other state-funded housing programs.

The QAP is a tool advocates can use to influence how their state's share of annual federal LIHTCs is allocated to affordable housing properties. Advocates can use the public hearing and comment requirements to convince their housing finance agency to better target tax credits to properties with extremely low-income households, locate projects in priority areas (particularly to affirmatively further fair housing), and preserve the existing stock of affordable housing.

Each QAP must specify an HFA's minimal criteria and priorities that it will use to select projects competing for tax credits. The priorities must be appropriate to local conditions. The statute requires a QAP to give preference to projects:

- Serving residents with the lowest incomes.
- Serving income-eligible residents for the longest period of time.
- Located in HUD-designated QCTs, as long as the project contributes to a "concerted community revitalization plan" (QCTs are census tracts with a poverty rate of 25% or in which 50% of the households have income less than 60% of AMI).

In December 2016, the IRS issued Notice 2016-77 stating that QAPs may only give preference to projects in QCTs if there is a "concerted community revitalization plan" and only if that plan contains more components than just the LIHTC project. That Notice observed that in some cases HFAs have given preference to projects located QCTs without regard to whether

the projects would contribute to a concerted community revitalization plan. In other cases, because development of new multifamily housing benefits a neighborhood, an LIHTC project without other types of community improvements has been treated as if it alone constituted a concerted community revitalization plan. The IRS declared that simply placing an LIHTC project in a QCT risks exacerbating concentrations of poverty. Therefore, a QCT preference should only occur when there is an added benefit to the neighborhood in the form of the project's contribution to a concerted community revitalization plan. The Notice requested public input to define "concerted community revitalization plan" because the IRS Code does not have a definition. To date, the IRS has not proposed definitions of "concerted community revitalization plan."

The QAP selection criteria must address 10 items: (1) location, (2) housing needs, (3) public housing waiting lists, (4) individuals with children, (5) special needs populations, (6) whether a project includes the use of existing housing as part of a community revitalization plan, (7) project sponsor characteristics, (8) projects intended for eventual tenant ownership, (9) energy efficiency, and (10) historic nature. These requirements are minimums; states may adopt more rigorous criteria that target advocates' priority populations and locations. Most states establish detailed QAP selection criteria and set-asides based on the characteristics of their state's needs.

HFAs may target tax credits in several ways:

- The QAP selection process may give preferences, in the form of extra points, to encourage developers to submit projects more likely to serve particular populations or locations; for example, by awarding 10 points to projects that set aside 10% of the units for special needs populations.
- The QAP may establish a set-aside, reserving a specific percentage or dollar amount of any given year's tax credit allocation for projects more likely to serve particular populations or locations. For example, there may be a \$20

million set-aside for rural projects.

- The QAP may establish thresholds or minimum requirements that projects must meet simply to get in the game, thus improving targeting to particular populations or locations. For example, they may require a 50-year income-eligible compliance period.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Because each state receives a new allocation of LIHTCs each year, QAPs are usually drafted annually. This gives advocates regularly scheduled opportunities to influence QAP priorities. LIHTCs are often in high demand among developers; therefore, developers propose projects that address the priorities set forth in the QAP to give themselves an advantage in the selection process.

Advocates should assess the QAP. If it only has a general statement of goals, advocates can work to get very specific set-asides or preference points for their priorities. If the QAP has too many priorities, this will render individual priorities less meaningful. Advocates should work to narrow the number of priorities or work to establish relative priorities so their priorities can compete more effectively.

If there are types of assisted housing that should be at the top of the priority list, advocates should work to ensure that they are positioned to better compete. For example, if there is a great need for units with more than two bedrooms, advocates might promote a QAP policy offering bonus points for projects providing units with two or more bedrooms for at least 10% of all low-income units. To facilitate rural projects, advocates might try to secure QAP policies that give points to projects with fewer than 50 units in rural areas.

Advocates can also argue for features that protect tenants, for example a QAP policy precluding tax credit assistance for projects that do not provide one-for-one replacement of units lost through redevelopment. Advocates should review the QAP to find out how long targeted units must serve lower-income people. If the QAP only requires the basic 15 years, plus the extended use period

of another 15 years, advocates should try to get the compliance period lengthened as a threshold issue or try to get point preferences or set-asides for projects that voluntarily agree to a longer compliance period.

All states are required to have a public hearing about their proposed QAP before it is approved by the unit of government overseeing the HFA, but there are no specific requirements for the public hearing. Although not required, most states also provide for a public review and comment period for a proposed QAP.

Advocates should contact the HFA early to learn about its annual QAP process and build this into their work plan for the year. In addition, advocates should be sure to get on any notification list the HFA might have about the QAP and public hearings. Advocates should also develop relationships with the HFA's governing board and communicate the advocate's priorities throughout the year. Not all communication has to take place in the context of the formal QAP process. Informal contacts can be used effectively to advance an advocate's priorities. In fact, the most effective means of advocating for any particular priority is to be in contact with the HFA long before a draft QAP is publicly released.

Once an HFA decides to award tax credits to a building, it must notify the chief executive officer of the local jurisdiction, such as the mayor or county executive, where the building is located. That official must have a reasonable opportunity to comment on the project. Advocates should ask the executive's office and any relevant housing department at the locality to notify them as soon as the HFA contacts the executive about a proposed project. Even better, advocates should seek a local policy requiring public notice and comment, along with public hearings, about a proposed project.

In December 2016, the IRS issued Revenue Ruling 2016-29 holding that the IRS Code does not require or encourage state agencies allocating LIHTCs to reject proposals that do not obtain the approval of the locality where a project is proposed to be developed. IRS added that QAP

policies requiring local officials to approve a proposed project could have a discriminatory effect based on race and therefore be contrary to the “Fair Housing Act of 1968.”

Before tax credits are allocated, there must be a comprehensive market study of the housing needs of low-income people in the area a project is to serve. The project developer must hire a third party approved by the HFA to conduct the market study.

If a building that does not fit the QAP’s priorities is to receive tax credits, the HFA must provide a written explanation and make it available to the public.

Most states post a list of properties that have won tax credits after each round of competition. These lists can often be found on an HFA’s website.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Advocates have growing concerns about four practices that can affect LIHTC properties keeping income and rent restrictions: Properties reaching Year 30 and the potential loss of rent-restricted units, Qualified Contracts (QCs), “planned foreclosures,” and the extent that HFAs monitor projects for compliance with income and rent restrictions for the full 30-year (or longer) extended use period. In addition, there are potential issues with the new “income averaging” option.

Income Averaging

The “FY18 Appropriations Act” introduced a third option for meeting an LIHTC lower-income unit set-aside: income averaging. This allows a developer to commit at least 40% of the units in a property to having an average designated income limit of no more than 60% AMI, with rents set at a fixed amount of 30% of a unit’s designated income limit. The IRS has not issued guidance for using the income averaging option, and it is not expected to do so.

The primary concern is that there is potential for fewer LIHTC units being available to extremely low-income households with Housing Choice Vouchers. As previously noted, researchers

have found that 45% of all LIHTC households have extremely low incomes and that 70% of these ELI households have rental assistance in order to be able to afford their LIHTC unit. The researchers could not discern whether the rental assistance was from Housing Choice Voucher or project-based Section 8. A public housing agency’s (PHA’s) voucher “payment standard” might not be enough to meet the contract rent, the actual rent charged by the owner of the LIHTC unit (the payment standard is the amount of the voucher that makes up the difference between the contract rent charged by the owner and the tenant’s share of the rent at 30% of the tenant’s adjusted income). The payment standard is very likely to be inadequate for units designated at 70% AMI or 80% AMI in areas that have high overall AMIs.

The National Housing Law Project (NHLP) provides an example of a 50-unit building with five units at 80% AMI, 15 units at 70% AMI, five units at 60% AMI, 15 units at 50% AMI, and 10 units at 40% AMI. The average AMI in this example is 58%, but 20 out of the 50 units may be out of reach for voucher households. NHLP suggests that advocates convince their state’s QAP to have incentives or requirements that the highest LIHTC rents be set at or below the local voucher payment standard.

Another potential problem is that income averaging might lead to fewer larger units for ELI households even though the community might need more larger units for ELI households. The income averaging calculation does not take unit size into consideration. A property could designate most of the smaller units at the lowest AMI and most of the larger units at the highest AMI and still come in at an average AMI less than 60% of AMI.

BEYOND YEAR 30

A NLIHC report, *Balancing Priorities: Preservation and Neighborhood Opportunity in the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program Beyond Year 30*, found that 8,420 LIHTC properties accounting for 486,799 LIHTC units will reach Year 30 between 2020 and 2029. This is nearly 25% of all current

LIHTC units. For-profit owners have 336,089 (69%) of these units, placing the units at risk after Year 30. At least 81,513 (17%) of these units have nonprofit owners so they will likely continue to operate as “affordable” housing if there is adequate support to make needed repairs for aging units.

Between 2020 and 2029, 42% of the LIHTC units losing their affordability restrictions are in neighborhoods with very low desirability and 26% are in low desirability neighborhoods. It is these units that likely face the most significant challenges meeting capital needs for rehabilitation because they can only rely on lower rental income.

On the other hand, 10% of the LIHTC units with expiring affordability restrictions are in high desirability neighborhoods and another 5% are in very high desirability neighborhoods. For-profit developers own 36,282 units in high desirability neighborhoods and another 16,641 units in very-high desirability neighborhoods. These units owned by for-profit entities are likely at the greatest risk for being repositioned as market-rate housing.

QUALIFIED CONTRACTS

As explained earlier, an owner may submit a request to the HFA to sell a project or convert it to market rate during year 14 of the 15-year compliance period. This is called a Qualified Contract (QC). The HFA then has one year to find a buyer willing to maintain the income and rent restrictions for the balance of the 30-year period. If the property cannot be sold to such a “preservation purchaser,” then the owner’s obligation to maintain income- and rent-restricted units is removed, and the lower-income tenants receive enhanced vouchers enabling them to remain in their units for three years. The IRS code specifies the price that a preservation purchaser must pay in a QC situation, and in most cases the price is far greater than market price. Consequently, preservation purchasers are unable to acquire an LIHTC property at year 15 and the property converts to market-rate, and income and rent restrictions are removed.

To prevent the loss of affordable housing, some HFA’s QAPs require LIHTC applicants to waive their right to a QC or give extra competitive points to proposals agreeing to waive the right to a QC. Some HFAs inform LIHTC applicants that if they eventually seek a QC, they will not be allowed to apply for LIHTCs in the future.

The National Council of State Housing Agencies updated its “Recommended Practices in Housing Credit Administration” in December 2017. It recommended that all states should require LIHTC applicants to waive their right to a QC for both 9% and 4% LIHTCs. In addition, it recommended that QAPs include disincentives for owners of existing LIHTC properties to seek a QC by awarding negative points should an owner apply for future LIHTCs.

Aggregators

Another feature related to year 15 is becoming a serious problem. The LIHTC law has afforded mission-driven nonprofits a special privilege to secure at the outset of preparing an LIHTC application with investors, a right to obtain eventual ownership of the project at a minimum purchase price after 15 years (called a transfer right). In recent years, some private firms have begun to systematically challenge nonprofits’ project transfer rights with the intent to eventually sell the property at market value. So-called “aggregators” acquire the initial investors’ interest in the property after the investors have obtained their 10-year tax savings benefits but before the rent restrictions expire at year 15. Aggregators are very large financial entities that take advantage of a legal ambiguity regarding the nonprofit’s “right of first refusal” to purchase the property by employing batteries of attorneys and other expensive maneuvers to overwhelm the mission-driven nonprofit. The Washington State Housing Finance Commission and others have been resisting the growing threat of aggregators in court (see *An Emerging Threat to Affordable Housing: Nonprofit Transfer Disputes in the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program*).

Planned Foreclosures

Another concern is with entities that appear to engage in strategic acquisition of LIHTC-funded properties after the LIHTC is allocated (and, in many instances, already claimed) with the hope of avoiding the LIHTC use restrictions. Advocates have identified “planned foreclosures,” actions by partners in LIHTC developments designed to result in a foreclosure and thus wipe out the affordable use restrictions. In such cases, the entity planning the foreclosure was not involved in the LIHTC application process and is not an entity that applies for LIHTCs. Instead, the entity buys into the development, loans itself money through distinct but related companies, and then essentially forecloses on itself after claiming that properties are unsuccessful. Unlike HFA-trusted partners that are sensitive to their standing with the HFA because they hope to secure LIHTCs in the future, planned foreclosure entities do not seek future LIHTC allocations. Because such firms operate outside of the QAP process, eligibility for future LIHTCs does not work as a disincentive to avoiding use restrictions.

Congress specifically gave the Treasury Secretary the authority to determine that such intentional transactions do not qualify as foreclosures that terminate the LIHTC affordable use requirements. Although the LIHTC program has been in existence for more than 30 years, the IRS has provided no guidance to HFAs regarding how to deal with these situations.

COMPLYING WITH USE RESTRICTIONS AFTER YEAR 15

Although HFAs are tasked with monitoring compliance, additional guidance is needed to ensure that properties comply with regulations through the extended use period, the period after year 15 to at least year 30 (and for some states longer). During the initial 10-year credit period and the five-year recapture period, developments are less likely to have compliance issues because they are subject to losing tax credits. However, during the following extended use period, it is difficult to encourage compliance because there are few penalties for failing to do so. HFAs focus

compliance monitoring and enforcement during the initial 15-year term. This is problematic given that a property is more likely to have compliance issues as it ages. IRS needs to develop guidance or new regulations to require an HFA plan for how they will ensure compliance throughout the entire restricted use period.

FUNDING

The LIHTC is a tax expenditure that does not require an appropriation. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that the program would cost \$10 billion in tax expenditures in 2020, rising to \$10.4 billion in FY21 and \$10.7 billion in FY22, with a total of \$49.5 billion between FY18 and FY22.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Although the LIHTC was preserved in the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017,” its ability to generate equity may be reduced because the act significantly lowered the corporate tax rate from 35% to 21%. In spring 2018, Congress provided a temporary four-year, 12.5% increase to the LIHTC to help address this negative impact.

Given the need for affordable rental homes for people with the lowest incomes, Congress should pair any expansion of the LIHTC with reforms to ensure that this resource can better serve the most vulnerable families. For that reason, NLIHC urges Congress to enact the “Affordable Housing Credit Improvement Act,” (AHCIA) introduced by Senators Maria Cantwell (D-WA) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) in 2017. Senator Hatch retired in 2018. It was reintroduced in June 2019 as S.1703 by Senators Cantwell, Todd Young (R-IN), Ron Wyden (D-OR), and Johnny Isakson (R-GA), and as H.R. 3077 by Representatives Suzan DelBene (D-WA), Kenny Marchant (R-TX), Don Beyer (D-VA), and Jackie Walorski (R-IN).

The bill would expand LIHTC by 50% over five years, set a fixed minimum 4% rate, and allow income averaging for 4% projects and Multifamily Bonds. The bill would improve the program by making reforms such as:

- Providing a 50% basis boost, thereby increasing investment in a project, for developments that set aside at least 20% of the units for extremely low-income households (those with income less than 30% of AMI or income less than the federal poverty level). With this much-needed financial incentive, the bill would help housing developments remain financially sustainable while serving families with limited means.
- Encouraging development in Native American communities by Difficult to Develop Areas (DDAs), thus making developments automatically eligible for a 30% basis boost. The bill also requires states to consider the needs of Native Americans when allocating housing tax credits.
- Encouraging development in rural areas by designating rural areas as DDAs, thus making developments automatically eligible for a 30% basis boost. The bill also would change the base income limits in rural projects to the greater of area median income or the national nonmetropolitan median income, in recognition of the much lower incomes in rural areas.
- Prohibiting measures that local officials have used to resist locating projects in areas of opportunity. The bill would remove the provision requiring HFAs to notify the chief executive officer of the local jurisdiction in which a proposed building would be located. The bill would also specify that QAP selection criteria cannot include consideration of any support for or opposition to a project from local elected officials.
- Better aligning the LIHTC program with the “Violence Against Women Act” (VAWA) by requiring all long-term use agreements to include VAWA protections. The bill would also clarify that an owner should treat a tenant who has their lease bifurcated due to violence covered by VAWA as an existing tenant who should not have to recertify their income eligibility as if they were a new tenant.
- Addressing the threat of “aggregators” by replacing the existing right of first refusal for newly financed projects with a purchase option at the minimum purchase price allowed by current law. For existing partnership agreements as well as for future partnership agreements using the purchase option, the bill clarifies that the right of first refusal or purchase option may be exercised without approval of the investor.
- Ensuring that affordability restrictions endure in the case of illegitimate foreclosures (“planned foreclosures”) by providing HFAs, rather than the Treasury Department, the authority to determine whether the foreclosure was an arrangement.
- Allowing existing tenants to be considered low income if their income increases, up to 120% AMI.
- Clarifying that LIHTC can be used to develop properties specifically for veterans and other special populations.
- Allowing tenant relocation costs incurred in connection with rehabilitation to be capitalized as part of the cost of rehab.
 - Allowing HFAs to determine what constitutes a “concerted community revitalization plan.”
 - Removing the QCT population cap.
 - Increasing the DDA population cap to 30% to enable properties in more areas to benefit from the 30% basis boost.
 - Allowing HFAs to provide a basis boost of 30% for Housing Bond-financed properties.
 - Requiring HFAs to consider cost reasonableness as part of the QAP selection criteria.
 - Limiting the rent charged to the maximum LIHTC rent instead of the Fair Market Rent (FMR) for units leased to households with a voucher if the unit is also benefiting from income averaging or the extremely low-income basis boost. The voucher payment standard based on the FMR can

be much higher than the LIHTC maximum rent. Using the FMR in such instances subsidizes the property, providing excess rental assistance that could otherwise be used by public housing agencies (PHAs) to provide vouchers to other families.

Washington State Housing Finance Commission, *An Emerging Threat to Affordable Housing: Nonprofit Transfer Disputes in the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program*, <https://bit.ly/34eRWAM>.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

A NLIHC's report, *Balancing Priorities: Preservation and Neighborhood Opportunity in the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Program Beyond Year 30*, <https://nlihc.org/research/balancing-priorities>.

National Housing Law Project, <https://www.nhlp.org/resource-center/low-income-housing-tax-credits>.

Affordable Rental Housing A.C.T.I.O.N. Campaign, <http://rentalhousingaction.org>.

HUD's database of LIHTC projects, updated through 2017, www.huduser.org/datasets/lihtc.html.

HUD's list of QCTs and DDAs, www.huduser.org/datasets/qct.html.

HUD's lists of HFAs, https://lihtc.huduser.gov/agency_list.htm.

Novogradac, a consulting firm has:

- A list of HFAs in all states, <http://bit.ly/XoOL2b>.
- A list of state income averaging policies, <https://bit.ly/2PBf3jH>.
- Links to state QAPs, <https://bit.ly/2ry4xS8>.

The National Council of State Housing Agencies (NCSHA) has:

- Recommended practices for administering the LIHTC program, <https://www.ncsha.org/resource-center/housing-credit-recommended-practices>.
- A list of state HFAs, <https://www.ncsha.org/membership/hfa-members>.
- A list of state income averaging policies, <https://www.ncsha.org/resource/state-income-averaging-policies>.

Native American, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian Housing Programs

By Anthony Walters, Executive Director,
National American Indian Housing
Council

The “Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996” (NAHASDA) is the primary federal statute designed to address Native American housing issues. NAHASDA has two major components: the Indian Housing Block Grant (IHBG) Program (which is not the same as the Indian Community Development Block Grant, or ICDBG) and the Title VI Tribal Housing Activities Loan Guarantee Program. Amendments made to NAHASDA in 2000 added Title VIII - Housing Assistance for Native Hawaiians, which includes the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant (NHHBG) Program and the Section 184A Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Program. All tribes are also eligible for the Native American Housing Loan Guarantee Program, better known as the Section 184 Program, which began in 1992. The program was created before NAHASDA but is often now associated with NAHASDA programs and legislation.

Enacted in 1996, NAHASDA provides assistance to Indian tribes by providing affordable housing-related opportunities for low-income families residing on reservations and in other tribal areas. The act, which became effective in October 1997, provides tribes with a consistent, dedicated annual funding stream without requiring them to navigate the myriad of general housing programs administered by HUD. The act recognizes tribal sovereignty and self-determination by providing block grant funds directly to tribes, which are operated pursuant to tribally created Indian Housing Plans. NAHASDA’s most recent reauthorization expired in 2013, though Congress has continued to fund its programs every year.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The United States has a unique legal and political relationship with Indian tribes that stems from treaties, federal statutes, court decisions, and executive agreements dating back to the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. With respect to tribal lands, the federal government often serves as a trustee with tribes and individual Native Americans acting as beneficiaries. Today, federal Indian law and policy largely extends the trust responsibility to include the provision of health care, education, natural resources protection and development, and housing.

In 1961, indigenous tribes became eligible for assistance under programs operated by HUD. Regional HUD offices administered programs to tribes in their areas. By the mid-1970s, HUD had created Offices of Indian Programs in Denver and in San Francisco to exclusively administer Indian housing programs. Finally, in 1992, legislation created the current administering entity, the Office of Native American Programs.

Although the enactment of NAHASDA in 1996 provided permanent dedicated funding to tribal housing programs, it also restricted tribes from accessing many other HUD programs. Tribes were restricted from most other public housing grants and voucher programs. Examples also include homeless assistance grants and homebuyer counseling grants. Originally, tribes were also excluded from the HUD-VA Supportive Housing Program (HUD-VASH), but Congress created a demonstration Tribal HUD-VASH in October 2015 providing rental vouchers and supportive services to Native American veterans in a limited number of tribal communities. There have since been bills introduced in Congress to make Tribal HUD-VASH permanent and available to all tribes. The bills have enjoyed bipartisan support, and another was close to passing in 2018 before that Congress ended.

The housing needs faced by Native American communities are as diverse as the communities served, which are located in more than 30 states. Overcrowding, poverty, unemployment, low household incomes, a rapidly increasing population, and lack of infrastructure are just some of the challenges that vex American Natives, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiian communities. According to an extensive **study** of American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) housing conditions released by HUD in early 2017, 6% of AIAN homes located in tribal areas had inadequate plumbing, 12% had heating deficiencies, and 16% were overcrowded, while nationwide only 1–2% of homes suffered each of these conditions. At the same time, 38% of AIAN households were cost burdened (paying more than 30% of income for housing), compared to 36% nationally. The study also confirmed that homelessness in tribal areas generally manifests as overcrowding: researchers estimated that 42,000–85,000 people in Native American communities were staying with friends or relatives because they had no place of their own. To address the issues of overcrowded and substandard homes, the HUD study estimated that 68,000 new units were needed.

HUD's study also found that NAHASDA's block grant program works well, and tribes are able to use the funds effectively. It noted, however, that funding levels have not been adjusted for inflation over time, so while funding has remained steady from year to year, the purchasing power of the IHBG has been reduced by about a third since the enactment of NAHASDA.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

NAHASDA enhances tribal capacity to address the substandard housing and infrastructure conditions in tribal communities by encouraging greater self-management of housing programs and by encouraging private sector financing to complement limited IHBG dollars. The amounts of annual IHBGs are based on a formula that considers need and the amount of existing housing stock. The grants are awarded to eligible

tribes or their Tribally Designated Housing Entities for a range of affordable housing activities on reservations or in other areas.

Activities eligible to be funded with NAHASDA assistance include new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, infrastructure, and various support services. Housing assisted with these funds may be either rental or homeowner units. NAHASDA funds can also be used for certain types of community facilities if the facilities serve eligible low-income indigenous families who reside in affordable housing. Generally, only families whose income does not exceed 80% of the area median income are eligible for assistance.

NAHASDA's Title VI loan guarantees can provide tribes and Tribally Designated Housing Entities (TDHEs) better access to capital to develop larger housing projects. For individual home construction, Section 184 loan guarantees can help secure mortgages for individual homebuyers or tribes, TDHEs, and Indian Housing Authorities.

NATIVE HAWAIIANS

In 2000, NAHASDA was amended to create a separate title addressing the housing and related community development needs of native Hawaiians. Title VIII Housing Assistance for Native Hawaiians includes the NHHBG program and the Section 184A Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Program. The NHHBG program provides eligible affordable housing assistance to low-income Native Hawaiians eligible to reside on Hawaiian home lands. Since 2005, Title VIII has not been reauthorized, but the NHHBG has nevertheless been funded each year.

The Department of Hawaiian Home Lands (DHHL), the sole recipient of NHHBG funding, uses the funds for new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, infrastructure, and various support services. Housing can be either rental or homeownership. The NHHBG can also be used for certain types of community facilities if the facilities serve eligible residents of affordable housing. DHHL also uses the funds to provide housing services, including homeownership counseling and technical

assistance, to prepare families for home purchase and ownership.

The “Hawaiian Homelands Homeownership Act of 2000” created a new Section 184A Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Program, equivalent to the Section 184 program for American Indians and Alaska Natives.

FUNDING

The IHBG program was funded at approximately \$650 million each year from FY12 through FY17. The current administration has proposed each year to cut funding to only \$600 million. but Congress, however, has not only maintained the funding level at \$655 million, but has also added an additional \$100 million for a competitive grant program for IHBG recipients. In addition to the gains through the new competitive grants, tribes have received additional funds through the Indian Country Development Block Grant, which has grown to \$70 million in FY 2020.

The tribal HUD-VASH demonstration program for Native American veterans received funding in the FY15 appropriations bill and the program began operations in FY16. The tribes participating in the demonstration program have had varied levels of success, with some struggling to find available housing stock in their communities, while other tribes were unable to receive consistent supportive services from the VA. Those issues have caused Congress to reduce appropriations to only \$1 million for the program in FY20, a cut from \$7 million in earlier years. The program can rely on carryover funds from prior years to maintain existing services, however tribes have advocated for the program to be expanded to add other tribal communities with tribal veteran populations, rather than lose funding.

FORECAST FOR 2020 AND WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

NAHASDA Reauthorization

NAHASDA programs are currently being administered without being authorized. In December 2019, a robust reauthorization bill was

introduced in Congress, which would not only reauthorize and update NAHASDA programs, but also update other federal housing programs to work better in Indian Country. The bill would make tribes eligible for homebuyer counseling grants, make Tribal HUD-VASH permanent, create set-asides for tribes in USDA Rural Housing programs, and many other smaller improvements. Advocates should strongly urge Congress to consider passing a reauthorization of these vital tribal housing programs.

Resources for Tribal Housing Programs

Funding for tribal housing is the lifeblood of community development in Native American communities. For many years, funding has leveled off, failing to keep pace with inflation and the ever-increasing costs of energy, materials, and construction. Advocates should ask Congress to fully fund tribal housing and tribal housing-related programs, including the IHBG program; the ICDBG program; the NHHBG program; and the Section 184, 184A, and Title VI Loan Guarantee Programs. If the IHBG program included funding growth with inflation since NAHASDA’s enactment, the IHBG would be funded at nearly \$1 billion. Mindful that such an increase is not likely, tribes were pleased to see an increase of \$100 million in funding in FY18, which has continued through FY2020.

HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing

The nation’s largest supported permanent housing initiative combines HUD Housing Choice Vouchers with U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs case management services that promote and maintain recovery and housing stability. The FY15 HUD appropriations bill directed the HUD secretary to set aside a portion of HUD-VASH funds for a rental assistance and supportive housing demonstration for Native American veterans who are at risk of homelessness living on or near reservations or in other Native American communities. In late 2015 and 2016, the pilot program provided \$5.9 million to 26 tribes. Congress was close to passing a permanent authorization of the tribal HUD-VASH program in late 2018. The Senate has already

passed the bill again, and the bill is pending with the House Financial Services Committee. Advocates should encourage Congress to pass the Tribal HUD-VASH bill that was passed by the Senate with unanimous support.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Housing Assistance Council, www.ruralhome.org.

National American Indian Housing Council, www.naihc.net.

HUD Office of Native American Programs, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/ih.

DHHL, <http://hawaii.gov/dhhl>.

The Affordable Housing Program and Community Investment Program of the Federal Home Loan Banks

By Greg Hettrick, Director of Community Investment, FHLBank Dallas

The Federal Home Loan Banks (FHLBanks) are the nation's largest single, private source of funds for community lending. They are behind-the-scenes players that perform a vital role in the nation's financial system. These 11 regional cooperatives provide reliable liquidity for their member institutions to turn into lendable funds to support housing and community investment. Local lending institutions borrow from the FHLBanks to finance housing, community development, infrastructure, and small businesses in their communities. The FHLBanks were created by Congress in 1932 and are regulated by the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA). FHFA was created by the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008" and also regulates Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac.

PROGRAM SUMMARIES

FHLBanks administer two housing and economic development programs.

Affordable Housing Program (AHP). The AHP is designed to help member financial institutions and their community partners develop affordable owner-occupied and rental housing for very low- to moderate-income families and individuals. Projects serve a wide range of needs. Many are designed for seniors, persons with disabilities, homeless families and individuals, first-time homeowners, and others with limited resources.

FHLBanks must contribute 10% of their net income from the previous year to affordable housing through the AHP. The minimum annual combined contribution by the 11 FHLBanks must total \$100 million. Member banks partner with developers and community organizations seeking to build and renovate housing for low-

to moderate-income households. To ensure that AHP-funded projects reflect local housing needs, each FHLBank is advised by an Affordable Housing Advisory Council for guidance on regional housing and community development issues.

AHP consists of two programs: a competitive application program and a homeowner set-aside program. Under the competitive application program, an FHLBank member submits an application on behalf of a project sponsor. Each FHLBank establishes a point system to score applications based on nine criteria required by regulation. AHP competitive awards are made during scheduled funding rounds each year, starting with the highest scoring application until the available money is distributed.

Project sponsors partner with financial institutions to seek the competitive grants or low-cost loans. Applicants are encouraged to leverage their awards with other funding sources, including conventional loans, government subsidized financing, Low-Income Housing Tax Credit equity, bond financing, national Housing Trust Fund loans or grants, Community Development Block Grants, and foundation grants. Each FHLBank provides training and application assistance. See individual FHLBank websites for details.

If rental housing is developed with AHP funds, at least 20% of the units must be reserved for and affordable to households with very low income, less than 50% of the area median income (AMI). Owner-occupied housing must be occupied by a household with income less than 80% of AMI. AHP is a shallow-subsidy program; for the competitive program the average urban area subsidy per unit in 2018 was \$10,939 per unit, while the average rural subsidy per unit was \$13,578.

Under the homeowner set-aside program, an FHLBank member applies for grant funds and disburses the funds directly to the homeowner. An FHLBank may set aside up to \$4.5 million, or 35% of its annual AHP contribution, to assist low- or moderate-income households purchase or rehabilitate homes. At least one-third of an FHLBank's aggregate annual set-aside contribution must be allocated to first-time homebuyers. The maximum grant amount per household is \$15,000.

In 2018, the FHLBanks awarded \$457.9 million under the competitive program to assist 30,604 households. In 2018, 89% of the competitive program units were rental units, down from the all-time high of 94% in 2016. Fifty-one percent of the rental units helped very low-income households with incomes between 31% and 50% of AMI and 27% served extremely low-income households, those with incomes less than 30% of AMI. Forty-three percent of owner-occupied units served very low-income households.

Between 1990 and 2018, the FHLBanks distributed approximately \$5.0 billion in competitive AHP funds. This supported more than 709,000 units, 78% of which were rental units.

The homeowner set-aside program was authorized in 1995. Between 1995 and 2018, the homeowner set-aside program provided approximately \$1.2 billion, supporting more than 202,000 households. In 2018, the set-aside program distributed \$112 million to assist 18,667 owner-occupied households. The average set-aside subsidy per household was \$6,002.

Community Investment Program (CIP). Each FHLBank also operates a CIP that offers below-market rate loans to members for long-term financing of housing and economic development that benefits low- and moderate-income families and neighborhoods. CIP finances housing for households with incomes less than 115% of AMI, including rental projects, owner-occupied housing, and manufactured housing communities. Economic development projects must be in low- and moderate-income

neighborhoods or benefit low- and moderate-income households. In 2018, total CIP advances amounted to \$3.1 billion; \$3.0 billion for housing projects resulting in about 26,000 housing units, 57% of which were rental units, up from 52% in 2017. Economic development projects were awarded \$3.2 billion.

How the FHLBanks Work. The FHLBanks are member-owned cooperatives that provide funding for housing through all market cycles. Approximately 7,000 lenders are members of the FHLBanks, representing more than 80% of the insured lending institutions in the country. Community banks, thrifts, commercial banks, credit unions, community development financial institutions, insurance companies, and state housing finance agencies are all eligible for membership in the system. The 11 FHLBanks are in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, Dallas, Des Moines, Indianapolis, New York, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and Topeka.

Each FHLBank has its own board of directors, comprised of members of that FHLBank and independent (non-member) directors. The boards of directors represent many areas of expertise, including banking, accounting, housing, and community development.

The primary purpose of the FHLBanks is to provide members with liquidity. In fact, the FHLBanks are the only source of credit market access for most their members. Most community institutions do not have the ability to access the credit markets on their own.

FHLBank loans to members, called "advances," are a nearly instantaneous way for members to secure liquidity. The FHLBanks go to the debt markets several times a day to provide their members with funding. The size of the entire system allows for these advances to be structured in any number of ways, allowing each member to find a funding strategy that is tailored to its needs.

In order to qualify for advances, a member must pledge high-quality collateral, in the form of mortgages, government securities, or loans on small business, agriculture, or community

development. The member must also purchase additional stock in proportion to its borrowing. Once the member's FHLBank approves the loan request, it advances those funds to the member institution, which then lends the funds out in the community for housing and economic development.

Each of the 11 regional FHLBanks is self-capitalizing. One of the benefits of the FHLBanks' regional, self-capitalizing, cooperative business model is the ability to safely expand and contract to meet member lending needs throughout various business cycles. During times of high advance activity, capital automatically increases. As advances roll off the books of the FHLBanks, capital is reduced accordingly.

During the financial crisis, the FHLBanks continued to provide liquidity nationwide to members for housing and community credit needs through an extremely challenging period of economic stress. As other sources of liquidity disappeared, and before the coordinated response of the federal government, the FHLBanks increased lending to members in every part of the country by 58% between the second quarter of 2007 and the third quarter of 2008. Advances exceeded \$1 trillion in the third quarter of 2008.

FHLBanks are jointly and severally liable for their combined obligations. That means that if any individual FHLBank would not be able to pay a creditor, the other 11 FHLBanks would be required to step in and cover that debt. This provides another level of safety and leads to prudent borrowing.

FUNDING

No taxpayer funds are involved in the operation of the privately owned FHLBanks. The FHLBanks' Office of Finance, the clearinghouse for FHLBank debt transactions, accesses the global capital markets daily. FHLBank debt is sold through a broad, international network of about 100 underwriters.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The FHLBanks are an indispensable resource in the work done by housing organizations to address the housing needs of low-income households. They have several programs and products that help create strong communities. Their community lending programs can be utilized to help drive job growth at the local level. The AHP grants have remained a reliable and stable source of much-needed affordable housing funding, even as other sources of affordable housing funding have dried up.

The role the FHLBanks play in the financial system is vitally important. In any restructured housing finance system, the FHLBanks must continue to function as steady and reliable sources of funds for housing and community development through local institutions.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Council of FHLBanks, www.FHLBanks.com.

Federal Housing Finance Agency, <https://www.fhfa.gov/SupervisionRegulation/FederalHomeLoanBanks>.

Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program

By Leslie R. Strauss, Senior Housing Analyst, Housing Assistance Council

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Rural Housing and Economic Development

Year Started: 1996

Number of Persons/Households Served: More than 29,500

Population Targeted: Households with incomes below 80% of the area median income

Funding: \$10 million in FY20.

SHOP is a competitive grant program that provides funds to national and regional nonprofits that assist low-income families in building their own homes using a “sweat-equity” or self-help model. The homes are sold to the homebuyers at below-market rates.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Congress first authorized SHOP in 1996. SHOP was created for the purpose of alleviating one of the largest obstacles faced by self-help housing developers in the production of affordable housing, which is the high cost of acquiring land and developing infrastructure before home construction begins.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

SHOP is a competitive grant program run by HUD that provides funds to national and regional nonprofits that assist low-income families in building their own homes using a sweat equity or self-help model. Funds are restricted to paying for land and infrastructure costs associated with building the homes, including sewer connections, streets, utilities, and environmental remediation. These funds must result in one home for each \$15,000 awarded. Each low-income family receiving assistance through SHOP is required to invest at least 100 hours of work in building a home and homes for others, although many

families work far more than the required hours; the requirement for each one-person household is 50 hours. The homes are sold to the homebuyers at below-market rates.

National or regional nonprofit organizations or consortia can apply to HUD annually for SHOP funds. There are currently two SHOP recipients that operate nationwide: Habitat for Humanity and the Housing Assistance Council. HUD awards grants competitively based upon an organization's experience in managing a sweat-equity program, community needs, its capacity to generate other sources of funding, and the soundness of its program design. The HUD-funded organizations may develop self-help housing themselves or act as intermediaries; that is, make SHOP loans to local organizations that work with self-help home buyers.

All families receiving SHOP funds must earn less than 80% of the area median income, although many of the organizations that facilitate the distribution of those funds work with families who have income well below that threshold. SHOP funds have been used to support the work of self-help housing organizations in every state, resulting in the development of thousands of affordable homes for ownership.

FUNDING

SHOP was appropriated \$27 million in FY11, \$13.5 million in FY12, \$13.5 million in FY13 (before sequestration was applied), and \$10 million each year from FY14 to FY20.

FORECAST FOR 2020

SHOP, created in 1996, received steady support from Congress and the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations. The Obama administration's support varied from year to year. The Trump administration's FY18, FY19, and FY20 budgets all proposed defunding SHOP, but Congress provided \$10 million in FY20. SHOP

is one of the few federal housing programs to receive an effective rating, the highest rating possible, on the Program Assessment Rating Tool developed by the Office of Management and Budget.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Local organizations can access SHOP funding by partnering with one of the national or regional funding recipients. The strongest applicants have self-help experience.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Members of the House and Senate should be asked to support continued SHOP funding at a minimum of \$10 million per year. The program has many positive aspects:

- Self-help housing provides families a hand up. The families that ultimately use the program's funds will put at least 100 hours, and often more, into building their own homes. For example, through the Housing Assistance Council's first 10 years of SHOP funding, participating homebuyers averaged more than 1,000 hours of labor.
- Because owners' sweat equity reduces mortgage amounts, the self-help process makes homeownership affordable to people with low and very low incomes.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Habitat for Humanity International, 404-962-3433, www.habitat.org

Housing Assistance Council, 202-842-8600, www.ruralhome.org

HUD, 877-787-2526 or 202-708-2290, <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/shop>.

State and Local Housing Trust Funds

By Michael Anderson, Director,
Housing Trust Fund Project, Center for
Community Change

State and local housing trust funds advance the way this country supports affordable housing by guaranteeing that revenues are available each year to support critical affordable housing needs. Established by legislation, ordinance, or popular vote, housing trust funds direct public revenue to meet specifically identified local housing needs. Cities, counties, and states have developed models that work, supported innovative approaches to all aspects of addressing affordable housing and homelessness, and demonstrated that state and local government can provide decent affordable homes for everyone if communities are willing to commit the resources to do so. Creating a state or local housing trust fund is a proactive step that housing advocates can take to make systemic change in the housing world.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Since the 1980s, state and local housing trust funds have employed the model of committing public funds to address communities' most critical affordable housing needs. With more than 800 housing trust funds in cities, counties, and states, those funds have become core elements in housing policy throughout the United States. In 2019, state and local housing trust funds generated more than \$2.5 billion for affordable homes. The popularity and proliferation of housing trust funds is due to their flexibility, sustainability, and success in addressing critical housing needs. Forty-seven states and the District of Columbia have created fifty-eight housing trust funds. Eight states, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Oregon, and Washington, have created more than one state housing trust fund, reflecting a recognized value in committing public revenues to accomplish precise objectives, such as addressing homelessness or providing rental assistance.

ISSUE SUMMARY

There are three key elements to any state or local housing trust fund:

1. **Administration and oversight:** Most housing trust funds are administered by a public or quasi-public agency. Housing advocates are not always comfortable with the performance of local agencies or departments and may not find this an easy condition to accept. Although there are alternatives, such as a nonprofit or Community Development Financial Institution administering the fund, there are very few examples of such models. In the long-run, it is desirable for elected officials to accept ownership and responsibility for addressing critical housing needs and designate the housing trust fund as one way in which they intend to do this. A best practice administrative characteristic of housing trust funds is the creation of an appointed oversight or advisory board. Most housing trust funds have such boards. They are typically broadly representative of the housing community, including banks, realtors, developers, nonprofit development organizations, housing advocates, labor, service providers, and low-income residents. These boards can be advisory, but it is preferable to delegate some authority to them, including at least advising, if not determining, which projects receive funding from the trust fund; overseeing policies; and evaluating and reporting on the performance of the fund. An oversight board provides considerable expertise to the operation of the trust fund, and maintains a connection and avenue for accountability to the community.
2. **Programs:** The basic programmatic issues for housing trust funds should be defined in the ordinance or legislation that establishes the fund. Definition ensures that the key operating components of the trust fund are not subject to the whims of changing Administrations.

Staff and board members will need to develop an application cycle, program requirements, and administrative rules.

3. **Funding:** What defines a housing trust fund is securing a dedicated revenue source. This means that the source of funding is committed by law to generate funds for the housing trust fund. Thus, by resolution, ordinance or legislation, a certain percentage or amount of public funds are automatically deposited in the housing trust fund each year. Securing a dedicated revenue source for a housing trust fund is a significant advance over the way low-income housing has historically been funded. With a dedicated revenue source, advocates no longer have to argue for scarce resources with city council members, county commissioners, or state legislators during the annual budget process. They will no longer have to compete with other worthy causes in a budget process that is generally neither fair nor generous towards low-income housing. The dedicated revenue source guarantees a regular, but possibly fluctuating, source of funds.

Key Decisions to Make

In order to ensure that a trust fund succeeds, several decisions must be made about its implementation, including identifying eligible applicants, eligible activities, and requirements that must be met to receive funding. Eligible applicants typically include nonprofit developers, for-profit developers, government entities, Native American tribes, and public housing agencies. Eligible activities are usually broadly defined, including new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, emergency repairs, accessibility, first time homeownership, operating and maintenance costs, and many others. Most housing trust funds provide loans and grants through a competitive application process, although some establish distinct programs and make awards through these initiatives. Grants are important to ensure that housing can be provided to meet the needs of those with the lowest incomes. Some housing trust funds provide rental assistance. There are a few state and local

housing trust funds that specifically serve the needs of people experiencing homelessness and define their activities accordingly.

Among the most important decisions to be made regarding implementation of the trust fund are defining the specific requirements proposals must meet to be eligible for funding. Chief among these is the income level of those who benefit from the housing provided. Most housing trust funds serve populations earning no more than 80% of the area median income (AMI), but many serve lower-income households either entirely or in part by setting aside a portion of the funds to serve those populations in particular. Without setting aside funds to serve very low- (50% of AMI) and extremely low-income households (30% of AMI), these most critical needs are unlikely to be met, given that it is easier to create a development proposal serving higher incomes. It is important to give serious consideration to set-asides and other programmatic issues that enable funding for those with the most critical housing needs.

Another key decision are requirements for long-term affordability. Many state and local housing trust funds require that the homes and apartments supported through the trust fund remain affordable to the targeted population for a defined amount of time, or in perpetuity. Housing advocates may identify other requirements to incorporate, including accessibility for people with disabilities, mixed income, green housing and energy-efficiency principles, transit-oriented housing, rural housing, and housing-related services requirements.

Revenue Sources

Identifying public revenue sources for a housing trust fund is always a significant challenge. Different revenue sources are available to different types of jurisdictions, because each jurisdiction controls specific taxes and fees. Research must be done to identify appropriate funding sources.

The most common revenue source for a city housing trust fund is a developer impact fee, sometimes implemented in conjunction with a

zoning ordinance. These impact fees are most often placed on non-residential developers to offset the impact that the development's employees may have on the housing supply. Along with linkage fees, many jurisdictions also use inclusionary zoning *in-lieu* fees. The second most common revenue source for city housing trust funds is a voter approved property tax. Other cities have committed various fees, such as condominium conversion fees or demolition fees, along with taxes, including property taxes, real estate excise taxes, and hotel and motel taxes (including AirBnB). Revenues from tax increment districts are an increasingly popular revenue source for housing trust funds.

The most common revenue source for a county housing trust fund is a document recording fee, a fee paid upon filing various types of official documents with a state or local government. Other sources used by counties include sales taxes, developer fees, real estate transfer taxes, and real estate excise taxes.

State housing trust funds are most commonly funded by real estate transfer taxes, followed by document recording fees. However, states have committed nearly two dozen different revenue sources to housing trust funds. Other options include revenue from state-held funds (such as unclaimed property funds), interest from real estate escrow or mortgage escrow accounts, and general obligation bonds.

Often, housing advocates study alternative revenue sources themselves and propose the best options. These are not difficult studies, but do take time and some diligence to obtain the necessary information. Relying on elected officials to identify a potential revenue source is not typically a productive strategy. Suggesting alternatives for their consideration is a strategy with a much greater track-record of success. Some housing trust funds were created through specially designated task forces with responsibility for doing the background research and making recommendations on how best to fund and implement the proposed housing trust fund.

Each state is unique in its treatment of taxes and fees. Research into what the state constitution and statutes permit regarding dedicating public revenues to a specific purpose must be conducted. Research should determine what, if any, limitations are placed on specific revenue options, including any caps imposed on tax or fee rates, any limitations on the uses to which the revenue may be applied, and any commitments already imposed on the revenues collected, among other questions. It pays to be creative in searching for potential public revenue sources. Although an increase in a tax or fee is the most common way to create a housing trust fund, it is also possible to dedicate the growth in revenue from a tax or fee or dedicate a portion of the existing revenue without imposing an increase.

It is extremely important to identify a dollar goal for revenue sought each year for the housing trust fund. This can be based on actual need, a realistic assessment of what can be secured, or an evaluation of the capacity to use new funds. This goal will be the measure by which each potential revenue source will be judged as sufficient. A combination of revenue sources may be necessary to reach the goal.

It is critical to keep the focus on dedicated sources of public funding that will provide an ongoing stream of revenue for the housing trust fund. Other alternatives will be proposed, such as a one-time appropriation, bond revenues, or private sources, but advocates must keep their sights on establishing an ordinance or legislation that will dedicate public funds over time. Several trust funds have been created with one-time initial funding, which can be used to demonstrate the impact of the trust fund to build support for on-going dedicated public revenues.

Reporting

Once a housing trust fund is established and becomes operational, it is critically important and beneficial for the administering agency, the oversight board, and/or housing and homeless advocates to report annually on the accomplishments of the fund. This helps ensure sustained, if not increased, funding, and

improves the understanding and support for effective affordable housing programs. These reports typically not only show how the trust fund made advances in specific affordable housing or homeless objectives, but also highlight the impact these expenditures have in creating jobs, adding to the tax base, and extending economic benefits. Many such reports have included stories sharing the impact of a safe affordable home on individual families.

Relationship Between State and Local Housing Trust Funds

One of the most innovative recent advances in the housing trust fund field is state legislation that enables local jurisdictions to create housing trust funds. There are several models in place. States can enact legislation that opens a door for local housing trust funds by providing matching funds to encourage and support local housing trust fund efforts, enabling cities or counties to utilize a specific revenue source for local housing trust funds, sharing a new public revenue source with local jurisdictions, or establishing a process whereby local jurisdictions can decide to commit specific funds to a local housing trust fund. Close to 75% of the funds that exist in the United States are in states where enabling legislation has encouraged cities and/or counties to advance local housing trust funds. These include communities in Massachusetts responding to the “Community Preservation Act” and localities in New Jersey complying with the “Fair Housing Act.” Washington and Pennsylvania have legislation enabling counties to use document recording fee revenues for local funds. Iowa’s state housing trust fund providing matching funds locally has generated funds in 27 locations throughout the state. Fourteen states have passed legislation to encourage local housing trust funds.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Today, there are at least 30 housing trust fund campaigns underway in cities, counties, and states across the country. Some are focused on creating new housing trust funds. Many housing trust fund initiatives are working to increase resources for existing housing trust funds. The

housing trust fund model can be adapted in many ways to make it possible to dedicate public funding toward addressing critical housing needs. Trust funds have been created in most states and many small cities, rural counties, and large metropolitan areas. The most common denominator is the commitment on the part of advocates. Housing trust funds are the result of strong affordable housing/homeless advocacy. Campaigns have been waged by faith-based organizations, coalitions of nonprofit developers, statewide housing advocacy groups, and combinations of these and many others. The experiences of the campaigns are as unique as they are uplifting and full of promise.

In 2019, housing and homeless advocates celebrated the following victories (in alphabetical order by state):

- In Arizona, the legislature made a one-time investment of \$15 million into the Arizona Housing Trust Fund, the highest funding allocation since 2007.
- In Colorado, the legislature passed a historic suite of housing bills, including a dedicated revenue source for the state housing fund. By 2021, revenue from a vendor fee will generate \$45-\$50 million annually for affordable housing. This will be augmented by an additional \$30 million from revenue generated from the state’s unclaimed property fund from 2020 to 2022.
- In Florida, the Board of Commissioners of Hillsborough County established a new housing trust fund and committed \$10 million annually from the County’s general fund that will commit at least 30% of the resources to households with incomes at or below 50% area AMI.
- In Kansas, the Topeka City Council unanimously established a new housing trust fund to serve households at or below 80% AMI, with priority for households at or below 50% AMI.
- In Michigan, the City Council allocated \$2 million in general funds to the Detroit Affordable Housing Development and

Preservation Fund (DAHDPF). The \$2 million is in addition to the \$2 million generated in 2019 by the sale of city-owned property, the revenue source dedicated to DAHDPF in the original 2017 ordinance.

- In Minnesota, Minneapolis, the Mayor's budget allocated \$40 million for affordable housing, including more than \$21 million for the city's Affordable Housing Trust Fund.
- In Minnesota, the St. Paul City Council committed \$10 million to the Housing Trust Fund.
- In Nevada, the Washoe County Commission unanimously passed a new housing trust fund.
- In New Jersey, for the first time in nearly a decade, the legislature fully allocated all of the funding intended for the state Affordable Housing Trust Fund, more than \$50 million in real estate transfer fees for FY20.
- In North Dakota, the legislature approved \$7.5 million for the Housing Incentive Fund.
- In Ohio, the legislature passed a fee adjustment in the budget that will generate an additional \$3-\$4 million each year for the Housing Trust Fund., the first funding increase since 2003.
- Also in Ohio, the Cincinnati City Council established a housing trust fund to provide housing affordable to households at 50% AMI or below, with a preference for households at 30% AMI or below. The City Council also established a new 7% excise tax on short-term rentals and committed the revenue to the housing trust fund.
- In Pennsylvania, the legislature increased the cap on the state housing trust fund (PHARE) portion of the Realty Transfer Tax revenue from \$25 million annually to up to \$40 million annually.
- In Tennessee, the Memphis City Council established the Memphis Housing Trust Fund in conjunction with Memphis 3.0, a 20-year comprehensive plan that will guide the city

of Memphis into its third century. The City of Memphis allocated \$900,000 in general funds to make the fund operational.

- In Virginia, the Richmond city council set aside \$2.9 million for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund (AHTF), a record allocation.
- In Washington state, the legislature allocated \$175 million to the state Housing Trust Fund, the highest allocation in more than a decade.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Although it is relatively easy for the public at large, and elected officials in particular, to nod toward the need to provide more affordable homes, committing precious resources to make it happen requires an active campaign. Advocates face the challenge of making affordable housing enough of a priority that elected officials can make the right decision. Housing trust fund campaigns have made important contributions in reframing affordable housing as a policy priority that is integral to the success of every community. Not only is there an obvious connection between jobs and housing, but building housing also fuels the economy in several direct and indirect ways. Housing has a direct relationship to education, health, the environment, and neighborhood quality. Personal stories and connections to real family experiences have given the issue a face that is far more powerful than statistics reflect. Campaigns have created effective communication strategies based on the value frame that everyone deserves a place to call home.

Housing trust fund campaigns have found numerous ways to boast about what housing programs can accomplish, pointing to thousands of remarkable and outstanding examples of good, well-managed, integrated affordable housing. There is no reason to be bashful about this. Housing advocates have an obligation to educate the public and elected officials about the new face of affordable housing. Rarely have housing trust funds been created without public pressure applied by a campaign. Housing advocates have succeeded in making the point that providing decent, safe, affordable homes is no longer an arbitrary decision to which we can simply

choose to devote resources or not. Rather, it is an ongoing, essential part of every community that is no less important than streets, sewers, health centers, police and fire protection, schools, and other basic components of a viable community.

Although housing trust funds are numerous, securing adequate resources to build and maintain affordable homes can be a challenge. Fortunately, there are many creative and successful examples of effective campaign strategies, ranging from coalition building to cultivating allies in sectors related to housing such as education, health, and economic development; to organizing people impacted by the lack of affordable homes.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Housing Trust Fund Project of Community Change, <https://communitychange.org/campaign/housing-trust-fund-project/>.

Cuts to Housing Benefits

By Sonya Acosta, Policy Analyst, NLIHC

During the 115th Congress, President Donald Trump and conservative members of Congress proposed to cut housing benefits that help America's poorest seniors, people with disabilities, families with children, and other people afford to keep a roof over their heads. Fortunately, many of these proposals—with the exception of recommendations from the Trump administration—have not been reintroduced in the 116th Congress. These proposals would have increased rents and imposed work requirements on millions of low-income families who receive housing benefits. If enacted, the proposals would have left even more low-income people without a stable home, making it harder for them to climb the economic ladder and live with dignity, and in worst cases, could have led to increased evictions and homelessness.

Congress must continue to reject proposals that take away housing benefits and instead enact proven solutions to help struggling families earn more and get ahead. This starts with expanding—not slashing—investments in affordable homes, job training, education, childcare, and other policies that help families thrive.

ISSUES

One of the biggest barriers to economic prosperity for America's lowest-income families is the lack of decent, accessible, and affordable homes. Research shows that when people have a stable, decent, and accessible home that they can afford, they are better able to find employment, achieve economic mobility, age in place, perform better in school, and maintain improved health (Weiss, E. 2017; *A Place to Call Home. The Campaign for Housing and Community Development Funding*).

Without housing benefits, it will be even harder for struggling families to get ahead and live with dignity. If Congress cuts housing benefits, even more families would be homeless, living

in substandard or overcrowded conditions, or struggling to meet other basic needs because too much of their limited income would go toward paying rent. When families cannot afford rent, they are forced to cut back on investments in their future, including education, training, retirement savings, and healthcare.

Families with rental assistance are already required to pay what they can afford in rent, based on their income. Charging higher rents would force them to divert money away from basic needs like medicine or clothing or would put them at risk of eviction and homelessness. Rent increases, such as higher minimum rents or eliminating deductions, target the very poorest people, including seniors and people with disabilities, who are already at great risk of homelessness (Fischer, W. et al. 2017; *Trump Budget's Housing Proposals Would Raise Rents on Struggling Families, Seniors, and People with Disabilities. Washington, DC: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*).

Additionally, cutting housing benefits will not create the well-paying jobs and opportunities needed to lift families out of poverty. Work requirements will only make it more difficult for families to get and keep their jobs. Research shows that for most families, work requirements do not lead to stable employment or a path out of poverty. In fact, work requirements are counter-productive and prevent people from working. Work requirements will have the greatest impact on people with disabilities, who need affordable homes and often other services offered by housing providers in order to maintain employment. Without housing assistance, low-income people face a greater risk of eviction and homelessness, circumstances that make it incredibly difficult to maintain a job. Affordable housing and housing assistance are foundational to employment and economic security (Desmond, M. and Gershenson, M. 2016; *Housing and Employment Insecurity among the Working Poor. Social Problems* 63: 46-67).

Imposing arbitrary time limits will only cut people off from the very housing benefits that make it possible for them to find and maintain jobs. Arbitrary time limits are especially harmful in high-cost areas and rural communities, where rents are well above what a low-income worker can afford and where there is a severe shortage of affordable homes. Time limits will not address this structural problem; only investments in affordable homes and job creation will encourage change.

Moreover, imposing work requirements, time limits, and rent increases creates new administrative costs for housing providers, without providing significant benefits to residents or the public. Housing providers will be forced to divert resources away from property maintenance and the employment-related resident services they already provide to pay for additional staff and regulatory compliance.

PROPOSALS FROM THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

President Trump's budget proposals consistently cut funding for critical housing programs and recommend increasing rents and imposing work requirements on already struggling families. Despite the Administration's push for cuts and punitive measures, Congress has ignored the proposed cuts and calls for higher rents in the current 116th Congress.

Trump Rent Proposal

The Trump Administration proposed the "Making Affordable Housing Work Act" in April 2018 to impose work requirements, rent increases, and other burdens on millions of low-income families who receive federal housing assistance through the HUD. The Administration claimed that such changes were needed to promote self-sufficiency and decrease federal spending. The legislation was not been formally introduced by a member of Congress.

Currently, most families receiving federal housing assistance pay 30% of their adjusted income as rent. Under the Trump proposal, most HUD-assisted families, with some exceptions,

would instead have had to pay 35% of their gross income or 35% of the amount earned by working at least 15 hours a week for four weeks at the federal minimum wage, whichever is higher. With this provision, HUD would have essentially set a new mandatory minimum rent of \$150, which is three times higher than the current minimum rent that housing providers may apply to families. The bill would have also increased rents for households with high medical or childcare expenses by eliminating income deductions for those expenses, the impact of which would disproportionately fall on seniors, people with disabilities, and families with young children. The bill granted the HUD secretary with the authority to impose even higher rents through alternative rent structures and de facto time limits. The proposal allowed housing providers to broadly impose work requirements, without any resources to help people gain the skills they need for well-paying jobs.

PROPOSALS FROM THE 115TH CONGRESS

During the 115th Congress, there were several proposals that would have imposed rent increases, work requirements, and *de facto* time limits on housing benefits. After enacting \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for wealthy individuals and corporations, Republican leaders, including President Trump and those in the House of Representatives, wanted to pay for the tax bill by cutting housing benefits through work requirements, rent increases, and other harmful measures. Advocates mobilized against proposals to cut housing benefits and were successful in stalling legislation from moving forward.

Turner Proposal

The House Financial Services Committee passed, on a party-line vote, Representative Mike Turner's (R-OH) "Fostering Stable Housing Opportunities Act of 2017" (HR 2069) in July 2018. The bill aimed to provide housing assistance to youth aging out of the foster system, but it provided no additional resources to do so. Instead, the bill would have imposed work requirements and other burdens on youth as a condition for

receiving housing assistance, the first time ever for individuals who rely on such assistance. The bill never received a vote on the House floor in the 115th Congress.

The bill directed public housing agencies to impose a combination of education and training or self-sufficiency requirements on youth aging out of the foster care system as a condition of receiving housing assistance. While the bill was amended to no longer expressly require youth to work a set number of hours each week to maintain their housing assistance, the HUD Secretary would have had the authority to establish hourly education and training requirements through regulation. As an alternative to imposing education and training requirements, public housing agencies would have been required under the bill to make participation in HUD's Family Self Sufficiency (FSS) programs mandatory for youth as a condition of receiving housing assistance. However, both alternatives would have put youth unable to meet these standards at risk of losing housing benefits that make it possible for them to live in stable, affordable homes and find and maintain work.

A bipartisan group of representatives reintroduced this bill as H.R. 4300 without the education, training, and self-sufficiency requirements. NLIHC supported this version of the bill, which passed the House on November 18, 2018.

Barr Proposal

The House approved by a vote of 230-173 the "Transitional Housing for Recovery in Viable Environments Demonstration Program (THRIVE) Act" (HR 5735) in June 2018. The bill, introduced by Representative Andy Barr (R-KY), would have diverted 10,000 vouchers, or \$83 million, away from the Housing Choice Voucher program to pay for transitional recovery housing for people with substance-use disorders. Eligible voucher recipients would have received 12-24 months of assistance, after which the provider would be able to transfer the voucher to a newly selected eligible recipient. While the House passed the

bill, it was not taken up by the Senate. Advocates opposed the bill in part because it would have reduced the availability of vouchers for families in need and would have allowed service providers to impose arbitrary and counterproductive time limits, and service engagement and self-sufficiency requirements on voucher recipients.

FORECAST FOR 2020

With the Democrats in control of the House in the 116th Congress, legislation to cut housing benefits is less likely to move forward through the legislative process since Democrats largely oppose such proposals. However, conservative lawmakers may still introduce harmful legislation. In his fiscal year 2021 budget request, President Trump again included his proposal to increase rents, impose work requirements on HUD-assisted tenants, and decrease overall federal spending on affordable housing programs. Given the response to such plans in previous years in addition to the support of congressional champions in both the House and the Senate, President Trump's proposal is not likely to be enacted.

In October 2018, HUD issued a new operating notice for the expansion of the Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration that would permit 100 PHAs participating in the expansion to impose the policy changes proposed by the Trump administration (See the Advocates' Guide article on *Public Housing*). HUD will finalize the MTW Operations Notice and designate the first two cohorts of MTW agencies in 2020. Advocates will continue to monitor the MTW expansion as HUD and participating PHAs move forward with its implementation.

The Trump administration has also attempted to limit immigrant families' access to housing assistance (See the Advocates' Guide article on *Attacks on Immigrants' Access to Housing*). Advocates will continue to monitor the HUD "Mixed-Status Families" proposed rule and others that seek to further restrict eligibility for federal housing programs.

HOW YOU CAN TAKE ACTION

Instead of taking away housing benefits, Congress and the Trump administration should enact proven solutions to help struggling families earn more and get ahead. This starts with expanding—not slashing—investments in affordable homes, job training, education, childcare, and other policies to help families thrive. Urge Congress and the administration to:

- Expand voluntary programs, like Jobs Plus and Family Self Sufficiency, that provide services and financial incentives to help families increase their earnings without the risks and added costs.
- Evaluate existing demonstration programs, like Moving to Work, to determine the impact on tenants and outcomes before imposing across-the-board changes.
- Use HUD’s Section 3 regulation, which provides an opportunity to promote job training and hiring among people receiving housing benefits.
- Implement bipartisan changes recently enacted by Congress in the “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act” that encourage work among housing beneficiaries.

Chapter 6:

SPECIAL

HOUSING

ISSUES

Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes

By David Jacobs, PhD, CIH, Chief Scientist, National Center for Healthy Housing, and Sarah Goodwin, Policy Analyst, National Center for Healthy Housing

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes (OLHCHH)

Year Started: Lead Hazard Control, 1992; Healthy Homes Initiative, 1999

Population Targeted: Low-income and very low-income families who reside in worst-quality private housing where children under six years of age reside or are likely to reside.

FY20 Funding: \$290 Million, including \$45 million for the Healthy Homes Initiative

Children spend as much as 90% of their time indoors, and toxic substances can reach more concentrated levels indoors than they do outside. Older, dilapidated housing with lead-based paint, and the settled interior dust and exterior bare soil it generates, are the biggest sources of lead exposure for children. Often these units have a combination of health dangers that include dust mites, molds, and pests that can trigger asthma; carcinogens, such as asbestos, radon, and pesticides; and other deadly toxins such as carbon monoxide.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

HUD published an important revision to its Lead Safe Housing rule on January 13, 2017, that conforms its definition of elevated blood lead level to that of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The revision also establishes more comprehensive testing and evaluation procedures for the assisted housing where such children reside and certain reporting requirements. See: https://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/HUD?src=/program_offices/healthy_homes/enforcement/lshr.

The National Safe and Healthy Housing Coalition tracks appropriations for these two programs and regularly circulates sign-on letters. See: www.nchh.org and: <http://www.nchh.org/Policy/National-Policy/Federal-Appropriations.aspx>. In addition, healthy housing fact sheets are now available for each state (<https://nchh.org/who-we-are/nchh-publications/fact-sheets/state-hh-fact-sheets/>).

A major new lead poisoning report is now available: (<https://nchh.org/information-and-evidence/healthy-housing-policy/10-policies/>).

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Lead Hazard Control

The “Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act,” or Title X of the “Housing and Community Development Act of 1992,” was enacted to focus the nation on making housing safe for children by preventing exposure to lead-based paint hazards (the statute defines this as deteriorated lead-based paint, lead contaminated settled house dust, and lead contaminated bare soil). The law authorized the HUD Lead Hazard Control Grants Program and related programs at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and CDC to provide grants to local jurisdictions to identify and control lead-based paint hazards in privately owned, low-income, owner-occupied, and rental housing and conduct training and public health surveillance and other duties. In 2003, Congress created Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grants to target additional lead hazard control grants to the nation’s highest-risk cities. Both programs and enforcement of related regulations are housed in HUD’s OLHCHH.

Healthy Homes Initiative

The Healthy Homes Initiative was established by Congress in 1999 to protect children and their families from residential health and safety hazards. The goal of this program is a comprehensive, integrated approach to housing hazards through grants that create

and demonstrate effective, low-cost methods of addressing mold, lead, allergens, asthma, carbon monoxide, home safety, pesticides, radon and other housing-related health and safety hazards. These grant programs are housed in HUD's OLHCHH.

The beneficiaries of both the lead and healthy homes programs are low-income households and the broader public through education campaigns. Assisted rental units served must be affirmatively marketed for at least three years for families with children under age six. Ninety percent of owner-occupied units served must house or be regularly visited by a child under age six. Because the funds do not cover all housing eligible under federal policy, each grantee develops its local plan and is permitted to target investment of grant funds based on factors such as the presence of a lead-poisoned child and location in a high-risk neighborhood. The programs' funds are awarded via competitive Notices of Fund Availability.

ISSUE SUMMARY

Recent research confirms that housing policy has a profound impact on public health, and for any public health agenda to be effective, it must include a housing component. The statistics and key findings regarding the long-term effects of housing-related health hazards are alarming. At least 270,000 children aged one to five in the U.S. have elevated blood lead levels above the current CDC reference value of 5 micrograms per deciliter. Childhood exposure to lead can have lifelong consequences including decreased cognitive function, developmental delays, behavior problems, and, at very high levels can cause seizures, coma, and even death. Asthma is one of the most common chronic conditions among children in the U.S.; 25 million people in the U.S. have asthma, including 9.5% of children under 18. In 2007-2008, the economic costs to society of lead poisoning and asthma were estimated at \$50 billion and \$56 billion, respectively.

The burden of housing-related health hazards falls disproportionately on the most vulnerable

children and communities, contributing greatly to U.S. health disparities. African American children are twice as likely to have asthma and are six times more likely to die from it than white children. Households with annual incomes less than \$30,000 are twice as likely as others to have lead hazards in their homes. Children of low-income families are eight times more likely to be lead-poisoned than those of higher-income families, and African American children are five times more likely than whites to be lead-poisoned. Children poisoned by lead are seven times more likely to drop out of school, and six times more likely to end up in the juvenile justice system.

There are even bigger consequences when dealing with the cumulative effects of multiple hazards. Inadequate ventilation increases the concentration of lethal indoor air pollutants, such as radon and carbon monoxide, and exacerbates moisture and humidity problems. Moisture causes paint deterioration, which puts children at risk of exposure to leaded dust and paint chips. Moisture also encourages the growth of mold, mildew, dust mites, and microbes that contribute to asthma and other respiratory diseases and structural rot, which is related to injuries. Asthma is exacerbated by allergic reaction to certain triggers such as dust, mold, pests (such as cockroaches, rats, and mice), cold air, and dry heat. Use of common pesticides to control infestations can contaminate homes. Thus, a 'whole-house' approach is critical, including thorough visual assessments, air tests, and remediation activities.

Additionally, solutions and opportunities may arise through existing weatherization, rehabilitation, maintenance, and home repair work. Because improperly disturbing lead-based paint may cause lead poisoning, it is necessary to use lead-safe work practices and comply with the EPA's renovation, repair, and painting rule (and for federally assisted housing, HUD's Lead Safe Housing rule, which was updated in Jan 2017). Many weatherization treatments have healthy homes benefits. For example, window replacement can help with lead poisoning

prevention, and roof repair and insulation may help reduce moisture intrusion and prevent mold. Improving ventilation to ameliorate the ill effects of tightening a building can help ensure no harm from energy-efficiency measures. Healthy Homes and weatherization/building performance are described in a new report from the Department of Energy and the National Center for Healthy Housing: https://www.energystar.gov/campaign/improvements/professionals/resources_library/health_and_home_performance.

The World Health Organization released new International Housing and Health Guidelines in December 2018. See: <http://www.who.int/sustainable-development/publications/housing-health-guidelines/en/>

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Healthy Homes Initiative

The Healthy Homes Demonstration Grant Program develops, demonstrates, and promotes cost-effective, preventive measures for identifying and correcting residential health and safety hazards. HUD awards Healthy Homes Demonstration grants to nonprofits, for-profit firms located in the U.S., state and local governments, federally recognized Indian Tribes, and colleges and universities.

Lead Hazard Control Grants

The typical award of \$3 million addresses hazards in several hundred homes and provides needed outreach and capacity-building services. Grants are awarded to states, counties, and cities for lead hazard control in privately-owned, low-income housing. At least 65% of the grant must be used for direct activities such as abatement, interim control, clearance, and risk assessment (and to a limited extent other healthy housing issues). Grantees are required to partner with community groups, typically by awarding sub-grants, and to provide a match of 10% to 25% from local or Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. More than \$1 billion has been awarded since the program started in 1993.

Lead Hazard Reduction Demonstration Grants

This program targets funds for lead hazard control to the nation's highest-risk cities as defined by the prevalence of lead poisoning and the number of pre-1940 rental housing units. Grants may be as high as \$3 million, but 80% of the funds must be spent on direct activities, and HUD requires a 25% local match from local or CDBG funds. High-risk cities can receive demonstration grants in addition to basic lead hazard control grants. HUD now allows a portion of the lead grants to be used for other healthy homes issues.

Healthy Homes and Lead Technical Studies Grants

These grants develop and improve cost-effective methods for evaluating and controlling residential health and safety hazards through a separate competition open to academic and nonprofit institutions, state and local governments, tribes, and for-profit and non-profit organizations.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

The CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, National Asthma Control Program, Environmental Public Health Tracking Network, and the EPA provide complementary programs to HUD's OLHCHH. The EPA provides training and licensing programs and laboratory quality control programs; CDC-funded programs provide surveillance data, education, and outreach on housing related diseases and injuries; and HUD-funded programs remediate homes to remove the health hazards.

For more information on healthy homes work at these and other federal agencies, see <https://nchh.org/who-we-are/nchh-publications/fact-sheets/agency-fact-sheets/>.

CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program

CDC's Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program provides funding to state and local health departments to determine the extent of childhood lead poisoning by screening children

for elevated blood lead levels, helping to ensure that lead-poisoned infants and children receive medical and environmental follow-up, and developing neighborhood-based efforts to prevent childhood lead poisoning (not all states receive these grants).

FUNDING

FY20 enacted budget:

- HUD Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes: \$290 million, including \$50 million for the Healthy Homes Initiative
- CDC Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Program: \$37 million
- CDC National Asthma Control Program: \$30 million
- CDC National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network: \$34 million
- EPA FY20 funding includes approximately \$13 million for programmatic lead work, about \$60 million in grants to states for lead paint and lead in drinking water activities, and about \$24.6 million for radon and indoor air quality.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The FY20 appropriation included \$290 million for HUD's Lead and Healthy Homes Program. The National Safe and Healthy Housing Coalition has requested \$356 million with an intention to advocate for \$606 million for FY21. While the NSHHC agrees with the administration's desire to increase funding for this office in general, the organization suggests that the increase include more funding for the Healthy Homes Program, with this request level-funds at \$45 million. The NSHHC request includes \$100 million for Healthy Homes. Please see this link for updates <https://nchh.org/information-and-evidence/healthy-housing-policy/national/current-nchh-work/federal-appropriations/>.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Many communities have improved the quality of their housing stock through the development of better codes, such as the National Healthy Housing Standard, and proactive code enforcement programs, instead of a complaint-driven process. For example, many housing codes prohibit peeling paint, standing water, chronic moisture, roof and plumbing leaks, and pest infestation. The International Residential Code requires carbon monoxide detectors in new homes with fuel-burning appliances or attached garages. Efforts are underway to require carbon monoxide detectors in existing housing and radon-resistant new construction and to prohibit lead hazards and excessive moisture that leads to mold. Increasing public awareness and concern about other housing-related hazards is fueling new attention to state and local regulation of healthy homes issues. Many communities have also urged strong collaboration between departments of housing, health, and environment; effective utilization of CDC surveillance data to guide HUD programs to families and areas of greatest need; enforcement of EPA requirements; and state Medicaid reimbursement for environmental health services in the homes of lead-exposed children and people with asthma. For example, the State of Michigan recently succeeded in obtaining a Children Health Insurance Amendment to conduct lead paint and lead drinking water pipe mitigation totaling \$160 million. Other states such as Ohio and Maryland have also succeeded in such amendments.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should contact their members of Congress, ask to speak to the person who deals with housing policy, and deliver the message that funding is needed to correct health and safety hazards and lead hazards in homes. Removing leaded drinking water service lines from the homes of children born in 2018 alone would protect more than 350,000 children and yield \$2.7 billion in future benefits, or about \$1.33 per dollar invested. Eradicating lead paint hazards

from older homes of children from low-income families would provide at least \$3.5 billion in future benefits, or approximately \$1.39 per dollar invested, and protect more than 311,000 children born in 2018 alone. For every \$1 spent on home-based asthma control, there is a return on investment of \$5.30 to \$14. Healthy homes interventions prevent injury, neurological and respiratory diseases, cancer, and even death from toxins such as carbon monoxide and radon.

Advocates should use the Healthy Housing Fact Sheets for each state at: <https://nchh.org/who-we-are/nchh-publications/fact-sheets/state-hh-fact-sheets/> and the Healthy Housing Agency Fact Sheets at <https://nchh.org/who-we-are/nchh-publications/fact-sheets/agency-fact-sheets/>.

Advocates should also inform legislators of the following ways through which they can lend support for reducing housing-related health problems:

- Fully fund HUD's Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes Program through which communities can fix homes with health hazards, including lead-based paint problems. This also requires full funding for allied HUD programs, such as the Community Development Block Grants, Public and Indian Housing, Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, and others.
- Fully fund CDC's Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Program so that all states can provide surveillance of children's blood lead levels, promote prevention, and respond to lead-poisoned children.
- Fully fund lead and healthy homes activities at EPA.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Center for Healthy Housing, 410-992-0712, <http://www.nchh.org/>

National Safe and Healthy Housing Coalition, www.nshhcoalition.org

HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, <https://www.hud.gov/lead>

CDC's Healthy Homes and Lead Poisoning Prevention Program, <http://www.cdc.gov/nceh/lead/>

Housing Needs of Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, and Stalking

By Monica McLaughlin, Director of Public Policy and Debbie Fox, MSW, Senior Housing Policy and Practice Specialist, National Network to End Domestic Violence

Administering Agencies: Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for the “Family Violence Prevention and Services Act” (FVPSA) and HUD, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Treasury Department, and the Department of Justice (DOJ)/Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) for housing programs and protections under the “Violence Against Women Act” (VAWA).

Year Started: FVPSA, 1984; VAWA, 1994; VAWA Housing Protections, 2005; HUD Continuum of Care funds, 2018

Number of Persons/Households Served: More than one million survivors and their children are served each year.

Population Targeted: Victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, human trafficking, and stalking (regardless of sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation).

Funding: VAWA Transitional Housing, \$37 million; FVPSA, \$175 million; HUD Domestic Violence Continuum of Care (DV CoC), \$50 million.

HISTORY

FVPSA, which created the first federal funding stream for domestic violence shelters and programs, passed in 1984 and is administered by HHS. VAWA passed in 1994 and was reauthorized in 2000, 2005, and 2013. VAWA created the first federal law to encourage coordinated community responses to address and prevent domestic and sexual violence. Various federal agencies are responsible for VAWA compliance;

housing-related agencies are HUD, USDA, and the Treasury Department.

ISSUE SUMMARY

Domestic violence is consistently identified as a significant factor in homelessness. A staggering 92% of women experiencing homelessness report having experienced severe physical or sexual violence at some point in their lives, and upwards of 50% of all homeless women report that domestic violence was the immediate cause of their homelessness. The intersection of homelessness and domestic violence is compounded for women of color and LGBTQI communities, particularly Native American and African American women. Native American and Alaska Native Women face both a lack of housing and disproportionate rates of violence. African American survivors of violence are disproportionately impacted by discriminatory nuisance ordinances resulting in evictions and homelessness as a result of their victimization. Domestic violence is often life threatening; in the U.S. three women are killed each day by a former or current intimate partner. Advocates and survivors identify housing as a primary need of survivors and a critical component in survivors’ long-term safety and stability.

Although safe housing can give a survivor a pathway to freedom, there are many barriers that prevent survivors from maintaining or obtaining safe and affordable housing. Many survivors have faced economic abuse as part of the violence, meaning that they have not had access to family finances, have been prohibited from working, and have had their credit scores destroyed by the abuser. Survivors often face discrimination in accessing or maintaining housing based on the violent and criminal actions of perpetrators and systemic barriers endemic in housing markets such as racism, sexism, and

family demographics. Additionally, survivors are limited in the locations and types of housing they can access because of their unique safety and confidentiality needs, and many housing/homelessness assistance programs have screening tools and barriers that inadvertently exclude victims of violence. Finally, survivors face common economic barriers, such as unemployment, the lack of affordable housing, living-wage jobs, transportation, safety nets, and childcare options, with additional safety barriers as abusers sabotage their attempts to leave the relationship. As a result, many survivors face the impossible choice between staying with or returning to their abusers or becoming homeless because they cannot find or afford safe, long-term, permanent housing.

Domestic violence programs do their best to serve those in need of emergency, transitional housing, and permanent and supportive housing. Due to a lack of resources, however, every day thousands of abused adults and children are turned away from emergency shelters and denied housing services because programs lack adequate resources and funding. The National Network to End Domestic Violence's [13th Annual Domestic Violence Counts: Census](#) found that, in just one 24-hour period in 2017, almost 7,500 nationwide requests for shelter and housing went unmet.

PROGRAM SUMMARIES

FVPSA shelters and services, the VAWA transitional housing program, and the HUD CoC set-aside are critical components in the effort to reduce homelessness and housing instability among victims of domestic and sexual violence. These essential programs respond to an array of victims' needs, from emergency shelter and transitional housing to permanent housing.

"Family Violence Prevention and Services Act"

FVPSA is administered by HHS. FVPSA created the first and only dedicated federal funding stream for community-based domestic violence programs and shelters. Approximately 1,600 emergency domestic violence shelters and programs across the country rely on FVPSA

to sustain lifesaving support to victims trying to escape violence. The funds are primarily distributed through a state formula grant. In addition to shelter, FVPSA-funded programs provide counseling, legal assistance, crisis intervention, and services for children.

"Violence Against Women Act"

VAWA includes many discretionary grant programs, including the Transitional Housing program administered by OVW. The program distributes grants to more than 225 entities annually across the country on a competitive basis, including states, units of local government, Indian tribes, and other organizations such as domestic violence and sexual assault victim service providers or coalitions, other nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations, and community-based and culturally specific organizations. Transitional housing grants allow entities to offer direct financial assistance for housing and housing-related costs for six to 24 months, operate transitional housing programs, and provide supportive services including advocacy in securing permanent housing. With VAWA Transitional Housing funding, organizations can provide a critical bridge from crisis to stability. The vast majority of VAWA transitional housing participants exit the program to safe, permanent housing.

VAWA, originally passed in 1994 and reauthorized in 2000, 2005, and 2013, created the first federal law to encourage coordinated community responses to combat domestic and sexual violence. The 2005 VAWA reauthorization instituted landmark protections to ensure that victims can access the criminal justice system without facing discrimination or jeopardizing their current or future housing, strengthened confidentiality protections for victims accessing housing and homelessness services, and maintained the transitional housing grant program. The 2013 VAWA reauthorization builds upon the strengths of these housing programs and protections with key improvements.

Victims often face unfair eviction and denial of housing benefits due to the violence and

criminal actions of others. VAWA housing protections prohibit covered housing programs from denying housing or evicting a victim (of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, or stalking) simply because they are victims; allow public housing agencies (PHAs) to prioritize victims for housing when their safety dictates; clarify that Housing Choice Vouchers are portable for victims; and delineate an emergency transfer policy process for victims who face continued threats or violence or who have been sexually assaulted on the premises. The covered federally subsidized housing programs are: public housing, tenant- and project-based Section 8, McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs, the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, the Section 221(d)(3) Below Market Interest Rate Program, the Section 236 program, the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS Program, the Section 202 Supportive Housing for the Elderly Program, the Section 811 Supportive Housing for People with Disabilities Program, USDA Rural Development Housing Properties, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) properties. See “For More Information” for list of implementing documents from HUD and other agencies.

IHUD issued a final rule, the Office of Multifamily Housing and the Office of Public and Indian Housing issued guidance, and the USDA released an Administrative Notice, but Treasury has not issued regulations or guidance on implementation for the LIHTC., [Projections Delayed: State Housing Finance Agency Compliance with the Violence Against Women Act](#) finds that inaction on the part of the Treasury has led to significant state-by-state variation in the implementation of VAWA protections under the LIHTC program. This has a substantial impact on the level of protection afforded to survivors.

VAWA is currently up for reauthorization. Existing statutory protections and HUD rules are essential to providing basic protections for survivors of VAWA crimes, but more must be done to ensure compliance with these requirements and close gaps that leave many survivors without a safe place to live. H.R. 1585 and S. 2843 expand and

amend VAWA’s housing provisions to strengthen protections for survivors of domestic violence from eviction due to any criminal actions of perpetrators, to allow victims to independently establish eligibility for housing assistance when leaving the household of an eligible perpetrator, enhance the emergency transfer process, strengthen compliance and implementation across agencies and providers, and to protect the right to report crime and support effective law enforcement.

Advocates call on HUD to issue guidance for remaining programs, call on the USDA to issue further guidance, and for the Treasury to issue guidance to fully implement the VAWA housing protections for survivors. New regulations, along with on-going training and technical assistance and possible expansions in VAWA reauthorization will help promote more consistent implementation of the protections. HUD and the other administering agencies should strongly enforce VAWA protections, ease the burden on victims to provide documentation, and reduce other barriers that arise when victims assert their rights or simply attempt to remain safe.

The “HEARTH Act” and McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Programs

Domestic violence shelters and housing programs depend on HUD McKinney-Vento funding to operate and provide safe housing and shelter for survivors. HUD’s interim rules on the CoC process and the Emergency Solutions Grants for McKinney-Vento homelessness programs include a number of changes to these programs. Additionally, the CoC funding process has created significant challenges for domestic violence programs and the survivors they serve. Over the course of the last several years, domestic violence housing programs have lost significant funds and in particular, transitional housing resources from the CoC program. In our assessment, the funding cuts are a result of a lack of clear guidance on how to evaluate the efficacy of domestic violence housing and a shift in priority away from transitional housing (without adequate evidence about the efficacy of DV transitional housing). Although the HUD Notice of Funding Availability

(NOFA) includes language encouraging communities to address domestic violence, many communities continue to defund long-standing domestic violence programs. The domestic violence calls for amended funding processes and guidance to ensure that domestic violence housing programs can continue to access these vital funding streams. HUD and the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) have issued guidance and messaging to encourage communities to assess domestic violence programs with safety and housing in mind and have made changes to the funding NOFAs. HUD should be encouraged to align their funding processes with their messaging by awarding points in the NOFA to ensure that domestic violence programs can be competitive and integral partners for the CoC funding and can continue their lifesaving services. The FY18 and FY19 CoC NOFA awarded points to CoCs that demonstrated efforts to address the needs of persons fleeing domestic violence by including victim service providers on CoC boards, offering training on coordinated entry best practices for serving survivors of domestic violence, having safety planning protocols for coordinated entry, and determining the needs of domestic violence and homelessness victims based on data from victim service provider Comparable Databases.

In FY17 and in subsequent NOFAs HUD included the Joint Transitional Housing (TH) and Permanent Housing (PH)-Rapid Rehousing (RRH) component project that allows two existing program models to become a single project to better serve and expand housing options for homeless individuals and families, including individuals or families fleeing domestic violence. The project furthers HUD's message to communities to create high quality projects regardless of component type and states that "transitional housing, rapid re-housing, and permanent supportive housing for survivors each can and should have a place in a community's system as long as these programs meet a need in the community, can show positive safety and housing related outcomes, and provide choice to the people who want these types of programs."

The HUD NOFA highlights compliance with VAWA Final Rule housing protections. The grants awarded under the FY17 NOFA will be the first CoC Program grants required to comply with the VAWA rule 24 CFR 578.99(j)(3). To enable full compliance with this rule, each CoC must establish an emergency transfer plan and make related updates to the written standards for administering CoC program assistance. The FY18 and FY19 HUD NOFA included \$50 million in additional funds to support projects serving victims of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking with a \$50 million set aside for Rapid Rehousing (RRH) or Joint Component (TH-RRH) Coordinated Entry Supportive Service Only projects. These resources provide critical support for CoCs to address the housing needs of survivors in their homelessness system of care coordinated entry and housing response. The funds would complement existing CoC funds and allow communities to invest in population specific housing for survivors and rebuild programs' stability after they were defunded.

Finally, the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV) endorses the "Help End Abusive Living Situation (HEALS) Act," which would help ensure that survivors' unique housing needs are met through HUD and community investment in tailored housing programs.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

"Violence Against Women Act"

Advocates can play a key role in promoting safe housing for victims of domestic and sexual violence by encouraging consistent implementation of VAWA housing protections in local jurisdictions. Housing advocates should work in partnership with domestic violence advocates to familiarize themselves with VAWA housing protections, improve advocacy for individuals, and improve PHAs' policies and procedures. Domestic violence advocates can train PHA staff, hearing officers, Section 8 owners, resident groups and other stakeholders of covered housing programs on VAWA implementation and the dynamics of domestic violence. PHAs should be encouraged

to institute a preference for victims when making admission decisions. Advocates must also get involved with their PHA's planning process to ensure that victims' needs are addressed and that VAWA housing protections are adequately communicated to consumers.

HEARTH

Implementation of the "HEARTH Act" and related funding decisions must reflect and respond to victims' serious safety needs and their desperate need for housing. Performance measures, evaluation, confidentiality, data collection, and more have an impact on funding decisions and ultimately on victims' access to safe housing. Implementation and funding decisions must support the unique role that domestic violence service providers play in meeting victims' specific needs. Communities must ensure that they have "HEARTH Act" funded domestic violence housing and shelter available. Each community should ensure that victim advocates are significantly involved in all homelessness resource planning.

Communities should use guidance from HUD and USICH to help support funding for domestic violence programs. In 2015, HUD, OVW, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the FVPSA at HHS launched the Domestic Violence and Housing Technical Assistance Consortium (DVHTAC) to better address the critical housing needs of victims of domestic violence and their children. The Consortium aims to foster increased collaboration among domestic violence and homeless service providers and provide national training, technical assistance, and resource development on domestic violence and housing. Communities are encouraged to contact the DVHTAC to address specific needs around implementation of HEARTH (see www.safehousingpartnerships.org).

FUNDING

Maintaining funding for FVPSA and VAWA programs and the \$50 million in DV funds at the CoC is critical to ending domestic and sexual violence and homelessness. When adequately funded, these acts help to reduce the societal

cost of domestic and sexual violence. In fact, by supporting critical services for victims, VAWA saved \$12.6 billion in net averted social costs in its first six years alone. Despite their lifesaving potential and efficacy, these programs are woefully underfunded; there is a serious gap caused by a lack of available resources. It is unacceptable that victims fleeing violence should be turned away from emergency shelters because the programs are full. Victims who must wait in emergency shelter for an available housing unit remain unstable, while other victims in crisis cannot access shelter.

FY20 funding levels include \$37 million for VAWA transitional housing and \$175 million for FVPSA, and \$50 million for the DV Bonus set aside in the CoC funds. In FY21, advocates should call on Congress to provide \$200 million for FVPSA and maintain funding for VAWA programs and the CoC funds, with special emphasis on ensuring funds are allocated to domestic violence programs.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should tell members of Congress why emergency shelter, transitional housing, and permanent housing are essential for survivors of domestic and sexual violence. Housing providers should talk about the victims that programs serve and about the struggles that programs face in meeting survivors' unique needs for safety. Advocates should share the latest information about the pervasive scarcity of emergency and transitional housing, and of safe, affordable long-term housing in their communities.

For these federal laws and programs to realize their full potential in meeting survivors' housing needs, program funding must be increased to its authorized level, new and existing VAWA housing protections must be fully implemented, and "HEARTH Act" funding and implementation must address survivors' needs.

Specifically, advocates should ask the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to maintain targeted investments in domestic violence shelter and housing programs including:

- In the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations bill, \$37 million for VAWA Transitional Housing.
- In the Labor, Health and Human Services Appropriations bill, \$200 million for FVPSA/ domestic violence shelters.
- In the Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development (THUD) bill, support \$50 million designated for domestic violence housing and encourage CoC and Emergency Solutions Grants funding processes to reflect the needs of victims of domestic violence.

Advocates should tell their senators and representatives to include improvements to the housing protections in the “Violence Against Women Act” (VAWA) (S. 2843) and pass the “HEALS Act,” which will help communities better meet the needs of homeless survivors of domestic violence.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Network to End Domestic Violence, 202-543-5566, www.nnedv.org/census.

NNEDV Tools on Confidentiality, <https://www.techsafety.org/confidentiality>.

NNEDV Toolkit on Housing for Domestic Violence Survivors (includes comments on HUD interim rules), <https://nnedv.org/content/housing/>.

DVHTAC: To learn more about expanding safe housing options for domestic and sexual violence survivors, please visit www.SafeHousingPartnerships.org, a website of the Domestic Violence and Housing Technical Assistance Consortium (DVHTAC). Members: NNEDV; National Alliance for Safe Housing <https://www.nationalallianceforsafehousing.org/>; National Resource Center on Domestic Violence www.VAWnet.org (search housing); CSI, Inc. <http://www.collaborative-solutions.net/>.

The HUD Final rule on VAWA <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-11-16/pdf/2016-25888.pdf>.

The HUD notice on the applicability of VAWA to HUD programs, issued August 6, 2013, <https://www.federalregister.gov/>

[documents/2016/11/16/2016-25888/violence-against-women-reauthorization-act-of-2013-implementation-in-hud-housing-programs](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2016-11-16/pdf/2016-25888.pdf).

Multifamily Owners and Management Agents VAWA guidance <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/17-05HSGN.PDF>.

PIH “Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013” guidance <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/PIH-2017-08VAWRA2013.PDF>.

SNAPS In-Focus on [Addressing the Needs of Domestic Violence Survivors](#).

USICH Guide to [Reviewing Domestic Violence Transitional Housing Programs](#).

USICH – [Domestic Violence Service Providers are Key Partners in Preventing and Ending Homelessness](#).

VAWA 2013 Resources, National Housing Law Project, 510-251-9400, www.nhlp.org.

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 202-638-2535, www.nlchp.org.


Inclusionary Housing Policies

By Stephanie Reyes, State & Local Policy Manager, Grounded Solutions Network

As housing prices rise, so does the value of land. Inclusionary policies seek to capture a portion of the increased land value for affordable housing by requiring or incentivizing developers to include affordable units in developments that would otherwise be entirely market-rate. In this way, inclusionary housing policies tie the creation of affordable homes for low- and moderate-income households to the construction of market-rate housing or commercial development. In its simplest form, an inclusionary housing program might require developers to sell or rent 10 to 20% of new residential units to lower-income residents.

Scholars like Richard Rothstein have detailed the long history of race-based housing policies and practices in the United States. For example, exclusionary zoning practices (e.g. low-density zoning permitting only for-sale single-family homes) exacerbated economic and racial segregation by preventing developers from building naturally lower-cost homes and apartments, like small houses, duplexes, or apartment buildings.

Inclusionary housing, although not intended to completely right racial injustices embedded in our nation's housing practices, can provide an immediate supply of affordable housing for households earning below median income in neighborhoods already rich with services and amenities. As research from Raj Chetty at [Opportunity Insights](#) shows, upward mobility within a person's lifetime is highly dependent on where they reside. Providing safe housing in neighborhoods with access to better schools, food, and transportation is one key step to addressing racial disparities in health and wealth.



Source: Grounded Solutions Network Inclusionary Housing Database (based on a survey conducted in 2016 and database updates thereafter). For more information about the database, visit the [Inclusionary Housing Database Map](#).

HISTORY

Inclusionary housing policies have existed for nearly half a century. Fairfax County, Virginia, which has the oldest policy in the U.S., passed its first inclusionary zoning ordinance in 1971. Montgomery County, Maryland, established its Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit program in 1974. Since then, more than 1,540 inclusionary housing programs have been adopted by over 900 jurisdictions across 31 states and the District of Columbia. Jurisdictions with inclusionary housing programs are found predominantly in New Jersey, Massachusetts, and California, where state laws incentivize or require localities to create a definable share of affordable housing.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Inclusionary housing programs generally rely on local governments' power to regulate land use. While the right of zoning power granted to governments has been established and upheld for generations, this is still a rapidly evolving area of law. Recent federal court decisions have limited zoning power in ways that do not prohibit inclusionary housing programs but can influence how they are designed.

In addition to federal legal considerations, state law can impact the design of inclusionary housing in significant ways. For instance, in some states there are statutory limitations on local policies that control rents on private property. In a subset of those states, such laws have been interpreted by courts as rendering mandatory inclusionary policies for rental housing illegal. A few states have adopted legislation that either explicitly permits or preempts (prohibits or limits) local inclusionary housing policies. States also have different legal frameworks regarding municipal authority to enact local legislation; these differences in municipal authority also impact the ability of local jurisdictions to adopt inclusionary housing policies.

The [Inclusionary Housing Map and Program Database](#) summarizes the state legal framework relevant to local inclusionary housing policies for each of the 50 states.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

No two inclusionary housing policies are exactly the same. Policymakers in each community must consider several distinct questions. Key policy design questions include: Will the policy be mandatory or voluntary? Will it apply city-wide or only to certain geographies or neighborhoods? What household income levels should be served to address housing needs and racial disparities in the community? Will developers be offered incentives to help offset the cost of compliance? Will there be alternative methods of compliance beyond building the affordable units on site?

Every policy addresses each of these questions, though the specific answers differ considerably from place to place depending on local conditions. More details on these policy considerations can be found [here](#).


PROGRAM CONSIDERATIONS

Passing a policy is only the first step in making inclusionary housing successful. Inclusionary housing programs cannot be successful unless they are well run and adequately staffed, and they must secure sufficient funding for ongoing administrative costs. Communities also need to be able to track program data in order to evaluate outcomes and make needed changes over time. Key program elements include supporting builders to comply with policy, monitoring rental units, and stewarding homeownership units.

Program implementation is also where some of the most powerful steps can be taken to advance racial equity. For example, programs can set strong marketing requirements for inclusionary housing units,

require developers to select tenants based on a lottery system rather than first come/first served, and limit the reasons that property owners may deny applications for inclusionary housing units (e.g. limit use of eviction and/or criminal record reviews).

More details on program implementation can be found [here](#).



FORECAST FOR 2020

At the local level, inclusionary housing policies tend to be popular when the housing market is strong (i.e., housing prices are high and there is sufficient new housing construction). However, there is usually a delay from the time at which an inclusionary housing policy is first considered to the time it is adopted, which can sometimes mean that by the time a policy is adopted the housing market may already have begun to turn down. This is one of many reasons it may make sense to adopt an inclusionary housing policy before the market heats up. More communities with mixed housing markets, like Detroit and Minneapolis, have recently adopted inclusionary housing policies. Inclusionary housing is also appealing during periods of low federal and state funding because it leverages the profitability of new development to pay for affordable housing without significant public subsidy.

At the state level, there has been an increasing trend toward state preemption of local inclusionary housing policies, with Tennessee and Wisconsin passing new laws preempting inclusionary housing in

2018 and Florida passing a new law limiting inclusionary housing in 2019. Advocates for local policies in states without a history of inclusionary housing policies should assess the potential risk of triggering a preemptive backlash at the state level.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The article [Ten Ways to Talk About Inclusionary Housing Differently](#) from the Grounded Solutions Network offers tips to help communicate about inclusionary housing in ways that circumvent common misperceptions and create a new narrative for policymakers in moderate markets and more conservative political climates.

Some of the key benefits of inclusionary housing that may be compelling to legislators include:

1. **Sharing the benefits of growth.** As housing and land costs increase, a relatively small number of landowners receive most of the benefit while, often, the lowest-income residents bear much of the burden in the form of higher rents and displacement pressure. Inclusionary housing leverages the profitability of new development to pay for new affordable housing units and supports the creation of more economically diverse and inclusive communities.
2. **Economic integration.** Inclusionary housing policies were first developed to specifically counteract a history of exclusionary zoning policies that reinforced economic and racial segregation. A wealth of recent research has convincingly demonstrated that concentrated poverty is a cause of many of the worst social problems and is especially damaging to children. Inclusionary housing has been successful in creating sustainable mixed-income communities.
3. **Conservation of scarce public resources.** Public funding for housing has been declining for decades, and in the current political climate, will probably continue to shrink. New affordable housing development can require over \$200,000 of local investment per unit. Inclusionary housing is one of the few ways to create reasonably priced housing without significant public subsidy. Jurisdictions can adopt inclusionary housing without draining the general fund.

Policymakers are often concerned that inclusionary housing requirements will become a barrier to housing development. While there is not much evidence of this outcome occurring at any significant level in real programs, this is an appropriate concern that plays a central role in the debate whenever any community considers affordable housing requirements.

There is evidence that it is possible to set affordable housing requirements so high that they prevent developers from wanting to build or landowners from wanting to sell. If this happens it can result in a reduced supply of housing and ultimately higher housing prices. However, data suggest that programs that provide incentives and flexibility can successfully require significant affordable housing without any impact on market supply or prices. [Economic feasibility analyses](#) can analyze the extent to which local market-rate housing development projects can realistically support a set-aside of lower cost units without slowing or deterring construction.

Policymakers may also be concerned that the costs of inclusionary housing requirements will be passed on to market-rate renters and homeowners. This is unlikely to happen for two reasons:

1. **Market rate is market rate.** Developers can't "pass along" the costs of inclusionary housing policies to market-rate renters and buyers because those renters and buyers will only pay what the market will bear. If developers and property owners could charge more, they would already be doing so.
2. **The costs of inclusionary housing requirements are generally borne by landowners.** One common concern is that if affordable housing requirements are set too high, developers may not be able to make sufficient profits and will choose not to build or to build in another community with fewer

requirements. But because landowners can't move to another community, they will have to lower land prices to attract developers, meaning that landowners are the ones whose profits ultimately drop.

[This page](#), [Will Inclusionary Housing Prevent Development?](#), addresses these concerns in more detail and includes an easy-to-understand video.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

[InclusionaryHousing.org](https://inclusionaryhousing.org).

[Inclusionary Housing Map and Program Database](https://inclusionaryhousing.org/map/) (<https://inclusionaryhousing.org/map/>).

[Inclusionary Housing Calculator](https://inclusionaryhousing.org/calculator/) (<https://inclusionaryhousing.org/calculator/>).

Manufactured Housing

By Doug Ryan, Senior Fellow, Prosperity Now and Lance George, Director of Research & Information, Housing Assistance Council

Manufactured homes are an often overlooked and maligned component of our nation's housing stock, but these homes are an important source of housing for millions of Americans, especially those with low incomes and in rural areas. Although the physical quality of manufactured housing continues to progress, the basic delivery system of how these homes are sold, financed, and managed is still in need of improvement to ensure that they are a viable and quality source of affordable housing.

ISSUE SUMMARY

There are approximately 6.7 million occupied manufactured homes in the U.S., comprising about 6% of the nation's housing stock. More than half of all manufactured homes are located in rural areas around the country. New manufactured housing accounts for about 10% of all new single-family housing starts. Although the demographics of manufactured housing are changing, lower-income households are still the primary residents of manufactured homes. Modern manufactured homes have their origins in the automobile and recreational travel trailer industry, but factory-built dwellings produced today are more comparable in quality and safety to conventionally constructed single-family homes. It is equally important to recognize the existing stock of older manufactured or mobile homes. An estimated one-fifth of currently occupied manufactured homes were built before 1980. These older units are likely to be smaller, less safe, and have fewer amenities and less investment potential than newer manufactured homes. The adoption of the HUD Code (see below) in 1976 and subsequent updates have significantly improved this housing type.

Affordability and convenience make manufactured homes a popular housing option. The average sales price of a new manufactured home in 2018 was \$78,500 (excluding land costs); much less compared to an average of \$297,747 for a newly constructed single-family home and approximately \$183,647 for an existing site-built home (see the U.S. Census Bureau's *Manufactured Homes Survey* and *Characteristics of New Housing*, along with the National Association of Realtors' *Median Sales Price of Existing Homes*). Manufactured homes cost about half of what site-built homes cost per square foot, though transportation and onsite work slightly increase the final costs. Even though the purchase price of manufactured homes can be relatively affordable, financing them may not. The majority of manufactured homes are still financed with personal property, or chattel loans (see the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's *Manufactured Housing Consumer-Finance in the United States*). With shorter terms and higher interest rates, personal property loans are generally less beneficial for consumers than conventional mortgage financing. Chattel loans do, however, typically have lower closing costs and can close faster than conventional mortgages. Approximately 66% of manufactured home loans in 2018 were classified as high cost (having a substantially high interest rate) which is more than five times the level of high cost lending for all homes nationally according to the Housing Assistance Council Tabulations of 2018 "Home Mortgage Disclosure Act" data. For the first time, new data from the 2018 "Home Mortgage Disclosure Act" allows for a greater understanding of how specific manufactured home characteristics impact consumer lending rates and affordability. Borrowers whose loan was secured by both the unit and land on which the home is placed had a lower rate of high cost lending at about 48%. Conversely, manufactured home borrowers whose loan was secured by the manufactured home only (i.e. chattel loan) had a staggering 90% high cost loan rate. Some factors,

such as the low-dollar nature of chattel loans, do factor into their higher costs. Manufactured homes are typically sold at retail sales centers. In some cases, dealers resort to unscrupulous sales and financing tactics, trapping consumers into unaffordable loans (*The Mobile Home Trap: How a Warren Buffett Empire Preys on the Poor*).

A significant portion of manufactured and mobile homes are located in community or park settings, though this is becoming less common. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2018, approximately 37% of new manufactured homes were sited in such settings. Estimates suggest that approximately 40% of all manufactured homes are in an estimated 45,000 to 50,000 land lease communities. Though about three quarters of manufactured homes are owner-occupied, the sector has a history of being placed on rented land and therefore manufactured homes have a pattern of land tenure status that is unique to this form of housing. In manufactured home communities, many residents own their homes and rent the land, which can devalue the asset. Ownership of land is an important component to nearly every aspect of manufactured housing, ranging from quality to assets and wealth accumulation. Residents who do not have control over the land on which their home is placed often have reduced legal protections than other homeowners. Other common concerns faced by tenants of manufactured home communities include excessive rent increases, poor park management and maintenance, restrictive rules, and restricted access to municipal services. For these and other reasons, alternative park ownership models, such as resident, nonprofit, and government ownership are gaining traction.

WHAT ADVOCATES SHOULD KNOW

Federal Resources for Affordable Manufactured Housing

Manufactured housing is largely financed in the private marketplace. However, there are several existing federal resources that support the development, financing, and rehabilitation of affordable manufactured housing, such

as HUD-HOME, USDA Rural Development, Veterans Affairs, and Weatherization funds. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are increasing their manufactured home loan offerings.

High-Quality Manufactured Housing

Once shunned by nonprofit housing developers, manufactured homes are now seen as options for infill, new developments, and other settings. Much of this progress is attributable to a growing and innovative group of advocates who challenged assumptions and convention about developing and preserving manufactured housing. Across the nation, several organizations and initiatives are utilizing manufactured homes to provide and maintain affordable housing. These efforts avoid the pitfalls of traditional dealer-based manufactured housing purchase and finance, and investor ownership of communities.

The HUD Code

An important factor in the designation of a manufactured home is whether the unit was built before or after June 15, 1976. This date marked the implementation of the “Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Act” (42 U.S.C. Sections 5401-5426) regulating the construction of manufactured homes and commonly referred to as the “HUD code.” HUD developed and administers the code that implements the statute. These federal standards regulate manufactured housing design and construction, strength and durability, transportability, fire resistance, and energy efficiency. The HUD code evolves over time and has undergone several major modifications since 1976. In 2018, HUD launched an effort to revise various regulations and other guidance governing the HUD Code.

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY ACTIONS

Duty to Serve

The “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008” mandates that Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac (the government sponsored enterprises, or GSEs) have a duty to serve underserved markets. Manufactured housing was identified

in the act as one of three underserved markets along with rural areas and housing preservation. Under the act, the GSEs will increase mortgage investments and improve the distribution of capital available for mortgage financing in these markets. In 2016, the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) issued a final rule on the duty to serve requirements. In a change from the initial and proposed rule, FHFA will now consider personal property or chattel loans for duty to serve credit on a pilot basis. 2019 was the second year of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac's three-year underserved markets plans. Both GSEs have launched new mortgage products for manufactured housing and new multifamily loan products for communities, including ones targeted to resident-owned communities and a loan program with required lease protections for residents. The Enterprises are currently developing their next three-year plans.

2019 Appropriations - "Minibus - HR 1865"

The appropriations bill that funded HUD for FY 2020 includes language from the HUD "Manufactured Housing Modernization Act of 2019." This requires HUD to "issue guidelines to jurisdictions on how to assess the potential inclusion of manufactured homes in a community's comprehensive housing and affordability strategy and community development plans." This will raise the profile of manufactured housing as part of a local community's affordable housing market as it decides priorities for federal housing funds.

The "Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act"

In 2018, the president signed into law S. 2155, which includes a provision on manufactured home loans. The statute amends the "Truth in Lending Act" (TILA) to specify that a retailer of manufactured housing is generally not considered a mortgage originator. The provision was not supported by affordable housing advocates on the grounds that it lessens already weak consumer protections in the manufactured housing market.

The "Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act" (PL 111-203)

Enacted in 2010, Dodd-Frank revised TILA to establish specific protections for mortgage loans, origination activities, and high-cost lending. These provisions enhance consumer protections for purchasers of manufactured homes. Dodd-Frank also directs the newly created Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to supervise manufactured housing finance activities. S. 2155 (above) modifies one provision of Dodd-Frank.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak to lawmakers with the message that:

- Manufactured homeowners should be provided opportunities to obtain standard mortgage lending instead of the more prevalent personal property loans.
- Borrowers with personal property loans should be afforded consumer protections consistent with real property or standard mortgage loans.
- Legislation should be enacted that limits predatory lending practices involving manufactured homes.
- Policies and programs should be enacted to facilitate manufactured housing community preservation, such as protection from community sales, closures, and predatory rent increases. Residents should be properly notified and given first right of refusal on the sale of their community.
- Improved data collection for manufactured homes should be incorporated into publicly available data resources such as the "Home Mortgage Disclosure Act," The American Community Survey, and the American Housing Survey. Manufactured home data should indicate property status (personal property or real property) and location information indicating whether the unit is located in a manufactured home community or on a scattered site lot. The inclusion of these updated and enhanced manufactured

home data would provide a much more complete assessment of manufactured housing.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Prosperity Now's I'M HOME Network: 202-409-9788, <https://prosperitynow.org/get-involved/im-home>.

The Housing Assistance Council: 202-824-8600, <http://www.ruralhome.org/>.

Rural Data Portal: <http://www.ruraldataportal.org/>.

Manufactured Homes by County (Interactive Map): <http://bit.ly/1KDssyX>.

High Cost Manufactured Home Loans by County (Interactive Map): <http://bit.ly/14QHVLk>

Next Step: <https://nextstepus.org/>.

ROC USA: 603-856-0246 <http://www.rocusa.org>.

National Consumer Law Center: 202-452-6352 <http://www.nclc.org/issues/manufactured-housing.html>.

National Manufactured Homeowners Association: <http://www.nmhoa.org/>.

Olmstead Implementation

By Kevin Martone, Executive Director,
Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc.

INTRODUCTION

June 22, 2019 marked the twentieth anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *Olmstead v. LC*. The lawsuit against the State of Georgia questioned the state’s continued confinement of two individuals with disabilities in a state institution after it had been determined that they were ready to return to the community. The court described Georgia’s actions as “unjustified isolation” and determined that Georgia had violated these individuals’ rights under the “Americans with Disabilities Act” (ADA). Because of the *Olmstead* decision, many states are now in the process of: (1) implementing “*Olmstead* Plans” that expand community-based supports, including new integrated permanent supportive housing opportunities; (2) implementing *Olmstead*-related settlement agreements that require thousands of new integrated permanent supportive housing opportunities to be created in conjunction with the expansion of community-based services and supports; or 3) implementing other related activities, such as Medicaid reform, that will increase the ability of individuals to succeed in integrated, community-based settings.

ADMINISTRATION

The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) is the federal agency charged with enforcing ADA and *Olmstead* compliance. Other federal agencies, including HUD and Health and Human Services (HHS), have funding, regulatory, and enforcement roles related to the ADA and *Olmstead*. Protection and Advocacy (P&A) agencies in each state are federally authorized and also have legal, administrative, and other appropriate remedies to protect and advocate for the rights of individuals with disabilities.

HISTORY

In its 1999 decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, the Supreme Court found that the institutionalization of persons with disabilities who were ready to return to the community was a violation of Title II of the ADA. In its decision, the court found that indiscriminate institutional placement of persons who can handle and benefit from community settings perpetuates unwarranted assumptions that persons so isolated are incapable or unworthy of participating in community life. The court also found that confinement in an institution severely diminishes everyday life activities, including “family relations, social contacts, work options, economic independence, educational advancement, and cultural enrichment.”

The court was careful to say that the responsibility of states to provide health care in the community was “not boundless.” States were not required to close institutions, nor were they to use homeless shelters as community placements. The court said that compliance with the ADA could be achieved if a state could demonstrate that it had a “comprehensive and effectively working plan” for assisting people living in “restrictive settings,” including a waiting list that moved at a “reasonable pace not controlled by the state’s endeavors to keep its institutions fully populated.”

Historically, community integration was achieved by moving people out of large, state-run institutions into community settings (deinstitutionalization). In recent years, there has been increasing scrutiny on ways that certain types of large, congregate residential settings in the community are restrictive, have characteristics of an institutional nature, and are inconsistent with the intent of the ADA and *Olmstead*. Such facilities are known by a variety of names (e.g., adult care homes, residential care facilities, boarding homes, nursing homes, assisted living), but share similar characteristics,

including a large number of residents primarily with disabilities, insufficient or inadequate services, restrictions on personal affairs, and housing that is contingent upon compliance with services.

Since *Olmstead*, several states have been threatened with litigation by DOJ or P&A's for over-reliance on such facilities and insufficient community-based services that place people at risk of institutionalization and are now implementing settlement agreements to correct for these issues. These states include Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Hampshire, and North Carolina. Other states, for example, Mississippi and New York, opted to defend themselves in trial. Both states were found to be in violation of the ADA (note: on appeal, the New York case was overturned because the court found that the plaintiffs lacked standing. However, the state subsequently entered into a settlement with DOJ rather than re-litigate the case).

Advocacy groups and potential litigants are now also examining the lack of integrated employment opportunities in an *Olmstead* context. For example, settlement agreements now exist in Rhode Island and Oregon regarding persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities unnecessarily segregated in “sheltered workshops” and related day activity service programs.

SUMMARY

Although the current administration rescinded guidance on *Olmstead* and employment services, the 2011 DOJ *Statement of the Department of Justice on Enforcement of the Integration Mandate of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Olmstead v. L.C.* that defines integrated and segregated settings remains.

DOJ defines the most integrated setting as:

“a setting that enables individuals with disabilities to interact with nondisabled persons to the fullest extent possible. Integrated settings are those that provide individuals with disabilities opportunities

to live, work, and receive services in the greater community, just like individuals without disabilities. Integrated settings are located in mainstream society; offer access to community activities and opportunities at times, frequencies, and with persons of an individual's choosing; afford individuals choice in their daily life activities; and, provide individuals with disabilities the opportunity to interact with nondisabled persons to the fullest extent possible. Evidence-based practices that provide scattered-site housing with supportive services are examples of integrated settings. By contrast, segregated settings often have qualities of an institutional nature. Segregated settings include, but are not limited to: (1) congregate settings populated exclusively or primarily with individuals with disabilities; (2) congregate settings characterized by regimentation in daily activities, lack of privacy or autonomy, policies limiting visitors, or limits on individuals' ability to engage freely in community activities and to manage their own activities of daily living; or (3) settings that provide for daytime activities primarily with other individuals with disabilities.”

States with *Olmstead* litigation or settlement agreements, as well as states trying to comply with *Olmstead* through proactive strategies, are working to expand access to integrated permanent supportive housing opportunities for people with significant and long-term disabilities. *Olmstead*-related settlement agreements typically require significant numbers of new permanent supportive housing opportunities. It is important to note, however, that several of these states are struggling to meet supportive housing compliance targets due to lack of resources for housing assistance and services.

Housing affordability is a critical issue for states working to comply with ADA requirements because most people with disabilities living in restrictive settings qualify for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) payments that average only 20% of median

income nationally. The Technical Assistance Collaborative's biannual Priced Out reports repeatedly demonstrate that in no housing market in the country can an individual on SSI afford the fair market rent. As federal housing assistance is so competitive, several states have created or expanded state-funded rental subsidies directly related to their *Olmstead* efforts (see <http://www.tacinc.org/knowledge-resources/publications/reports/state-funded-housing-assistance-report/> and <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/cityscape/vol20num2/ch4.pdf>). These state rental subsidies are typically designed as “bridge” subsidies to help people until a permanent HUD subsidy can be obtained, but often come at the expense of funding that could have been used for other necessary services.

In June of 2013, HUD issued *Olmstead* guidance to provide information on *Olmstead*, to clarify how HUD programs can assist state and local *Olmstead* efforts, and to encourage housing providers to support *Olmstead* implementation by increasing integrated housing opportunities for people with disabilities. HUD's guidance emphasizes that people with disabilities should have choice and self-determination in housing and states that “HUD is committed to offering individuals with disabilities housing options that enable them to make meaningful choices about housing, health care, and long-term services and supports so they can participate fully in community life.”

HUD also advises that, “For communities that have historically relied heavily on institutional settings or housing built exclusively and primarily for individuals with disabilities, the need for additional integrated housing options scattered through the community becomes more acute.” HUD 504 regulations require that HUD and its grantees/housing providers administer their programs and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of individuals covered by the ADA. HUD's guidance does not change the requirements for any existing HUD program, but points out that requests for disability-specific tenant selection “remedial” preferences may be approved by

HUD's Office of General Counsel if they are related to *Olmstead* implementation.

OLMSTEAD ACTIVITY IN 2019

Olmstead activity continued in several states in 2019. Key highlights from across the country are described below:

- Following a trial in Mississippi federal court, U.S. District Court Judge Carlton Reeves issued a decision in 2019 that the State of Mississippi is violating the civil rights of persons with disabilities. The USDOJ was able to prove that the state relied on institutional care for too many people who could be served in integrated community-based settings if the services existed. It is expected that the court will issue an order in 2020 that the state will have to comply with expanding community-based services and integrated housing opportunities.
- The state of New York defended itself in court this past summer against litigation filed by a transitional adult home (TAH). TAHs are congregate facilities with a certified bed capacity of 80 beds or more in which 25% or more of the resident population are persons with serious mental illness. Consistent with its *Olmstead* settlement and plan, the state issued the regulation to minimize the number of people with SMI living in segregated settings populated primarily by people with SMI. The state is currently implementing a 2013 settlement with DOJ to move persons with SMI from TAH's to supported housing. The TAH alleged that the state is violating the fair housing rights of people with SMI by limiting the number of people with SMI who can live in a transitional adult home. A decision is expected in early 2020.
- For the twentieth anniversary of the Supreme Court decision, the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC) facilitated an *Olmstead* symposium in March 2019 to address the incarceration of persons with mental illness. TAC convened top civil rights attorneys, national associations, and stakeholders from around the country to discuss the issue within

an *Olmstead* context and issued a report with recommendations for public entities to address criminalization in *Olmstead* planning.

- HUD continues to implement roughly \$400 million for the Section 811 Mainstream Voucher program and \$82.6 million for the Section 811 program that was budgeted in federal fiscal year 2018. This significant investment of resources for people with disabilities should produce roughly 50,000 new affordable housing opportunities for people with disabilities and aligns with states' *Olmstead* efforts. Information about both the Mainstream Voucher and the Section 811 programs are available elsewhere in this Guide.
- Nebraska is in the process of completing its first *Olmstead* plan. Nebraska's legislature passed a law in 2016 requiring state agencies to develop a cross disability *Olmstead* plan by December 2019.
- Several states continued to implement settlement agreements in 2019, including Connecticut, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, New York, New Hampshire, and North Carolina.
- The successful CMS Money Follows the Person (MFP) Program that provides enhanced federal matching funds to help persons with disabilities and seniors transition from institutions to community settings is set to expire on December 31, 2019. MFP has helped 90,000 people in 44 states between 2007 and 2018. As of writing, reauthorization by Congress is not yet final. Twenty percent of MFP states will have exhausted their current funds by the end of 2019, and most of the remaining states are expected to do so during 2020. Over one-third of MFP states identified a range of services that they expect to discontinue if federal funding expires, with community transition services most often cited. States also expect that they will not be able to maintain staff and activities focused on enrollee outreach and community housing,

which are financed with enhanced federal matching funds.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Title II of the ADA is the law, upheld by the Supreme Court in *Olmstead v. L.C.* The recent ruling in the Mississippi *Olmstead* case reinforces the obligation of states and other public entities to ensure that individuals with disabilities live in the most integrated settings possible. Complying with *Olmstead* is not a one-time exercise, and states need to plan and implement integration strategies actively. Most *Olmstead* activity will continue to occur in states with active settlement agreements or litigation, but all states should be engaging in *Olmstead* activities. These activities include expanding PSH and services such as Assertive Community Treatment (ACT), community support services, supported employment, and integrated treatment. Other activities might include implementation of Home and Community Based Services transition plans, HUD Section 811 Project Rental Assistance, Money Follows the Person programs, state strategic supportive housing plans, Medicaid high cost utilizer cost savings initiatives, and local Continuum of Care supportive housing initiatives for the chronically homeless.

Key states to watch in 2020 include Mississippi, Nebraska, Minnesota, Georgia, New York, Illinois, North Carolina, and New Hampshire. In Mississippi, the court will be issuing a ruling on the remedy to correct for violations of the ADA and *Olmstead*. Georgia's settlement, after several amendments, was scheduled to expire in 2018 but the court monitor has not found the state compliant yet. Minnesota has an updated plan and is proactively working on *Olmstead*, and Nebraska will be implementing its first *Olmstead* plan. The pending decision in the New York transitional adult home case will affect the state's ability to regulate the density of persons with SMI living in segregated settings.

Housing affordability remains a crisis heading into 2020, especially for persons with disabilities in extremely low-income households. However, the FY17 and FY18 federal budgets included

funds for new HUD Mainstream Vouchers and Section 811 Project Rental Assistance creating roughly 50,000 new affordable housing opportunities for extremely low-income people with disabilities over the next couple of years. public housing agencies (PHAs) will administer the vouchers and will be required to work with service providers to ensure that tenants can access needed services. Providers and advocates should be working with PHA's to ensure that these vouchers are implemented effectively. PHA's that have been awarded vouchers can be found on HUD's [website](#). This new housing assistance can certainly support state *Olmstead* efforts.

STAKEHOLDER ACTIONS WITH POLICY MAKERS

Stakeholders should educate elected officials and policy makers on their obligations under the ADA and Olmstead. States and other public entities are legally obligated to ensure that all individuals with disabilities have the civil right to live and work in integrated, community-based settings. With access to housing assistance and comprehensive health care services and supports, people with mental illness, intellectual or developmental disabilities, and physical or sensory disabilities can live and thrive in the community. There is a growing body of research that links access to safe, decent housing and adequate health care to positive health outcomes with reduced health care costs. Conversely, individuals with unstable housing and inadequate health care are often high utilizers of costly services and likely to have poor health outcomes. Reducing federal support for housing and health care may provide initial budgetary relief, but will end up swelling costs overall by increasing uncompensated health care, increasing unnecessary reliance on nursing facilities, further stressing the criminal justice and child welfare systems, and adding to homelessness in communities.

Stakeholders should also encourage national and state organizations to ensure that Olmstead is leveraged as a policy priority that can strengthen

arguments to increase affordable housing and community-based services. Reinforcing the HUD Mainstream Voucher and Section 811 PRA programs will create new affordable housing opportunities, and advocacy around the MFP program should continue into 2020. Groups such as state P&A organizations and other legal rights groups can provide leverage with state agencies to comply with Olmstead, and initiate litigation against states when necessary. For information on state protection and advocacy networks, see the National Disability Rights Network at <https://www.ndrn.org/>.

States are increasingly recognizing the benefits of integrated physical and behavioral health care for individuals with multiple chronic conditions and are beginning to include tenancy support services into their Medicaid programs. Stakeholders should work with their state Medicaid agencies to include these service delivery strategies into their Medicaid program so that people with disabilities have access to services that can help them maintain their housing and succeed in integrated, community-based settings.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc. (TAC), 617-266-5657, www.tacinc.org.

Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure

By Kimberly Johnson, Policy Analyst,
NLIHC

Administering Agency: The Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act (PTFA) is self-executing; no agency is responsible for administering the act.

Year Started: 2009

Population Targeted: Renters living in a foreclosed building

A permanent extension of the “Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act” (PTFA) was signed into law in May 2018. The PTFA, which was enacted in 2009 but expired at the end of 2014, is the only federal protection for renters living in foreclosed properties.

Unlike homeowners who have some indication that a foreclosure is coming, renters are not typically aware that their landlords are behind on mortgage payments and are often caught entirely off guard by a foreclosure. Before the permanent extension, renters in most states could be evicted with just a few days’ notice.

The PTFA enables renters whose homes were in foreclosure to remain in their homes for at least 90 days or for the term of their lease, whichever is greater. The PTFA now applies in all states but does not override more protective state laws.

In the 115th Congress, Representative Keith Ellison (D-MN) and Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) introduced legislation to remove the 2014 sunset date and make the law permanent. Congress eventually passed the PTFA as part of a larger deregulation bill (S. 2155) that became Public Law No. 115-174.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

During the financial crisis, inappropriate lending, falling home prices, and high unemployment led to a very high number of foreclosures across the U.S. However, the impact of these foreclosures was not limited to homeowners – renters lost

their homes when the owner of the home they were renting went into foreclosure. In fact, one in five properties in the process of foreclosure was a rental. Research from NLIHC concluded that because these properties often contained more than one unit, and many owner-occupied properties also housed renters, roughly 40% of the families that faced eviction as a result of the foreclosure crisis were renters. As expected, very low-income families and low-income and Black and Latino communities bore the brunt of rental foreclosures.

Prior to May 2009, protections for renters in foreclosed properties varied from state to state and in most states, tenants had few protections. Recognizing the hardships experienced by tenants in foreclosed properties, in early 2009 Congress acted to provide a basic set of rights for such tenants. On May 20, 2009, President Obama signed PTFA into law (Public Law 111-22, division A, title VII). The PTFA was extended and clarified in the “Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act” (Public Law 111-203, section 1484). The law expired on December 31, 2014 but was made permanent by Congress in May 2018.

ISSUE

The PTFA requires the immediate successor in interest at foreclosure to provide bona fide tenants with notice 90 days before requiring them to vacate the property and allows tenants with leases to occupy the property until the end of the lease term. A bona fide lease or tenancy is defined as one in which: the tenant is neither the mortgagor, nor the spouse, parent, or child of the mortgagor; the lease or tenancy is the result of an arm’s length transaction; and, the lease or tenancy requires rent that is not substantially lower than fair market rent, or is reduced or subsidized due to a federal, state, or local subsidy. If the property is purchased by someone who will occupy the property, then that purchaser can terminate the lease with 90 days’ notice, even

when the tenant has a lease that extends beyond 90 days after foreclosure.

Under PTFA, tenants with Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher assistance have additional protections allowing them to retain their Section 8 lease and requiring the successor in interest to assume the housing assistance payment contract associated with that lease.

The PTFA applies to all foreclosures on all residential properties and traditional one-unit single family homes were covered, as were multi-unit properties. The law applies in cases of both judicial and nonjudicial foreclosures. Tenants with lease rights of any kind, including month-to-month leases or leases terminable at will, are protected as long as the tenancy was in effect as of the date of transfer of title at foreclosure.

The 90-day notice to vacate can only be given by the successor in interest at foreclosure. The successor in interest is whoever acquires title to the property at the end of the foreclosure process. It can be the financial institution that holds the mortgage, or it can be an individual who purchased the property at foreclosure. Notices of the pending foreclosure, although desirable, do

not serve as the 90-day notice required by the PTFA.

The PTFA applies in all states but does not override more protective state laws. The PTFA specifically provides that it does not affect “any [s]tate or local law that provides longer time periods or other additional protections for tenants.” Consequently, state law should be examined whenever there is a tenant in a foreclosed property to maximize the protections available to tenants.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Visit NLIHC’s website at www.nlihc.org or call 202-662-1530.

Renters in Foreclosure: A Fresh Look at an Ongoing Problem, from NLIHC, <https://bit.ly/2rpeHEm>.

See NHLP’s chart of state and local laws, <https://bit.ly/35CWnWZ>.

Visit NLCHP’s website at www.nlchp.org.

Housing Access for People with Criminal Records

By Kimberly Johnson, Policy Analyst, NLIHC

The United States is the world's largest jailer, imprisoning just under 1.5 million people. The FBI estimates as many as one in three Americans has a criminal record, and Black and Latino people, people with a disability, and members of the LGBTQ community are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system. After decades of imprisoning non-violent drug offenders with punitive and destructive mandatory minimum sentences, lawmakers and criminal justice reform advocates are making progress in the decarceration of prison inmates across the country. Since reaching its peak in 2009, the U.S. prison population has decreased 8%; however, as more former prisoners return to their communities, there is a growing concern about how they will fare upon reentry.

Formerly incarcerated people typically return to low-income communities where resources, particularly affordable, accessible housing, are scarce—there is a national shortage of 7 million rental units affordable and available to extremely low-income households. A criminal record poses an additional barrier to accessing affordable, accessible housing for justice-involved individuals, placing them at risk of housing instability, homelessness, and ultimately recidivism. One study showed that returning inmates without stable housing were twice as likely to recidivate than those living in stable housing. Public housing authorities (PHAs) and owners of federally assisted housing have broad discretion in screening out applicants with criminal records or precluding returning citizens from rejoining their families. Unless the administration and Congress work to reduce these barriers by providing additional guidance and housing resources, large-scale decarceration efforts will result in an even greater unmet demand for affordable, accessible housing.

LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

In past decades, Congress passed legislation that included increasingly stringent crime and drug enforcement policies in public housing. These policies increased penalties for certain drug-related activities and gave broad discretion to PHAs to evaluate potential and current residents. They also broadened resident accountability to include the behavior of a wider range of individuals, including minors and social acquaintances, and increased the oversight and penalties for PHAs that failed to make progress in implementing strategies to lower crime and drug use.

The “Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988” required PHAs to include a provision in their lease agreements that would allow them to evict tenants who used drugs or behaved in a way that threatened the safety of other tenants (Pub. L. No. 100-690, 102 Stat. 4181, 4300, 1988). Ten years later, Congress passed the “Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998,” which allowed PHAs to exclude applicants with criminal records and use discretion in determining whether an applicant was a potential safety risk to current residents (Pub. L. No. 105-276, 112 Stat. 2461, 2518, 1998). Additionally, the “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990” created a mandatory three-year ban on readmitting tenants who had previously been evicted for engaging in drug-related criminal activity (Pub. L. No. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079, 4180, 1990), and gave PHAs the option to increase the ban beyond the initial three years. The “Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996” (HOPEA) increased PHA’s ability to evict tenants and allowed them to request applicants’ criminal records from the National Crime Information Center and local police departments (Pub. L. No. 104-120, 110 Stat. 834, 836, 1996). HOPEA also granted PHAs the ability to reject applicants they believed were

abusing drugs or alcohol or whose history of drug or alcohol use could pose a potential risk to the health and safety of current residents.

MANDATORY SCREENING POLICIES

Although PHAs have broad discretion in evaluating current and prospective tenants, there are several federal admissions policies that all PHAs and project owners are required to follow. However, these policies merely act as a floor that many PHAs supplement with additional screening policies. Under federal law and regulation, PHAs and project owners must impose a permanent admission ban when a household includes a person who is required to register as a sex offender for life [42 U.S.C. § 13663(a) (2015); 24 C.F.R. §§ 960.204(a) (4), 982.553(a)(2), 2012]. Additionally, PHAs must impose a permanent admission ban or permanently terminate a household's tenancy when a household member has been convicted of manufacturing methamphetamine on federally assisted property [42 U.S.C. § 1437f(n) (2015); 24 C.F.R. §§ 960.204(a)(3), 982.553(a)(1)(ii)(C), 2012].

PHAs and project owners are also required to prohibit admitting a household for three years if a household member has been evicted from federally assisted housing for drug-related criminal activity [42 U.S.C. §13661(a) (2015); 24 C.F.R. §§ 960.204(a)(1), 982.553 (a)(1)(i), 2012]. However, the PHA or project owner has discretion to admit the household if it is determined that the member successfully completed drug rehabilitation or the circumstances leading to the eviction no longer exist (e.g., the incarceration or death of the person who committed the drug-related criminal activity). Additionally, households must be denied admission if a member is currently engaged in illegal drug use or alcohol abuse [42 U.S.C. §13661(b) (2015); 24 C.F.R. §§ 960.204(a)(2)(i), 982.553 (a)(1)(ii) (a), 2012]. PHAs and project owners must also prohibit admitting households where the PHA or property owner has reason to believe that a

household member's historical or current abuse of illegal drugs or alcohol "may threaten the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents" [42 U.S.C § 13661(b)(1) (2015); 24 C.F.R. §§ 960.204(a)(2)(ii), 982.553(a)(1)(ii)(B) (2012)].

These policies, along with whatever additional screening criteria a PHA or project owner may develop, are contained in the housing provider's written admissions policy and grant housing providers broad discretion in screening out tenants with a criminal record. Depending on the program, these written policies are referred to as: admission and continued occupancy policies for public housing, administrative plans for the Housing Choice Voucher program, or tenant selection plans for project-based Section 8 developments.

ISSUES

Much of HUD's guidance on evaluating current and potential tenants is advisory and not mandatory so PHAs and project owners across the country have developed their own criteria, creating additional barriers for people with criminal records and raising fair housing concerns.

One issue that continues to prevent justice-involved people from accessing affordable housing arises from PHAs and project-owners using unreasonable lookback periods to evaluate applicants' criminal records. Federal law instructs housing providers to look back in an applicant's history of criminal activity within a "reasonable time," but neither the statute nor HUD explicitly define what constitutes a reasonable time; instead, HUD has provided suggested time limits or best practices for establishing a reasonable lookback time. This lack of formal guidance has allowed a large number of housing providers to establish admissions policies that have no time limit on using a person's criminal history to evaluate their application. Although HUD expects housing providers to define a "reasonable time," some neglect to do so or leave it open ended and, as a

result, discourage people with criminal records from applying. Others impose blanket lifetime bans or use overly long lookback periods for particular crimes.

Despite HUD's suggested limit on lookback periods for certain crimes (for example, five years for serious crimes), housing providers routinely look further back into a person's criminal history, sometimes as long as 20 years. HUD has also long held that permanent bans contradict federal policy. Moreover, housing providers often neglect to include what events in a lookback period trigger denial (e.g., the criminal activity itself, a conviction, or release from incarceration), again making it difficult for people with criminal records to determine their eligibility. Until a 2015 HUD guideline banned the use of arrest records in federally assisted housing decisions (Notice PIH 2015-19), a criminal arrest alone could trigger denial even if it did not lead to a subsequent conviction.

Many housing providers utilize overly broad categories of criminal activity that reach beyond HUD's three general categories: drug-related criminal activity; violent criminal activity; and other criminal activity that may threaten the health, safety, or right to peaceful enjoyment of the premises by other residents or anyone residing in the immediate vicinity. By casting such a wide net over almost any felony, which can include shoplifting and jaywalking, housing providers screen out potential tenants to the point that anyone with a criminal record need not apply. As a result, housing providers create a de facto ban on individuals with a criminal record, even if they do not have a policy explicitly barring individuals with a criminal record from being admitted.

Housing providers are increasingly turning to private tenant screening companies to review applicants' criminal records and make recommendations about whether to admit or deny. These companies usually pull criminal records data from public databases that are often incomplete or inaccurate. For example, a jurisdiction might misreport a misdemeanor as a felony or vice-versa, fail to indicate when

a record has been expunged or sealed, or mix up the criminal histories of two people with the same name. Tenant screening companies use the records they gather to make an "up or down" determination as to whether a prospective tenant should be approved for residency. Despite federal law guaranteeing tenants' right to see a copy of their criminal background report, not all housing providers comply. This lack of transparency means applicants are typically left in the dark about the criminal record information used to deny their admission.

Too often, PHAs and project owners ignore or do not provide mechanisms for applicants to present mitigating circumstances to show they do not pose a risk to the community and will be good tenants. PHAs are required by federal law to consider mitigating circumstances during their admissions process, including the time, nature, and extent of the applicant's conduct, as well as the seriousness of the offense. PHAs can also take into consideration actions that indicate future good conduct, such as an applicant successfully completing a drug rehabilitation program. However, PHAs often fail to inform applicants of their right to present evidence or choose to ignore mitigating circumstances when considering an application. For the Housing Choice Voucher program and Section 8 project-based properties, HUD merely encourages housing providers to consider mitigating circumstances rather than requiring them to do so. Some housing providers are reluctant to adopt such a policy, arguing that its subjective nature makes it too hard to apply uniformly and puts them at risk of violating the FHA. Adopting a one-size-fits-all policy that is not narrowly tailored and fails to consider mitigating circumstances may violate the FHA if it has a disparate impact on a protected class of people, including racial minorities.

Returning citizens attempting to reunite with their families living in federally subsidized housing are sometimes barred from doing so or are not permitted to be added to the household's lease. Although HUD has no prohibition on adding returning citizens to a lease, it is widely believed that PHAs and project owners are not

permitted to do so. Housing providers' refusal to add returning citizens to a lease places these individuals and their families at risk of losing their housing if something happens to the head of household.

Finally, people with criminal records who have managed to secure a Housing Choice Voucher can run into trouble if they need to transfer their voucher to another jurisdiction. When a household moves from one jurisdiction to another, the receiving PHA might rescreen the household using a more stringent criteria than the one used by the initial PHA. If the receiving PHA determines that the household does not meet its criteria, it will try to terminate assistance. This practice of rescreening prevents justice-involved individuals and their families from being able to move to new areas that offer greater opportunities. In 2015, HUD published a [final rule](#) on voucher portability that reiterated PHAs' ability to rescreen families, stating, “[R]eceiving PHAs should be allowed to apply their own screening standards consistently among families in their program and for families moving into their jurisdiction under portability. However, it is important that moving families be informed that they are subject to screening based on the receiving PHA’s criteria, and that the receiving PHA’s screening criteria may be different than that of the initial PHA.”

RECENT EFFORTS TO ADDRESS CRIMINAL RECORDS AND HOUSING

Administrative Efforts

The Obama administration first took action in helping returning citizens gain access to housing in 2011, when then HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan issued a [letter](#) to PHA executive directors stating, “[T]his is an Administration that believes in the importance of second chances—the people who have paid their debt to society deserve the opportunity to become productive citizens and caring parents, to set the past aside and embrace the future. Part of that support means helping justice-involved individuals gain access to one of the most fundamental building

blocks of a stable life—a place to live.” Secretary Donovan further encouraged PHAs to allow justice-involved people, when appropriate, to live with their families in public housing or the Housing Choice Voucher program and asked that when PHAs screened for criminal records, they “consider all relevant information, including factors which indicate a reasonable probability of favorable future conduct.” A year later, Secretary Donovan sent a similar [letter](#) to owners and agents of HUD-assisted properties.

In 2013, the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) published a [guidebook](#) for PHAs that includes best practices and policies to increase access to housing. In the guidebook, USICH notes the relationship between incarceration and homelessness, “as difficulties in reintegrating into the community increase the risk of homelessness for released prisoners, and homelessness increased the risk of re-incarceration.” Like Secretary Donovan, USICH encourages PHAs to consider individual factors when screening potential tenants with criminal records in order to remove barriers to housing assistance.

In November 2015, then President Barack Obama announced new actions to promote the rehabilitation and reintegration for formerly incarcerated people, including a new \$8.7 million demonstration program to address homelessness and reduce recidivism rates. President Obama also announced that HUD would provide \$1.75 million to aid eligible public housing residents under the age of 25 in expunging or sealing their criminal records under the new Juvenile Reentry Assistance Program.

In conjunction with the announcement, HUD released PIH 2015-19, recognizing the responsibility PHAs and project owners have in ensuring people with a criminal record are not automatically barred from federally subsidized housing. The guidance clarifies the use of arrest records to determine who can live in federally subsidized properties, and notes an individual’s arrest record cannot be used as evidence that they have committed a crime, stating “[T]he fact that there has been an arrest for a crime is not

a basis for the requisite determination that the relevant individual engaged in criminal activity warranting denial of admission, termination of assistance or eviction.”

The guidance also makes clear that HUD does not require PHAs and project owners to adopt or enforce “one strike” policies that deny admission to anyone with a criminal record or that require families to be automatically evicted any time a household member engages in criminal activity in violation of the lease. However, it does not preclude PHAs and owners from utilizing such a policy. Instead, the guidance urges PHAs and owners to exercise discretion before making such a decision and to consider all relevant circumstances, including the seriousness of the crime and the effect an eviction of an entire household would have on family members not involved in the criminal activity. Additionally, the guidance reminds PHAs and property owners of the due process rights of tenants and applicants applying for housing assistance.

In April 2016, HUD issued legal guidance from the Office of General Counsel stating that housing providers, both in the public and private housing market, likely violate the “Fair Housing Act of 1968” when employing blanket policies refusing to rent or renew a lease based on an individual’s criminal history since such policies may have a disparate impact on racial minorities. The Fair Housing Act prohibits housing discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, familial status, national origin or disability while coining these as “protected classes” of people and noting, “Because of widespread racial and ethnic disparities in the U.S. criminal justice system, criminal history-based restrictions on access to housing are likely disproportionately to burden African Americans and Hispanics.”

The guidance, known as the “disparate impact rule,” states that when a housing provider’s seemingly neutral policy or practice has a discriminatory effect, such as restricting access to housing on the basis of criminal history, which has a disparate impact on individuals of a particular race, national origin, or other protected class, the policy or practice is unlawful under the

Fair Housing Act if it is not necessary to serve a substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest of the housing provider, or if the interest could be served by another practice that has a less discriminatory effect.

Some landlords and property managers assert the reason they have blanket criminal history policies is to protect other residents and the property. HUD’s 2016 disparate impact guidance declares that “bald assertions based on generalization or stereotype that any individual with an arrest or conviction record poses a greater risk than those without such records are not sufficient.” Landlords and property managers must be able to prove through reliable evidence that blanket policies assist in protecting residents and property.

The guidance also states that a housing provider with a policy that excludes people because of a prior arrest without conviction cannot satisfy its burden of showing the policy is necessary to achieve a “substantial, legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest,” since an arrest is not a reliable basis upon which to assess an applicant’s potential risk to residents or property. When a person has been convicted, the policy must be applied on a case-by-case basis considering the nature and severity of the conviction, what the individual has done since conviction, and how long ago the conviction took place.

In addition, the guidance discusses how a housing provider may violate the Fair Housing Act if the provider intentionally discriminates when using criminal history information in evaluating applicants and tenants, “which occurs when the provider treats an applicant or renter differently because of race, national origin or another protected characteristic. In these cases, the housing provider’s use of criminal records or other criminal history information as a pretext for unequal treatment of individuals because of race, national origin or other protected characteristics is no different from the discriminatory application of any other rental or purchase criteria.”

In August 2019, the Trump Administration proposed changes to HUD’s disparate impact rule that would make it more difficult to challenge a housing provider’s discriminatory policies. Under the rule’s 2016 guidelines, bringing a disparate impact claim requires a three-part “burden-shifting” standard that begins with a plaintiff, usually the target of a discriminatory policy, showing a policy or practice causes (or will likely cause) a discriminatory effect. Next, the burden shifts to the defendant, usually a housing provider, to prove that the policy or practice is necessary to achieve a legitimate, nondiscriminatory interest. Finally, if the defendant can prove the policy is necessary, the burden shifts back to the plaintiff who must then prove that the defendant’s interest can be achieved through another policy or practice that has a less discriminatory effect.

Under the Trump administration’s proposed revisions, the burden of proof shifts entirely to the plaintiff, who would be required to show that the policy or practice under question is “arbitrary, artificial, and unnecessary” to achieve a valid interest. They must then establish a “robust causal link” between the policy or practice and its disparate impact on members of a protected class and show that the disparate impact has a significant negative impact. Finally, plaintiffs must show that the disparate impact is directly linked to adverse outcomes for members of a protected class. The rule would also allow defendants to cite financial gain as a valid reason for imposing a discriminatory policy or practice. The Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs projects that the final disparate impact rule will be released in April 2020.

Efforts in Congress

In December 2018, Congress passed, and President Trump signed into law, the bipartisan “First Step Act” (P.L. 115-391), which rolls back mandatory minimum sentences in certain circumstances and expands on “good time credits” for well-behaved prisoners looking to shorten their sentences. While advocates acknowledged the bill was not perfect, they agreed it was a modest step forward for

comprehensive criminal justice reform. The bill also included the “Second Chance Reauthorization Act” that supports state, local, and tribal governments and nonprofit organizations in their work to reduce recidivism and improve outcomes for people returning from incarceration. Second Chance grants support a variety of reentry services, including housing, job training, education, mentoring, and mental health treatment. The “Second Chance Reauthorization Act” expands opportunities for community-based nonprofits to apply for grants to develop support programs, such as housing, and drug treatment programs. It also requires coordination among multiple federal agencies (including HUD), state and local governments, and service providers on federal programs and policies related to reentry.

While the “First Step Act” authorizes \$75 million per year over five years to carry out the reforms, grants, and programs the bill establishes, the Trump administration’s budget request for fiscal year (FY) 2020 appropriated only \$14 million for “First Step Act” implementation. The president’s budget request is just that—a request—and has no bearing on how much programs are ultimately appropriated. However, it does signal the administration’s priorities, and significantly underfunding the “First Step Act” has led criminal justice reform advocates to question the Trump administration’s sincerity in implementing meaningful criminal justice reform measures. Both the House and Senate FY20 appropriations bills would fully fund “First Step Act” implementation at the authorized amount.

In July 2019, Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) and Senator Kamala Harris (D-CA) introduced legislation to ensure that people with criminal records have access to federally assisted housing. The “Fair Chance at Housing Act” would ban “one-strike” and “no-fault” eviction policies, demand higher standards of evidence to reject an applicant on the basis of their criminal record, and mandate an individualized review processes that takes into account both the totality of circumstances surrounding a criminal offense and any mitigating evidence provided by a

prospective tenant. These measures would allow families to reunify when a household member returns home after serving time in prison or jail and help end the cycle of homelessness and recidivism too often experienced by justice-involved individuals.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The “First Step Act” was passed well into FY19, delaying funding and implementation of many of the law’s reforms. It is crucial that the “First Step Act” receive full funding in the new fiscal year to fully implement the reforms established by the law. Criminal justice advocates will also continue pushing for new reforms and remind lawmakers that as its title suggests, the “First Step Act” is just that: a first step and one of many steps toward comprehensive criminal justice reform. Advocates can press for legislation, including the “Fair Chance at Housing Act,” that helps people returning from incarceration get back on their feet and reconnect with their communities.

HOW ADVOCATES CAN TAKE ACTION

Urge legislators to:

- Pass comprehensive spending bills that include full funding for implementation of the “First Step Act.”
- Ensure that criminal justice reform efforts include a comprehensive plan addressing the housing needs of people with criminal records.
- Support legislation that reduces housing barriers for people with criminal records, including the “Fair Chance at Housing Act.”

Urge HUD to:

- Withdraw proposed changes to weaken the disparate impact rule.
- Ensure compliance with and build upon HUD guidance that would expand access to federally assisted housing for people with a criminal record.

- Require all federally subsidized housing providers to consider mitigating circumstances.
- Provide concrete guidance on reasonable lookback periods.
- Place limitations on what criminal activity housing providers may consider when reviewing applications.
- Set minimum standards for the quality and nature of criminal background information that can be used by PHAs and federally assisted housing providers to make housing decisions.
- Work with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to identify comprehensive, interagency solutions to tenant screening problems.
- Increase data collection on applicant screening practices.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Visit the Reentry and Housing Working Group, <http://www.reentryandhousing.org>.

Criminalization of Homelessness

Eric S. Tars, Legal Director, National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty

Every day in America, people experiencing homelessness are threatened by law enforcement, ticketed, and even arrested for living in public spaces when they have no other alternative. Millions of individuals, families, and youth experience homelessness each year and millions more lack access to decent, stable housing they can afford. Rather than providing adequate housing options, too many communities criminalize homelessness by making it illegal for people to sit, sleep, or even eat in public places, despite the absence of adequate alternatives. These laws and policies violate constitutional, civil, and human rights and create arrest records, fines, and fees that stand in the way of homeless people securing jobs or housing. Yet these expensive policies are ineffective at addressing homelessness or reducing the number of people who must sleep on the streets. In fact, more effective policies such as providing affordable housing and services have been proven to cost less than criminalizing homelessness.

2020 holds both great promise and great peril for the issue of criminalization. In 2019, the Supreme Court declined to hear a 9th Circuit case establishing that homeless people have freedom from the cruel and unusual punishment of being criminalized for basic life-sustaining activities in the absence of adequate alternatives. Advocates are already hopeful that this will spur communities to reexamine their failed criminalization approaches and take more constructive steps. However, contrary to the positive role the prior administration took in taking increasingly strong actions to discourage and stop the criminalization of homelessness, the current administration is rumored to be considering razing encampments and mass incarceration of people experiencing homelessness in relocation camps. Now, more than ever, we need a united voice for Housing, Not Handcuffs.

HISTORY

From vagrancy laws and the workhouses of pre-industrial England to legal segregation, sundown towns, and anti-Okie laws in the U.S., ordinances regulating the use of public space have long been used to exclude marginalized persons based on race, national origin, and economic class. With the advent of modern homelessness in the 1980s, rather than addressing the underlying lack of affordable housing, communities faced with increasingly visible homelessness began pushing homeless persons out of public view with laws criminalizing life-sustaining acts such as self-sheltering (“camping”), sleeping, resting, eating, or asking for donations. Other communities have used disparate enforcement of other ordinances, such as jaywalking or littering, to harass and push homeless persons out of certain spaces. These practices gained even more traction with the trend toward “broken windows” policing in the 1990s.

Over the course of the past 13 years, the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty has tracked these laws in 187 cities and found that city-wide bans on camping have increased by 92%, on sitting or lying by 78%, on loitering by 103%, on panhandling by 103%, and on living in vehicles by 213%. Meanwhile, a 1,300% growth of homeless encampments have been reported in all 50 states. Too often homeless residents experience forced evictions or “sweeps” of the encampments, usually with little notice and no provision of alternative housing, frequently resulting in the destruction of important documents, medicines, and what little shelter the residents have.

However, recent court victories have provided advocates with new opportunities to change the conversation. These include the 2018 victory in *Martin v. Boise* in the 9th Circuit (successfully defended from Supreme Court review in 2019), which held that in the absence of adequate alternatives, it is cruel and unusual punishment

under the 8th Amendment to punish someone for life-sustaining activities like sleeping, resting, or sheltering oneself. This has already resulted in a number of communities ceasing the enforcement of anti-camping laws and setting up legal camping zones or shelters. Similarly, since the 2015 *Norton v. Springfield* decision in the 7th Circuit, no panhandling ordinance challenged in court has withstood constitutional scrutiny under the 1st Amendment, and dozens of cities have repealed their ordinances.

2019 was a breakthrough year in terms of national attention to the issue of criminalization. On the positive side, several Democratic presidential contenders for the first time addressed criminalization either in their [policy platforms](#) or in [opposing Las Vegas' new camping ban](#). On the negative side, President Trump has used increasingly dehumanizing language to describe homeless people is reportedly [developing policies](#) to encourage criminalization and incarceration of homeless persons.

ISSUE SUMMARY

The growing affordable housing gap and shrinking social safety net have left millions of people homeless or at-risk, and most American cities have fewer emergency shelter beds than people who need shelter. Despite this lack of affordable housing and shelter space, many cities have chosen to criminally or civilly punish people living on the street for doing what any human being must do to survive, like sleeping, resting, and eating—activities we all do every day and take for granted. Communities of color; mentally and physically disabled persons; and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer/questioning youth and adults, who are already disproportionately affected by homelessness, are most likely to be further marginalized by criminalization.

Criminalization policies are ineffective and, in fact, make homelessness harder to exit. Because people experiencing homelessness are not on the street by choice but because they lack choices, criminal and civil punishment serves no constructive purpose. Instead,

arrests, unaffordable tickets, and the collateral consequences of criminal convictions make it more difficult for people to exit homelessness and get back on their feet. Criminalization of homelessness might mean that individuals experiencing homelessness are taken to jail, where they may remain for weeks if they cannot pay their bail or fines, perhaps losing custody of their children, property and/or employment in the process. Once released, they could have criminal records that make it more difficult to get or keep a job, housing, or public benefits. Moreover, fines and court fees associated with resolving a criminalization case can amount to hundreds, or even thousands, of dollars. Without the resources to pay, homeless people may be subject to additional jail time.

Criminalization is the most expensive and least effective way of addressing homelessness and wastes scarce public resources on policies that do not work. A growing body of research comparing the cost of homelessness, including the cost of criminalization, with the cost of providing housing to homeless people shows that ending homelessness through housing is the most affordable option in the long run. Indeed, the provision of housing using a Housing First model, which focuses on providing people with quick, low-barrier access to housing followed by any needed services to maintain housing stability, is cheaper and more effective than all other strategies for addressing homelessness. For example, a study in Charlotte, NC, found that the city saved \$2.4 million over the course of a year after creating a Housing First facility, as tenants spent 1,050 fewer nights in jail and 292 fewer days in the hospital and had 648 fewer visits to emergency rooms. With state and local budgets stretched to their limit and the threat of additional federal cuts on the horizon, rational, cost-effective policies are needed, not ineffective measures that waste precious taxpayer dollars.

PROGRAM SUMMARIES

In response to the growing cost data and advocacy at the international and domestic levels, many federal agencies have taken an

increasingly strong stance against criminalization of homelessness, but these programs are under threat.

U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness

In 2009, Congress passed the “Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act,” directing the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) to prepare a report on criminalization and constructive alternatives. In 2012, the USICH issued this report, *Searching out Solutions: Constructive Alternatives to the Criminalization of Homelessness*. *Searching Out Solutions* was groundbreaking in stating that in addition to raising constitutional issues, criminalization of homelessness may violate international human rights law, the first time a domestic agency has labelled domestic practice as such. In 2015, the USICH issued guidance on *Ending Homelessness for Persons Living in Encampments*, providing a checklist of steps for communities to constructively address homeless encampments without criminalization and added several case studies of positive practices in 2017. The USICH coordinated *Home, Together*, the 2018 Federal Strategic Plan to End Homelessness, listing reducing criminalization among the top strategic priorities in ending homelessness. However, in December 2019, the Trump administration named Robert Marbut as the new executive director of the agency, a man with a history of promoting heavy enforcement of laws criminalizing homelessness in order to drive people experiencing homelessness into jail-like shelter facilities (more below).

U.S. Department of Justice

In 2015, DOJ filed a statement of interest brief stating that “Criminally prosecuting those individuals for something as innocent as sleeping, when they have no safe, legal place to go, violates their constitutional rights.” DOJ’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services dedicated its December 2015 newsletter to reducing criminalization, stating, “Arresting people for performing basic life-sustaining activities like sleeping in public takes law

enforcement professionals away from what they are trained to do: fight crime.” DOJ also issued a letter on the impact of excessive fines and fees for poor persons that also is useful in addressing criminalization practices. DOJ’s Office for Access to Justice commented on a proposed ordinance in Seattle that would create constructive procedures for dealing with homeless encampments.

U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development

In 2015, HUD inserted a new question into its application for the \$2 billion Continuum of Care (CoC) funding stream, giving local governments and providers higher scores and potentially increased funding if they demonstrate that they are preventing the criminalization of homelessness. In 2016, this question was updated with increased points and more specific steps CoCs could take, which have remained in subsequent years. Although the Trump administration sought freedom to remove these incentives, the 2019 HUD funding authorization statutorily required the agency to retain the funding criteria of the 2018 application.

U.S. Department of Education

In 2016, the Department of Education issued guidance on homeless students, reminding school personnel that they have to work outside the school building to remove barriers to homeless students’ success in school, including working with state legislatures and local governments to address the criminalization of homelessness.

FORECAST FOR 2020

With the Supreme Court victory in *Martin v. Boise*, advocates are looking to try to push the decision as far as it can go to help turn communities from criminalization to housing solutions. However, a backlash is also brewing, with communities looking to find loopholes in constitutional compliance. Moreover, there is deep concern for what the president’s policies and the new executive director of the USICH may bring. In particular, the administration is reportedly considering steps that may utilize

multiple federal funding and enforcement levers to either directly implement criminalizing policies or incentivize their development at the local level. However, advocates can also use the attention to help legislators look for opportunities to include incentives or requirements for non-criminalization in other legislation. For example, an infrastructure funding bill could require applicants to certify that any homeless persons living under bridges displaced by the project would receive alternative housing (and perhaps even make that an included authorized expense for the funds). In order to build on existing gains and address the urgent need, hundreds of national and local organizations, including the Law Center and NLIHC, launched the Housing Not Handcuffs Campaign in late 2016 to fight against criminalization and for adequate housing for all. It is being used as an umbrella to unify efforts to oppose the current threat from President Trump. It will not be an easy struggle, but it is more important than ever and within our sights if we work together.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The Housing Not Handcuffs Campaign has developed Model Policies for local, state, and federal governments that emphasize 1) shortening homelessness by stopping its criminalization, 2) preventing homelessness by strengthening housing protections and eliminating unjust evictions, and 3) ending homelessness by increasing access to and availability of affordable housing. The Campaign also has model one-pagers and Six Ideas for Talking About Housing Not Handcuffs that may be useful in framing conversations with legislators, including a sample script:

Value: Together, we have the opportunity—and responsibility—to do better for the worst off amongst us. Everyone can agree that it does not make any sense to arrest people for being homeless. And we can also all agree that we don't want to see people sleeping on the sidewalks.

Problem: But instead of solving homelessness, we have expensive policies that make it worse. Unfortunately, too many places in this country

are ignoring data/common sense and are using handcuffs rather than housing to address homelessness. But when anyone experiencing homelessness faces criminal punishment for simply trying to survive on the streets, these criminal records only make it more difficult to hold a job and regain housing. Not only do these policies make homelessness harder to solve, they also cost MORE taxpayer dollars than the policies that actually work.

Solution: But there is a better way. We've seen in city after city that where they change their laws and policies to reduce their reliance on law enforcement and instead invest in affordable, supportive housing, it gets homeless people off the streets far more effectively, and, as it turns out, far more cheaply than endlessly cycling people through courts, jails, and back onto the streets. It increases public safety when police cars, jails, and courts aren't clogged with people being arrested simply for trying to survive. It increases public health when people are able to get services and are housed, rather than forced to the margins.

Action: If you want to see an end to homelessness in your community, join our campaign for Housing Not Handcuffs, learn more about the best practices that are working around the country, and call for an end to criminalization and more support for housing so we can all enjoy a community where no one has to sleep on the streets or beg for their daily needs.

Recent court victories also provide an opportunity for local elected officials to shift some political pressure from themselves to the courts. When constituents come to them complaining of visible homelessness, they can now say “look, the courts have told us we can't just criminalize people living on the streets, but if you work with me, we can find creative solutions that will be a win-win for everyone.”

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty,
202-638-2535, email@nlchp.org, www.nlchp.org

Housing Not Handcuffs Campaign,
<http://www.housingnothandcuffs.org>

The Mortgage Interest Deduction

Andrew Aurand, Vice President for Research, NLIHC

The mortgage interest deduction (MID) is a federal tax expenditure that allows homeowners to deduct from their federal taxable income the interest paid on the first \$750,000 of a home mortgage. Although the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017” significantly reduced its cost, the MID remains a regressive tax benefit for higher-income homeowners at a cost of \$163 billion between 2018 and 2022 in lost federal tax revenue (Joint Committee on Taxation, 2018: [Estimates of Federal Tax Expenditures For Fiscal Years 2018-2022](#)).

HOW IT WORKS

Taxpayers can subtract from their federal taxable income either a fixed dollar amount known as the standard deduction or itemized deductions allowed by the federal tax code. Taxpayers must itemize their tax deductions to benefit from the MID. Most taxpayers, however, find it more advantageous to claim the standard deduction, because their itemized deductions are lower. The [Joint Committee on Taxation](#) estimated that less than 11% of the nation’s 171 million federal tax returns would include itemized deductions in 2018. The Joint Committee also estimated that 8% of taxpayers would claim the MID in 2018, 73% of whom have incomes over 100,000.

MID’s value depends on the taxpayers’ marginal tax rate. Taxpayers in the 37% tax bracket can reduce their taxes by 37% of the interest paid for their mortgage, while taxpayers in the 22% tax bracket can reduce their taxes by 22% of the interest paid. Because higher-income homeowners are more likely to claim the MID and the value of the MID increases with income, taxpayers with incomes over \$100,000 receive 92% of MID’s benefits (Tax Policy Center, 2018: [Individual Income Tax Expenditures October 2018](#), Table T18-0170).

HISTORY

Contrary to popular belief, the MID was not created to encourage homeownership. When the federal income tax was implemented in 1913, personal interest on all loans was an allowable deduction from taxable income. At the time, it was too difficult to differentiate between personal consumption and home loans from business loans for farms, small businesses, and individual proprietors (Ventry, D., 2010: *The Accidental Deduction: A History and Critique of the Tax Subsidy for Mortgage Interest*. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 73(1): 233-284). There is no evidence that Congress intended to use the interest deduction to encourage homeownership. While one-third of homeowners had a mortgage in 1910, few benefited from the interest deduction since 98% of households were initially exempt from the federal income tax given its generously high tax-free income threshold (Ibid). The post-World War II housing boom, fueled by FHA- and VA-insured mortgages, and the transformation of the federal income tax to a more broad-based tax made the interest deduction available to an increasing number of homeowners with mortgages. The cost of MID grew significantly through the 1980’s to late 2000’s, along with the growth in homeownership rates and home values. Prior to tax reform in 2017, the cost of MID was approximately \$70 billion per year.

The “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017” made significant changes to the value of the MID to taxpayers. The act reduced the amount of a mortgage eligible for MID from \$1,000,000 to \$750,000 for loans taken after December 15, 2017 and eliminated the MID for home equity loans not for substantial home improvement. Previously, interest paid on up to \$100,000 on any home equity loans could be deducted. The act also significantly increased the standard deduction for taxpayers, making itemized deductions less likely for middle-income taxpayers.

The “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017” reduced the cost of the MID from approximately \$70 billion per year prior to tax reform to an estimated \$31 billion in 2020 (Joint Committee on Taxation, 2018: [Estimates of Federal Tax Expenditures For Fiscal Years 2018-2022](#)), but skewed the MID’s benefits even more to affluent taxpayers. The Tax Policy Center estimates that taxpayers with incomes greater than \$319,100 (the 95th percentile of incomes) would receive approximately 46% of MID’s benefits in 2018, up from 32% before tax reform (Tax Policy Center, 2018: [Individual Income Tax Expenditures \(October 2018\)](#), Tables T18-0171 and T18-0169). The same analysis indicates that the share of MID benefits received by middle-income households (40th to 60th percentile) would decline from 6% to 4%.

OTHER THINGS TO KNOW ABOUT THE MID

A study of MID reform in Denmark indicated that the tax benefit does not promote homeownership, but induces homeowners to buy larger, more expensive homes and incur greater debt than they otherwise would (Gruber, J., Jensen, A., and Kleven, H., 2017: *Do People Respond to the Mortgage Interest Deduction? Quasi-Experimental Evidence from Denmark*. National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper Series No. 23600). The MID also contributes to racial and gender inequities. In a recent study, single women were 6.2% less likely than single men of the same age and income to own a home with a mortgage (Chacon, F., 2016: [Minorities and Women are Losing Out On Homeownership](#)

[and Tax Breaks](#)). Black and Hispanic households were 56.9% and 50.9%, respectively, less likely than white households to own a mortgaged home. Without mortgages, single women and minority households do not receive MID benefits to the same extent as white households. A study by the Institute on Assets and Social Policy (IASP) at Brandeis University and NLIHC found that white households, prior to 2017 tax reform, received 78% of MID’s benefits even though they accounted for 67% of all households. African American and Latino households each accounted for 13% of the nation’s households, yet they received only 6% and 7% of the MID’s benefits (Sullivan, L., Meschede, T., Shapiro, T., and Escobar, M.F., 2017: [Misdirected Investments: How the Mortgage Interest Deduction Drives Inequality and the Racial Wealth Gap](#)). White households are more likely to benefit from the MID because they are more likely to own a home, have larger mortgages, and earn higher incomes. This disparity in MID benefits has likely worsened since tax reform.

After tax reform, the MID still remains a costly federal tax expenditure that disproportionately benefits higher-income households who do not need assistance to afford their home. At the same time, nearly eight million extremely low-income renters spend more than half of their incomes on housing (National Low Income Housing Coalition, 2019: *The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes*), forcing them to sacrifice other necessities. The federal revenue lost to the MID would be better spent on housing assistance for these lowest-income households who have the greatest need.

Medicaid Expansion

By Chandra Crawford, Program and Policy Analyst, National Alliance to End Homelessness

BACKGROUND

One of the most important provisions of the “Affordable Care Act” (ACA) is the expansion of health coverage to low-income individuals through Medicaid. The ACA extends Medicaid eligibility to childless adults with incomes at or below 138% of the federal poverty level. Prior to the ACA, low-income adults with no disabilities and no children were largely excluded from the benefit. Under the ACA, the federal government covered 100% of the costs for states to expand Medicaid at the beginning of the program in 2014, with a gradual decrease to 90% by 2020. To date, 37 states have adopted Medicaid expansion (see [Kaiser Brief, 2019](#)).

Before the expansion, over 44 million non-elderly people were uninsured. By 2016, the number of uninsured dropped to under 27 million, which was a historic low of uninsured adults ([Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 2018](#)). In the U.S., Medicaid expansion has been a lifeline to health care access for some of the most vulnerable populations, including people experiencing homelessness. Homelessness often exacerbates health problems and people experiencing homelessness often suffer from unmanaged illness, which can lead to higher health care costs. Medicaid has provided more vulnerable adults access to a broad range of needed services, particularly specialty care, substance abuse treatment, and life-saving surgeries often out of reach for the uninsured. Medicaid also covers services for permanent supportive housing (PSH), which helps people remain stably housed and places them in a better position to manage their health and to reduce costs to the system. At the same time, Medicaid coverage prevents people in poverty from experiencing a financial crisis, which could subsequently lead to homelessness

because of their inability to pay high medical bills for needed services.

CURRENT TRENDS

Although the ACA has led to historic gains in health insurance coverage, some of the positive trends are beginning to reverse. In 2018, 27.5 million people were uninsured, an increase of almost 2 million people from 2017 (United States Census Bureau, 2019). This is the first year the data has shown a statistically significant increase in the uninsured rate since the ACA came into effect. Non-expansion states, such as Texas, Oklahoma, Georgia, and Florida had the highest uninsured rates in 2018 ([Kaiser Health News, 2019](#)). Medicaid coverage declined by 0.7% and largely accounted for the decline in insured rates overall.

Many who lost coverage were legal immigrants with a drop in insurance by approximately 2.3% or 574,000 people ([Kaiser Health News, 2019](#)). The drop among immigrants is likely reflective of the current Administration’s stance and proposals on immigration like the “public charge” that links the use of public benefits to immigration status. The declination of benefits is known as the “chilling effect,” whereby immigrants not targeted under a rule or measure choose to give up or forgo benefits out of fear ([Urban Institute, 2019](#)). Other policies, such as Medicaid work requirements, are likely to have impacted 2018 trends as well.

MEDICAID WAIVERS AT THE STATE LEVEL AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR COVERAGE

Over the years, Congress has tried unsuccessfully to repeal the ACA, which could result in millions of people losing coverage. Since the current House of Representatives is controlled by Democrats, it is unlikely that a bill to repeal the ACA will pass through Congress.

Congress' inability to repeal the law has not thwarted attempts to weaken the ACA or Medicaid expansion at the state level, however. In March 2017, then US Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price and Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Administrator Seema Verma sent a letter to governors explaining that states would have unprecedented discretion in running their Medicaid programs. Specifically, the letter reported that the federal government would view certain requirements, such as work activities, favorably. Encouraged by the letter, some states have begun to chip away at Medicaid expansion through restrictive waiver requests that include work requirements, drug testing, cost-sharing, and premiums.

If carried out, these waivers are expected to create barriers to coverage and care for low-income people. It would particularly impact homeless populations that are more likely to have multiple barriers to workforce participation and reporting, paying premiums, and the like.

In Arkansas, for example, the negative impact has already been seen. Before a federal judge blocked "Arkansas Works" in early 2019, approximately 18,000 people lost coverage due to unreported work status less than a year after its launch in June 2018. Critics of Arkansas's waiver have argued that the state failed to properly inform recipients of the new rules and criticized the state for requiring recipients to update their status on a web portal for the program, noting the state's low level of internet access and literacy and high level of poverty and other related barriers.

Kentucky Health was the first waiver approved by the administration that tied Medicaid eligibility to work requirements. A federal judge also blocked the requirements, which were estimated by the state to affect 95,000 beneficiaries. With the newly elected Democratic governor, these requirements are not expected to advance. During the latter part of 2019, Indiana and Arizona both placed holds on their plans for Medicaid work requirements due to litigation and the national landscape. However, South Carolina was granted approval to move forward with work requirements at the end of 2019 suggesting the

current administration's continued support of such measures.

WHAT ADVOCATES CAN DO TO PROTECT THE GAINS MADE UNDER THE EXPANSION

1. Track the impact of the waivers or proposed rules by gathering stories from individuals who are negatively impacted by the measures.
2. Build a coalition by bringing together diverse community groups and leaders who can advocate collectively on behalf of vulnerable populations at risk of losing Medicaid.
3. Stay Alert! As new states propose waivers and the Administration proposes rules that might negatively affect the expansion, seek opportunities to participate in hearings and comment at the state and federal level.

For a comprehensive listing and updates about 1115 Medicaid waivers, please visit

<https://familiesusa.org/initiatives/waiver-strategy-center> and explore the interactive map of state activity.

Although Congress has likely moved on from ACA repeal for now, advocates must remain vigilant to protect the gains made for millions of uninsured people under the law.

REFERENCES

Urban Institute: <https://www.urban.org>

Census Bureau: <https://www.census.gov>

Kaiser Brief:

<https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/status-of-state-medicaid-expansion-decisions-interactive-map/>

Kaiser Health News: <https://khn.org/news/number-of-americans-without-insurance-rises-in-2018/>

Disaster Housing Programs

By Noah Patton, Policy Analyst, NLIHC

FEMA leads the federal government's efforts to prepare for potential disasters and to manage the federal response and recovery efforts following any disaster that overwhelms local and state authorities. FEMA provides immediate, direct financial and physical assistance to those affected by disasters and is responsible for coordinating government-wide relief efforts. Long-term recovery efforts are typically handled by HUD, with the agency providing funding to states to rebuild disaster impacted communities.

HISTORY

Until the 1930s, ad hoc legislation was passed in response to hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, and other natural disasters. When the federal approach to disaster-related events became popular, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was given authority to make disaster loans for repair and reconstruction of certain public facilities following an earthquake, and later, other types of disasters. However, a piecemeal approach to disaster assistance continued. The "Disaster Relief Act of 1974" firmly established the process of presidential disaster declarations. Finally, on April 1, 1979, President Jimmy Carter signed Executive Order 12127, merging many of the separate federal disaster-related responsibilities into the newly created FEMA. In 2003, FEMA became part of the new Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Long-term recovery funding is also managed by HUD, which administers several programs focused on housing and economic recovery in areas struck by disasters.

The "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act" (Public Law 100-707), amending the "Disaster Relief Act of 1974," became law on November 23, 1988. It created the system still in place today through which presidential disaster declaration of an emergency triggers financial and physical

assistance through FEMA. The act gives FEMA responsibility for coordinating government-wide relief efforts and provides orderly and systemic federal natural disaster assistance for state and local governments. Congress' intention was to encourage states and localities to develop comprehensive disaster preparedness plans, prepare for better intergovernmental coordination in the face of a disaster, encourage the use of insurance coverage, and provide federal assistance for disaster-related losses.

President George W. Bush signed the "Post-Katrina Emergency Reform Act" on October 4, 2006. The act significantly reorganized FEMA and provided substantial new authority to remedy gaps that became apparent in the response to Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, including a more robust preparedness mission for FEMA. President Barack Obama signed the "Sandy Recovery Improvement Act (SRIA) of 2013" on January 29, 2013. SRIA authorized several significant changes to the way FEMA delivered federal disaster assistance.

The "Disaster Recovery Reform Act," (Public Law 115-254), amending the "Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act," was signed into law on October 5, 2018. The act further reforms FEMA, increasing the agency's pre-disaster planning process and its overall efficiency after the destructive 2017 hurricane and wildfire seasons. Notably, the act changes the factors FEMA considers when advising a president to issue a federal disaster declaration. The agency will now consider a disaster-stricken state's ability to pay for its own recovery along with damage reports and assessments.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

FEMA

Along with other government agencies, FEMA may provide disaster victims with low-interest loans, veterans' benefits, tax refunds, excise tax relief, unemployment benefits, crisis counseling,

and free legal assistance. These resources are available once the president grants a governor's request for Individual Assistance (IA) as part of a major disaster declaration.

Disaster housing and community development programs unique to FEMA include the Individuals and Households Program (IHP). The Housing Assistance provision of the IHP provides financial and direct assistance for disaster-caused housing needs not covered by insurance or provided by any other source. IHP Assistance lasts for 18 months, although the impacted state may request an extension that must be approved by the president. Four types of housing assistance are available under IHP:

1. Temporary housing assistance, which includes:
 - a. Transitional Shelter Assistance (TSA). In recent large-scale disasters, FEMA has provided TSA to cover the cost of staying in an approved hotel or motel for an initial period of up to 14 days (which may be extended in 14-day intervals for up to six months). TSA does not cover additional fees, such as resort fees, that hotels may include in the cost of a room. Participation in TSA does not count against a household's maximum amount of assistance available under IHP.
 - b. Rental Assistance. FEMA may provide financial assistance to rent temporary housing. The amount is based on the impacted area's Fair Market Rent (FMR) and covers rent plus utilities typically for two months, although it may also be used as a security deposit equal to one month of FMR. Households may seek Continued Rental Assistance when alternate housing is not available.
 - c. Direct Temporary Housing Assistance. FEMA may provide direct housing assistance when disaster survivors are unable to use Rental Assistance due to a lack of available housing resources. Direct Temporary Housing Assistance is not counted toward the IHP maximum

award amount and must be specifically requested by the impacted government. Direct Temporary Housing Assistance may include:

- Manufactured Housing Units provided by FEMA and made available to use as temporary housing.
 - Multi-Family Lease and Repair, which allows FEMA to enter into lease agreements with owners of multi-family rental properties and make repairs to provide temporary housing.
 - Permanent or Semi-Permanent Housing Construction, which allows home repair and/or construction services to be provided in insular areas outside the continental U.S. and other locations where no alternative housing resources are available, and where other types of FEMA Housing Assistance are unavailable, infeasible, or not cost effective.
2. Home repair cash grants, available to homeowners for damage not covered by insurance. These grants are intended to repair homes to safe, sanitary, or functional conditions but are not intended to return the home to its pre-disaster condition.
 3. Home replacement cash grants, available to homeowners to help replace a destroyed home that is not covered by insurance.

Other Needs Assistance (ONA): In addition to housing assistance, the IHP includes ONA, which provides financial assistance for disaster-related necessary expenses. There are two categories of ONA: those that do not require a household to have been denied a Small Business Administration (SBA) loan, and those that do require such a denial. "Non-SBA dependent" types of ONA that may be awarded regardless of a household's SBA status include covering medical, dental, childcare, and funeral expenses. Also included in this category is Critical Needs Assistance, which provides up to \$500 to meet lifesaving or life-sustaining needs such as water, food, first aid, prescriptions, infant

formula, diapers, consumable medical supplies and durable medical equipment, and fuel for transportation. Assistance that depends on a household being denied an SBA loan or receiving a partial SBA loan that is not adequate to meet needs include funds to repair or replace damaged personal property, repair or replace vehicles, and cover moving and storage costs.

Public Assistance (PA): FEMA provides disaster assistance to state, territorial, tribal, and local governments as well as certain private nonprofits through the PA program. Under the Permanent Work component of Public Assistance, FEMA provides grants to state and local governments to repair roads, bridges, water control facilities, public utilities, public buildings, and parks and recreational facilities (Categories C through G). In addition, PA can be provided to nonprofits to restore damaged facilities, which could include repair funds for public housing agencies. The Emergency Work component of PA aids in the removal of debris and carries out emergency protective measures (Categories A and B). FEMA generally provides 75% of the cost of PA, requiring the state and subgrantees (for example, counties) to provide the remaining 25%.

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP): To reduce the risk of damage and reliance on federal recovery funds in future disasters, FEMA administers the HMGP. HMGP provides state and local governments funds for long-term mitigation following a federally declared disaster. Nonprofits, individuals, and businesses may apply through their local government. Uses of HMGP include acquiring an individual property in a flood-prone zone and permanently removing the property, raising a home so that flood water flows underneath, erecting barriers to prevent flood water from entering a home, flood diversion and storage, and aquifer storage and recovery. FEMA provides up to 75% of the funds for mitigation projects.

National Flood Insurance Program

The National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) was created in 1968 to make flood insurance available to homeowners for the first time. The

“Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973” made the purchase of flood insurance mandatory for properties in Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHAs) if the property had a mortgage from a federally regulated or insured lender. To participate in NFIP, a community must adopt and enforce floodplain management ordinances. The NFIP has an arrangement with private insurance firms to sell and service flood insurance.

HUD

Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery (CDBG-DR): CDBG-DR funding is provided for presidentially declared major disasters by appropriations acts and is generally tailored to specific disasters. To determine how much a state or local government receives, HUD uses a formula that considers damage estimates and disaster recovery needs unmet by other federal disaster assistance programs such as FEMA and SBA. In addition to any requirements cited in the specific appropriation act, the regular CDBG regulations at 24 CFR 570 apply to CDBG-DR funds. However, CDBG-DR appropriations generally grant HUD broad authority to issue waivers and alternative requirements identified in a Federal Register notice issued by HUD following the announcement of the appropriation.

CDBG-DR grantees, usually states, must prepare an Action Plan to assess housing, infrastructure, and economic revitalization needs and then identify activities to address unmet needs. Public participation in devising the Action Plan is required. In the regular CDBG program, a minimum 30-day public review and comment period is required. However, in recent CDBG-DR Federal Register notices, HUD has reduced the public participation period to a mere 14 days. Advocates stress that more time for public engagement is necessary, especially since the consequences of the final plan will have long-term impacts on low-income households.

The regular CDBG program requires that at least 70% of the funds be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income households or those with income at or less than 80% of the area median income. The CDBG-DR Federal Register

notices regarding funds for the 2017 disasters maintained the 70% low/mod-income benefit requirement; however, most of the major notices between Hurricane Katrina in 2005 and 2016 allowed waivers so that only 50% of the CDBG-DR had to meet the low/mod benefit test.

Recent Federal Register notices have required that at least 80% of the total funds provided to a state address unmet needs within an area designated by HUD as being the most impacted and distressed. They have also required the Action Plan to propose allocating CDBG-DR to primarily address unmet housing needs and describe how the grantee's program will promote housing for vulnerable populations, including a description of activities to address the housing needs of homeless people and to prevent extremely low-income households from becoming homeless.

Grantees must submit Quarterly Performance Reports (QPRs) using HUD's electronic Disaster Recovery Grant Reporting System showing each activity's progress, expenditures, accomplishments, and beneficiary characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and gender.

CDBG Mitigation (CDBG-MIT): As part of a new focus on pre-disaster mitigation and preparedness after the destructive 2017 and 2018 hurricane seasons, Congress has begun to appropriate funds under a HUD CDBG-MIT program. Like CDBG-DR, CDBG-MIT funding is provided for areas that suffered from a presidentially declared disaster and is distributed similarly to CDBG-DR. Program funding is available for mitigation and resiliency projects, defined as activities that reduce the risk to life and property by lessening the impact of a future disaster. These projects are not required to address an existing disaster impact, but rather, areas that are likely to be impacted in the future. Like the CDBG-DR program, the regular CDBG regulations at 24 CFR 70 apply to CDBG-MIT funding subject to waivers and alternative requirements released by HUD in the program's enacting Federal Register Notice.

The process for CDBG-MIT grantees is also essentially the same as the CDBG-DR program, with the grantee developing an action plan that outlines the planned use of the funds. The plans are subject to public comment and HUD approval. The program requires a 30-day public participation window and specifies a minimum number of public meetings to be held that correspond to the amount of funding allocated to that state. As this program is relatively new, program guidelines and policies can be expected to change as the program develops.

Disaster Housing Assistance Program (DHAP): The aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 demonstrated that HUD, not FEMA, was best suited to oversee and administer federal disaster housing assistance to the lowest-income people. Congress amended the "Stafford Act" to require the federal government to create a disaster housing plan. In 2009, that plan made it clear that HUD should play a key role in creating and operating disaster housing assistance programs and **recommended that Congress make the DHAP permanent. The 2011 National Disaster Recovery Framework** also recommended that HUD, not FEMA, serve as the coordinating agency for delivering housing assistance. However, before HUD can put a DHAP program in place, FEMA must enter an interagency agreement with HUD. In the wake of the 2017 and 2018 hurricanes and wildfires, FEMA has resisted.

DHAP has been used after past disasters, including Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Gustav, Ike, and Sandy, to provide low-income, displaced families with safe, decent, and affordable rental homes while they rebuild their lives and get back on their feet. DHAP is administered through HUD's existing network of local public housing agencies, which have significant local market knowledge and experience administering HUD's Housing Choice Voucher program.

DHAP provides displaced households with temporary rental assistance, covering the cost difference between what a family can afford to pay and their rent, capped at a reasonable amount. Over the course of several months, families are required to pay a greater share of

their rent to encourage and help them assume full responsibility for housing costs at the end of the program. All families receiving DHAP rental assistance are provided wrap-around case management services to help them find permanent housing, secure employment, and connect with public benefits.

DHAP helps fill the gaps that low-income households experience with FEMA's Transitional Shelter Assistance (TSA) and Rental Assistance programs. Many hotels do not participate in TSA, and those that do often charge daily resort fees, ask for security deposits, and require that displaced households have credit cards, all of which are barriers for low-income households. Because disasters generally reduce the amount of available housing stock, low-income renters are often unable to use Rental Assistance in their communities. If a displaced household relocates, the Rental Assistance amount, which is based on the FMR of the impacted area, may not be enough to cover the cost of an apartment in a different community.

Federal Housing Administration (FHA): The FHA grants a 90-day moratorium on foreclosures and forbearance on foreclosures of FHA-insured home mortgages. HUD's Section 203(h) program provides FHA insurance to disaster victims who have lost their homes and need to rebuild or buy another home. Borrowers from participating FHA-approved lenders may be eligible for 100% financing. HUD's Section 203(k) loan program enables those who have lost their homes to finance the purchase of or refinance a house along with repairs through a single mortgage. It also allows homeowners who have damaged houses to finance the rehabilitation of their existing single-family home.

U.S. Small Business Administration

After households apply to FEMA, they might be contacted by SBA to apply for a low-interest loan. If eligible, the household does not have to accept the loan. If a household is not eligible for an SBA loan, they will be referred to FEMA to be considered for a FEMA ONA grant. To be

considered for an ONA grant, a household must have submitted an SBA loan application.

SBA can provide physical disaster loans to cover uninsured or uncompensated losses of a home or personal property. A homeowner can apply for a loan to repair or rebuild a primary residence to its pre-disaster condition based on the verified losses and homeowners may apply for up to \$200,000 to repair or replace their home to its pre-disaster condition. The loan amount can increase by as much as 20% to help homeowners rebuild in a manner that protects against damage from future disasters of the same kind, up to the \$200,000 maximum. Both homeowners and renters may apply for loans—up to \$40,000—to replace personal property (anything not considered real estate or part of the structure of the home) lost in a disaster. The interest rate on SBA physical disaster loans depends on the applicant's ability to secure credit from another source. In 2017, applicants unable to obtain credit elsewhere were charged 1.75% interest; for those who could obtain credit elsewhere, the interest rate was 3.5%. The term of loans is often 30 years.

Businesses, including rental property owners and nonprofit organizations, can apply for loans for real estate and personal property loss up to a maximum of \$2 million. In addition, businesses and nonprofits can apply for economic injury loans of up to \$2 million to cover working capital to meet their ordinary financial obligations.

U.S. Department of Agriculture

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) provides loans, grants, and loan servicing options to its loan borrowers and their tenants or grant recipients.

U.S. Department of the Treasury

Congress authorized the Department of the Treasury to provide special Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs) and other tax incentives after recent major disasters without a permanent disaster recovery program in place. In the case of hurricanes Katrina and Rita, the

Treasury established Gulf Opportunity (GO) Zone tax credits, GO Zone tax-exempt bonds, and additional New Markets Tax Credits to help rebuild housing. After Superstorm Sandy in 2011, Congress also authorized additional LIHTCs, private activity bonds, and New Markets Tax Credits.

Revenue Procedure 2014-49 (Rev. Proc. 2014-49) from 2014 provides guidance to owners and state housing finance agencies (HFAs) regarding temporary relief from certain requirements that apply to the LIHTC program. A key provision allows an owner to provide up to twelve months of emergency housing to households that have been displaced by a presidentially declared major disaster. Households are eligible for emergency housing in an LIHTC unit if their home is in an area eligible for FEMA individual assistance.

Unless a property's written policies and procedures provide a preference for households displaced by a presidentially declared disaster, an owner may not skip over households on a waiting list to provide emergency housing. Existing households cannot be displaced in order to provide emergency housing.

Rev. Proc. 2014-49 relieves an owner and household of providing evidence of income eligibility. All other LIHTC rules apply, however, including LIHTC rent limits. The emergency relief period ends one year after the date the disaster was declared. After that date, displaced households that are not income-eligible under the LIHTC program cannot occupy a unit assisted under the LIHTC program. To provide emergency housing, an owner must request written approval from the HFA.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The ongoing recovery from Hurricanes Harvey, Florence, Irma, Michael, and Maria, the wildfires in California in 2017 and 2018, and an abnormally active 2019 hurricane season pushed Congress to introduce several bills that encourage quick and equitable recovery. In 2019, Representatives Ann Wagner (R-MO) and Al Green (D-TX) introduced the "Reforming Disaster Recovery Act," which permanently authorizes

the CDBG-DR program. The bill also creates important safeguards and tools to ensure that federal disaster recovery and rebuilding efforts reach all impacted households, including those with the lowest incomes that are often hardest hit by disasters but have the fewest resources. NLIHC strongly supports this bill. The bill passed out of the House Financial Services Committee by unanimous vote and was later passed by a bipartisan vote of the House of Representatives. Companion legislation in the Senate was introduced by Senators Brian Schatz (D-HI) and Todd Young (R-IN).

Several other members of Congress introduced bills directing FEMA to activate DHAP, remove barriers that low-income households face when applying for aid, boost pre-disaster planning efforts, and allow more types of residential communities to access disaster recovery aid.

Congress will enact relief bills to address disasters as they occur. Any disaster relief bill should include resources to ensure that all survivors, including people with the lowest incomes, are served.

In addition to potential legislative changes, advocates should remain aware of administrative and programmatic releases from federal agencies surrounding disaster recovery.

While HUD has released guidance and allocations for almost all 2017, 2018, and 2019 CDBG-DR grantees in the Federal Register, the territory of Puerto Rico continues to wait for over \$16 billion in CDBG-DR and MIT funding already appropriated to the island by HUD. HUD violated both its own self-imposed timeline as well as congressional statute with its delay.

HUD has now published guidance in the Federal Register regarding funding through the CDBG-MIT program with very onerous requirements for the use of the funds unique to Puerto Rico. The territory will now need to develop an action plan for the CDBG-MIT funds. Advocates should be prepared to respond to the plan to push for adequate resources for the lowest-income people.

States that received CDBG-DR and MIT funds for 2017 and 2018 disasters will begin implementing

programs outlined in their state action plans. As states continue to work through the CDBG-DR and MIT process, advocates should be prepared to ensure that all guidelines and policies, including federal civil rights law, are being followed as long-term recovery dollars begin to reach disaster areas.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Low-Income Housing Coalition, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org

The Disaster Housing Recovery Coalition's webpage, <http://nlihc.org/issues/disaster>, including its recommendations:

- [To Congress](#)
- [To HUD](#)
- [To FEMA](#)

NLIHC's Report, "Reforming America's Broken Disaster Housing Recovery System, Part One: Barriers to a Complete and Equitable Recovery", <https://bit.ly/2RZHmuK>

NLIHC's 2017 Top Priorities for Any Disaster Recovery Package, <https://bit.ly/2K8Mp6b>

NLIHC's Disaster Recovery Resources webpage: <https://nlihc.org/issues/disaster/resources>

NLIHC's Disaster Housing Assistance Program fact sheet: <https://bit.ly/2QZ2WvP>

Attacks on Immigrants' Access to Housing

By Sonya Acosta, Policy analyst, NLIHC

Under the Trump administration, several agencies, including HUD, the Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Department of Justice (DOJ) have introduced changes to current policy that would harm low-income immigrant families. Advocates have mobilized to oppose these changes by holding meetings with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), submitting comments on proposed rules, working with members of Congress on legislative actions, and supporting litigation (for more information, see “Introduction to the Federal Regulatory Process” in Chapter 2). These regulatory changes would not help expand resources for U.S. citizens and others with eligible immigration statuses but would serve to prevent immigrants from accessing vital health, nutrition, and housing assistance.

CHANGES TO THE DEFINITION OF “PUBLIC CHARGE”

Background

The “public charge” test is a long-standing component of U.S. immigration policy used to determine if an individual is likely to depend on government benefits as their main source of support. If someone is deemed likely to become a “public charge,” the federal government can deny admission to the U.S. or deny an application for lawful permanent resident status (a “green card”). Permanent residents applying to become U.S. citizens are not subject to the public charge test. The current policy under *Field Guidance on Deportability and Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds* of 1999 defined public charge to mean a person “primarily dependent on the government for subsistence, as demonstrated by either the receipt of public cash assistance for income maintenance or institutionalization for long-term care at government expense.” When making public charge determinations, immigration officials look at the use of federal, state, or

tribal cash assistance, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), in addition to the individual’s circumstances, including age, income, education and skills, health, family size, and support from friends or family in the U.S. All these factors are considered as part of the public charge test so that positive factors can help overcome negative factors.

The Trump administration has proposed expanding the list of benefits considered as part of the public charge test, which would make it easier for immigration officials to deny entry or permanent resident status to low-income immigrants because they use, or might in the future use vital health, nutrition, or housing assistance programs. Decisions about applications for admission or lawful permanent resident status inside the U.S. are made by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) within DHS; applications for admission or green cards outside the U.S. at embassies or consular offices abroad are reviewed by the Department of State. Each agency has its own regulations, but the administration has worked to align the policies.

Refugees, asylees, survivors of trafficking and other serious crimes, certain people who have been paroled into the U.S., self-petitioners under the “Violence Against Women Act (VAWA),” special immigrant juveniles, and several other categories of noncitizens are exempt from the public charge rule.

DHS Final Public Charge Rule on Inadmissibility

On August 14, 2019, DHS published the final version of their Rule on Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds (Public Charge Rule). The agency released its proposed rule in October 2018, which garnered more than 266,000 public comments during the 60-day comment period. The final rule was set to go into effect on October 15, 2019, but several courts blocked the rule from implementation until the lawsuits are settled.

Two of the three national injunctions were later lifted after appeals by the administration.

The final rule expands the public benefits included as part of the public charge test to include Housing Choice Vouchers, public housing, Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA), the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and most forms of Medicaid (with some exceptions) in addition to cash assistance programs. Receipt of any of these programs for a combined total of 12 months in a 36-month period will be a heavily weighted negative factor against applicants. The use of two benefits in the same month, such as receiving both SNAP and Medicaid, would count as two of the 12 months. Neither receipt of benefits by family members nor Medicaid for pregnant women or individuals under 21 would be considered. The use—or potential use based on other circumstances like education, income, and age—of any of these programs would be considered a negative factor in the public charge test.

Tenants of Public Housing and Section 8 programs must already meet immigration status eligibility requirements established under Section 214 of the “Housing and Community Development Act.” Only some immigrants eligible for this federal housing assistance would also potentially be subject to the public charge test: parolees, immigrants granted withholding of removal, and those lawfully admitted pursuant to Section 141 of the Compacts of Free Association with the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and Palau (COFA). Since family members’ use of benefits is not counted against an applicant, individuals subject to public charge living in a mixed-status immigrant household can continue living with family members receiving housing assistance without harming their own immigration case.

Although the Public Charge Rule has not gone into effect as of publication of this *Advocates Guide*, the proposal has already had a chilling effect on immigrant families. The rule has increased fear and confusion in immigrant communities, deterring eligible immigrant

families from applying for needed housing, health, and medical assistance.

Legislative Action and Lawsuits

Following the publication of the final Public Charge Rule, state, county, and city governments joined nonprofits and individuals in suing the Trump administration in a total of nine cases. Three courts ordered national injunctions, preventing DHS from implementing the rule until a final decision is made.

Representative Judy Chu (D-CA) and an additional 117 House Democrats sponsored the “No Federal Funds for Public Charge Act of 2019” (H.R. 3222), which would prevent DHS from using funds to implement the Public Charge Rule. The House Appropriations Committee adopted similar language included in an amendment offered by Representative David Price (D-NC).

Led by the National Immigration Law Center and the Center for Law and Social Policy, the Protecting Immigrant Families Campaign of over 1,500 organizations nationwide has organized opposition to the Public Charge rule and is working to ensure that immigrant communities know their rights.

Anticipated DOJ Proposed Public Charge Rule on Deportation

On July 3, 2019, the Department of Justice (DOJ) submitted a draft notice of proposed rulemaking titled “Inadmissibility and Deportability on Public Charge Grounds” to OMB for formal review before publication in the *Federal Register*. At the time of writing this *Advocates’ Guide*, the proposal has not been published, so not many details are known. The administration has indicated that it plans to align standards on public charge where appropriate.

Currently, a person can be deported on public charge grounds under a very narrow set of circumstances involving a debt to the government because of receipt of benefits. An individual would need to meet six conditions to face deportation, including being successfully sued by the government. Deportation on public charge grounds is very uncommon. A change

to current policy might keep the circumstances allowing for deportability narrow, but it would have a substantial chilling effect on immigrant communities.

EXCLUSION OF MIXED-STATUS FAMILIES FROM FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

Background

Residents of certain federally subsidized units are subject to immigration status restrictions under Section 214 of the “Housing and Community Development Act of 1980” (Section 214). HUD programs under Section 214 include public housing, Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers, Section 8 PBRA, Section 235 Home Loan Program, Section 236 Rental Assistance Program, the Rent Supplement Program, and the housing development grant programs (low-income units only). Section 214 also governs the Section 542 Rural Development Voucher program, Section 502 Guaranteed Rural Housing Loans, the Section 504 Home Repair program, and Section 521 rental assistance for the Section 515 and Section 514/516 programs operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Rural Housing Service (RHS).

Under Section 214, individuals with the following immigration status are eligible for federal housing assistance programs: U.S. citizens and nationals, lawful permanent residents, VAWA self-petitioners, asylees and refugees, parolees, persons granted withholding of removal, victims of trafficking, individuals residing in the U.S. under COFA, and immigrants admitted for lawful temporary residence under the “Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.” Being ineligible for housing assistance is not equivalent to being undocumented. Immigrants with student visas, Temporary Protected Status, U-visa non-immigrant status, and other statuses are also not eligible for federal housing subsidies.

Currently, families with at least one U.S. citizen or eligible immigrant are allowed to live in a HUD subsidized housing unit. These families are referred to as “mixed-status” and receive

prorated assistance so that the subsidy amount is decreased to only cover family members with an eligible immigration status. Family members that are applying for assistance must have their immigration status verified; ineligible family members can choose not to contend eligibility, which allows the family to receive prorated assistance. Noncitizens 62 years old or older are only required to provide a signed declaration of eligible immigration status and a document proving their age.

RHS does not prorate assistance for mixed-status families. The agency attempted in 2004 to implement Section 214 for all residents of Sections 515 and 514/516 housing, but the proposed regulation failed to properly follow the law. The 2004 rule ignored the full list of eligible immigration statuses listed in Section 214, required all residents of Sections 515 and 514/516 units be citizens or legal permanent residents even if they were not receiving Rental Assistance, and did not allow for proration. After advocacy organizations threatened the agency with litigation, RHS indefinitely postponed the rule with respect to the Section 515 program but failed to widely publish this change. Given the inconsistent guidance, some owners enforce the requirements of the 2004 rule and others do not.

HUD Proposed Mixed-Status Families Rule

On May 10, 2019, HUD released a proposed rule that would further restrict eligibility for federal housing assistance based on immigration status by prohibiting mixed-status families from living in subsidized units subject to Section 214. The rule would force impacted households to choose between separating as a family to keep their subsidy or facing eviction and potentially homelessness. According to HUD’s own analysis, the proposed rule would effectively evict 25,000 immigrant families from their homes, including 55,000 children eligible for housing assistance. In fact, two-thirds of people in mixed-status families are already U.S. citizens, the majority of them children.

Additionally, the proposed rule would eliminate the option to not contend eligibility in order

to receive prorated assistance. Instead, the immigration status of all household members under the age of 62 would need to be verified through DHS's Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system. Those aged 62 years or older would also be subject to new documentation requirements. The additional documentation requirements would create a substantial administrative burden for housing authorities and could force them to divert resources away from property maintenance and other services.

HUD claims that the new policy will address the public housing waiting list, but the agency's own analysis found that the proposed rule would actually result in fewer families receiving housing assistance. Since mixed-status families do not receive housing assistance for ineligible family members, taking assistance away from these households would require HUD to provide full subsidies for additional families, costing the government at least \$193 million. HUD admits that the agency could be forced to reduce the quality and quantity of assisted housing to cover these additional costs.

In response to the proposed rule, the National Low Income Housing Coalition, the National Housing Law Project (NHLP), and other partners launched the Keep Families Together campaign to mobilize opposition. During the public comment period, individuals and organizations submitted over 30,450 comments; the previous time a HUD proposal garnered significant public attention resulted in just over 1,000 public comments. An NHLP analysis of these comments found that more than 95% of the comments opposed the rule.

Legislative Action

Representative Sylvia R. Garcia (D-TX) and 14 other House Democrats sponsored the "Keeping Families Together Act of 2019" (H.R. 2763), which would prohibit HUD from implementing the proposed rule. Senator Kirsten Gillibrand (D-NY) introduced a companion bill in the Senate (S. 1904), and similar language was included in the House version of the fiscal year 2020 spending bill.

Anticipated RHS Rule on Mixed-Status Families

The 2019 Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions reports that RHS is developing a rule, Implementation of the Multi-Family Housing U.S. Citizenship Requirements, noting that the agency's rule will align its immigration eligibility requirements with those at HUD. Given RHS's inconsistent implementation of Section 214, the exact impact of a rule similar to HUD's will be difficult to determine.

OUTLOOK FOR 2020

The DHS Public Charge Final Rule went into effect (except in Illinois) on February 24 after the Supreme Court lifted a nationwide injunction. As of this writing, a statewide injunction is still in place for Illinois. The courts will likely issue rulings on the legality of the rule in spring or summer of 2020.

HUD may also issue a Mixed-Status Immigrant Families Final Rule as early as May. USDA and DOJ may also publish their proposed rules. NLIHC will continue to monitor these regulatory actions.

If President Trump is not reelected in the presidential election of 2020, a new president could halt implementation or retract any of these rules.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak to lawmakers with the message that:

- Blaming struggling families will not fix the long waitlist for housing assistance or the affordable housing crisis. Congress should instead make significant new investments in affordable housing resources to ensure that every family, regardless of immigration status, who is eligible for HUD assistance has access to one of the most basic of human rights: a safe, accessible, and affordable place to call home.
- These rules will directly impact thousands of immigrant families' access to housing and will have a chilling effect that puts thousands more at risk of homelessness. This country

is already facing an affordable housing crisis and limiting access for more people will only exacerbate the problem.

- Human needs do not change based on immigration status. It is simply impractical, dangerous, and inhumane to only allow citizens to access critical, lifesaving benefits such as housing assistance. Members of Congress should work to restrict or halt the implementation of these harmful rules.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

DHS’s “Inadmissibility on Public Charge Ground”
Final Rule: <https://bit.ly/38zU9K6>

HUD’s “Housing and Community Development
Act of 1980: Verification of Eligible Status”
Proposed Rule: <https://bit.ly/2YGfu07>

Keep Families Together campaign:
<https://www.keep-families-together.org/>

National Housing Law Project: <https://www.nhlp.org/initiatives/immigrant-rights/>

Protecting Immigrant Families campaign:
<https://protectingimmigrantfamilies.org/>

Chapter 7:

HOUSING

TOOLS

Housing Counseling Assistance

By Melody Imoh, Policy and Program Director, National Housing Resource Center

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Housing Counseling

Year Started: 1968

Number of Persons/Households Served: More than 1.1 million households in FY18

Populations Targeted: Low- and moderate-income households, people of color, people with limited English proficiency, and rural households

Funding: \$53 million in FY2020
The Housing Counseling Assistance (HCA) Program provides grants to nonprofit, HUD-approved housing counseling agencies. Grants are distributed through a competitive grant process.

HISTORY

The HUD Housing Counseling Program was first authorized by the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968" "to provide counseling and advice to tenants and homeowners, both current and prospective, to assist them in improving their housing conditions, meeting their financial needs, and fulfilling the responsibilities of tenancy or homeownership." In 2010, the Obama Administration signed the "Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act" into law. The new law made important changes to the HUD Housing Counseling program, including the creation of the Office of Housing Counseling (OHC) within HUD, and mandated that all counseling by HUD-approved counseling agencies be provided by certified counselors. A new rule, put into effect in 2017 by the OHC, requires that by August 2020 all HUD-approved housing counseling agencies must provide counseling services via certified counselors.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Since its inception, HUD-approved housing counseling agencies that receive grants through the HCA program have been on the frontlines of helping predominantly low and moderate-income households achieve their housing goals, whether by purchasing their first home, saving their home from foreclosure, or finding safe and affordable rental housing (in FY 2018, 73% of counseled households had incomes below 80% of area median income). In addition to addressing housing-specific issues, counselors also work to improve their clients' general financial outlook by teaching skills such as household budgeting, paying down debt, and increasing savings. Unfortunately, due to a lack of public awareness of housing counseling availability and value, many do not take full advantage of such services. Effective public education and advocacy are necessary to increase the visibility and access of these valuable services.

HUD-approved counseling agencies provide both counseling services and educational programs. Housing counseling is conducted one-on-one with a household and delivers personalized information including a review of income, credit, household budget, and saving. Education programs deliver generalized information in a group workshop setting or online. In FY18, over two-thirds of all clients of HUD-approved counseling agencies sought one-on-one counseling and a little less than one-third sought group education.

All one-on-one counseling begins with an in-depth review of household finances, including income, expenses, credit, and debts. When the counselor and client have a better understanding of the client's financial picture, they work together to create an action plan to address the client's specific housing needs. Two-thirds of counseling clients seek to either purchase a home, often for the first time, or resolve or prevent a mortgage delinquency or default. The

remaining one-third of counseling clients seek assistance with rental housing or homelessness, are seniors interested in a reverse mortgage (which requires counseling from a HUD-approved agency), or are homeowners seeking home maintenance and financial management assistance.

Most clients who seek group education services from HUD-approved counseling agencies attend a pre-purchase homebuyer education workshop (48%) or a financial literacy workshop (38%) that covers home affordability, budgeting, and understanding credit.

HOUSING COUNSELING ASSISTANCE FUNDING

Federal funding for housing counseling is a constant legislative fight for advocates, especially in recent years. At its peak, federal funding for the HCA program was \$87.5 million for FY2010. However, since the elimination of the National Foreclosure Mitigation Counseling (NFMC) program and the lowering of HUD Housing Counseling Assistance allocations, the housing counseling field has had to deal with an ever-decreasing pot of funding. For FY2019, the Housing Counseling Assistance program was funded at \$50 million. For FY2020, the President's Budget Request and the Senate FY2020 appropriations level for the program was at \$45 million, a 10% decrease from the previous year. For FY2020, the House and Senate Conference funded the program at \$53 million.

Another focus for housing counseling advocates will be integrating counseling into FHA mortgages. FHA-insured mortgages are the most common mortgage for people of color and low- and moderate-income buyers. As of the writing of this publication, there is legislation to incentivize FHA borrowers to participate in housing counseling programs by providing discounts on the required mortgage insurance. That legislation, the "Housing Financial Literacy Act of 2019," has passed the House and may be introduced in the Senate.

Housing counseling advocates will remain involved in a wide range of housing policy

advocacy, including the expansion of language capacity in the lending and servicing industries for people with limited English proficiency, expanding homeownership opportunities and bridging the wealth gap for people of color, and integrating housing counseling into the mortgage process. If Congress revisits housing finance reform, Fannie Mae, and Freddie Mac, there should be opportunities to include housing counseling in that conversation.

Finally, disaster recovery legislation should include housing counseling services. The bipartisan "Reforming Disaster Recovery Act of 2019" has passed the house and has been introduced in the Senate. This legislation would permanently authorize Community Development Block Grant Disaster Recovery funding and make it year-round rather than requiring separate authorizations for each disaster, speeding up the availability of recovery funding and housing counseling services.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

When talking with legislators, keep advocacy as locally focused as possible.

- Discuss the local communities served by advocates, why people from those communities are seeking housing counseling services, and the outcomes advocates are helping them to achieve.
- Describe some of the local trends that advocates are seeing (e.g., are more first-time homebuyers seeking out pre-purchase counseling or are large numbers of folks still seeking delinquency and default counseling?).
- Focus on the real-life impact that HUD-approved counseling agencies have on people in the state/district. Include counseling clients in meetings. Meeting a first-time homebuyer or a former client of a housing counseling agency can have a lasting impact on a legislator or his or her staff. Offer to be help constituents who call the district office for help with housing issues.

Do not assume that every congressional office is aware of the HUD-approved counseling

agencies in their district or state. Provide a list of HUD-approved counseling agencies that serve relevant communities (search for HUD-approved counseling agencies by state using the HUD search tool at <https://apps.hud.gov/offices/hsg/sfh/hcc/hcs.cfm> or by zip code using the CFPB search tool at <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/find-a-housing-counselor/>). When providing a list of local agencies to staff, explain its value for their constituents who call the legislative office about housing issues.

Finally, data is always a powerful tool to showcase impact. Every HUD-approved counseling agency provides data to HUD (9902 data), including client income level, race and ethnicity information, and types of counseling sought. In addition to HUD 9902 data, ask local counseling agencies for specific data to present at advocate meetings.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The profile and perception of housing counseling has improved in recent years, particularly among legislators and their staff on the Republican side of the aisle. With the creation of the OHC, past concerns about HUD's administration of the program seem to have dissipated and housing counseling advocates are generally well-received by both Democratic and Republican offices. That said, advocates should adjust their messaging appropriately for the office with which they are meeting.

- **Have a concrete ask.** If talking with a member of the Appropriations Committee, “Please support \$65 million for HUD Housing Counseling in the upcoming budget.” If talking with a legislator, “Please tell your Appropriations Committee leadership that you support \$65 million for HUD Housing Counseling in the upcoming budget.”
- **Focus on local issues.** Focus on the local impact counseling has in the legislator’s state or district, including using localized data as often as possible, if available (please see section on “Tips for Local Success”).
- **Use current data and research.** Make sure any data presented demonstrates the effectiveness and value of counseling. Advocates should be prepared to point to one or two studies and talk to their representatives about the value of housing counseling services, not just for consumers but for all participants in the housing process (i.e., benefits to lenders, investors, servicers, etc.). Try to use data that is no more than 2-3 years old, so that the information is current, likely relevant to the lawmakers, and reflects current markets. OHC has a comprehensive review of research into the effectiveness of housing counseling at <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Housing-Counseling-Works.pdf>
- **Connect program effectiveness to funding.** Highlight the connection between funding levels and the ability to start, continue, and/or expand operations to serve their communities (please see Section on “Funding”).
- **Be a resource.** Turnover is very common on the Hill, so many legislators and their staff may hold a meeting with very little knowledge or understanding of housing counseling. In these instances, it’s critical that advocates position themselves as a resource for the office. Highlight how an agency can be of assistance to their office, either for constituent services or if they need housing data for internal or external policy documents.
- **Build a champion.** The overall goal when meeting with legislators is to win them over as champions for housing counseling who will be willing to tell leadership that fully funding counseling is a top priority. Try to approach meetings with legislators as an opportunity to give that legislator a reason to want to be a champion for housing counseling.
- **Stay on message.** Not all lawmakers understand or support housing counseling assistance. Do not let this deter from sticking to the goal. Explain what a typical counseling session looks like. Be specific but clear. Focus on the holistic approach counseling takes to

improve clients' overall financial well-being and sustainability. Emphasize stories and data from the local district.

- **Tell the National Housing Resource Center (NHRC) about a housing counseling champion.** Contact Melody Imoh at NHRC about a strong housing counseling supporter at mimoh@hsgcenter.org

TALKING TO APPROPRIATORS

When talking to appropriators or their staffs, advocates are likely to hear either that they are unable to fully fund all of the programs because spending levels are too low or that they would love to fully fund HCA but do not have much say because they are in the minority. There are several responses to this, including:

- It is critical that Congress lift spending caps in order to ensure that critical programs such as housing counseling are able to meet the existing demand in their district.
- Federal funding for HCA is down significantly since 2010 (please see “Funding,” above) and funding for foreclosure mitigation counseling was eliminated in the FY17 spending bill.
- Although foreclosures are down from their peak, default and delinquency continue to be a major share of our work (if that is true for the agency).
- As the housing market has recovered, demand for pre-purchase counseling is soaring. It is critical that potential homebuyers are given the tools they need to become successful homeowners.

RESOURCES FOR HOUSING COUNSELING

HUD's OHC website has relevant resources for housing counselors, advocates, homeowners, and tenants: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/housing-counseling/>

Find housing counseling in a specific area: <https://apps.hud.gov/offices/hsg/sfh/hcc/hcs.cfm> (to search by state) or <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/find-a-housing-counselor/> (to search by ZIP code).

HUD 9902 quarterly reports (these are the quarterly reports each HUD-approved counseling agency is required to submit and include data on client demographics and types of counseling provided): <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/housing-counseling/9902-quarterly-reports/>

OHC has an excellent summary of research into the effectiveness of housing counseling: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/sites/default/files/pdf/Housing-Counseling-Works.pdf>

A particularly helpful study on pre-purchase counseling: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/citysce/vol18num2/ch4.pdf>.

A particularly helpful study on foreclosure prevention counseling: [http://www.neighborworks.org/Documents/HomeandFinance_Docs/Foreclosure_Docs/ForeclosureCounseling\(NFMC\)_Docs/2014_NFMC_UrbanInstituteReport.aspx](http://www.neighborworks.org/Documents/HomeandFinance_Docs/Foreclosure_Docs/ForeclosureCounseling(NFMC)_Docs/2014_NFMC_UrbanInstituteReport.aspx)

NHRC is an advocacy organization for the nonprofit housing counseling community and has resources for counselors and advocates: www.hsgcenter.org

Fair Housing Programs

By Jorge Andres Soto, Director of Public Policy, National Fair Housing Alliance

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO)

Year Started: 1989

Number of Persons/Households Served: In 2017 through 2018, organizations primarily funded by the Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) investigated 44,002 complaints of housing discrimination.

Population Targeted: Protected classes under the "Fair Housing Act" are based on race, national origin, color, religion, sex, familial status, and disability.

Funding: Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP), \$45 million; Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP), \$23.5 million in FY20.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing* sections of this guide.

The federal "Fair Housing Act" protects the public from discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, color, religion, sex, familial status, and disability in all housing transactions, public and private. HUD has also provided guidance that interprets the Fair Housing Act prohibition on sex discrimination to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity in HUD-assisted housing and housing insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

Two HUD-funded programs are specifically dedicated to the enforcement of the Fair Housing Act: The Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) and the Fair Housing Assistance Program (FHAP).

ADMINISTRATION

HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) is responsible for administering FHIP, FHAP, and HUD's investigation of fair housing and fair lending

complaints. The Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) may also investigate complaints and is responsible for litigating on behalf of the federal government in cases of fair housing and fair lending violations. DOJ also retains exclusive fair housing authority over complaints the government receives involving zoning, land use, and pattern and practice cases.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The federal Fair Housing Act was passed in 1968 and amended in 1974 and 1988. FHIP and FHAP were created as a means of carrying out the objectives of the act.

PROGRAMS SUMMARY

There are two federal programs that support enforcement of the Fair Housing Act. FHIP funds private fair housing organizations, and FHAP funds the fair housing enforcement programs of state and local government agencies.

Fair Housing Initiatives Program

FHIP supports private nonprofit fair housing organizations in their efforts to provide education and outreach to the public and housing providers and to enforce the Fair Housing Act by investigating allegations of rental, real-estate sales, homeowner insurance, and lending discrimination in their local housing markets. FHIP is a competitive grant program administered by FHEO. FHIP supports three primary activities: The Private Enforcement Initiative enables qualified private nonprofit fair housing organizations to conduct complaint intake, testing, investigations, and other enforcement activities. The Education and Outreach Initiative funds organizations to educate the general public about fair housing rights and responsibilities and local housing providers about how to comply with the law.

The Fair Housing Organizations Initiative builds the capacity and effectiveness of fair housing organizations and funds the creation of new organizations.

In 2017 and 2018, FHIP-funded organizations investigated over 44,000 complaints of housing discrimination across the country, more than twice that of all state and federal agencies combined and over three times as many as local and state government agencies participating in HUD's FHAP program combined during the same period.

Fair Housing Assistance Program

State and local government agencies certified by HUD to enforce state or local fair housing laws that are substantially equivalent to the Fair Housing Act receive FHAP funds. HUD funds FHAP agencies by reimbursing them based on the number of cases they successfully process. In addition, FHAP funds help cover administrative expenses and training. New FHAP organizations receive three years of capacity building funding before moving to the reimbursement phase. In 2017 and 2018, FHAP entities investigated 12,883 complaints of housing discrimination.

FUNDING

The FY20 budget is \$45 million for FHIP and \$23.5 million for FHAP. At least \$57 million, including \$5 million for a systemic testing program, must be provided for the FHIP program going forward. FHAP must be funded at \$40 million.

An increased FHIP appropriation would provide fair housing groups with the capacity to address larger systemic issues, such as discriminatory sales practices, insurance policies, and bringing about investigations into increasingly harmful blanket policies that have a widespread impact on available housing choice in entire markets. FHIP must also be increased to allow for private nonprofit fair housing organizations to address the onslaught of discrimination against immigrants and religious minorities.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Fair housing enforcement has repeatedly come under attack from this current Administration. The current Administration has suspended HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule and has rewritten its Discriminatory Effects rule in a manner that makes it nearly impossible for victims of discriminatory policies or practices to successfully bring disparate impact claims. Moreover, this Administration has failed to release the Notice of Funding Availability ("NOFA") for FHIP during its tenure, drawing out the time between the end of expiring three-year enforcement grants. As of December 17, 2019, HUD had still not released the FY19 FHIP NOFA, causing a crisis scenario in which nearly a third of all grant recipients will experience some form of significant lapse in enforcement funding. The practical impacts of this decision will be felt in communities across the nation as nearly a third of FHIP grant organizations may be forced to shut down fair housing intake services and investigations. This will be a massive setback for fair housing enforcement in the long run as agencies will risk losing expert fair housing specialists who took years to train and cultivate.

NFHA has raised these concerns with HUD and Congress. Advocates should call on Congress to increase funding for FHIP and FHAP and to create increased accountability measures to ensure that HUD and the Office of Management and Budget release FHIP funding opportunities in a timely manner.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Individuals and advocates who suspect or observe a fair housing violation, including a failure to affirmatively further fair housing, should contact a local fair housing organization, the National Fair Housing Alliance, or submit a request for assistance using the "Report Housing Discrimination" feature at www.nationalfairhousing.org.

Fair housing complaints can be submitted to local fair housing organizations, state or local government agencies, or HUD.

Individuals who experience hate crimes in a dwelling should call the local authorities, but they should also reach out to their local fair housing organization or the National Fair Housing Alliance. The Fair Housing Act has a criminal section that protects victims of certain hate crimes at their place of dwelling.

Advocates working with distressed homeowners who believe they may have been victims of lending discrimination should encourage borrowers to submit mortgage complaints to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). Individuals and advocates may submit mortgage complaints by visiting www.consumerfinance.gov or by calling 855-411-CFPB (2372). Non-English speakers can receive information and submit mortgage complaints in 200 languages by calling the CFPB.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak to legislators with the message that private fair housing organizations investigate more than two thirds of all fair housing complaints each year, which is twice as many as all government agencies combined. This important service is historically underfunded and as a result, fair housing and fair lending violations remain under-reported and unaddressed. To help put an end to pervasive housing discrimination, funding for FHIP should be at least \$55 million, including \$5 million for a systemic testing program, and funding for FHAP should be \$35.2 million going forward.

Legislators must also be prepared to protect HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule and oppose changes to the current Discriminatory Effects regulation.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Fair Housing Alliance, 202-898-1661, 800-910-7315, www.nationalfairhousing.org.

Disparate Impact

By Jamie L. Crook, ACLU Foundation of Northern California

Disparate impact is best understood as a method for proving housing discrimination without having to show that the discrimination was intentional. Under the disparate impact theory, most courts, as well as HUD, use a “burden shifting” test (24 C.F.R. § 100.500, hereinafter “Disparate Impact Rule”).

First, the plaintiff must show that the challenged conduct, policy, or practice disproportionately harms members of a group that is protected by the “Fair Housing Act (FHA)” For example, a plaintiff could show that a municipal zoning ordinance that excludes mobile homes disproportionately harms Latinxs because in that jurisdiction, Latinxs are overrepresented among mobile home occupants. Second, the defendant may seek to prove that the challenged practice is justified by a legitimate, non-discriminatory purpose. In our hypothetical, the city might try to prove that it passed the ordinance to ensure a minimum level of habitability for all housing in the jurisdiction. At the final stage of the analysis, the plaintiff may prove that despite any legitimate, non-discriminatory purposes, the jurisdiction could achieve that goal in a way that has a less discriminatory impact on Latinxs. For example, the plaintiff might show that the city could achieve its habitability goals by enacting and enforcing specific codes for the maintenance of mobile home parks, rather than banning such housing altogether.

The burden-shifting proof framework ensures that courts apply the disparate impact standard in a pragmatic, fact-specific way, thereby reconciling two goals: (1) ferreting out conduct that unjustifiably discriminates by harming a protected class, and (2) allowing housing providers, lenders, local governments, and other potential defendants to pursue legitimate business and governmental goals. In fact, a quantitative survey of disparate impact cases over the past four decades found that disparate

impact plaintiffs only rarely prevail (see Stacy E. Seicshnaydre’s *Is Disparate Impact Having Any Impact? An Appellate Analysis of Forty Years of Disparate Impact Claims Under the Fair Housing Act*, 63 Am. Univ. L. Rev. 357 (2013), indicating that the availability of disparate impact liability is not an obstacle to legitimate planning or business objectives.

In *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project* (135 S. Ct. 2507 (2015), hereinafter “ICP”), a civil rights organization claimed that the State of Texas’s methodology for allocating Low-Income Housing Tax Credits lead to increased racial segregation in Dallas. Dozens of friend-of-the-court briefs submitted to the Court on the plaintiff’s side argued that preserving the disparate impact standard was consistent with the statutory text and congressional intent and was critical to fulfill and further the broad mandate of the federal Fair Housing Act. On the state’s side, dozens of such briefs argued in contrast that a defendant should not be held liable without evidence of discriminatory intent, because allowing liability to turn on discriminatory effect alone would chill reasonable underwriting practices, local zoning decisions, city planning efforts, etc.

The majority opinion, by Justice Kennedy, addressed both themes. First, the Court recognized that disparate impact is a necessary tool for combatting ongoing, systemic discrimination of the type that motivated passage of the Fair Housing Act in the first place, such as exclusionary zoning. The Court found that “[m]uch progress remains to be made in our Nation’s continuing struggle against racial isolation” and that the Fair Housing Act has an important “continuing role in moving the Nation toward a more integrated society” by helping to combat, among other things, “discriminatory ordinances barring the construction of certain types of housing units” (*id.* at 2525-26). Thus, recognizing disparate impact liability enables “plaintiffs to counteract unconscious prejudices and disguised animus that escape

easy classification as disparate treatment,” and “prevent segregated housing patterns that might otherwise result from covert and illicit stereotyping” (*id.* at 2523).

Second, the Court emphasized that the disparate impact standard has been and remains properly limited “to give housing authorities and private developers leeway to state and explain the valid interest served by their policies... [H]ousing authorities and private developers [must] be allowed to maintain a policy if they can prove it is necessary to achieve a valid interest... The FHA does not decree a particular vision of urban development; and it does not put housing authorities and private developers in a double bind of liability, subject to suit whether they choose to rejuvenate a city core or to promote new low-income housing in suburban communities” (*id.* at 2522-23).

The *ICP* decision thus continues a long tradition of allowing disparate impact liability under the Fair Housing Act, while ensuring that the theory does not serve as a trap for housing providers or governments that are pursuing legitimate, housing-related objectives, so long as those legitimate objectives could not be achieved with less harmful impact on protected classes (a similar balancing is achieved in HUD’s Disparate Impact Rule).

As discussed in *ICP*, courts have historically applied disparate impact liability under the Fair Housing Act in “heartland” cases targeting “zoning laws and other housing restrictions that function unfairly to exclude minorities from certain neighborhoods without any sufficient justification” (*ICP*, 135 S. Ct. at 2522 citing *Huntington Branch NAACP v. Town of Huntington*, 844 F.2d 926 2d Cir. 1988) (holding that town’s zoning restrictions against multifamily housing had an unlawful adverse racial impact and perpetuated segregation); *United States v. City of Black Jack*, 508 F.2d 1179 (8th Cir. 1974); *Greater New Orleans Fair Hous. Action Ctr. v. Saint Bernard Parish*, 641 F. Supp. 2d 563 (E.D. La. 2009). But this pragmatic and flexible standard has also been used to challenge myriad other housing-related practices that have discriminatory effects,

such as subsidized housing waitlist preferences (see, e.g., *Langlois v. Abington Hous. Auth.*, 207 F.3d 43, 49 1st Cir. 2000), community redevelopment (see, e.g., *Mount Holly Gardens Citizens in Action Inc. v. Twp. of Mount Holly*, 658 F.3d 375 3d Cir. 2011), redlining and predatory lending (see, e.g., *Compl. for Declaratory and Inj. Relief and Damages, Mayor of Balt. v. Wells Fargo, N.A.*, No. 08-062 D. Md. Jan. 8, 2008) and *Ramirez v. GreenPoint Mortg. Funding Inc.*, 633 F. Supp. 2d 922 (N.D. Cal. 2008), mobile home registration requirements (see *Cent. Ala. Fair Hous. Ctr. v. Magee*, 835 F. Supp. 2d 1165 M.D. Ala. 2011), *vacated as moot* (No. 11-16114, 2013 WL 2372302 11th Cir. May 17, 2013), and condominium association rules restricting the presence of children (see, e.g., *Hous. Opportunities Project for Excellence Inc. v. Key Colony No. 4 Condominium Assoc.*, 510 F. Supp. 2d 1003 S.D. Fla. 2007), to give a few examples. Courts have also applied the disparate impact standard to conduct that, while facially neutral, would have the effect of perpetuating existing patterns of residential segregation.

Courts have long accepted that a diverse range of housing practices can be subject to a disparate impact challenge, and that has continued following *ICP*. One such example is redevelopment or urban renewal efforts. As cities throughout the country experience a massive resettlement of the urban cores (Leigh Gallagher, *The End of the Suburbs*; William H. Frey, *Demographic Reversal: Cities Thrive, Suburbs Sputter*), they are rapidly seeking to redevelop formerly blighted areas. Because long-time residents of these areas are disproportionately Black and Latinx, redevelopment can have a disparate impact if it causes displacement. In a case that settled before *ICP*, a group of African American and Latinx residents of a blighted neighborhood in Mount Holly, NJ, challenged a redevelopment plan using a disparate impact theory. The plaintiffs argued that the proposed redevelopment would displace them; indeed, their statistical evidence showed that that the negative impact would overwhelmingly affect African Americans and Latinxs, who were also significantly less likely to be able to afford replacement housing in the community

(*Id.* at 382-83). The plaintiffs got a favorable decision from the Court of Appeals, and the case subsequently settled in a fashion that permitted most of the families to move into newly constructed units in the same neighborhood.

Now that the *ICP* decision has resolved that plaintiffs can challenge this type of conduct using disparate impact, one can expect similar cases to be brought in areas facing rapid gentrification. Such cases may be brought against private developers as well as governmental entities. In the recently filed case *Crossroads Residents Organized for Stable and Secure Residences et al. v. MSP Crossroads Apartments LLC et al.*, No. 0:16-cv-00233 (D. Minn.), the plaintiffs, mostly low-income tenants, challenge a private housing provider's plan to "reposition the complex in the market in order to appeal to and house a different [young professional] tenant demographic population." See Compl. (Doc. 1), 1; *id.* pgs 49-59, 68-71 (disparate impact allegations). The District Court held that the plaintiffs adequately alleged both disparate treatment and disparate impact under the FHA and allowed those claims to proceed. *Crossroads Residents Organized for Stable and Secure Residences (CROSSRDS) v. MSP Crossroads Apartments LLC*, 2016 WL 3661146 (D. Minn. July 5, 2016). The case subsequently settled as a certified class action that will amend the screening criteria and fund the acquisition and preservation of affordable rental properties. *Soderstrom v. MSP Crossroads Apartments LLC*, Civ. No. 16-233, 2018 WL 692912 (D. Minn. Feb. 2, 2018).

An example along similar lines is addressed in a 2016 Second Circuit affordable housing case, *MHANY Management, Inc. v. County of Nassau* (819 F.3d 581 2d Cir. 2016). Citing the Supreme Court's recognition in *ICP* of the importance of such "heartland" zoning cases, the Second Circuit held that the plaintiffs met their burden of establishing that a rezoning decision by the City of Garden City, NY, prevented the development of affordable housing and therefore disproportionately harmed African Americans and Latinxs and perpetuated residential segregation (*Id.* at 619-20). On remand from the

Second Circuit, the District Court held that the plaintiffs' evidence at trial met their burden to show that Garden City could achieve its professed zoning goals through less discriminatory alternative means (*MHANY Mgmt., Inc. v. Cty. of Nassau*, No. 05CV2301ADSARL, 2017 WL 4174787, at *1 E.D.N.Y. Sept. 19, 2017). The case settled in 2019 with terms that will allow for the creation of new affordable housing in Nassau County.

Similarly, in *Avenue 6E Investments, LLC v. City of Yuma*, the Ninth Circuit emphasized the importance of "policy to provide fair housing nationwide" in holding that the denial of an affordable housing provider's zoning request in order "to permit the construction of housing that is more affordable" may constitute an unlawful disparate impact, and rejected an argument that the availability of affordable housing in the same region necessarily precludes a plaintiff from showing disparate impact (818 F.3d 493, 509-13 9th Cir. 2016). On remand, the district court denied the city's motion for summary judgment, holding that the record showed that the rezoning denial had a discriminatory effect on Latinxs and that whether the city could establish a valid justification and the availability of less discriminatory alternatives were material issues of fact for trial (217 F. Supp. 3d 1040 D. Ariz. 2017).

Plaintiffs have also used a disparate impact theory to challenge housing restrictions against people with criminal records, another area where bias may well be at play but can be difficult to prove. In *Sams v. Ga West Gate, LLC*, for example, current and former tenants and a fair housing organization challenged an apartment complex's "99-year criminal history rule," which "barred from residency any individual who had certain felony or misdemeanor convictions within the past 99 years" (*Sams v. Ga W. Gate, LLC*, No. CV415-282, 2017 WL 436281, at *1 S.D. Ga. Jan. 30, 2017). The district court held that the plaintiffs had adequately pleaded a disparate impact claim by showing that nationwide, African Americans were more likely than whites to have criminal convictions and were over-represented

in the prison population, and that the 99-year criminal history rule therefore adversely impacted African Americans (*Id.* at *5). District courts across the country have recognized the viability of similar disparate impact challenges to criminal-record bans by housing providers. *See Fortune Soc’y v. Sandcastle Towers Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 388 F. Supp. 3d 145 (E.D.N.Y. 2019); *Conn. Fair Hours. Ctr. v. Corelogic Rental Prop. Solutions, LLC*, 369 F. Supp. 3d 362 (D. Conn. 2019); *Jackson v. Tryon Park Apartments*, No. 6:18-cv-06238 EAW, 2019 WL 331635 (W.D.N.Y. Jan. 25, 2019); *Alexander v. Edgewood Mgmt. Corp.*, No. 15-01140 (RCL), 2016 WL 5957673, at *2-*3 (D.D.C. July 25, 2016). It is critical in bringing such challenges to identify a policy of exclusion based on an applicant’s criminal history (for example, an automatic ban against anyone with a felony conviction) and relevant statistical racial disparities comparing the group excluded by the policy and the relevant housing market.

Drawing on this breadth of successful disparate impact challenges in new areas, advocates should explore more disparate impact challenges to “disorderly conduct” or “chronic nuisance” ordinances, which subject landlords to fines and other penalties based on (among other things), police activity at their properties. Because these ordinances are drafted broadly, they have often been applied to include police responses to domestic violence incidents. Such ordinances will often force landlords to take steps to evict affected tenants following a triggering number of police responses at the property, under threat of hefty fines or other penalties (see Matthew Desmond & Nicol Valdez, *Unpolicing the Urban Poor: Consequences of Third-Party Policing for Inner-City Women* and Emily Werth, *The Cost of Being “Crime Free”: Legal and Practical Consequences of Crime Free Rental Housing and Nuisance Property Ordinances*). These laws can have a clear disparate impact on women, who make up the very large majority of domestic violence victims.

One plaintiff who had experienced extreme and life-threatening domestic violence and had been threatened with eviction after the police were called to her apartment three times sued the

Borough of Norristown, PA, which had applied its disorderly conduct ordinance to compel her landlord to evict her (*Briggs v. Borough of Norristown*, Compl. Doc. 1, No. 2:13-cv-2191 E.D. Pa. 2013). The plaintiff argued, among other things, that the Norristown ordinance violated the Fair Housing Act because it adversely affected and penalized victims of domestic violence, who are disproportionately women.

Although the Norristown case ultimately settled, it provides an important model that should be studied and applied by fair housing practitioners. Hundreds of jurisdictions across the country have similar nuisance laws, some of which may have a chilling effect by discouraging victims from calling the police in an event of domestic violence for fear of losing housing (see *Briggs*, Compl. pgs 55–60, 68–75, 87–102; *Markham v. City of Surprise, AZ*, Compl. Doc. 1, No. 2:15-cv-01696 D. Ariz. 2015; and Annamarya Scaccia’s *How Domestic Violence Survivors Get Evicted from their Homes After Calling the Police*). To the extent that such laws lead to the evictions of tenants affected by domestic violence, they will also create a risk of increased homelessness for domestic violence victims and their children (nationwide, one in five homeless women cites domestic violence as the primary cause of her homelessness, demonstrating a strong correlation between domestic violence and homelessness). The availability of the disparate impact standard will allow plaintiffs to bring successful challenges if they can present evidence of a discriminatory effect on women or families with children, without having to also present frequently difficult or impossible-to-obtain evidence of bias.

Courts have also allowed disparate impact challenges to policies characterized by the delegation of discretion, relying on Title VII case law. For example, in *City of Oakland v. Wells Fargo Bank (City of Oakland v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.)*, No. 15-CV-04321-EMC, 2018 WL 3008538, at *13 N.D. Cal. June 15, 2018 citing Title VII cases including *Watson v. Fort Worth Bank & Trust*, 487 U.S. 977 1988; *Rose v. Wells Fargo Co.*, 902 F.2d 1417 9th Cir. 1990; *Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 285 F.R.D. 492 N.D. Cal. 2012), the Court

held that the plaintiffs adequately identified a policy with a discriminatory effect—a lender’s granting of discretion to loan officers combined with incentives that encouraged them to sell more expensive and riskier loans than for which borrowers were qualified. The court held that the complaint adequately alleged that the granting of such discretion and incentives was a specific policy, and that there was a “sufficient causal link between the specific policies and practices and the disparate impact on minority borrowers for pleading purposes.” The court reached a similar conclusion in *National Fair Housing Alliance v. Federal National Mortgage Association*, holding that by identifying a policy of “delegate[ing] discretion or fail[ing] to supervise and differential maintenance based on the properties’ age and value,” the plaintiffs adequately alleged a policy that was the “robust cause” of disproportionate harm to communities of color (294 F. Supp. 3d 940, 948 N.D. Cal. 2018, hereinafter “*NFHA v. Fannie Mae*”).

Also consistent with HUD’s Disparate Impact Rule, courts have required that a defendant meet a burden of *proof*, not production, to justify a policy’s discriminatory effect. The Ninth Circuit recently affirmed summary judgment for fair housing plaintiffs, including an award of punitive damages, in a disparate impact challenge to an occupancy limitation because the defendant failed to produce evidence sufficient to justify the policy (*Fair Hous. Ctr. of Washington v. Breier-Scheetz, LLC*, 743 F. App’x 116 Nov. 19, 2018). The court held that punitive damages were justified because the defendant did not change its policy even after being notified by the city’s Office of Civil Rights that the occupancy limit was a fair housing violation).

Several Circuit Courts’ adoption of HUD’s Disparate Impact Rule, the *ICP* decision, and post-*ICP* caselaw confirm that going forward, disparate impact will remain an important tool for combatting practices that may not be motivated by bias, but which nonetheless disproportionately harm protected groups. At the same time, the Court’s reference in *ICP* to a “robust causality requirement” has engendered

debate in subsequent disparate impact litigation, with defendants frequently arguing that plaintiffs face a new or heightened burden to show causation. Justice Kennedy wrote that requiring “robust causality” was “important in ensuring that defendants do not resort to the use of racial quotas.” Several courts have rejected this interpretation of *ICP*, applying longstanding disparate impact precedent in finding a sufficient causal link between the challenged practice and the disproportionate harm to a protected class.

The Fourth Circuit analyzed *ICP*’s “robust causality requirement” in detail in *de Reyes v. Waples Mobile Home Park Limited Partnership* (903 F.3d 415 4th Cir. 2018, *cert. denied*, 139 U.S. 2026 2019), in which non-U.S. citizen mobile home park residents claimed that a mobile home park’s policy of requiring that adult occupants provide documentation showing legal immigration status in order to renew their leases had an unlawful disparate impact on Latinxs. After holding that the plaintiffs demonstrated the policy’s disproportionate effect on Latinxs (based on statistical data showing that over 35% of the state’s Latinx population was undocumented, compared to less than 4% of the overall population), the Fourth Circuit held that the plaintiffs could demonstrate robust causality by: (1) showing a statistical disparity (e.g., the group of people who cannot demonstrate legal immigration status is disproportionately Latinx); (2) identifying the specific housing practice being challenged (e.g., a requirement to provide documentation of legal immigration status in order to renew a lease); and (3) demonstrating that the policy causes the statistical disparity (e.g., the requirement to demonstrate legal immigration status disproportionately excludes Latinx renters compared to non-Latinx renters) (*Id.* at 428-29. The Court emphatically rejected the defendant’s argument that unauthorized immigration status would preclude the plaintiffs from establishing a prima facie case of disparate impact: “That view ‘threatens to eviscerate disparate impact claims altogether’ by ‘require[ing] an *intent* to disparately impact a protected class in order to show robust causality . . .” *Id.* at 430.

A similar conception of “robust causality” drove the decision in *NFHA v. Fannie Mae*, in which the district court found a sufficient causal connection between a habitational insurance policy that excluded landlords who rent to tenants who use Housing Choice Vouchers to pay their rent, and harm to African American and women-headed households (both protected classes under the Fair Housing Act), who were more likely to be voucher recipients in the relevant geographical housing market.

Yet other courts have been receptive to defense arguments that *ICP* changed or heightened the standard to prevail on a disparate impact claim under the Fair Housing Act, including in a recent decision from the Fifth Circuit. Despite the fact that the Supreme Court in *ICP* acknowledged HUD’s Disparate Impact Rule without rejecting or discrediting it, the Fifth Circuit held in *Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. v. Lincoln Property Co.*, 920 F.3d 890 (5th Cir. 2019), that *ICP* requires a “more demanding test” than HUD’s Disparate Impact Rule. *Id.* at 902. It concluded that the “robust causality” language in *ICP* meant that the plaintiff in *Lincoln Property* needed to show that the defendant’s policy of excluding Housing Choice Voucher recipients existing disparity in the racial composition of voucher-holding households—the argument the Fourth Circuit and D.C. District Court rejected.

In a deeply concerning effort that appears intended to align with industry goals, HUD has signaled its own willingness to backpedal from its 2013 Disparate Impact Rule. In August 2019, the agency issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) that proposes a new five-pronged standard for disparate impact claims, in a clear departure from the existing Disparate Impact Rule and decades of well-settled caselaw (Implementation of the Fair Housing Act’s Disparate Impact Standard, 84 Fed. Reg. 42,855 Aug. 19, 2019). The new proposed standard would require that plaintiffs show how a challenged policy or practice actually results in a disparity, demonstrate a harmful impact

on members of a protected class, and show not only that a statistical disparity exists but that it is directly caused by a specific policy or practice and not just attributable to chance. By requiring plaintiffs to plead, as an element of their claims, that a challenged policy or practice is “arbitrary, artificial, and unnecessary” to achieve a valid interest or legitimate objective, the Proposed Rule would force plaintiffs to anticipate at the pleading stage which justifications a defendant might invoke and preemptively debunk them.

The NPRM furthermore makes profit a legitimate justification and proposes a distinct framework for disparate impact challenges based on algorithmic modeling that would all but ensure that such challenges fail. Among other things, the proposed requirement to plead a “robust causal connection” between the challenged policy or practice and the discriminatory effect would be incredibly difficult in many cases, and especially in the context of algorithmic modeling, which is typically proprietary and incorporates a host of complex factors that are not transparent to the public. Moreover, the NPRM proposes a framework in which a business practice that relies on statistics or algorithms and has some predictive value will almost always be immune from liability, because such predictive algorithms, by nature and design, serve a valid interest or legitimate objective. The amendment would effectively shield many credit scoring, pricing, tenant screening, and underwriting models from liability under the FHA, even when it is clear that they result in the discriminatory denial of housing or credit.

As of the time of publication, the agency is reviewing comments on its NPRM. If and when HUD issues a final rule amending the current Disparate Impact Rule, it will likely face a number of legal challenges. Until HUD issues a final rule and such rule goes into effect, advocates should continue to plead and prove disparate impact claims consistent with the existing Disparate Impact Rule and any guidance in their Circuits.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson’s Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity

Year Started: 1968

Population Targeted: The Fair Housing Act’s “protected classes” – race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, and religion

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson’s Challenges to AFFH in 2018*, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule*, as well as the *Consolidated Planning Process and Public Housing Agency Plan* sections of this guide.

SECRETARY CARSON PROPOSES AFFH RULE THAT IS NOT A FAIR HOUSING RULE

HUD published a proposed affirmative furthering fair housing (AFFH) rule on January 14, 2020 intending to replace the 2015 rule. The proposed rule is not a fair housing rule; rather, it is a complete retreat from efforts to undo historic, government-driven patterns of housing segregation and discrimination. It considers housing that might be “affordable” to be the same as housing that is available to people in the Fair Housing Act’s protected classes based on race, color, national origin, sex, familial status, disability, or religion. The proposed rule even deletes the words “segregation” and “discrimination.” HUD proposes to substitute a supply-side ideology that misleadingly assumes that an overall increase in the supply of housing

will trickle down to become “affordable” housing without any consideration for the effect of individual jurisdictions’ policies and practices on race and other protected classes or on overcoming patterns of housing segregation.

The proposed rule would be worse than the minimal AFFH process from 1994 that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found to be ineffective. In the meantime, until a final rule is published or until HUD reinstates the 2015 rule, jurisdictions and public housing agencies (PHAs) must continue to follow the 1994 process. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*.

The proposed rule eliminates the 2015 rule’s statement of purpose: to have an effective planning approach to aid jurisdictions and PHAs in taking meaningful actions to “overcome historic patterns of segregation, promote fair housing choice, and foster inclusive communities that are free from discrimination.” It also deletes a detailed definition of “affirmatively furthering fair housing” that among other features included “taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.” Also eliminated is a detailed definition of “segregation.” The proposed rule would also only use the word “discrimination” on a few occasions.

HUD prematurely suspended implementation of the 2015 rule based on only 49 initial Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) submissions, 32 of which were ultimately accepted by HUD. It is understandable that initial AFH submissions would not be ideal on first draft. The 2015 rule anticipated that a new and meaningful

approach to AFFH would entail a learning curve and provided for a back-and-forth process between jurisdictions and HUD. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018*.

REPLACING THE ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING (AFH) WITH A BEEFED UP AFFH CERTIFICATION

The proposed rule discards a genuine means to affirmatively further fair housing as required by the Fair Housing Act of 1968. It would scrap the 2015 rule's Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) that was the product of nearly four years of diligent consultation and broad public engagement on the part of HUD starting in late 2009. The AFH was developed in response to jurisdictions' requests for uniform guidance in order to reduce uncertainty regarding how to meet their AFFH obligation. The AFH is the document to be used by jurisdictions and public housing agencies (PHAs) to demonstrate their compliance with the Fair Housing Act's obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. The AFH provides a standardized road map that jurisdictions and PHAs can use, eliminating the lack of guidance and subsequent uncertainty that many jurisdictions and PHAs complained about regarding the Analysis of Impediments (AI) process. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule*.

In place of the AFH, HUD proposes to rigorously tie AFFH compliance to a significantly altered meaning of AFFH "certification." The 2015 AFFH rule defined AFFH certification to mean that a jurisdiction "will take meaningful actions to further the goals of the AFH...and that it will take no action that is materially inconsistent with the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing."

HUD proposes to essentially eliminate a genuine assessment of affirmatively furthering fair housing, one which identified and addressed harmful patterns of segregation, discriminatory practices, and disinvestment, replacing it with a supply-side assessment. HUD equates an increased supply of housing with fair housing choice. However, simply increasing the supply of

housing will not necessarily result in housing that is affordable to low-income (much less extremely low-income) people, and it is even less likely to reduce or eliminate discriminatory attitudes, policies, practices, or entrenched segregation. AFFH will seldom trickle down from a supply side strategy. The proposed rule advances neither fair housing nor affordable housing.

The proposed rule would require a jurisdiction to identify a minimum of three goals it aims to achieve and explain how meeting the goals over the course of the next five years would affirmatively further fair housing. However, 16 goals on a proposed HUD list would not need to be described because HUD misleadingly asserts that they are inherent obstacles to fair housing choice. The effect of the exemptions is to steer a jurisdiction toward choosing the obstacles, 13 of which have nothing to do with fair housing; rather, they are factors that might have some marginal effect on the cost of building new housing and perhaps thereby inhibit the growth of the housing supply. They also reflect the current Administration's intent to drastically reduce regulations, even if those regulations provide valuable protections for people and the environment.

Increasing the overall supply of housing, however, does not address the many obstacles to fair housing choice for people in the protected classes under the Fair Housing Act; it might not even have a measurable impact on developing housing that is affordable. An augmented housing supply will not necessarily trickle down to low-income (much less extremely low-income) people, nor will it necessarily reduce or eliminate discriminatory attitudes and practices.

The proposed rule does have three conditions that could pertain to fair housing choice:

- Concentration of substandard housing stock in a particular area.
- Source of income restrictions on rental housing.
- Unnecessary manufactured housing regulations and restrictions.

While the first item does potentially address undue concentrations of substandard housing in a particular area, it does not directly address racial or ethnically concentrated housing, whether substandard or even standard.

A fourth condition is not a fair housing obstacle but is a problem that must be addressed: high rates of housing-related lead poisoning. Even this otherwise meritorious item is inadequate; it ought to address lead hazards, not just lead poisoning. Congress, HUD, and local jurisdictions must do much more to identify and mitigate or eradicate lead hazards before children become poisoned by lead.

That leaves 12 irrelevant supply-side conditions (word-for-word):

- Lack of a sufficient supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing that is affordable.
- Lack of a sufficient supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing that is affordable and accessible to people with disabilities.
- Not in derogation of applicable federal law or regulations, inflexible or unduly rigorous design standards or other similar barriers which unreasonably increase the cost of the construction or rehabilitation of low-to-mid price housing or impede the development or implementation of innovative approaches to housing.
- Lack of effective, timely, and cost-effective means for clearing title issues, if such are prevalent in the community.
- Administrative procedures that have the effect of restricting or otherwise materially impeding the approval of affordable housing development.
- Artificial economic restrictions on the long-term creation of rental housing, such as certain types of rent control.
- Unduly prescriptive or burdensome building and rehabilitation codes.
- Arbitrary or excessive energy and water efficiency mandates.

- Unduly burdensome wetland or environmental regulations.
- Cumbersome or time-consuming construction or rehabilitation permitting and review procedures.
- Tax policies that discourage investment or reinvestment.
- Arbitrary or unnecessary labor requirements.

Among the above, depending on how they are designed and implemented, some of the “inherent obstacles” could protect protected class people as well as others, for example rent control and labor requirements. Energy and water efficiency standards, as well as wetlands and environmental regulations, are essential components of addressing human-made climate change. “Tax policies” might be interpreted in a way that inhibits the creation or growth of local and state housing trust funds.

Ironically the list of 16 conditions does not explicitly include zoning policies. However, the preamble to the proposed rule states that jurisdictions can consider zoning or land-use policies as one method of complying with their AFFH obligation, but if they do not, HUD will not question their AFFH certification. Combating restrictive zoning or land-use policies that inhibit housing production is an important goal given the deep racial disparities created by some local zoning land-use laws and land-use policies. Any AFFH rule must treat restrictive zoning laws and land-use policies as potential obstacles to AFFH.

A NEW WAY FOR HUD TO EVALUATE AND RANK AFFH COMPLIANCE

The proposed rule would introduce a new provision titled, “Jurisdiction risk analysis.” Continuing HUD’s proposed emphasis on a supply-side approach to AFFH, HUD would create an “evaluation” component focused on measuring the adequacy of a jurisdiction’s supply of affordable housing throughout the jurisdiction as well as the quality of the affordable housing. The 2015 rule did not have an evaluation.

Each year, HUD proposes to conduct an analysis and ranking of jurisdictions to determine which jurisdictions are succeeding at AFFH and which should be subject to an enhanced review by HUD and that may need additional assistance. Yet, HUD adds that this ranking will not determine whether a jurisdiction has complied with the Fair Housing Act.

Evaluating AFFH Performance by Looking at Factors Unrelated to Fair Housing

As with the proposed AFFH certification that (with two or three exceptions) would not address genuine fair housing choice issues, HUD proposes to evaluate jurisdictions looking at nine factors, only two of which relate to fair housing choice. The remaining seven will not address genuine obstacles to meeting the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing, and therefore will in no way provide a genuine analysis of a jurisdiction's success at achieving AFFH.

Using the nine factors, HUD will give each jurisdiction a baseline score that HUD thinks indicates the adequacy of the supply of quality affordable housing.

Two actually address fair housing choice:

- The availability of housing accepting vouchers.
- The availability of housing accessible to persons with disabilities.

Another two factors relate to affordability:

- Median home value and contract rent.
- Household cost burden (does HUD consider "cost burden" to mean the standard of a household paying no more than 30% of adjusted income for rent and utilities or homeowner payments plus utilities?).

Three factors relate to housing quality:

- Percentage of dwellings lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities.
- Rates of lead-based paint poisoning.
- Rates of subpar public housing conditions. (Note that HUD has a very bad track record of enforcing Uniform Physical Inspection

Standards for both public housing and private, HUD-assisted multifamily housing).

Two factors relate to supply:

- Vacancy rates.
- The existence of excess housing choice voucher reserves. (This is a function of PHAs playing accounting games given the annual uncertainty of congressional appropriations for voucher renewals).

Relying on these nine factors does not even provide a meaningful indication of HUD's purported desire to substitute increasing the supply of housing for AFFH. Only two factors indicate anything regarding supply, and most PHAs do not hoard vouchers. Regarding the three quality factors, all housing should be free of lead hazards (not just lead poisoning) and have complete plumbing and kitchen facilities. HUD should enforce Uniform Physical Condition Standards. Affordability indicators such as cost burden and rents and home prices (as well as vacancy rates) are affected by much greater market forces. For example, in areas of high demand those affordability indicators will only be addressed if the housing supply is vastly increased and people are paid living wages, while areas that are losing sources of employment will "look good" because rents will decline and vacancy rates will increase.

Ranking Jurisdictions

Based on each jurisdiction's baseline score using the nine factors above, HUD proposes to rank all jurisdictions. Arbitrarily ranking jurisdictions, especially using the nine factors, makes no sense. In addition, it is contrary to HUD's frequent refrain that each jurisdiction's situations are unique. On that, NLIHC agrees. Therefore, to establish a ranking system solely to compare jurisdictions contradicts HUD's own view of jurisdictions' relative fair housing choice needs, while proposing to undertake a meaningless exercise that cannot truly assess the success of any jurisdiction's compliance with its AFFH obligations.

Providing Incentives for Jurisdictions Ranked as “Outstanding”

Jurisdictions that HUD ranks as “outstanding” based on the nine-factor evaluation would be eligible for preference points when competing for grants through Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs), as well as for receiving funds from HUD programs that are reallocations of recaptured funds. HUD apparently views these as incentives for jurisdictions to better perform their AFFH obligations. However, there are relatively few HUD programs that operate via NOFAs and most of them are relatively small programs.

Jurisdictions that HUD ranks as “outstanding” are likely to be jurisdictions that readily strive to genuinely comply with their obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. Jurisdictions that attempt to avoid complying with AFFH are not at all likely to be motivated by the marginal benefits of points awarded in a NOFA competition.

Residents of low-ranking jurisdictions should not be “punished” if their jurisdictions lose out to “outstanding” jurisdictions that receive added points in a NOFA competition; they might be the residents who could benefit the most from the program tied to a NOFA.

Program funds that are reallocations of recaptured funds might be of marginal value to jurisdictions due to the potentially modest sums and/or due to the fact that the reallocated funds will be limited to a given program, one that a jurisdiction does not need more of or does not value highly.

Adjudicated Fair Housing Violations

HUD proposes that no jurisdiction may be considered an outstanding AFFH performer if it or a PHA operating within the jurisdiction has in the past five years been found by a court or administrative law judge in a case brought by or on behalf of HUD or by the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) to be in violation of civil rights law.

Simply being free of any civil rights violations is not a measure of AFFH. The proposed text

limits this “adjudication” provision to court or administrative judge decisions brought in response to complaints by HUD or DOJ. As the National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA) notes, most complaints are settled out of court. In addition, year in and year out, NFHA reports that most fair housing complaints are brought by private, nonprofit organizations. In 2018, 75% of all complaints were brought by nonprofits, while the other 25% were brought by local and state agencies as well as by the federal government.

In addition, local jurisdictions have little, if any, control over PHAs; therefore, it does not seem appropriate to downgrade a jurisdiction for the fair housing findings attached to a PHA.

Also, what would having an “adjudicated” violation mean for a jurisdiction that was not otherwise at the “outstanding” level, but nonetheless measured somewhere in between “outstanding” and “low-ranking”?

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The proposed rule would eliminate a separate public participation process pertaining to AFFH that requires a public hearing and written comment period to inform a jurisdiction about its residents’ fair housing concerns and priorities before any AFFH-related considerations might be reflected in a jurisdiction’s Consolidated Plan (ConPlan). Instead, HUD contends that AFFH will be adequately dealt with in the otherwise crowded ConPlan public participation process.

Because AFFH compliance in the proposed rule would hinge on the proposed, detailed AFFH certification (replacing the AFH), there is even less public involvement in the AFFH process because development of the AFFH certification is not subject to public input.

NLIHC welcomed the 2015 AFFH rule’s requirement that there be genuine public participation in drafting an AFH. Under the flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) protocol, there was no public input, no opportunity to identify fair housing issues, or to suggest reasonable actions and policies to address those fair housing issues. The 2015 AFFH rule also

introduced for the first time a requirement that jurisdictions consult with fair housing organizations in the development of the AFH, long before a ConPlan was to be drafted.

The Consolidated Plan's public participation process is designed to obtain input regarding housing and community development needs, assessing which needs among the many have the highest priority in the five-year ConPlan cycle, and which programs and activities ought to be funded and at what level. That is quite a bit to consider.

Identifying fair housing issues, assessing priorities among many fair housing issues, and recommending goals entail very different concepts and sometimes even different stakeholders, thereby warranting separate public participation procedures. The 2015 AFFH rule reasonably designed the AFFH public participation process to precede and inform the decision making associated with the ConPlan and its Annual Action Plan system.

As with public participation, HUD thinks that there is no need for special, separate consultation with fair housing organizations regarding AFFH issues and solutions in advance of the ConPlan process; that the ConPlan regulation's consultation provisions are adequate. However, it is important to obtain consultation regarding AFFH goals long before a jurisdiction begins thinking about its how those AFFH goals might fit in its ConPlan priorities and objectives.

CHANGES RELATING TO PHAS

Public housing agencies (PHAs) would not have to submit an AFFH certification with goals. All a PHA would have to do is certify each year when it updates its PHA Plan that it has consulted with the jurisdiction in which it is located regarding their common AFFH obligations. This consultation and certification would fulfill a PHA's AFFH responsibility.

If the proposed rule is implemented as drafted, it would eliminate the 2015 rule's requirement to take "meaningful actions" rather than token

actions, and to not take actions that are not consistent with the obligation to AFFH.

It is important for PHAs to develop and submit specific AFFH-specific goals and proposed actions unique to PHA operations, policies, and programs, such as project basing of vouchers, implementing required or voluntary Small Area Fair Market Rents (SAFMRs), proposals to develop mixed-finance projects, deciding which public housing projects to propose for demolition or disposition, and how the voucher program is administered (including portability).

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Even though HUD has indefinitely suspended the AFFH rule and proposed a completely different rule, advocates can still organize to convince their local jurisdictions and PHAs to follow the lead of the AFFH rule and use the Assessment Tool to create an AFH.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Jurisdictions will continue to only be required to use the flawed AI process in 2020, unless a final rule is issued late in 2020, because the 2015 AFFH rule was indefinitely suspended by Secretary Carson's HUD.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Ask your congressional delegation to register its opposition to Secretary Carson's proposal to gut the AFFH rule and ask them to consider congressional avenues to prevent HUD from carrying out its harmful intent. Remind your congressional delegation that the 2015 AFFH rule did not mandate specific outcomes; rather, it established basic parameters to help guide public sector housing and community development planning, along with investment decisions. The rule encouraged a more engaged and data-driven approach to assessing fair housing and planning actions. The rule established a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process to give jurisdictions and PHAs a more effective means to affirmatively further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530,
<http://nlihc.org/issues/affh>

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, <https://www.nhlp.org/initiatives/fair-housing-housing-for-people-with-disabilities/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

National Fair Housing Alliance, 202-898-1661,
<http://nationalfairhousing.org/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

Poverty & Race Research Action Council, <https://prrac.org/fair-housing/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO)

Year Started: 1968

Population Targeted: The Fair Housing Act “protected classes”—race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and familial status (in other words, households with children).

See Also: For related information, refer to the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule, and the Consolidated Planning Process, Public Housing Agency Plan sections of this guide.

This article describes the pre-existing Analysis of Impediments (AI) process. All but 32 local governments that submit a Consolidated Plan (roughly 1,200 local governments) will not have to comply with the July 16, 2015, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule as a result of Secretary Carson indefinitely suspending it before it was fully implemented. Consequently, jurisdictions must, at a minimum, revert to the old, flawed AI process. Jurisdictions and public housing agencies (PHAs) may voluntarily follow the AFFH rule and use its Fair Housing Assessment Tool in order to develop an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) as outlined in the suspended AFFH rule. See the *Advocates' Guide* article *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018* to learn more about what led up to this reversion to the AI.

See also, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule* to learn what might be lost and what advocates can attempt to convince their jurisdiction and PHA to voluntarily follow. Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020. If it becomes effective, jurisdictions would no longer use the AI; instead they would use a newly created “AFFH Certification” that would merely require jurisdictions to identify three fair housing goals they intend to address in an upcoming five-year period. The proposed rule falsely equates increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*.

By reverting to the old Analysis of Impediments (AI) process, states and local governments merely have to certify that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing in their Consolidated Plans (ConPlans), and public housing agencies (PHAs) must certify that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing in their Public Housing Agency Plans (PHA Plans). In order to comply, these jurisdictions must have an AI.

HISTORY

Title VIII of the “Civil Rights Act of 1968” (the “Fair Housing Act”) requires HUD to administer its programs in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing. The laws that establish the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS, the statutory basis of the Consolidated Plan, ConPlan), and the PHA Plan all require local governments, states, and PHAs to certify in writing that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing. States must

ensure that units of local government receiving CDBG or HOME Investment Partnerships Program funds from the state comply. Further, HUD's 1996 *Fair Housing Planning Guide* declares that the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing applies to all housing and housing-related activities in a jurisdiction, whether publicly or privately funded.

SUMMARY

AFFH is defined in CDBG regulations [24 CFR 570.601(a)(2)] and ConPlan regulations [24 CFR 91.225(a)(1)] as:

- Having an Analysis of Impediments (an AI) to Fair Housing Choice.
- Taking appropriate actions to overcome the effects of impediments.
- Keeping records reflecting the analysis and showing actions taken.

The regulations for public housing and vouchers are similar [24 CFR 903.7(o)].

Analysis of Impediments

In the context of an AI, an impediment to fair housing can be an action or an inaction that restricts housing choice or that has the effect of restricting housing choice. Some policies or practices might seem neutral, but in fact can deny or limit the availability of housing. Obvious impediments include outright discrimination based on race or ethnicity, refusing to rent to families with children, or insurance practices that reinforce segregated housing patterns. Less obvious impediments include development policies that discourage the construction of properties with more than two bedrooms per unit, inadequate multilingual marketing, zoning that limits group homes, and insufficient public transportation to areas with affordable housing.

The contents of an AI are not prescribed by HUD, which has led to uncertainty on the part of some jurisdictions and has led to inadequate AIs from many jurisdictions. There is no specific term for a PHA's AI. AIs must be available to the public. HUD's *Fair Housing Planning Guide* defines an AI as:

1. A comprehensive review of a jurisdiction's laws, regulations, and administrative policies, procedures, and practices.
2. An assessment of how those laws, regulations, and practices affect the location, availability, and accessibility of housing.
3. An assessment of conditions, both public and private, affecting fair housing choice for all "protected classes." The protected classes under the Fair Housing Act are race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and familial status (in other words, households with children).
4. An assessment of the availability of affordable, accessible housing in a range of unit sizes.

The *Fair Housing Planning Guide* explains that analyzing fair housing impediments and taking appropriate actions means:

- Eliminating housing discrimination in the jurisdiction.
- Promoting fair housing choice for all.
- Providing housing opportunities for people of all races, colors, religions, genders, national origins, disabilities, and family types.
- Promoting housing that is structurally usable by all people, particularly those with disabilities.
- Fostering compliance with the nondiscrimination features of the Fair Housing Act.

The name of the agency or department that will have an AI varies from locality to locality. Generally, the office that manages the Consolidated Planning (ConPlan) process should be able to provide a copy, and the public housing agency (PHA) should have a copy of its own analysis.

AIs are their own separate documents. AIs are not submitted to HUD and they are not a formal piece of the ConPlan's Annual Action Plan or Five-Year Strategy, both significant shortcomings in the AI process. However, a HUD policy memorandum (no longer featured on the HUD webpages) dated September 2, 2004 stated that a jurisdiction may

include in its Annual Action Plan the actions it plans to take in the upcoming year to overcome the effects of impediments to fair housing. Note that this is only a “may,” not a “must;” in addition, many jurisdictions did not know that this policy memorandum existed. Also, some jurisdictions point to a part of their ConPlan or Action Plan called “barriers to affordable housing” and claim that to be the AI. The law creating the CHAS (the statutory root of the ConPlan) requires such a discussion, but this is not an AI. Examples of barriers to affordable housing in that law include tax policies and building fees.

Timeframe

There is no specific guidance to suggest when an AI should be updated, another shortcoming of the AI process. However, according to the *Fair Housing Planning Guide*, AIs must be updated on the same timeframe as the ConPlan updates. So, theoretically, if a jurisdiction has to come up with a new ConPlan every five years, then it should also revise its AI on a five-year cycle in time to inform revisions to the ConPlan. However, the HUD policy memorandum dated September 2, 2004 stated that a jurisdiction “should update, where appropriate, its AI...to reflect the current fair housing situation in their community,” and that “each jurisdiction should maintain its AI and update the AI annually where necessary.” That policy memorandum also implies that jurisdictions that do not make appropriate revisions to update their AIs could face problems. Because much can change before a five-year ConPlan update, advocates should be sure that their jurisdiction’s AI is up-to-date and reflects all impediments.

Public Participation

Unfortunately, the regulations do not directly tie public participation in CDBG, the ConPlan, or the PHA Plan with the AI, yet one more substantial weakness of the AI process. However, the *Fair Housing Planning Guide* offers a few words that advocates might be able to use: “Since the FHP [Fair Housing Plan] is a component of the Consolidated Plan, the citizen participation requirements for the Consolidated Plan apply.”

The introduction to the *Fair Housing Planning Guide* stresses that “all affected people in the community must be at the table and participate in making those decisions. The community participation requirement will never be more important to the integrity, and ultimately, the success of the process.”

The *Fair Housing Planning Guide* also suggests that before developing actions to eliminate the effects of impediments, a jurisdiction “should ensure that diverse groups in the community are provided a real opportunity” to take part in the process of developing actions to be taken. HUD “encourages jurisdictions to schedule meetings [for public comment and input] to coincide with those for the Consolidated Plan.”

Monitoring Compliance

In order to get CDBG, HOME, or public housing money, jurisdictions must certify that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing before the start of the CDBG, HOME, or public housing program year. All ConPlan Annual Action Plans have this written certification, signed by the authorized official. There must be evidence that supports this pledge, and such evidence must be available to the public.

HUD can disapprove a PHA Plan or a ConPlan (and therefore block receipt of CDBG and HOME dollars) if a certification is inaccurate. The policy memorandum dated September 2, 2004 gave examples of an inaccurate certification:

1. There is no AI.
2. The AI is substantially incomplete.
3. No actions were taken to overcome the impediments.
4. The actions taken were “plainly inappropriate” to address impediments.
5. There are no records.

Another situation that could cause HUD to look more carefully at an AI, according to the policy memorandum dated September 2, 2004, is the failure to make “appropriate revisions to update the AI.” This can be an important advocacy tool in years between new five-year ConPlans and PHA

Plans. If there are major changes in conditions for people who are members of protected classes, advocates should make sure the AI is revised to show those changed conditions.

In general, if advocates think that a jurisdiction's AI is inadequate or that the jurisdiction has not taken reasonable actions to overcome impediments to fair housing, they should write a complaint to the FHEO Regional Office.

CDBG regulations also allow a certification to be challenged if there is evidence that a policy, practice, standard, or method of administration that seems neutral really has the effect of significantly denying or adversely affecting fair housing for persons of a particular race, color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, or disability [24 CFR 570.904(a)(1)(ii)]. PHA Plan regulations also claim that a certification can be challenged [24 CFR 903.2(d)(3)].

In the Annual Performance Report related to the ConPlan, called the CAPER, a jurisdiction must describe the actions taken in the past year to overcome the effects of impediments in the CAPER template report CR-35 (pages 281 and 281).

If advocates think that the actions taken to overcome impediments to fair housing were inadequate, it is important to write a complaint to the jurisdiction and to send a copy to the FHEO Regional Office.

Records to Be Kept

CDBG regulations require jurisdictions to keep three types of records:

1. Documents showing the impediments and the actions carried out by the jurisdiction with CDBG and other money to remedy or lessen the impediments.
2. Data showing the extent to which people have applied for, participated in, or benefited from any program funded in whole or in part with CDBG. HOME regulations require similar data reporting.
3. Data indicating the race, ethnicity, and gender of those displaced as a result of CDBG use, plus the address and census

tract of the housing to which they were relocated. This is not reported in the CAPER template.

A joint memorandum (no longer on HUD webpages) dated February 9, 2007 from the Assistant Secretaries for HUD's FHEO and Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD), which administers CDBG and HOME, suggested that a jurisdiction keep for the record: (1) copies of local fair housing laws and ordinances, (2) the full history of the development of its AI, (3) options available for overcoming impediments, (4) a list of those consulted, (5) actions taken and planned, and (6) issues that came up when actions were carried out.

The *Fair Housing Planning Guide* also suggests that jurisdictions keep transcripts of public meetings or forums and public comments or input, a list of groups participating in the process, and a description of the financial support for fair housing, including funds or services provided by the jurisdiction.

The CAPER template report CR-10 (page 266) requires a description of the race and ethnicity of families and persons assisted.

- For CDBG, local jurisdictions must maintain data on the extent to which each racial and ethnic groups and single-headed households (by gender of household head) have applied for, participated in, or benefited from, any program or activity funded in whole or in part by CDBG funds. States must maintain records for CDBG-funded projects that include data on the racial, ethnic, and gender characteristics of persons who are applicants for, participants in, or beneficiaries of the program.
- HOME grantees are required to maintain equal opportunity and fair housing documentation, including data on the extent to which each racial and ethnic group and single-headed households (by gender of household head) have applied for, participated in, or benefited from, any program or activity funded in whole or in part with HOME funds.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Even though HUD has indefinitely suspended the AFFH rule and proposed a completely different rule, advocates can still organize to convince their local jurisdictions and PHAs to follow the lead of the AFFH rule and use the Assessment Tool to create an AFH.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Jurisdictions will continue to only be required to use the flawed AI process in 2020, unless a final rule is issued late in 2020, because the 2015 AFFH rule was indefinitely suspended by Secretary Carson's HUD. Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not a fair housing rule. It does not mention race or discrimination or segregation; it falsely equates increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. If the proposed rule becomes effective, jurisdictions would no longer use the AFH or the AI; instead they would use a newly created "AFFH Certification" that would merely require jurisdictions to identify three fair housing goals they intend to address in an upcoming five-year period. If a jurisdiction chooses its three goals from a list of 16 HUD-presumed so-called "obstacles" to fair housing, then the jurisdiction would not have to provide a detailed description of the three goals. But 13 of the "obstacles" have nothing to do with fair housing. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*. Jurisdictions will continue to use the old AI process unless HUD publishes a final rule. Consult NLIHC's AFFH webpage to learn whether anything new has transpired in the subsequent months.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Ask your congressional delegation to register its opposition to Secretary Carson's proposal to gut the AFFH rule and ask them to consider congressional avenues to prevent HUD from carrying out its harmful intent. Remind your congressional delegation that the 2015 AFFH rule did not mandate specific outcomes; rather, it established basic parameters to help guide public

sector housing and community development planning, and investment decisions. The rule encouraged a more engaged and data-driven approach to assessing fair housing and planning actions. The rule established a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process to give jurisdictions and PHAs a more effective means to affirmatively further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530,
<http://nlihc.org/issues/affh>

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, <https://www.nhlp.org/initiatives/fair-housing-housing-for-people-with-disabilities/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

National Fair Housing Alliance, 202-898-1661,
<http://nationalfairhousing.org/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

Poverty & Race Research Action Council, <https://prrac.org/fair-housing/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

AFFH on HUD's Policy Development and Research (PD&R) website containing its AFFH data and mapping tool https://www.huduser.gov/portal/affht_pt.html

HUD's *Fair Housing Planning Guide*, Vol. 1 (#HUD-1582B-FHEO) is no longer on HUD's AFFH webpage, but remains buried deep in the Notices and Other Documents webpage of FHEO's homepage, <https://www.hud.gov/sites/documents/FHPPG.PDF>

HUD's Office of Affordable Housing once had a good chapter summarizing the *Fair Housing Planning Guide*, "Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing" (page 18) in Fair Housing for HOME Participants. Although no longer directly indicated on the HOME webpages, it remains available at http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=19790_200510.pdf

September 2, 2004, Memorandum from HUD's CPD (no longer on HUD webpages), <http://nlihc.org/sites/default/files/finaljointletter.pdf>

February 9, 2007, Joint Memorandum from Assistant Secretaries for CPD and FHEO (no longer on HUD webpages), <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=fairhousing-cdbg.pdf>

CAPER template reports CR-10 and CR-35 are in “Consolidated Plan in IDIS Desk Guide,” <https://files.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/eCon-Planning-Suite-Desk-Guide-IDIS-Conplan-Action-Plan-Caper-Per.pdf>

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO)

Year Started: 1968

Population Targeted: The Fair Housing Act "protected classes"—race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and familial status (in other words, households with children).

See Also: For related information, refer to the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule, and Consolidated Planning Process, Public Housing Agency Plan sections of this guide.

THE AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING REGULATION IS INDEFINITELY SUSPENDED

On May 23, 2018, HUD published three notices in the *Federal Register* indefinitely suspending implementation of the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule. (See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 AFFH Rule*). On August 16, HUD published an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making (ANPR) inviting public comment regarding amending the AFFH rule. While the AFFH rule is suspended, jurisdictions are obligated to revert to using the flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI). See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*. Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not an

AFFH rule; in fact it would gut fair housing by, among other means, falsely equating increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*.

This article, AFFH Part 3, explains HUD's recent attempts under Secretary Carson to undermine fair housing, especially the AFFH Rule.

UNDER SECRETARY CARSON, HUD SEEKS TO UNDERMINE TWO FAIR HOUSING RULES IN ADDITION TO THE AFFH RULE

Not only has HUD sought to undermine the AFFH rule, attacks on two other fair housing rules demonstrate the breadth of HUD's approach under Secretary Carson to weakening fair housing protections.

Small Area Fair Market Rents

The first attack on fair housing was HUD's attempt in the fall of 2017 to suspend the final rule implementing Small Area Fair Market Rents (SAFMRs) in 24 metropolitan areas. This was an attack on fair housing because the use of SAFMRs would help households with Housing Choice Vouchers use vouchers in areas that did not have concentrations of poverty and racial or ethnic populations. However, after fair housing advocates filed a lawsuit, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia issued a preliminary injunction in December 2017. Consequently, HUD began implementing SAFMRs in those 24 metropolitan areas in April of 2018.

Disparate Impact

A June 20 *Federal Register* Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making (ANPR) was another HUD attack on fair housing. The ANPR requested public comment on whether HUD's February 15, 2013 disparate impact regulation was consistent

with the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities*. For more than 45 years, HUD and courts interpreted the Fair Housing Act to prohibit housing practices that seem to be neutral or do not appear to have an overt intent to discriminate, but nonetheless have a discriminatory effect. The 2013 regulation was issued to establish uniform standards for determining when a housing practice with a discriminatory effect violates the Fair Housing Act.

HUD acknowledged that the Supreme Court upheld the use of disparate impact theory, but HUD argued that the Court did not directly rule on the disparate impact regulation. Therefore, HUD wanted public input regarding whether the regulation is consistent with the Court's ruling in *Texas v. Inclusive Communities*.

Formal, proposed changes to the disparate impact rule were published on August 19, 2019. The proposed rule would shift the burden of demonstrating disparate impact entirely to people in the Fair Housing Act's protected classes. Among other obstacles, the proposed rule would require those alleging discrimination to guess what justifications a housing provider, government, or business might invoke as a legitimate practice and also preemptively counter those justifications. Nearly 47,000 comments were submitted by the October 18, 2019 due date. As of the date this *Advocates' Guide* went to press, a final disparate impact rule has not been published. See the *Disparate Impact* article in this *Advocates' Guide*.

THE LEAD UP TO INDEFINITELY SUSPENDING THE 2015 AFFH RULE

Before he was HUD Secretary, Ben Carson criticized the 2015 AFFH rule in a 2015 *Washington Times* op-ed, claiming that the AFFH rule was a mandated social-engineering scheme that repeated a pattern of failed socialist experiments in this country. This was just a prelude to future attacks on fair housing a little after he became HUD Secretary.

In a surprise move, HUD published a notice in the *Federal Register* on January 5, 2018 suspending until 2025 the obligation of about 900 out of 1,200 local jurisdictions to submit an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) as required by the AFFH rule. HUD's suspension was based on a review of the first 49 AFH initial submissions. Eighteen of the 49 submissions were not accepted when first submitted. However, according to HUD, 32 AFHs were ultimately accepted using the AFFH rule's back-and-forth review process that provides for HUD field staff to identify issues with an AFH that a local jurisdiction can address.

On May 8, 2018, the National Fair Housing Alliance, Texas Low-Income Housing Information Services (Texas Housers), and Texas Appleseed filed suit against HUD for that suspension. The plaintiffs asserted that HUD violated the "Administrative Procedure Act" (APA) in three ways:

1. HUD failed to provide public notice and comment.
2. HUD acted in an arbitrary and capricious manner because it did not provide a reasoned basis.
3. HUD abdicated its duty under the Fair Housing Act to ensure that recipients of HUD funds affirmatively further fair housing.

HUD Indefinitely Suspended the AFFH Rule

On May 23, 2018, HUD published three notices in the *Federal Register* affecting the AFFH rule. The first notice withdrew the January 5, 2018 notice that delayed until 2025 the obligation of about 900 local jurisdictions to submit an AFH. The second notice claimed that there were significant deficiencies in the Assessment Tool that jurisdictions were required to use in order to complete an AFH. Consequently, HUD withdrew the Assessment Tool. HUD again based this drastic action on the experience of only the first 49 AFH submissions, 18 of which were accepted on initial submission and, according to HUD, 32 were ultimately approved. The third notice acknowledged that without the Assessment Tool there can be no AFH. Therefore, HUD reminded jurisdictions that they must revert to using the

flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) to fair housing process.

The second notice stated that HUD identified seven categories of problems that led to the decision to withdraw the Assessment Tool. The second notice elaborated on those problems. Based on the examples offered, most problems could have been addressed very easily by using the AFFH rule's provision for a back-and-forth process requiring HUD to offer suggestions to a jurisdiction for curing a deficiency in an AFH.

One of the problems HUD referred to was "insufficient use of local data and knowledge" as required by the AFFH rule. HUD claimed a jurisdiction's failure to use local data resulted in an inability to address an issue in that community because HUD-provided data did not include all issues. HUD's sole example was a jurisdiction that did not identify multiple Superfund locations when discussing environmental health issues. HUD blamed this on the fact that the HUD-provided maps did not include Superfund sites. However, identifying Superfund sites should be easy. It would be simple for HUD to request and for the jurisdiction to include a discussion of the impact of Superfund sites on people living in racial/ethnic areas of concentrations of poverty.

Another problem claimed by HUD related to the identification of "contributing factors" to "fair housing issues," two technical terms in the AFFH rule. The example in the notice was of a jurisdiction that had three pages of detailed analysis of "Home Mortgage Disclosure Act" (HMDA) information outlining lending discrimination. The jurisdiction did not take the logical step of identifying lending discrimination as a "contributing factor" in its AFH. Again, the back-and-forth HUD review process provided for in the AFFH rule could have readily corrected this shortcoming.

Yet another example HUD pointed to in the notice entailed inadequate community participation, which HUD blamed on the wording of the Assessment Tool. HUD wrote, "The questions vaguely incorporate by reference the existing community participation requirements in

HUD's Consolidated Plan regulations." However, jurisdictions should be experts at providing meaningful public participation because it has been a requirement since the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program was authorized in 1974 and elaborated on in subsequent CDBG and Consolidated Plan regulations. The sole example HUD gave was of one community posting a draft AFH for public comment on a Friday and submitting the final AFH to HUD the following Monday. Clearly this single example was of an egregious violation of the public participation requirements by a jurisdiction; a violation that warranted rejection of the AFH until adequate public participation was provided.

HUD SEEKS TO HAVE A STREAMLINED AFFH RULE

HUD published an [Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking](#) (ANPR) in the *Federal Register* on August 16, 2018 inviting public comment regarding amending the AFFH rule. The opening summary of the ANPR lists five changes that HUD sought to make:

1. Minimize regulatory burden,
2. Create a process that is focused primarily on accomplishing positive results rather than on performing an analysis of community characteristics,
3. Provide for greater local control,
4. Encourage actions that lead to greater housing supply, and
5. Use HUD resources more efficiently.

Regarding the proposed change to encourage actions that increase the supply of housing, HUD claimed that the AFFH rule was ineffective at addressing the lack of adequate housing supply. A HUD media release asserted that the AFFH rule was "suffocating investment." However, the AFFH rule could not have had much, if any, effect because the AFFH rule had only been in effect for very few local jurisdictions and for only a very short period of time. The supply of housing is affected by various factors such as the

cost of land and building materials, local zoning restrictions, and the loss of construction labor due to the great recession. The supply of housing affordable to extremely low- and very low-income households is due to declining federal financial support for gap financing and operating costs.

With perhaps one exception, it is difficult to imagine how an AFFH rule could address the failure of the private market to build affordable multifamily housing. That one exception relates to local zoning and land-use ordinances. While the AFFH rule does not require jurisdictions to change their zoning codes or land-use ordinances, the Assessment Tool considers land-use and zoning laws to be a potential “contributing factor” leading to a lack of racial integration that jurisdictions could consider.

Seemingly contradicting his pre-HUD days when he echoed others’ fears that the AFFH rule would force localities to change their zoning codes, Secretary Carson said he wanted to “focus on restrictive zoning codes” in a *Wall Street Journal* interview on August 13, 2018. In addition, indirectly referring to the CDBG program, Secretary Carson said he “would incentivize people who really would like to get a nice juicy government grant to take a look at their zoning codes.”

However, increasing the supply of housing does not address the core of the Fair Housing Act obligations to affirmatively furthering fair housing based on the protected classes. A robust AFFH rule is essential to ensuring that any increased supply of housing is in fact available to people in the protected classes.

HUD ASKS QUESTIONS IN PREPARATION FOR STREAMLINING THE AFFH RULE

HUD’s Advanced Notice of Proposed Rule Making posed eight sets of questions, six of which are discussed here.

Question Set 1

HUD asked whether issues considered in the context of affirmatively furthering fair housing merit public participation procedures separate

from the public participation procedures already required by the Consolidated Plan’s Annual Action Plan process. In other words, HUD wanted to know whether public input about affirmatively furthering fair housing could be included as part of the Annual Action Plan process.

NLIHC Response: A separate AFFH community participation process is essential. Under the flawed AI protocol, there was no public input and no opportunity to identify fair housing issues or to suggest reasonable actions and policies to address those fair housing issues. The AFFH rule had a fairly robust community participation process for the first time and also required public engagement and consultation with fair housing organizations for the first time.

Identifying and assessing priorities among many fair housing issues and recommending fair housing goals entail very different concepts and sometimes even different stakeholders than those considered in the Annual Action Plan process. Consequently, separate public participation procedures are warranted. The AFFH rule designed the AFFH public participation process in order to draft an AFH that preceded and informed the decision making associated with the Consolidated Plan and its Annual Action Plan system.

Question Set 2

Question 2a: Should local governments be allowed to choose which data to consider instead of using uniform data provided by HUD?

NLIHC Response: A uniform standard set of data for all jurisdictions to use is important. One of the hallmarks of the system underlying the AFFH rule was that HUD provided data from national sources and a free mapping tool to make it easier for jurisdictions to prepare an AFH. This was intended, in part, to lessen if not totally eliminate dependency on procuring expensive outside consultants, as was done under the AI protocol. The publicly available data and mapping tool also enabled the public to verify a jurisdiction’s analysis and/or to offer additional analytical input. The AFFH rule also required jurisdictions to use local information and knowledge, including

that suggested during the public input process, to complement the standard data provided by HUD.

There must be a minimum, uniform standard set of data that jurisdictions should use. All recipients of federal housing and community development assistance should be required to attempt AFFH analysis based on the same data considerations. Allowing a jurisdiction to selectively choose which data to use can lead to jurisdictions creating overly optimistic AFHs and/or establishing easy-to-achieve fair housing goals and accomplishments.

Question 2b: HUD also asked whether jurisdictions should be allowed to rely on their experiences instead of relying on what HUD calls a “data-centric approach.”

NLIHC Response: Data is essential for rational analysis of fair housing issues. Data can reveal situations that might not otherwise be obvious, can help overcome unconscious bias, and can help discern degrees of severity (or lack thereof) associated with fair housing issues. The AFFH rule’s requirement to use local information and knowledge, which is often not quantitative, can complement a “data-centric approach.” Question Set 2 seems to be related to HUD’s second proposed amendment to the AFFH rule, “to create a process that is focused primarily on accomplishing positive results, rather than on performing analysis of community characteristics.” But, how can a jurisdiction accomplish appropriate results without first conducting, within a broad but standardized framework, a reasoned analysis of underlying conditions and the factors and forces that cause those conditions? How else can jurisdictions set priorities for deciding which results to strive for, in what order, and in what timeframe?

Question Set 3

Question 3a: HUD asked whether jurisdictions should be required to provide a detailed report of any AFFH analysis, or whether a summary of goals is sufficient.

NLIHC Response: Details are essential. Public officials who are responsible for complying with the Fair Housing Act need a thorough

presentation of the analysis to responsibly set policies, establish procedures, and fund activities that affirmatively further fair housing. A summary of general goal statements cannot provide the nuance essential for decision-making. The public also needs a detailed analysis to monitor AFFH compliance and progress and to keep public officials accountable.

Question 3b: HUD asked how often program participants should report on their AFFH efforts.

NLIHC Response: Annual reporting is essential. The AFFH rule required a jurisdiction to identify metrics and milestones for measuring the extent to which they were achieving fair housing results. The intent of this requirement would be less than effective if annual reporting was not required. Public officials and the general public need to have annual performance reports in order to detect difficulties in meeting metrics and milestones so that corrections or adjustments can be made on a timely basis.

Question 3c: HUD asked whether the rule should continue to require that a new AFH be submitted every five years in synch with the five-year Consolidated Plan cycle.

NLIHC Response: The five-year cycle makes sense. The AI protocol did not specify how often a new AI should be conducted. Consequently, some AIs were very out of date. The *Fair Housing Planning Guide* from March 1996 suggested that jurisdictions update their AI with the Consolidated Plan cycle. Because the *Guide* was not formal HUD policy it had little weight among most jurisdictions. In addition, HUD guidance in the form of a Memorandum dated September 2, 2004 suggested that a new AI be conducted in concert with the Consolidated Plan cycle. The AFFH rule, for the first time, required jurisdictions to undertake a new AFH process every five years, in synch with the five-year Consolidated Plan and PHA Plan cycle.

Question Set 4

One of the questions in this set asked whether the AFFH rule should be amended to allow program participants to determine the number and types of fair housing obstacles to address.

NLIHC Response: The AFFH rule did not specify, as is hinted at in Question Set 4, the number or types of fair housing obstacles a jurisdiction must address. The AFFH rule offered jurisdictions great latitude in assessing their communities, determining the number and types of fair housing obstacles to address, and setting their own goals.

Question 5

In a related vein, HUD asked how much deference jurisdictions should have in establishing objectives to address obstacles to identified fair housing goals and associated metrics and milestones.

NLIHC Response: Again, the AFFH rule did not prescribe how jurisdictions should set objectives, goals, metrics, or milestones.

Question Set 6

HUD asked what types of elements should distinguish acceptable efforts to address fair housing issues from those that should be considered unacceptable.

NLIHC Response: The AFFH rule, for the first time, required HUD field staff to review a jurisdiction's AFH and assess whether it should be accepted. If there were shortcomings or problems in an initial AFH submission, HUD was to specify the shortcomings or problems and jurisdictions would have 45 days to address them in order to have an AFH accepted. The criteria for HUD to decide to not accept an AFH were very general, consequently there was a lot of leeway.

That leeway could allow a jurisdiction to have an AFH accepted that fair housing advocates might consider very inadequate. On the other hand, that absence of "prescription" offered jurisdictions the opportunity to submit and HUD to accept an AFH that was appropriately tailored to a given community. The only consideration should be whether the public agrees that an AFH identified meaningful goals and activities that related to genuine fair housing issues.

THE COURT DISMISSES ADVOCATES' CHALLENGE TO HUD'S WITHDRAWAL OF AFFH ASSESSMENT TOOL

When the advocates first filed suit against HUD, it was based on HUD's January 5, 2018 delay of the obligation to submit an AFH until after 2025 for approximately 900 out of 1,200 local jurisdictions. The advocates modified their legal complaint after HUD withdrew use of the Assessment Tool on May 23, 2018. The plaintiffs asserted that the May notices constituted an unlawful action because the notices effectively suspended the AFFH rule without the public notice and comment procedures required by the "Administrative Procedure Act," and because withdrawing the Assessment Tool was arbitrary and capricious.

Unfortunately, on August 18, 2018 the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia dismissed the advocates' motion for a preliminary injunction against HUD for withdrawing the Assessment Tool. The judge found that the plaintiffs lacked standing to sue.

In addition, the judge wrote that one of the May notices directed jurisdictions to revert to the AI process. The judge also noted that the Consolidated Plan regulations requiring jurisdictions to certify that they were affirmatively furthering fair housing still entailed "taking appropriate actions" to overcome the effects of impediments to fair housing as well as to maintain records reflecting the analysis of impediments and actions taken to overcome them. Therefore, the judge concluded that the notice "effectively reminded program participants about the continuing effective parts of the AFFH rule," and that "despite withdrawal of the Assessment Tool, many components of the AFFH rule remain in effect." The components the judge claimed remained in effect were: the definition of "affirmatively furthering fair housing," community participation and consultation, certification of AFFH compliance, and recordkeeping. However, the new community participation requirements in the AFFH rule and

in the Consolidated Plan rule (the most important feature of the four) as amended by the AFFH rule all refer to the AFH, not the AI.

The three advocacy organizations that sued HUD filed a motion on September 14, 2018 asking the court to set aside its judgement and to allow the plaintiffs to amend their legal argument. The plaintiffs asserted that the court misunderstood key elements of the AFFH and Consolidated Plan processes. They also asserted that because the provisions that the court mistakenly concluded remained active were never even raised by HUD (they were the judge's observations), the plaintiffs never had an opportunity to respond to such conclusions. The judge did not accept the plaintiffs' motion.

HUD's Next Move – A Proposed Rule That Is Not a Fair Housing Rule

Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not a fair housing rule. It does not mention race or discrimination or segregation; it falsely equates increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. If the proposed rule becomes effective, jurisdictions would no longer use the AFH or the AI; instead they would use a newly created "AFFH Certification" that would merely require jurisdictions to identify three fair housing goals they intend to address in an upcoming five-year period. If a jurisdiction chooses its three goals from a list of 16 HUD-presumed so-called "obstacles" to fair housing, then the jurisdiction would not have to provide a detailed description of the three goals. But 13 of the "obstacles" have nothing to do with fair housing. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Even though HUD has indefinitely suspended the AFFH rule and proposed a completely different rule, advocates can still organize to convince their local jurisdictions and PHAs to follow the lead of the AFFH rule and use the Assessment Tool to create an AFH.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Jurisdictions will continue to only be required to use the flawed AI process in 2020, unless a final rule is issued late in 2020, because the 2015 AFFH rule was indefinitely suspended by Secretary Carson's HUD. Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not a fair housing rule. It does not mention race or discrimination or segregation; it falsely equates increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. If the proposed rule becomes effective, jurisdictions would no longer use the AFH or the AI; instead they would use a newly created "AFFH Certification" that would merely require jurisdictions to identify three fair housing goals they intend to address in an upcoming five-year period. If a jurisdiction chooses its three goals from a list of 16 HUD-presumed so-called "obstacles" to fair housing, then the jurisdiction would not have to provide a detailed description of the three goals. But 13 of the "obstacles" have nothing to do with fair housing. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*. Consult NLIHC's AFFH webpage to learn whether anything new has transpired in the subsequent months.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Ask your congressional delegation to register its opposition to Secretary Carson's proposal to gut the AFFH rule and to consider congressional avenues to prevent HUD from carrying out its harmful intent. Remind your congressional delegation that the 2015 AFFH rule did not mandate specific outcomes; rather, it established basic parameters to help guide public sector housing and community development planning and investment decisions. The rule encouraged a more engaged and data-driven approach to assessing fair housing and planning actions. The rule established a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process to give jurisdictions and PHAs a more effective means to affirmatively further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530,
<http://nlihc.org/issues/affh>

HUD's January 5, 2018 *Federal Register* notice,
<https://bit.ly/2A6Iu5U>

HUD's three May 23, 2018 *Federal Register* notices,

- <https://bit.ly/2Bx38fu>
- <https://bit.ly/2GxJ1Uh>
- <https://bit.ly/2S65wkx>

HUD's August 16, 2018 Advanced Notice of
Proposed Rulemaking, <https://bit.ly/2BtSZ3k>

The Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, https://prrac.org/pdf/Amended_complaint_AFFH.pdf

Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs' Renewed
Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Summary
Judgment, https://prrac.org/pdf/Memo_of_law_-_new_AFFH_PI-SJ.pdf

Judge's Opinion, https://prrac.org/pdf/Opinion_US_District_Court_DC_8_17_18.pdf

Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend the Judgement, http://prrac.org/pdf/rule_59_motion.pdf

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 4: The Suspended 2015 Final Rule

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO)

Year Started: 1968

Population Targeted: The Fair Housing Act "protected classes"—race, color, religion, sex, national origin, disability, and familial status (in other words, households with children).

See Also: For related information, refer to the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018, and the Consolidated Planning Process, and the Public Housing Agency Plan sections of this guide.

HUD EFFECTIVELY SUSPENDED THE 2015 AFFH RULE INDEFINITELY

All but 32 local governments that submit a Consolidated Plan (roughly 1,200 local governments) will not have to comply with the July 16, 2015, Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule as a result of Secretary Carson indefinitely suspending it before it was fully implemented. Consequently, jurisdictions must, at a minimum, revert to the old, flawed AI process. (See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*) Even though it is effectively suspended, this article describes the 2015 AFFH rule because advocates should know what might be lost. In addition, jurisdictions and public housing agencies (PHAs) may voluntarily follow the AFFH

rule and use its Fair Housing Assessment Tool in order to develop an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) as outlined in the suspended AFFH rule. See the previous *Advocates' Guide* article *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson's Challenges to AFFH in 2018* to learn more about what led up to the indefinite suspension of the 2015 AFFH rule. Finally, Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not an AFFH rule; in fact it would gut fair housing by, among other means, falsely equating increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*.

AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHERING FAIR HOUSING

This article describes the AFFH rule implemented on July 16, 2015 and the Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) process introduced by the rule. This new rule and process was to be implemented on a staggered basis. Only an estimated 22 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) entitlement jurisdictions were required to use this new rule and process in 2016. Another estimated 105 CDBG entitlement jurisdictions began in 2017. Both lists are approximate; for example, a few of the 2016 jurisdictions decided to pair with another jurisdiction in their region, resulting in the 2016 jurisdiction postponing implementation due to the later required start date of the jurisdiction it paired with. All other CDBG entitlement jurisdictions, states, and public housing agencies were required to use the pre-existing Analysis of Impediments (AI) process (see the preceding *Advocates' Guide* article, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*).

HISTORY

Title VIII of the “Civil Rights Act of 1968” (the “Fair Housing Act”) requires jurisdictions receiving federal funds for housing and urban development activities to affirmatively further fair housing. The Fair Housing Act not only makes it unlawful for jurisdictions to discriminate; the law also requires jurisdictions to take actions that can undo historic patterns of segregation and other types of discrimination, as well as to take actions to promote fair housing choice and to foster inclusive communities. The “protected classes” of the Fair Housing Act are determined by race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, and/or familial status.

The laws that establish the CDBG program, the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS; the statutory basis of the ConPlan), the HOME Investment Partnerships Program, and the PHA Plan for public housing agencies (PHAs) each require jurisdictions to certify in writing that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing. States must assure that units of local government receiving CDBG or HOME funds from the state comply.

On July 16, 2015, HUD published the long-awaited final rule implementing the “Fair Housing Act of 1968” obligation for HUD to administer its programs in a way that affirmatively furthers fair housing. HUD began planning for an AFFH rule in 2009 by meeting with a broad spectrum of stakeholders, mindful of vehement opposition that erupted in 1998, which ultimately doomed HUD’s effort to publish a rule then. On July 19, 2013, HUD published a proposed AFFH rule. On September 26, 2014, HUD published a proposed Fair Housing Assessment Tool to help guide the AFFH planning process. A final Fair Housing Assessment Tool for larger CDBG entitlement jurisdictions was published on December 31, 2015. An Assessment Tool for PHAs was published on January 13, 2017; however, PHAs did not have to use the Tool until HUD provided the needed data and issued a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing a new submission date. A proposed tool for states was published on March 11, 2016, but never finalized.

HUD under Secretary Carson suspended use of the 2015 AFFH rule for all but 32 jurisdictions on May 23, 2018. For details about the suspension, see *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 3: Secretary Carson’s Challenges to AFFH in 2018*. Finally, Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not an AFFH rule; in fact it would gut fair housing by, among other means, falsely equating increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson’s Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*.

SUMMARY

The opening text of the 2015 final AFFH rule declared that the purpose of the AFFH rule was to provide “program participants” (cities, counties, states, and PHAs) “with an effective planning approach to aid them in taking meaningful actions to overcome historic patterns of segregation, promote fair housing choice, and foster inclusive communities that are free from discrimination.”

In the preamble, HUD stressed that the new AFFH approach did not mandate specific outcomes; rather, it established basic parameters to help guide public sector housing and community development planning and investment decisions. The rule encouraged a more engaged and data-driven approach to assessing fair housing and planning actions. The rule established a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process to give jurisdictions and PHAs a more effective means to affirmatively further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act.

The Need for the AFFH Rule

Although affirmatively furthering fair housing has been law since 1968, meaningful regulations to provide jurisdictions and PHAs with guidance on how to comply had not existed. The 1974 law creating CDBG required jurisdictions to certify that they would affirmatively furthering fair housing. Eventually, that certification was defined in CDBG regulations (and later in ConPlan regulations) to mean that the executive of a jurisdiction affirmed that the jurisdiction had an Analysis of Impediments (AI) to fair

housing choice, that the jurisdiction would take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of the impediments, and that the jurisdiction would keep records of its actions.

That pre-existing system was not effective, as noted by the Government Accountability Office. There were numerous limitations of the pre-existing AFFH system, beginning with the absence of regulatory guidance (HUD published a booklet in 1996, but that booklet did not have the authority of regulation, policy notice, or policy memorandum). Consequently, there was no authoritative source to suggest what might constitute impediments to fair housing choice, nor was there guidance to indicate what actions to overcome impediments might be adequate. Without guidance, many jurisdictions did not take meaningful actions to overcome impediments to fair housing. A classic abuse on the part of some jurisdictions was to assert that they were taking actions to overcome impediments to fair housing by placing fair housing posters around public places during Fair Housing Month. Without guidance and because public participation was not required in the preparation of an AI, many wholly inadequate AIs were drafted. Although other AIs were quite extensive, they seemed destined to sit on a shelf in case HUD asked to see them (AIs were not submitted to HUD for review). In addition, AIs were not directly linked to a jurisdiction's ConPlan or a PHA's Five-Year PHA Plan. AIs also had no prescribed schedule for renewal; consequently, many were not updated in a timely fashion.

How the New AFH System Differed from the Pre-existing AI System

The key differences the 2015 AFFH rule established, compared to the pre-existing AI system, included:

1. The Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) replaced the AI. There was no formal guidance for preparing an AI. The AFFH rule provided a standardized framework for “program participants” (the generic name given to local governments, states, and PHAs) to use to identify and examine what

HUD called “fair housing issues” and the underlying “contributing factors” that cause the fair housing issues.

2. HUD provided each program participant data covering not only the local jurisdiction, but also the surrounding region. Program participants were required to consider this data when assessing fair housing.
3. HUD would for the first time receive and review AFHs; HUD did not receive or review AIs.
4. The fair housing goals and priorities that program participants set in their AFH were to be incorporated into their ConPlans and PHA Plans.
5. Public participation was required in the development of the AFH.
6. The AFH had to be submitted every five years in sync with a new ConPlan or PHA Plan.

The AFFH Rule Supported a Balanced Approach to AFFH

In the AFFH rule, HUD clarified that it supported a balanced approach to AFFH.

“Strategies and actions must affirmatively further fair housing and may include, but are not limited to, enhancing mobility strategies and encouraging development of new affordable housing in areas of opportunity, as well as place-based strategies to encourage community revitalization, including preservation of existing affordable housing, including HUD-assisted housing.”

At several places in the preamble to the AFFH rule, HUD stressed that the final rule supported a balanced approach to AFFH. For example:

“The concept of affirmatively furthering fair housing embodies a balanced approach in which additional affordable housing is developed in areas of opportunity with an insufficient supply of affordable housing; racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty are transformed into areas of opportunity that continue to contain affordable housing as a result of preservation and revitalization efforts; and the mobility of

low-income residents from low-opportunity areas to high-opportunity areas is encouraged and supported as a realistic, available part of fair housing choice.”

“HUD’s rule recognizes the role of place-based strategies, including economic development to improve conditions in high-poverty neighborhoods, as well as preservation of the existing affordable housing stock, including HUD-assisted housing, to help respond to the overwhelming need for affordable housing. Examples of such strategies include investments that will improve conditions and thereby reduce disparities in access to opportunity between impacted neighborhoods and the rest of the city or efforts to maintain and preserve the existing affordable rental housing stock, including HUD-assisted housing, to address a jurisdiction’s fair housing issues.”

WHAT DID IT MEAN TO “AFFIRMATIVELY FURTHER FAIR HOUSING”?

There was a new AFFH definition:

“Affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics.”

“Specifically it means taking meaningful actions that:

7. Address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to community opportunity.
8. Replace segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns.
9. Transform racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity.
10. Foster and maintain compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.”

What Are “Meaningful Actions”?

Meaningful actions are “significant actions that are designed and can be reasonably expected to achieve a material positive change that affirmatively furthers fair housing by, for example, increasing fair housing choice or decreasing disparities in access to opportunity.”

What Would It Mean to “Certify”?

Jurisdictions submitting ConPlans and PHAs submitting PHA Plans have always had to certify (pledge) that they are affirmatively furthering fair housing choice. The AFFH rule amended the old definitions of certifying AFFH compliance to mean that program participants would:

- Take meaningful actions to further the goals in the AFH.
- Not take any action that is materially inconsistent with its obligation to AFFH.
- PHAs would also have to address fair housing issues and contributing factors in their programs.

FIRST, A FEW DEFINITIONS OF OTHERWISE SIMPLE WORDS

Fair Housing Choice

Fair housing choice meant people would have enough information about realistic housing options to live where they chose without unlawful discrimination and other barriers. For people with disabilities, it also meant accessible housing in the most integrated setting appropriate to the person’s needs, including disability-related services needed to live in the housing.

Fair Housing “Issue”

This definition was important. The term was used throughout the AFFH rule. Fair housing issue meant a condition that restricted choice or access to opportunity, including:

1. Ongoing local or regional segregation, or lack of integration.
2. Racial or ethnic concentrations of poverty.
3. Significant disparities in access to opportunity.

4. Disproportionate housing needs based on the “protected classes” of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, familial status, or disability.

A fair housing issue also included evidence of illegal discrimination or violations of civil rights laws, regulations, or guidance.

Fair Housing “Contributing Factor”

This definition was important. The term was used throughout the AFFH rule. Fair housing contributing factor meant something that created, contributed to, perpetuated, or increased the severity of one or more fair housing “issues.”

Definitions for the Four Fair Housing Issues

- Integration meant that there was not a high concentration of people of a particular protected class in an area subject to analysis required by the Fair Housing Assessment Tool, such as a census tract or neighborhood, compared to the broader geographic area.
- Segregation meant that there was a high concentration of people of a particular protected class in an area subject to analysis required by the Assessment Tool, such as a census tract or neighborhood, compared to the broader geographic area.
- Racially or Ethnically Concentrated Area of Poverty (R/ECAP) meant a geographic area with significant concentrations of poverty and minority populations. The rule did not define “significant” or give metrics. However, the mapping system provided by HUD outlines R/ECAPs on maps and indicates them on data tables. An obscure document, AFFH Data Documentation, defined a R/ECAP as an area with a non-white population of 50% or more and a poverty rate greater than 40% or that was three or more times the average poverty rate for the metropolitan area, whichever threshold was lower.
- Significant disparities in access to opportunities meant substantial and measurable differences in access to education, transportation, economic, and other important opportunities in a

community, based on protected class related to housing.

- Disproportionate housing need referred to a significant disparity in the proportion of a protected class experiencing a category of housing need, compared to the proportion of any other relevant groups or the total population experiencing that category of housing need in the geographic area. Categories of housing need were:
 - Cost burden and severe cost burden (paying more than 30% and 50% of income, respectively, for rent/mortgage and utility costs).
 - Overcrowded housing (more than one person per room).
 - Substandard housing conditions.

Fair Housing Assessment Tool

The Fair Housing Assessment Tool referred to forms or templates provided by HUD that had to be used to conduct and submit an AFH. The Assessment Tool consisted of a series of questions designed to help program participants identify racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, patterns of integration and segregation, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs. The Assessment Tool gave more detailed definitions of those than the rule did. HUD stated that the Assessment Tool questions were intended to enable program participants to perform meaningful assessments of fair housing issues and contributing factors, and to set meaningful fair housing goals and priorities. The Assessment Tool provided more detailed examples of fair housing issues and contributing factors. There were to be separate assessment tools for local jurisdictions, states, and PHAs.

What Was an Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH)?

An Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) was an analysis of fair housing data, identification of fair housing “issues,” and assessment of “contributing factors” leading to the establishment of fair housing priorities and statement of fair housing goals, all of which were to be submitted to HUD

using the Assessment Tool. The purpose of the AFH was to identify goals to affirmatively furthering fair housing that had to inform fair housing strategies in the Five-Year ConPlan, Annual ConPlan Action Plan, PHA Plan, and other community plans regarding transportation, education, or the environment. The introduction to the AFH in the regulation stated that in order to develop a successful AFFH strategy, it was necessary to assess the factors that cause, increase, contribute to, or maintain fair housing problems such as segregation, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, significant disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs.

CONTENT OF AN AFH

Program participants had to conduct an AFH using the HUD-prescribed Assessment Tool. The rule set out a structure for the AFH, unlike the AI it replaced, requiring the AFH to:

1. Analyze data and other information, such as HUD-provided data, other readily available local data, and local knowledge—including information gained from community participation. The purpose of this analysis was to identify—across the protected classes, both within the jurisdiction and region—the “fair housing issues” of integration and segregation patterns and trends, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, significant disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs.
2. Assess fair housing issues by using the Assessment Tool and the data analysis of step #1 to identify “contributing factors” for segregation, racially or ethnically concentrated areas of poverty, disparities in access to opportunity, and disproportionate housing needs.
3. Identify fair housing priorities and goals based on the identified “fair housing issues” and “contributing factors” of steps #1 and #2. The AFH had to:
 - a. Identify and discuss the fair housing issues.

- b. Identify significant contributing factors, assign a priority to them, and justify the priorities.
 - c. Set goals for overcoming the effects of the prioritized contributing factors. For each goal the program participant had to:
 - a. Identify one or more contributing factors that the goal was designed to address;
 - b. Describe how the goal related to overcoming the contributing factor(s) and related fair housing issue(s); and,
 - c. Identify the metrics and milestones for determining the fair housing results to be achieved.
4. Summarize the public participation, including a summary of efforts to broaden participation in developing the AFH, public comments received in writing and/or orally at public hearings, and unaccepted comments and the reasons why they were declined.
 5. Review progress by summarizing (after the first AFH) the progress achieved in meeting the goals and related metrics and milestones of the previous AFH and identifying any barriers that prevented achieving those goals.

LINKAGE BETWEEN THE AFH AND THE CONPLAN OR PHA PLAN

Strategies and actions to implement the fair housing goals and priorities in an AFH had to be included in a program participant’s Five-Year ConPlan, Annual ConPlan Action Plan, or Five-Year PHA Plan. However, the AFH did not have to include the strategies and actions. If a program participant did not have a HUD-accepted AFH, HUD would not approve its ConPlan or PHA Plan.

ConPlan or PHA Plan strategies and actions had to affirmatively furthering fair housing. Strategies and actions could include (but were not limited to) enhancing mobility, encouraging development of new affordable housing in areas of opportunity, encouraging community revitalization through place-based strategies, and preserving existing affordable housing.

Activities to affirmatively further fair housing could include:

- Developing affordable housing in areas of high opportunity.
- Removing barriers to developing affordable housing in areas of high opportunity.
- Revitalizing or stabilizing neighborhoods through targeted investments.
- Preserving or rehabilitating existing affordable housing.
- Promoting greater housing choice within or outside of areas of concentrated poverty.
- Promoting greater access to areas of high opportunity.
- Improving community assets, such as quality schools, employment, and transportation.

The ConPlan regulations were modified to require the Strategic Plan portion of the ConPlan to describe how a program participant's ConPlan priorities and specific objectives would affirmatively further fair housing by having strategies and actions consistent with the goals and "other elements" identified in the AFH. Annual Action Plans submitted in between Five-Year ConPlans had to describe the actions the program participant planned to take during the upcoming year to address fair housing goals.

HUD REVIEW OF THE AFH

The AFH (unlike the AI) had to be submitted to HUD for review and "acceptance." HUD would determine whether the AFH had a fair housing analysis, assessment, and goals. HUD could decide not to "accept" an AFH, or a part of an AFH, if:

- The AFH was "inconsistent" with fair housing or civil rights laws, examples of which included:
 - The analysis of fair housing issues, fair housing contributing factors, goals, or priorities in the AFH would result in policies or practices that would discriminate.

- The AFH did not identify policies or practices as fair housing contributing factors even though they could result in excluding protected class people from areas of opportunity.
- The AFH was "substantially incomplete," examples of which included an AFH that:
 - Was developed without the required community participation or required consultation with other entities.
 - Failed to satisfy a required element of the AFFH regulation, examples of which included an AFH with priorities or goals materially inconsistent with the data and other evidence and an AFH that had priorities or goals not designed to overcome the effects of contributing factors and related fair housing issues.

The AFH would be considered "accepted" by HUD within 60 calendar days. HUD "acceptance" did not mean a program participant was meeting its obligation to AFFH; rather, it meant that for purposes of administering HUD funds (such as CDBG) the program participant had provided the elements required in an AFH. If HUD did not "accept" an AFH, HUD had to provide specific reasons and describe actions that must be taken to gain "acceptance." Program participants had 45 days to revise and resubmit an AFH. A revised AFH would be considered "accepted" after 30 calendar days, unless HUD did not "accept" the revised version.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE AFH PROCESS

To ensure that the AFH is informed by meaningful community participation, the rule required program participants to give the public reasonable opportunities for involvement in both the development of the AFH and its incorporation into the ConPlan, PHA Plan, and other planning documents. The public participation provisions of the ConPlan and PHA Plan regulations had to be followed in the process of developing the AFH.

Program participants “should” use communications means designed to reach the broadest audience. Examples in the rule included: publishing a summary of each document in one or more newspapers; making copies of each document available on the program participant’s official website; and, making copies of each document available at libraries, government offices, and public places.

The AFFH Rule Amended the ConPlan Public Participation Regulations to Include the AFH Encouraging Public Participation in the Development of the AFH

The AFFH rule added to the ConPlan rule, requirements for jurisdictions to:

- Provide for and encourage residents to participate in the development of the AFH and any revisions to the AFH.
- Encourage participation by the Continuum of Care, local and regional institutions, and other organizations (including community-based organizations) in the process of developing and implementing the AFH.
- Encourage participation by public housing residents, public housing Resident Advisory Boards, resident councils, and other low-income residents of a targeted revitalization area where a development was located, regarding developing and implementing the AFH.
- Describe procedures for assessing residents’ language needs, including any need for translation of notices and other vital documents. At a minimum, jurisdictions had to take reasonable steps to provide language assistance to ensure meaningful access to participation by people with limited English proficiency.

Make Data, the Proposed and Final AFH, and Records Available to the Public

The AFFH rule added to the ConPlan rule, requirements for jurisdictions to:

- Make available to the public as soon as practical [but] “after the start of the public

participation process,” the HUD-provided data and any supplemental information the jurisdiction intended to use in preparing the AFH.

- Publish the proposed AFH in a manner that gives the public a reasonable opportunity to examine it and submit comments. The public participation plan had to indicate how the proposed AFH would be published. Publishing could be met by:
 - Summarizing the AFH in one or more newspapers of general circulation. The summary had to include a list of places where copies of the entire AFH could be examined.
 - Making copies available on the jurisdiction’s official website, and at libraries, government offices, and other public places.
- Provide a reasonable number of free copies of the proposed AFH to those who request it.
- Make available to the public the HUD-accepted AFH and any revisions—including in forms accessible to people with disabilities—when requested.
- Provide the public with reasonable and timely access to records from the last five years that relate to the AFH.

Public Review and Comment During the Development of the AFH and the ConPlan

The AFFH rule added to the ConPlan rule, requirements for jurisdictions to:

- Have at least one public hearing during the development of the AFH.
- Have at least one public hearing before the proposed AFH was published for comment, in order to obtain public comments about AFH-related data and affirmatively furthering fair housing in the jurisdiction’s housing and community development programs.
- Provide the public at least 30 days to comment on the proposed AFH.
- Consider public comments submitted in writing, or orally at public hearings, when

preparing the final AFH. A summary of the comments had to be attached to the final AFH, and an explanation of reasons for not accepting comments had to be attached to the final AFH.

- Have at least one public hearing before a proposed ConPlan was published for comment in order to obtain public comments about affirmatively furthering fair housing concerns.
- Make one of the two required public hearings about the ConPlan address a program participant’s proposed strategies and actions for affirmatively furthering fair housing consistent with the AFH.
- Respond to written complaints from the public about the AFH or any revisions to it. The response had to be in writing, meaningful, and provided within 15 working days.

A Few Additional Key Public Participation Features of the ConPlan Regulations

- Jurisdictions had to take appropriate actions to encourage participation by people of color, people who do not speak English, and people with disabilities. Localities also had to encourage participation by residents of public and assisted housing.
- Access to information had to be reasonable and timely. For local jurisdictions (not states) the public had to have “reasonable and timely” access to local meetings, such as Advisory Committee meetings, City Council subcommittee meetings, etc.
- There had to be “adequate” public notice of and access to upcoming hearings. Publishing small print notices in the newspaper a few days before the hearing was not adequate notice. Two weeks’ notice was adequate. Hearings had to be held at times convenient to people who were likely to be affected. Hearings had to be held in places easy for lower-income people to get to.

Consultation with Other Entities and the AFH Process

The AFFH rule also amended the ConPlan regulations’ consultation requirements to include the AFH. When preparing the AFH and then the ConPlan, jurisdictions were required to consult with community and regionally based (or state-based) organizations, including:

- Organizations that represent protected class members.
- Organizations that enforce fair housing laws (including participants in the Fair Housing Assistance Program).
- Fair housing organizations and nonprofits receiving funding under the Fair Housing Initiative Program.
- Other public and private fair housing service agencies.
- Adjacent governments, including agencies with metro-wide planning and transportation responsibilities, particularly for problems that go beyond a single jurisdiction.
- Entities previously listed in the ConPlan regulations, such as public and private agencies that provide assisted housing, health services, and social services.
- PHAs, not only about the AFH, but also about proposed strategies and actions for affirmatively furthering fair housing in the ConPlan.
- Consultation had to be with any organizations that had relevant knowledge or data to inform the AFH, and that were independent and representative.
- Consultation “should” occur with organizations that had the capacity to engage with data informing the AFH and were independent and representative.
- Consultation had to occur at various points in the fair housing planning process, at least in the development of both the AFH and the ConPlan.

- Consultation regarding the ConPlan had to specifically seek input about how the AFH goals would inform the priorities and objectives of the ConPlan.

HUD ENCOURAGED JOINT AND REGIONAL AFHS

HUD encouraged program participants to collaborate to submit a joint AFH or a regional AFH. A joint AFH involved two or more program participants submitting a single AFH. A regional AFH involved at least two program participants that had to submit a ConPlan. Collaborating program participants did not have to be adjacent to each other, and they could cross state lines, as long as they were in the same Core Based Statistical Area. One of the program participants had to be designated as the lead entity. All program participants were accountable for the analysis and any joint goals and priorities. Collaborating program participants had to include their individual analysis, goals, and priorities in the collaborative AFH, and were accountable for them. A joint or regional AFH did not relieve each program participant from its obligation to analyze and address local and regional fair housing issues and contributing factors, and to set priorities and goals for its geographic area to overcome the effects of contributing factors and related fair housing issues. Collaborating program participants had to have a plan for public participation that included residents and others in each of the jurisdictions.

TIMING OF THE AFH

As originally designed in the AFFH rule, most program participants were not required to use the new AFFH system until 2019. Until a program participant was required to submit an AFH, it had to continue to follow the AI to fair housing choice process. (See the previous *Advocates' Guide* article, *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 2: Reverting to the Flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) During AFFH Rule Suspension*).

There were five categories of due dates for the initial AFH. In each case, the first AFH had to be submitted to HUD 270 calendar days before the start of the program participant's program year in which a new Five-Year ConPlan or Five-Year PHA Plan was due.

1. CDBG entitlement jurisdictions receiving \$500,000 or more in FY15 and that were required to have a new Five-Year ConPlan on or after January 1, 2017, had to submit an initial AFH 270 calendar days before that new ConPlan was due. It was estimated that there were 22 such jurisdictions. However, HUD indicated that several of those jurisdictions decided to join with another jurisdiction which had a later due date.
2. CDBG entitlement jurisdictions receiving \$500,000 or less in FY15 and that were required to have a new Five-Year ConPlan on or after January 1, 2018, had to submit an initial AFH 270 calendar days before that new ConPlan is due. It was estimated that there were 105 entitlement jurisdictions with less than \$500,000 expected to have to submit a new Five-Year ConPlan on or after January 1, 2018. However, on October 24, 2016, HUD announced in the *Federal Register* that the deadline for submitting an AFH for them was extended to new Five-Year ConPlans due on or after January 1, 2019.

The Assessment Tool published on January 13, 2017, had an "insert" intended to streamline compliance for local governments with a CDBG entitlement of \$500,000 or less that chose to collaborate with another local government completing the regular Assessment Tool.

3. States that were required to have a new Five-Year ConPlan on or after January 1, 2018, had to submit an initial AFH 270 calendar days before that new ConPlan was due. Six states were expected to start then. However, although a proposed Assessment Tool for states was published on March 11, 2016, it was never finalized. In response to comments from states, HUD started working with states

to redesign the state Assessment Tool. In addition, HUD had not fully developed the data and mapping tool for states. HUD introduced interim guidance on January 18, 2017.

4. PHAs with more than 550 public housing units and vouchers, combined, (“non-qualified PHAs”) had to submit an AFH 270 calendar days before a new Five-Year PHA Plan was due on or after January 1, 2018. An Assessment Tool for PHAs was published on January 13, 2017; however, PHAs did not have to use the Tool until HUD provided the needed data and issued a notice in the *Federal Register* announcing a new submission date. HUD introduced interim guidance on January 18, 2017.
5. PHAs with fewer than 550 public housing units and vouchers, combined (“qualified PHAs”) had to submit an AFH 270 calendar days before a new Five-Year PHA Plan was due on or after January 1, 2019. As with the non-qualified PHAs, qualified PHAs did not have to use the Assessment Tool right away. HUD introduced interim guidance on January 18, 2017.

The PHA Assessment Tool published on January 13, 2017, had an “insert” intended to streamline compliance for PHAs with 1,250 or fewer public housing units and vouchers (combined), that chose to collaborate with a local government completing the regular Assessment Tool. In addition, HUD indicated its intent to create a separate Assessment Tool for qualified PHAs.

After the first AFH, all program participants were to submit a new AFH 195 calendar days before the start of the first year of their next Five-Year ConPlan or Five-Year PHA Plan. All program participants were to submit an AFH at least every five years.

REVISING THE ASSESSMENT OF FAIR HOUSING

An AFH had to be revised if there was a “material change” that would affect the information the AFH was based on so that the analysis, fair housing contributing factors, or priorities and goals no longer reflected the present situation. Examples included a presidentially declared disaster, major demographic changes, new significant contributing factors, or significant civil rights findings. HUD could also require a revision if it detected a significant change. A revised AFH had to be submitted within 12 months of the onset of the material change. For presidentially declared disasters, the revised AFH was due two years after the date the disaster was declared.

A revised AFH might not require submitting an entirely new AFH. It only needed to focus on the material change and any new fair housing issues and contributing factors. It had to include appropriate adjustments to the analysis, assessments, priorities, or goals.

A jurisdiction’s ConPlan-required “Citizen Participation Plan” and a PHA’s definition of a significant amendment had to specify the criteria that would be used for determining when substantial (ConPlan) or significant (PHA Plan) revisions to the AFH were appropriate. When there were revisions to the AFH, the ConPlan and PHA Plan public or resident participation regulations pertaining to substantial/significant amendments had to be followed. Completed revisions had to be made public and submitted to HUD, following the ConPlan or PHA Plan regulations.

RECORDKEEPING

ConPlan participants and PHAs preparing their own AFHs were required to have and keep records, including:

- The information that formed the development of the AFH.
- Records demonstrating compliance with the consultation and community participation requirements, including: the names of the

organizations involved in the development of the AFH, written public comments, summaries or transcripts of public meetings or hearings, public notices, other correspondence, distribution lists, surveys, interviews, etc.

- Records demonstrating actions taken to AFFH.

The records had to be made available to HUD. The AFFH rule did not state that these records were to be made available to the public as well. However, the modified ConPlan regulations required ConPlan jurisdictions to provide the public with reasonable and timely access to information and records relating to the jurisdiction's AFH.

FOCUS ON PUBLIC HOUSING AGENCIES

The AFFH rule offered PHAs three ways to meet their obligation to affirmatively further fair housing:

1. A PHA could work with a local or state government in preparing an AFH. If a PHA served residents of two or more jurisdictions, the PHA could choose the jurisdiction that most closely aligned with its PHA Plan activities.
2. A PHA could work with one or more other PHAs in the planning, resident participation, and preparation of an AFH. One of the PHAs had to be designated the lead agency.
3. A PHA could conduct its own AFH.

A PHA had to certify that it would affirmatively further fair housing. This meant the PHA would take meaningful actions to further the goals identified in the AFH, take no action that was materially inconsistent with its obligation to affirmatively furthering fair housing, and address fair housing issues and contributing factors.

A PHA was obligated to affirmatively furthering fair housing in its operating policies, procedures, and capital activities. A PHA's admission and occupancy policies for public housing and vouchers had to comply with the PHA's plans to affirmatively furthering fair housing. A

PHA's policies should be designed to reduce the concentration of tenants by race, national origin, and disability. Any affirmative steps or incentives a PHA planned to take had to be stated in the admission policy. PHA policies should include affirmative steps to overcome the effects of discrimination and the effects of conditions that resulted in limiting participation because of race, national origin, disability, or other protected class. Affirmative steps could include:

- Marketing.
- Tenant selection and assignment policies that lead to desegregation.
- Providing additional supportive services and amenities (for example, supportive services that enable someone with a disability to transfer from an institutional setting into the community).
- Coordinating with agencies serving people with disabilities to provide additional community-based housing opportunities.
- Connecting people with disabilities to supportive services to enable them to transfer from an institutional setting into the community.

HUD could challenge a certification if a PHA failed to meet the requirements in the AFFH regulations, failed to take meaningful actions to further the goals of its AFH, or took action that was materially inconsistent with affirmatively furthering fair housing.

A PHA's certification was in compliance if it met the above requirements and it:

- Examined its programs.
- Identified any fair housing issues and contributing factors in those programs.
- Specified actions and strategies designed to address contributing factors, related fair housing issues, and goals in its AFH.
- Worked with local governments to implement those local governments' efforts to affirmatively furthering fair housing that required the PHA's involvement.

- Operated its programs in a manner consistent with local jurisdictions' ConPlans.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Even though HUD has indefinitely suspended the AFFH rule and proposed a completely different rule, advocates can still organize to convince their local jurisdictions and PHAs to follow the lead of the AFFH rule and use the Assessment Tool to create an AFH.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Jurisdictions will continue to only be required to use the flawed AI process in 2020, unless a final rule is issued late in 2020, because the 2015 AFFH rule was indefinitely suspended by Secretary Carson's HUD. Secretary Carson published a proposed rule on January 14, 2020 that is not a fair housing rule. It does not mention race or discrimination or segregation; it falsely equates increasing the housing supply with fair housing choice. If the proposed rule becomes effective, jurisdictions would no longer use the AFH or the AI; instead they would use a newly created "AFFH Certification" that would merely require jurisdictions to identify three fair housing goals they intend to address in an upcoming five-year period. If a jurisdiction chooses its three goals from a list of 16 HUD-presumed so-called "obstacles" to fair housing, then the jurisdiction would not have to provide a detailed description of the three goals. But 13 of the "obstacles" have nothing to do with fair housing. See *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH), Part 1: Secretary Carson's Proposed Rule Would Gut AFFH*. Consult NLIHC's AFFH webpage to learn whether anything new has transpired in the subsequent months.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Ask your congressional delegation to register its opposition to Secretary Carson's proposal to gut the AFFH rule and ask them to consider congressional avenues to prevent HUD from carrying out its harmful intent. Remind your congressional delegation that the 2015 AFFH rule did not mandate specific outcomes; rather, it

established basic parameters to help guide public sector housing and community development planning and investment decisions. The rule encouraged a more engaged and data-driven approach to assessing fair housing and planning actions. The rule established a standardized fair housing assessment and planning process to give jurisdictions and PHAs a more effective means to affirmatively further the purposes of the "Fair Housing Act."

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, <http://nlihc.org/issues/affh>

National Housing Law Project, 415-546-7000, <https://www.nhlp.org/initiatives/fair-housing-housing-for-people-with-disabilities/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

National Fair Housing Alliance, 202-898-1661, <http://nationalfairhousing.org/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

Poverty & Race Research Action Council, <https://prrac.org/fair-housing/affirmatively-furthering-fair-housing>

AFFH on HUD's Policy Development and Research (PD&R) website containing its AFFH data and mapping tool https://www.huduser.gov/portal/affht_pt.html

HUD's Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing webpage, <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/affh/>, has links to the pre-suspension Assessment Tools, Frequently Asked Questions, an extensive Guidebook, and mapping tools.

HUD Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/fair_housing_equal_opp

The Community Reinvestment Act

By Josh Silver, National Community Reinvestment Coalition

The “Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) of 1977” established continuing and affirmative responsibilities for banks to meet the credit needs of low- and moderate-income (LMI) neighborhoods in a manner consistent with safety and soundness. Congress has considered updating this critical law to strengthen CRA as applied to banks and expand CRA to non-bank financial institutions. In the spring of 2018, the Trump Administration’s Treasury Department issued recommendations to the regulatory agencies for modernizing CRA. This winter, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) regarding the agency’s proposed changes to CRA.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

Congress passed CRA in 1977 at a time when many banks and other financial institutions would routinely “redline” low-income or minority communities, refusing to invest in them or to extend credit to their residents. Since its enactment, CRA has expanded access to banking services and increased the flow of private capital into LMI communities.

PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATION SUMMARY

Three bank regulatory agencies ensure that banks comply with CRA: the Federal Reserve Board, the OCC, and the FDIC. These three agencies are charged with evaluating the extent to which banks are meeting local credit needs. This takes the form of a periodic CRA examination of a bank, during which the bank is given a rating for its performance.

Under CRA, large banks with assets exceeding \$1.284 billion are evaluated with three tests that measure performance in LMI communities (asset levels for the bank size categories are adjusted annually to take inflation into account):

- The lending test evaluates a bank’s record of meeting credit needs in its assessment area(s) through home mortgage, small business, and small farm lending, as well as financing community development projects such as the construction of rental units.
- The investment test evaluates the number and responsiveness of investments, including Low-Income Housing Tax Credits and equity investments in small businesses.
- The service test evaluates the availability of bank branches, basic banking services, and community development services in low- and moderate-income communities.

Banks with less than \$1.284 billion in assets are evaluated primarily on lending and mid-sized banks (between \$321 million to \$1.284 billion in assets) also undergo an examination of their community development performance. Exams for smaller institutions below \$250 million in assets occur every four to five years, depending on their previous performance. Banks with assets exceeding \$250 million are examined once every two to three years.

CRA exams issue one of four ratings: outstanding, satisfactory, needs-to-improve, or substantial noncompliance. The last two ratings are considered failing ratings. In a particular assessment area, a bank can also receive a low or high satisfactory rating. Even a passing rating, such as satisfactory or low satisfactory, can motivate a bank to do better since ratings influence banks’ public relations and business strategies.

The federal agencies also consider banks’ CRA records when ruling on merger applications. A weak CRA record may be grounds for denying a

merger application. Although denials are rare, federal agencies occasionally approve merger applications subject to specific conditions around improving CRA and fair lending performance.

RESULTS

Because it holds lenders publicly accountable and empowers citizens and communities to engage in the regulatory process, CRA is effective in increasing access to credit and capital for traditionally underserved communities.

In February 2019, BB&T and SunTrust announced a proposed merger that would result in the sixth-largest U.S. commercial bank based on assets and deposits. The National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC) was able to work with BB&T and SunTrust on a \$60 billion community benefits plan related to their merger. The plan includes \$31 billion in home purchase lending to underserved borrowers and neighborhoods, \$7.8 billion in small business lending, \$17.2 billion in community development loans and investments, \$3.6 billion in CRA eligible philanthropy, and 15 new bank branches in either LMI communities or neighborhoods that are primarily people of color.

Philanthropic giving will include support for organizations that address key issues facing communities of color – economic sustainability, public safety, education, and youth workforce development – with a focus on organizations having persons of color in board and management leadership. The plan was developed through direct participation in six input and listening sessions throughout the bank’s service areas, as well as input from participants in the regulator-hosted public meetings.

Since 2016, NCRC and its members have worked with CIT, KeyBank, Huntington, Iberiabank, Fifth Third, First Financial Bank, Santander, First Tennessee, and Wells Fargo to negotiate agreements. The agreements made since 2016 total more than \$157 billion in loans and investments for communities of color and LMI communities.

A [HUD publication](#) reviewed CRA’s accomplishments over its 40 year history. Studies conclude that lending is higher in low- and moderate-income census tracts than in tracts with median incomes just above CRA-income thresholds. In addition, a [report](#) published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia concluded that home purchase lending in LMI tracts would have declined by about 20% had CRA not existed. Recently, the [Penn Institute for Urban Research](#) also published a series of CRA research and policy papers, one of which found that CRA has prevented branch closures in LMI communities.

RECENT REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

The OCC led by Trump Administration appointee Joseph Otting has taken the lead among the three regulatory agencies in considering reforms to the CRA regulation. In mid-December, the OCC and the FDIC issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPR) that would fundamentally weaken CRA.

In the NPR, the OCC and FDIC proposed concepts that would reduce CRA-related lending and investing in future years. In particular, the agency proposed a “one ratio” measure that would consist of all CRA activity (the dollar amount of loans and investments) divided by bank deposits. Under the one ratio measure, banks could choose to forego certain activities such as low dollar mortgage lending to lower-income homebuyers in favor of large deals such as purchases of mortgage backed securities that are not as responsive to immediate credit needs. In particular, the one ratio would enable banks to ignore local needs in some geographical areas and allow them to focus on lending and investing in areas where it may be easier to do so. This would violate the intent of CRA which was to rectify redlining and to ensure that banks were responsive to needs in all localities in which they had branches and in which they did business.

The OCC and FDIC also propose to broaden the activities that would count under CRA. Financing large infrastructure such as bridges would count, which would divert bank attention away from affordable housing and community development

in LMI neighborhoods. Even financing “athletic” stadiums in Opportunity Zones would count.

To compound matters, the proposal would re-define affordable housing, allowing middle-income housing in high cost areas to count. In addition, rental housing would be considered affordable if LMI households can afford the rent without verifying that they would be the actual tenants. All of these proposed changes would again deviate from the purpose of the CRA legislation which was focused on addressing the credit needs in lower-income communities that were redlined.

On the legislative front, Senator Elizabeth Warren (D-MA) introduced the “American Housing and Economic Mobility Act of 2019.” This ambitious bill strengthens CRA as applied to banks by updating assessment areas to include geographical areas in which banks make considerable numbers of loans and engage in other business activity but do not have branches. It would also mandate the inclusion of mortgage company affiliates on bank CRA exams. Finally, it would expand CRA to include independent mortgage companies.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

CRA is vital to promoting safe and sound lending and investing in communities. Community organizations are encouraged to comment on CRA exams and merger applications. The federal agencies post lists on their websites every quarter of upcoming CRA exams. Additionally, organizations should establish and expand upon dialogues with CRA officers at banks in their service areas to see how banks can increase their support of affordable housing. NCRC can help advocates get started with CRA dialogues in their community.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Legislative efforts to weaken CRA may arise at any time. Members should:

- Oppose bills that would weaken or repeal CRA.
- Support any proposed bills such as Senator Warren’s that update and strengthen CRA.
- Ask Members of Congress to oppose regulatory efforts to weaken CRA.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

An important means to preserving and strengthening CRA is to use it. Comment on CRA exams and merger applications. Engage with the regulatory agencies and insist that their CRA exams and merger reviews are rigorous.

Although the comment period on the OCC’s and FDIC’s proposed changes is over, the Federal Reserve Board (as of this writing) has still not proposed its changes to the CRA regulation that would apply to banks. Keep in touch with NCRC regarding opportunities to comment on any additional proposed changes to the CRA regulation.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Community Reinvestment Coalition, 202-628-8866, www.ncrc.org

For CRA exam results, www.ffiec.gov

Consolidated Planning Process

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD)

Year Started: 1990 as Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) and significantly modified in 1994 as the Consolidated Plan.

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Public Housing Agency Plan* and *The National Housing Trust Fund* sections of this guide.

The Consolidated Plan, popularly called the ConPlan, is a tool advocates can use to influence how federal housing and community development dollars are spent in their communities. The ConPlan merges into one process and one document all the planning and application requirements of five HUD block grant programs: the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program, the HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program, the Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) Program, the Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) Program, and the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF) Program. States, large cities, and urban counties that receive any of these grants must have a ConPlan. In addition, Public Housing Agency Plans (PHA Plans) must be consistent with the ConPlan.

HISTORY

The statutory basis for the ConPlan is the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS), a provision of the "Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990." The CHAS established a state and local planning process that determined housing needs and assigned priorities to those needs. In order to receive CDBG, HOME, ESG, or HOPWA dollars, jurisdictions had to have a CHAS. In 1994, HUD amended the CHAS regulations to create the ConPlan; there is no ConPlan statute.

The ConPlan regulations interwove the planning, application, and performance reporting

processes of the four block grants and the CHAS, resulting in one long-term plan (the Strategic Plan), one application document (the Annual Action Plan), and one set of performance reports, the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), which no longer includes CDBG's Grantee Performance Report (GPR). The interim regulations implementing the HTF require the HTF Allocation Plan to be integrated into a state's Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plans.

SUMMARY

Jurisdictions develop ConPlans at least once every five years in the form of the long-term Strategic Plan and must prepare Annual Action Plans during that period to show how resources will be used in the upcoming year to address Strategic Plan priorities. The regulations are at 24 CFR Part 91.

The Seven Key ConPlan Elements

1. **Housing and Community Development Needs:** The ConPlan must estimate housing needs for the upcoming five years. It must also describe "priority non-housing community development needs." According to the regulations, the needs in the ConPlan should reflect the public participation process and the ideas of social service agencies, must be based on U.S. Census data, and "shall be based on any other reliable source." NLIHC's *Out of Reach* and *Congressional District Housing Profiles* are excellent sources of data.

The ConPlan must estimate housing needs by:

- Income categories, including households with income less than 30% of the area median income (AMI) or less than the federal poverty line, called extremely low-income; between 30% and 50% of AMI (low-income), between 50% and 80% of AMI (moderate-income), and between 80% and 95% of AMI (middle-income).

- Tenure type (whether the household rents or owns).
- Family type, including large families (five or more people), individuals, and elderly households.
- A summary of the number of people who have a housing cost burden (pay more than 30% of their income for rent and utilities) or severe cost burden (pay more than 50% of their income for rent and utilities), live in very poor quality housing, or live in overcrowded housing. Each of these characteristics must be presented by income category and tenure type.
- The nature and extent of homelessness by racial and ethnic groups.
- The characteristics and needs of people, especially extremely low-income people, who are housed but who are threatened with homelessness.

2. Housing Market Analysis: The housing market analysis requires a description of key features of the housing market, such as the supply of housing, demand for housing, and the condition and cost of housing. It must also have an inventory of facilities and services for homeless people, with categories for permanent housing, permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, and emergency shelters. A description of facilities and services for people who are not homeless but require supportive housing must be included, along with a description of programs ensuring that people returning from mental and physical health institutions receive supportive housing.

The ConPlan must estimate the housing needs of:

- Domestic violence survivors,
- Persons with disabilities,
- Persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and
- Persons who were formerly homeless and receive rapid re-housing assistance that is about to expire.

The ConPlan must estimate:

- The need for public housing and Housing Choice Vouchers (Section 8), referring to waiting lists for those programs.
- The supportive housing needs of people who are elderly, have physical or mental disabilities, have addiction problems, are living with HIV/AIDS, or are public housing residents.
- The number of housing units containing lead-based paint hazards occupied by low-income households.
- The needs of any racial or ethnic group if their needs are 10% greater than all people in the same income category.

The ConPlan must describe the nature and extent of homelessness, addressing:

- The number of homeless people on any given night, the number who experience homelessness each year, and the number of days people are homeless.

Localities (not states) have additional requirements:

- A description of the housing stock available to people with disabilities, HIV/AIDS, or special needs.
- An estimate of the number of vacant or abandoned buildings, with an indication of whether they can be rehabilitated.
- A narrative or map describing areas where low-income people and different races and ethnic groups are concentrated.
- A list of public housing developments and the number of units in them, along with a description of their condition and revitalization needs.
- A description of the number of units assisted with other federal (e.g., Project-Based Section 8), state, or local funds, including the income levels and types of families they serve.
- An assessment of whether any units are expected to be lost, such as through Section 8 contract expiration.

3. Strategic Plan: This long-term plan must be done at least every five years. It must indicate general priorities for allocating CPD money geographically and among different activities and needs (“CPD money” is used here to refer to each of the five block grant programs administered by CPD subject to the ConPlan). The Strategic Plan must describe the rationale for the fund allocation priorities given to each category of priority needs among the different income categories. Needs may refer to types of activities, such as rental rehabilitation, as well as to demographic groups, such as extremely low-income households. Although the regulations do not specifically require it, past HUD guidance required jurisdictions to assign to each priority need a relative priority of high, medium, or low. Since August 2012, HUD has only required priority assignments of high or low priority. The ConPlan must identify proposed accomplishments in measurable terms and estimate a timetable for achieving them.

For housing, the regulations add that the Strategic Plan must explain the reasoning behind priority assignments, the proposed use of funds, and how the reasoning relates to the analysis of the housing market, the severity of housing problems, the needs of the various income categories, and the needs of renters compared to owners. The number of families who will receive affordable housing must be shown by the income categories of extremely low, low, and moderate. The Strategic Plan must also describe how the need for public housing will be met.

Priority homeless needs must be shown. The Strategic Plan must also describe strategies for reducing and ending homelessness by helping people to avoid becoming homeless, reaching out to homeless people to determine their needs, addressing needs for emergency shelter and transitional housing, and helping homeless people make the transition to permanent housing.

For people with special needs who are not homeless, the Strategic Plan must summarize

the priority housing and supportive service needs of people who are elderly or who have disabilities (mental, physical, or developmental), HIV/AIDS, alcohol or drug addiction, or who are public housing residents.

For jurisdictions receiving CDBG funds, the Strategic Plan must summarize non-housing community development needs, such as daycare services, health centers, parks, roads, and commercial development.

4. Anti-poverty Strategy: The statute calls for a description of goals, programs, and policies for reducing the number of people with income below the poverty level. It also requires a statement of how affordable housing programs will be coordinated with other programs and the degree to which they will reduce the number of people in poverty.
5. Lead-based Paint: The Strategic Plan must outline actions to find and reduce lead paint hazards.
6. Fair Housing: Each year the jurisdiction must certify that it is affirmatively furthering fair housing (AFFH). Because HUD suspended the 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule, instead of carrying out that rule’s AFFH and related ConPlan provisions, in 2020 virtually every jurisdiction must follow the flawed Analysis of Impediments (AI) to fair housing choice process. That means that the jurisdiction has an AI, is taking appropriate action to overcome the effects of impediments, and keeps records. The AI is not required to be a part of the Strategic Plan or Annual Action Plan. Although HUD’s official 1996 *Fair Housing Planning Guide* says an AI “must be completed/updated in accordance with timeframes for the Consolidated Plan,” a September 2004 memorandum says that each jurisdiction “should maintain its AI and update the AI annually where necessary.” See the *Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing* articles.
7. Annual Action Plan: The Annual Action Plan must describe all the federal resources

reasonably expected to be available, including those in addition to CDBG, HOME, ESG, HOPWA, and HTF, such as Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTCs), Continuum of Care (CoC) funds, and Housing Choice Vouchers. The Annual Action Plan must also indicate other private and local and state resources expected to be available. The geographic areas that will get assistance in the upcoming year must be indicated, and the Annual Action Plan must give reasons why these areas have priority.

Local jurisdictions' Action Plans must describe the activities the jurisdiction will carry out in the upcoming year. State Action Plans must describe their method for distributing funds to local governments and nonprofits, or the activities the state will undertake itself. The Action Plan must also describe the reasons for making these allocation priorities. Local jurisdictions must describe the use of CDBG for each activity in enough detail, including location, to enable people to determine the degree to which they could be affected. States must describe the criteria used to select CDBG applications from localities. States must also describe how all CDBG money will be allocated among all funding categories (e.g., housing, economic development, public works, etc.).

There must be an estimate of the number and type of households expected to benefit from the use of CPD funds (this does not apply to states). In addition, based on any funds available to the jurisdiction, the Action Plan must specify one-year goals for the number of non-homeless, homeless, and special needs households to be provided affordable housing through new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, and rental assistance

The Annual Action Plan must indicate the activities that will be carried out in the upcoming year to reduce homelessness by preventing homelessness, especially for those with income less than 30% of AMI, meeting emergency shelter and transitional housing needs, helping people make the transition to permanent housing and independent living, and meeting the special

needs of people who are not homeless but have supportive housing needs.

The Five Steps of the ConPlan Calendar

1. **Identify Needs:** The CDBG and CHAS laws require a public hearing to gather the public's ideas about housing and community development needs. HUD's regulations require this hearing to take place before a proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan is published for comment.
2. **Proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan:** There must be a notice in the newspaper that a proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan is available. Complete copies of the proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan must be available in public places, such as libraries. A reasonable number of copies of a proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan must be provided at no cost. There must be at least one public hearing during the development of the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan (this does not apply to states). The public must have at least 30 days to review and comment on the proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan.
3. **Final ConPlan/Annual Action Plan:** The jurisdiction must consider the public's comments about the proposed ConPlan/Annual Action Plan, attach a summary of the comments to the final ConPlan/Annual Action Plan, and explain in the final ConPlan/Annual Action Plan why any suggestions were not used. A copy of the final ConPlan/Annual Action Plan must be available to the public.

HUD can disapprove the final ConPlan/Annual Action Plan for several reasons, including if a jurisdiction did not follow the public participation requirements, did not "satisfy all of the required elements," or provided an inaccurate certification (for example, HUD finds that a jurisdiction's certification that it took appropriate actions to overcome impediments to fair housing is not accurate).
4. **The Annual Performance Report:** In this report a jurisdiction shows what it did during the past year to meet housing and community development needs. The report must include

a description of the money available and how it was spent; the location of projects; and the number of families and individuals assisted, broken down by race and ethnicity as well as by income category, including income less than 30% of AMI. For CDBG-assisted activities, the performance report must describe the assisted activities and explain how they relate to the ConPlan priorities, giving special attention to the highest priority activities. The Annual Performance Report must describe the actions taken to affirmatively further fair housing.

There are several public participation features related to the Annual Performance Report. There must be reasonable notice that a report is completed, and the report must be available to the public. The public has only 15 days to review and comment on it; nevertheless, the jurisdiction must consider public comments and attach a summary of the comments.

The annual performance reporting requirements of the five block grant programs have been merged into a set of computer-based records, the CAPER for local jurisdictions and the Performance and Evaluation Report (PER) for states. These performance reports only offer a general, aggregate picture of what a jurisdiction accomplished. Although no longer a part of the CAPER, local jurisdictions receiving CDBG must still complete a GPR, which also goes by the term IDIS Report PR03. The GPR should provide detailed information about each activity funded by CDBG. Although many jurisdictions do not make the GPR known to the public, it must be provided if requested.

5. Amendments to the ConPlan: The ConPlan must be amended if there are any changes in priorities, or in the purpose, location, scope, or beneficiaries of an activity, or if money is used for an activity not mentioned in the Annual Action Plan. If there is a substantial amendment, then public participation similar to that for Annual Performance Reports is required, but with a 30-day comment period. HUD allows the jurisdiction to define

substantial amendment. At a minimum, the regulations indicate that a substantial amendment must include a change in the use of CDBG funds, and a change in the way a state allocates CDBG money to small towns and rural areas.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In addition to the public participation requirements mentioned in the previous paragraphs, each jurisdiction must have a written “citizen participation plan” available to the public. The plan must provide for and encourage public involvement in the creation of the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan, review of the Annual Performance Report, and any substantial amendment. It must encourage involvement by people with low incomes, especially in low income neighborhoods and areas where CDBG money might be spent. Jurisdictions “are expected to take whatever actions are appropriate to encourage the participation of all of its citizens, including minorities and non-English speaking persons, as well as persons with disabilities.” Jurisdictions must also encourage involvement by residents of public and assisted housing.

There must be reasonable and timely access to information and records relating to the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan. The public must be able to review records from the previous five years related to the ConPlan and any use of federal money covered by the ConPlan. For local jurisdictions (not states) the public must have reasonable and timely access to local meetings, such as community advisory committee meetings and city council meetings.

Public hearings must be held after adequate notice to the public. “Publishing small print notices in the newspaper a few days before the hearing is not adequate notice,” according to the regulations, but “two weeks’ notice is adequate.” Public hearings must be held at times and places convenient for people with low incomes. Where there are a significant number of people with limited English proficiency, the public participation plan must show how they can be involved. The jurisdiction must give written,

meaningful, and timely responses to written public complaints; 15 days is considered timely if the jurisdiction gets CDBG funding.

CONPLAN TEMPLATE AND MAPPING TOOLS

ConPlans, their subsequent Annual Action Plans, and CAPERs must be submitted electronically using an electronic template tied into CPD's management information system, known as IDIS.

The template is a combination of data tables and narratives that set a baseline of HUD's expectations for the type and amount of information required. Jurisdictions can customize their templates by adding additional text, data, or images from other sources. The data tables required by the regulations pertaining to housing and homelessness needs and the housing market are automatically pre-populated with the required data; however, jurisdictions may substitute better data if they have it. Some of the data includes the five-year American Community Survey data from the Census Bureau, special Census CHAS tabulations, public housing resident characteristics from HUD's *Picture of Subsidized Housing*, and business and employment data from Census.

Most jurisdictions' ConPlans are posted on the HUD website. Advocates will benefit from reviewing the ConPlan Desk Guide containing the components of the template because it outlines the regulatory requirements that jurisdictions must follow and because it helps advocates know what the various template tables should look like. Unfortunately, advocates cannot use the template to electronically create their own alternative ConPlan because only jurisdictions have access to IDIS. Nevertheless, the Desk Guide provides advocates an outline of what jurisdictions must submit that advocates can use to manually fashion their own ideal ConPlan to promote prior to the public participation process.

CPD also has a mapping tool that allows both grantees and members of the public to access a large amount of data in a user-friendly, web-based format. Jurisdictions are not required to use the maps. Users can search, query,

and display information on the map that will help them identify trends and needs in their communities. Some of the features available on the mapping tool include the capacity to show where CDBG and HOME activities have been provided and where public housing and private, HUD-assisted housing and LIHTC housing is located. It is also possible to see housing, economic, and demographic characteristics of an area down to the census tract level. The web-based software enables advocates to draw custom geographies, such as neighborhood boundaries, which might not fit neatly into census tracts.

THE CONPLAN AND THE NATIONAL HOUSING TRUST FUND

The HTF statute requires states to prepare an Allocation Plan each year showing how the state will allot the HTF dollars it will receive in the upcoming year. Each state must distribute its HTF dollars throughout the state according to the state's assessment of priority housing needs as identified in its approved ConPlan.

HTF advocates should determine which state agency is responsible for drafting the HTF Allocation Plan (available on [HUD's HTF website](#) and on [NLIHC's HTF website](#)). It is probably not the same agency that drafts the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan. Advocates should inform the ConPlan agency (if it is different than the HTF state agency) that they are interested in participating in the process for planning where and how HTF money will be used.

Although the HTF statute requires public participation in the development of the HTF Allocation Plan, the HTF interim rule does not explicitly declare that, in order to receive HTF money, states must develop their Allocation Plans using the ConPlan public participation rules. It merely requires states to submit an HTF Allocation Plan following the ConPlan rule, which does have public participation requirements. After 2016, most state HTF Allocations Plans are found in a section of the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan concerning "program-specific" information, or in an appendix to the ConPlan/Annual Action Plan.

Action around the HTF Allocation Plan takes place at the state level. For advocates only accustomed to ConPlan/Annual Action Plan advocacy at the local level because a locality gets CDBG and HOME directly from HUD, the state HTF process will be an important new experience. To better ensure that HTF dollars are used properly, it might be necessary for advocates to learn how to influence their state ConPlan.

The interim HTF rule requires states receiving HTF dollars to submit a performance report according to the ConPlan regulations. The HTF performance report must describe HTF program accomplishments, and the extent to which the state complied with its approved HTF Allocation Plan and all of the requirements of the HTF rule. NLIHC will monitor how HUD addresses performance reporting through changes to the ConPlan template.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

The ConPlan is a potentially useful advocacy tool for directing funds toward activities more beneficial to people with low incomes because jurisdictions must provide for and encourage public participation, particularly by people with low incomes. Advocates and residents should monitor the needs assessment and priority setting processes, making sure that all needs are identified and assigned the level of priority they deserve. With the mapping tool, advocates can add information and data that the jurisdiction might not include, such as data from studies conducted by local universities. Advocates can also devise an alternative plan using the mapping tool to draw neighborhood boundaries that more realistically reflect community dynamics. Through the Annual Action Plan's public participation process, advocates and residents can strive to ensure that federal dollars are allocated to activities that will truly meet the high priority needs of low-income people.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org.

HUD Consolidated Plan on HUD Exchange [https://](https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/consolidated-plan)

www.hudexchange.info/programs/consolidated-plan

ConPlan template Desk Guide, <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/2641/econ-planning-suite-desk-guide-idis-conplan-action-plan-caper-per>

ConPlan mapping tool, <https://egis.hud.gov/cpdmaps> and CPD Maps Desk Guide, <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/2405/cpd-maps-desk-guide>

Find jurisdictions' ConPlans and Annual Action Plans at <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/consolidated-plan/con-plans-aaps-capers>

End of year reporting, <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/idis/idis-reporting>, and <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/3312/hud-memo-caper-for-entitlement-grantees-for-1997-program-year>

Continuum of Care Planning

By Mindy Mitchell, Senior Technical Assistance Specialist, National Alliance to End Homelessness

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Special Needs Assistance Programs within the Office of Community Planning and Development

Year Started: 1994

Population Targeted: People experiencing homelessness

See Also: For related information, refer to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Programs, Ten-Year Plans to End Homelessness, and the Federal Surplus Property to Address Homelessness sections of this guide.

The Continuum of Care (CoC) planning process is used by communities to apply for funding from HUD's CoC program. Through the CoC planning process, government agencies, service providers, advocates, and other stakeholders evaluate the needs of homeless people in the community, assess the performance of existing activities, and prioritize activities going forward. The CoC process was introduced by HUD in the mid-1990s. It was codified into law by Congress through the "Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009."

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The CoC process was developed by HUD in 1994 to coordinate the distribution of several competitive homeless assistance programs. Prior to the CoC process, organizations applied individually for funding from several homeless assistance programs. As a result, there was little coordination between these programs or between different organizations receiving funding in the same community. The CoC process was established to promote coordination within communities and between programs. It was also designed to bring together a broader collection

of stakeholders such as public agencies, the faith and business communities, and mainstream service providers. Guidelines for the CoC planning process were included in annual Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs). HUD regularly modifies the process.

On May 20, 2009, President Barack Obama signed the "HEARTH Act" (Public Law 111-22), providing congressional authorization of the CoC process. Regulations governing the CoC program were published in the summer of 2012. The "HEARTH Act" reauthorized the housing title of the "McKinney-Vento Act." HUD began issuing regulations in 2011, with the release of interim regulations on the Emergency Solutions Grant and the Homeless Management Information Systems, along with a final regulation on the definition of homelessness.

Regulations on the CoC program were published in the summer of 2012. Key changes made by the "HEARTH Act" include changes to outcome measures, funding incentives, eligibility for assistance, matching requirements, rural assistance, and administrative funding.

SUMMARY

The term Continuum of Care (CoC) is used in many ways and can refer to the planning process, the collection of stakeholders involved in the planning process, the geographic area covered by the CoC, or the actual grant received from HUD.

The CoC planning process is typically lead and staffed by either a local government agency or a community-based nonprofit. The geography covered by a CoC can vary, covering an entire city, state, or a collection of counties. The goal of the CoC is to create a system-wide response to ensure that homelessness is rare, brief, and nonrecurring. The CoC is tasked with compiling information about homelessness in the community, including information about homeless populations and performance of homeless service programs and the community in reducing homelessness.

In recent years, HUD has incentivized coordination between CoCs and various entities including Consolidated Plan jurisdictions, public housing authorities, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Runaway and Homeless Youth, Head Start programs, and other programs.

As of this writing, HUD has not announced awards for the FY2020 CoC NOFA. However, the FY2019 CoC NOFA, released on July 3, 2019, made available approximately \$2.3 billion to serve people experiencing homelessness nationally. As in previous years, although the available amount of funding was expected to be sufficient to fund eligible renewal projects, applicants for the FY2019 CoC NOFA had to prioritize projects, including renewal projects, into two tiers. The FY2019 CoC NOFA included a strong preference for performance and effective practices that Congress originally included in the “HEARTH Act.” CoCs had to place up to 6% of their funds in Tier 2, meaning these funds were at risk of being lost if the CoC was low performing. Through the “FY2019 HUD Appropriations Act,” which set aside up to \$50 million, CoCs were also able to apply for a Domestic Violence Bonus for Rapid Re-Housing projects, Joint Transitional Housing and Rapid Re-Housing Component projects, and Support Services Only projects for Coordinated Entry.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The “HEARTH Act” placed more of the responsibility for measuring outcomes and overseeing performance on the leaders of local CoCs. Like the previous year, the FY2019 CoC competition continued to require CoCs to submit data on their system’s performance and to place a strong emphasis on performance measures that ensure homelessness is a rare, brief, and one-time experience. As CoC data collection and quality improve, HUD will likely use requested data to establish baselines for measuring improvements in future competitions. Demonstrating reductions in homelessness, the time people experience homelessness, and the effectiveness of programs continue to be emphasized.

The FY2019 CoC NOFA competition also continued to emphasize that efforts to prevent and end homelessness should consider and address racial inequities to achieve positive outcomes for all persons experiencing homelessness (e.g., receiving necessary services and housing to exit homelessness). CoCs were required to identify steps they will take to ensure that traditionally marginalized populations (such as racial and ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities) will be able to meaningfully participate in the planning process. Unfortunately, the FY2019 NOFA removed specific incentives for partnering with LGBTQ-serving organization *and* any reference to LGBTQ populations at all, even though LGBTQ people are overrepresented among people experiencing homelessness. However, in report language in the “Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020,” Congress directed HUD to return to the LGBTQ-inclusive language of the FY2018 CoC NOFA for its FY2020 CoC NOFA, which has not been published at the time of this writing.

Finally, the FY2019 NOFA increased the emphasis on improving employment outcomes for people experiencing homelessness, and that emphasis is expected to be continued in 2020.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

The CoC planning process is intended to focus on the needs of homeless people in the community and should focus on the most effective strategies for reducing homelessness. Yet many CoCs struggle to assist lower performing providers to improve their performance or shift to more effective strategies. Similarly, accessing mainstream resources, generally available for low-income people, is often difficult for people experiencing homelessness. For example, there are numerous barriers for homeless people to access employment services, housing assistance, cash assistance, and treatment services.

Advocates play a crucial role in ensuring that the CoC serves people most in need of assistance and expands access to mainstream resources. For CoCs to be effective, it is important that key stakeholders have a seat at the table. In many

communities, the needs of children, people of color, LGBTQ, veterans, people with disabilities, youth, and domestic violence survivors are not always adequately represented. Advocates should work to ensure that they are part of the CoC planning process. By joining their local CoC, advocates can inform and shape a community's priorities in addressing homelessness for current and emerging populations.

Critically, all stakeholders should participate in data collection efforts whenever appropriate and ensure that programs achieve positive outcomes. Information about the CoC Program and the local CoC coordinator can be found at HUD's Homelessness Resource Exchange website.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

National Alliance to End Homelessness, 202-638-1526, www.endhomelessness.org

HUD Homelessness Resource Exchange,
<https://www.hudexchange.info>

Public Housing Agency Plan

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing

Year Started: 1998

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Public Housing* and *Resident Participation in Federally Subsidized Housing* sections of this guide.

The Public Housing Agency Plan (PHA Plan) is the collection of a public housing agency's key policies (such as admissions policies) and program intentions (such as demolition). This includes a Five-Year Plan and Annual Plan updates. The PHA Plan was meant to ensure local accountability through resident and community participation. However, various administrative and legislative efforts have weakened PHA Plans.

ADMINISTRATION

PHA Plans are administered by local public housing agencies (PHAs), with oversight by HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH). There are about 3,900 PHAs. PHA Plan regulations are at 24 CFR Part 903, Subpart B.

HISTORY

The "Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998" (QHWRA) established the PHA Plan because of the significant shift of authority to PHAs provided by that law. The PHA Plan was meant to ensure local accountability through resident and community participation opportunities. Resident Advisory Boards (RABs) were also created by QHWRA to ensure participation in the PHA Plan process by public housing residents and voucher-assisted households.

In June 2004, HUD issued regulations streamlining the Annual Plan requirements for PHAs with fewer than 250 public housing units and any number of voucher units, known as "small PHAs." These PHAs are only required

to submit certifications regarding capital improvement needs and civil rights compliance. Congress broadened this regulatory streamlining in 2008, enacting several reforms that essentially eliminated the requirement to submit an Annual Plan for PHAs administering fewer than 550 units of public housing and vouchers combined, known as "qualified PHAs." There are more than 2,700 qualified PHAs. Also in 2008, HUD took administrative action to dilute the information provided to residents and the general public through the PHA Plan template.

PLAN SUMMARY

All PHAs must develop Five-Year PHA Plans that describe the overall mission and goals of the PHA regarding the housing needs of low-income families in its jurisdiction. Larger PHAs, called "non-qualified PHAs," must also develop an Annual Plan, which is a gathering of a PHA's program intentions, such as demolition, as well as key policies, such as those relating to admissions, income targeting, rents, and pets. However, these larger PHAs must submit only a short PHA Plan template to HUD each year.

The 19 Required PHA Plan Components

- 1. Housing Needs** of extremely low-, very low-, and low-income families, elderly families, families with a member who has a disability, and those on public housing and Section 8 waiting lists.
- 2. Tenant Eligibility, Selection, and Admissions Policies** as well as waiting list procedures, admissions preferences, unit assignment policies, and race and income deconcentration policies.
- 3. Financial Resources** and planned uses of these resources for the upcoming year listed in categories such as operating funds, capital funds, other federal funds, and non-federal funds.

4. **Rent Determination** including rent policies for tenants, and for landlords receiving vouchers.
5. **Operations and Management** of facilities, including PHA programs, their organization, and policies governing maintenance (including policies regarding pest infestation).
6. **Grievance Procedures** for residents and applicants.
7. **Capital Improvement Needs** and planned actions for the long-term physical and social health of public housing developments. This should include plans and costs for the upcoming year and a Five-Year Plan.
8. **Demolition and Disposition Plans** that the PHA has applied for, or will apply for, including timetables.
9. Designation of Public Housing for Elderly or Disabled identified.
10. **Conversion of Public Housing** to tenant-based vouchers through Section 33 (required conversion) or Section 22 (voluntary conversion) of the “United States Housing Act.”
11. **Homeownership Programs** described, such as Section 8(y) or Section 5(h).
12. **Community and Self-Sufficiency Programs** that aim to improve families’ economic or social self-sufficiency, including those that will fulfill community service requirements. This also refers to a PHA’s Section 3 jobs efforts.
13. **Safety and Crime Prevention** including coordination with police.
14. **Pets** policy.
15. **Civil Rights** as reflected in a formal pledge that the PHA will comply with the “Civil Rights Act of 1964,” the “Fair Housing Act,” Section 504 of the “Rehabilitation Act,” and the “Americans with Disabilities Act.”
16. **Financial Audit** from the most recent fiscal year.

17. Asset Management for long-term operating, capital investment, rehabilitation, modernization, or sale of the PHA’s inventory.

18. Domestic Violence activities, services, or programs that prevent or serve survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking as added by the “Violence Against Women Act of 2005” as amended in 2013.

19. Additional Information including progress in meeting or deviating from the PHA’s mission and goals as listed in the Five-Year Plan.

Resident Advisory Boards

As part of this planning process, PHAs are required to have at least one RAB to assist in the development of the PHA Plan and any significant amendments to the plan. RAB membership must adequately reflect and represent residents served by the PHA, including voucher holders if they make up at least 20% of all those assisted.

In order to ensure that RABs can be as effective as possible, the PHA must provide reasonable means for RAB members to become informed about programs covered by the PHA Plan, communicate with residents in writing and by telephone, hold meetings with residents, and obtain information through the Internet.

The PHA must consider RAB recommendations when preparing a final PHA Plan or any significant amendment. A copy of the RAB’s recommendations and a description of whether those recommendations were addressed must be included with the final PHA Plan.

Resident and Community Participation

The law and regulations provide for a modest public participation process. The PHA must conduct reasonable outreach to encourage broad public participation. The PHA’s board of commissioners must invite public comment regarding a proposed PHA Plan and conduct a public hearing to discuss the plan. The hearing must be held at a location convenient to PHA residents. At least 45 days before the public hearing, the PHA must publish a notice indicating

the date, time, and location of the public hearing, as well informing the public that the proposed PHA Plan, required attachments, and other relevant information is available for public inspection at the PHA's main office during normal business hours.

The final, HUD-approved PHA Plan, along with required attachments and other related documents, must be available for review at the PHA's main office during normal business hours. Small PHAs submitting so-called streamlined Annual PHA Plans must certify that any revised policies and programs are available for review at the PHA's main office during normal business hours.

There are four places in the regulations indicating that writing and calling HUD to complain about the PHA Plan might secure attention and relief from HUD:

1. If a RAB claims in writing that the PHA failed to provide adequate notice and opportunity for comment, HUD may make a finding and hold up approval of a PHA Plan until this failure is remedied.
2. Before approving a PHA Plan, HUD will review "any... element of the PHA's Annual Plan that is challenged" by residents or the public.
3. HUD can decide not to approve a PHA Plan if the Plan or one of its components:
 - Does not provide all of the required information.
 - Is not consistent with information and data available to HUD.
 - Is not consistent with the jurisdiction's Consolidated Plan.
4. To ensure that a PHA complies with all of the policies adopted in its HUD-approved PHA Plan, "HUD shall, as it deems appropriate, respond to any complaint concerning PHA noncompliance with the plan...HUD will take whatever action it deems necessary and appropriate."

Significant Amendments

The PHA Plan must identify the PHA's basic criteria for determining what makes an amendment significant. Significant amendments can only take place after formal adoption by the PHA board of commissioners at a meeting open to the public and after subsequent approval by HUD. Significant amendments are subject to all of the RAB and public participation requirements discussed above.

Advocates and residents should be alert to changes to the PHA Plan at any time of the year because any policy or program in it can be modified. Advocates and residents should review the PHA Plan's criteria defining significant amendments and work to change them if they are written so that few modifications would be judged significant and therefore escape the RAB and public participation requirements.

Major Changes Since 2008

Congress weakened the usefulness of the PHA Plan with changes made in the "Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008." This law included a provision greatly diminishing PHA Annual Plan requirements for PHAs that administer fewer than 550 units of public housing and vouchers combined. As of September 30, 2019, HUD reported that there were 2,705 so-called "qualified PHAs." This means that 70% of the nation's PHAs were exempt from developing an Annual Plan. Qualified PHAs only need to certify that they are complying with civil rights law and that their Five-Year PHA Plan is consistent with the local or state government's Consolidated Plan. Qualified PHAs must still hold a public hearing annually regarding any proposed changes to the PHA's goals, objectives, or policies. They must also have RABs and respond to RAB recommendations at the public hearing.

HUD also took action in 2008 that weakened the usefulness of the PHA Plan for larger PHAs. Previously, HUD required public housing agencies to use a computer based PHA Plan template. This was a helpful outline of all of the PHA Plan components required by the law. But HUD drastically diminished the template in

2008, reducing it from a helpful 41-page, easy-to-access electronic guide, to a mere page-and-a-half-long form, making it much more difficult for residents and the public to know what the law requires and what changed at the PHA during the previous year.

The 2008 PHA Plan template made it more difficult for residents and others to understand the PHA Plan process, engage in it, and have access to information associated with the 19 statutorily required PHA Plan components. The template merely asked PHAs to indicate which of the components were revised, not how the components were revised. Also, there was no longer a list of required plan components prompting residents and others to proactively recommend their own revisions to the Annual Plan.

After proposing changes to the 2008 template in 2011 and 2012, HUD issued [Notice PIH 2015-15](#) on October 23, 2015, announcing final revised PHA Plan templates. Instead of one single Annual PHA Plan template used by all PHAs, HUD now has four types of Annual PHA Plan templates to be used for different categories of PHAs. These templates include several modest improvements over the streamlined PHA Plan in use since November 2008; however, they are still far less helpful for residents and advocates than the pre-2008 template.

The Annual PHA Plan templates are:

- **HUD-50075-ST for Standard PHAs and Troubled PHAs.** A Standard PHA owns or manages 250 or more public housing units and any number of vouchers for a combined total of more than 550. The PHA was designated “standard” in its most recent assessments for the Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) and Section Eight Management Assessment Program (SEMAP). A Troubled PHA has an overall PHAS or SEMAP Score of less than 60%.
- **HUD-50075-HP for High Performer PHAs.** A High-Performer PHA owns or manages any number of public housing units and any number of vouchers, for a combined total of

more than 550 and the PHA was designated a “high performer” in its most recent assessments for PHAS and SEMAP.

- **HUD-50075-SM for Small PHAs.** A Small PHA owns or manages fewer than 250 public housing units and any number of vouchers, for a combined total of more than 550 and the PHA was not designated as troubled in the most recent PHAS or SEMAP assessment, or at risk of being designated as troubled.
- **HUD-50075-HCV for HCV Only PHAs.** A Housing Choice Voucher (HCV)-only PHA does not own or operate any public housing units but does administer more than 550 vouchers and the PHA was not designated as troubled in its most recent SEMAP assessment.

Qualified PHAs that were not designated as troubled in the most recent PHAS assessment or as having a failing SEMAP score during the prior 12 months are not required to complete and submit an Annual PHA Plan. However, Qualified PHAs must submit a Five-Year PHA Plan.

Previously, the PHA Plan template for the Five-Year PHA Plan and the Annual Plan were the same. Notice PIH-2015-15 introduced a separate template for the Five-Year PHA Plan to be used by all PHAs.

Several modifications are improvements over the 2008 template. Each of the current templates clearly state that a proposed PHA Plan, each of the statutorily required PHA Plan elements, and all information relevant to the public hearing about a proposed PHA Plan and the proposed PHA Plan itself must be available to the public. The current templates also require PHAs to indicate where the public can access the information. At a minimum, PHAs are required to post PHA Plan templates at each Asset Management Project (public housing developments or a group of developments) and at the PHA’s main office. PHAs are encouraged to post PHA Plans on their official websites and provide copies to resident councils. Notice PIH-2015-15 adds that the approved PHA Plan and required attachments and documents related to

the PHA Plan must be made available for review and inspection at the principal office of the PHA during normal business hours. The PIH website does not have links to individual PHA's PHA Plans.

The Current Standard/Troubled PHA Template

This article focuses on the template for Standard/Troubled PHAs. The current template offers several modest improvements over the 2008 version. In a section titled "Revision of PHA Plan Elements," the template lists key statutorily required PHA Plan elements (for example, rent determination policies or grievance procedures), with boxes to check if a change has been made. This modification offers residents a clue about what some of the required elements are; without listing them, the 2008 template merely directed PHAs to identify any elements that were revised during the year. The current template also directs PHAs to describe any revisions.

The Standard/Troubled PHA Plan template is also improved because it has a "New Activities" section for a PHA to indicate whether or not it intends to undertake a new activity, such as project-basing vouchers, converting public housing units under the Rental Assistance Demonstration, or undertaking a mixed finance project. Any new activities must be described.

The current template requires PHAs to include any comments received from the RAB, along with the PHA's analysis of the RAB's comments and a description of the PHA's decision regarding RAB comments.

One of the changes trumpeted in Notice PIH-2015-15 is that the templates would have descriptions of the PHA's policies or programs to enable a PHA to serve the needs of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking in accord with requirements of the "Violence Against Women Act" (VAWA). However, the body of the templates do not mention VAWA-related information. Only by reading the instructions regarding any revision to a PHA Plan statutorily required element and then carefully examining the last half of the entry

pertaining to "Safety and Crime Prevention" does one detect VAWA-related language.

The 2008 template required PHAs to submit as an attachment to the PHA Plan any challenge to one of the statutorily required PHA Plan elements. The regulations call for HUD to review any such challenge. Although Notice PIH-2015-15 acknowledges this aspect of the regulations, it removed from the current template the requirement to submit any challenge. HUD writes that it will consider incorporating the requirement in the future.

Ongoing Concerns

NLIHC remains concerned that resident involvement in the PHA Plan will continue to diminish due to the loss of guidance in the PHA Plan template. The template still has fewer reminders about the role of the RAB in developing the PHA Plan. The template no longer includes the list of RAB members or residents on the PHA Board, nor does it include a description of the process for electing residents to the PHA board.

NLIHC is also concerned that HUD no longer posts a directory of approved PHA Plans by state. HUD should resume posting PHA Plans on its website.

PHA Annual Plans should be enhanced to provide additional data on:

- The number of Annual Contributions Contract (ACC) units the PHA has, by development, the occupancy level at each development, and a plan to reduce any development's vacancy rate that is above 3%.
- The number of ACC units planned for redevelopment that will no longer be available or affordable to extremely low-income households.
- The number of authorized housing vouchers that the agency has under lease.
- The PHA's SEMAP ratings, any audits of the agency performed by HUD, and any corrective action the agency took regarding SEMAP or audit findings.

In addition, NLIHC believes that more PHAs must be required to comply with the PHA Plan so that residents and community members can have an opportunity to learn about and participate in the decisions affecting the nation's investments in public housing and vouchers.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Advocates should participate in the development of their local agency's PHA Plan. Find out the dates PHA Plans are due to HUD; those dates are based on PHAs' fiscal year start dates. Ask the PHA to provide notice well in advance of the required public hearing and ask specifically about proposed changes. Review all PHA Plan components thought to be important and prepare written comments as well as comment at the public hearing. Work with others, especially residents of public housing, voucher households, and other low-income people to increase participation in the PHA Plan process. All year long advocates should be on the lookout for significant amendments and submit written comments as well as verbal comments at the public hearing required for significant amendments.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should let their Members of Congress know that:

- The PHA Annual and Five-Year Plans are important, local tools that should be expanded to more PHAs and enhanced to require more information about components important to residents and other community members.
- HUD's diminished template for Annual PHA Plan submission should be returned to its original state.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org

HUD PHA Plan webpage, including the 2015 templates, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/pha

Notice PIH-2015-18, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/publications/notices/2015

HUD list of Qualified PHAs, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/public_indian_housing/pha/lists

HUD-Funded Service Coordination Programs: ROSS, Family Self-Sufficiency, and Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for Elderly and Disabled

By Melissa Harris, Senior Manager of Government Affairs, American Association of Service Coordinators

HUD currently has three distinct service coordinator programs, each with its own federally appropriated funding stream:

- Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled.
- The Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency (ROSS) Service Coordinator Program.
- The Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program.

HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing administers the ROSS Service Coordinator and FSS programs. The Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled program funds the work of service coordinators in Section 202 housing and is administered by HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs. That office also oversees the FSS program for owners of private multifamily projects that have a project-based Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment contract.

A service coordinator is defined as a social service staff person hired or contracted by a property owner, housing management company, public housing agency (PHA), resident association (RA), or Tribal Housing entity.

In the past, a service coordinator was a social service professional who acted as an information and referral resource for families, seniors, and persons with disabilities residing in publicly funded subsidized apartments or other affordable housing environments. However, the role of the service coordinator has evolved to a more hands-on, enhanced level of coordination, motivation,

and assistance.

This model represents a proactive approach to service coordination in which the service coordinator reaches out to and engages residents, conducts non-clinical assessments of resident interests and needs, and makes referrals to service providers in the community as necessary and appropriate. The service coordinator's primary role is to coordinate the provision of supportive services and provide access to benefits, entitlements, and community-based resources for low-income residents.

Many service coordinators see their roles as facilitators rather than fixers and as resources rather than rescuers. Specifically, service coordinators empower the residents in these settings to remain independent and increase their assets and self-sufficiency. They do this by influencing positive behavior changes linked to improved wellness while connecting residents with community-based services, supports, and other income-related benefits.

HISTORY

Service coordination is a growing profession that expanded when Congress created HUD's Service Coordinator Program through Section 808 of the "National Affordable Housing Act of 1990" (also known as the "Cranston-Gonzalez Affordable Housing Act," Public Law 101-625). This law gave HUD the authority to use Section 8 funds to employ service coordinators in Section 202 Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled. The act also enacted the FSS program.

Service coordination programs received additional authority through the 1992 "Housing and Community Development Act" (HCDA; Public Law 102-550). The HCDA Amendments

of 1992 amended Section 808 through Sections 674 and 677 and added Sections 675 and 676. Section 851 of the “American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000” (Public Law 106-569) further amended these acts. These amendments allowed service coordinators to serve low-income elderly and disabled persons living in the vicinity of the development and expanded the program by broadening authority for funding of service coordinators in most HUD-assisted and conventional public housing (PH) developments designated for the elderly and people with disabilities. The “Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2015” authorized voluntary FSS participation for owners of private multifamily projects that have a project-based Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment contract.

As a response to the “Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998” (the “Public Housing Reform Act”), ROSS is a redefined and restructured combination of programs funded in prior years: The Tenant Opportunities Program, Economic Development and Supportive Services Program, and Public Housing Service Coordinators Program.

PROGRAM SUCCESSES

National research conducted in the past 30 years has chronicled the widely recognized preference by older adults to remain independent and in their own homes and communities for as long as possible.

HUD has invested in a new reporting model called Standards for Success (SfS) that all Multifamily Service Coordinators and ROSS Service Coordinators began using in 2019. For the first time in program history, HUD will have the ability to track outcomes that may be related to service coordinator-led programming and assistance using resident-level data in addition to aggregate data.

National data about service coordination is currently available from the American Association of Service Coordinators’ AASC Online documentation system, which has shown the benefits of service coordination in terms of providing access to services and supports,

increased length of independent living, and improved health outcomes for elderly residents through wellness and healthy habits programs, health status checks, and other services arranged for and brought to the property by the service coordinator. Additionally, the AASC Online system has identified cost savings for residents through their access to needed services, benefits, and supports and for property owners/managers by preventing evictions, intervening faster when tenancy issues arise, and keeping the property “leased up.”

In terms of cost savings, a comparison of the national average monthly cost of nursing home care versus keeping a low-income, frail elderly person in their own apartment with access to benefits, supports, and services at a property with a service coordinator reveals some startling data. According to the *Genworth 2017 Cost of Care Survey of Home Care Providers, Adult Day Health Care Facilities, Assisted Living Facilities and Nursing Homes*, the average monthly cost of a semi-private room in a nursing home is \$7,148. Keeping a frail elderly person independent in his/her own subsidized apartment with supportive services and public benefits can reduce spending of taxpayer dollars to approximately 64% less than the monthly average cost of nursing home care. This figure is based on the average SNAP (food stamp) benefit for seniors of \$192/month, Homemaker/Home Health Aide services at an average of 40 hours/month, 70% of the national average of HUD’s Fiscal Year 2018 fair market rent for a one-bedroom apartment, and the average monthly cost of a service coordinator based on the *AASC 2017 Service Coordinator Salary Survey*.

HUD’s Office of Policy Development and Research evaluated the level of satisfaction among property managers in multifamily housing properties with the provision of service coordination. The report, *Multifamily Property Managers’ Satisfaction with Service Coordination*, was based on a survey of property managers in multifamily developments who have or did not have a service coordinator program in place.

Overall, the report found a high level of

satisfaction from property managers regarding the service coordinator program, as well as a strong belief that service coordinators improve the quality of life for residents in their housing properties. The report also describes longer resident occupancies in properties with a service coordinator when compared to properties without the position. Specifically, the length of occupancy in developments with a service coordinator was 10% longer than at developments without a service coordinator. This increased length of independent living serves to reduce the long-term care costs for this population.

SUMMARIES OF THE PROGRAMS

Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled and Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Service Coordinators

The service coordinator position is funded to carry out the following activities:

- Assessing each elderly resident's needs in Activities of Daily Living and determining their respective service needs.
- Assisting residents with obtaining needed community-based services and/or public benefits.
- Motivating residents to adopt self-directed care options that maximize independence and promote wellness.
- Monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the supportive services provided to residents individually and collectively.
- Identifying and networking with appropriate community-based supports and services.
- Advocating on behalf of residents individually and collectively to ensure their needs are met.
- Assisting residents with establishing and working with RAs/Resident Councils, as requested.
- Assisting residents in setting up informal support networks.
- Assisting heads of family households with removing barriers to gainful employment and self-sufficiency.

- Assisting residents with resolving problems with their tenancy.
- Developing and updating a profile of the property through resident capacity and needs assessments to acquire appropriate health, wellness, education, and other programs for the housing community.
- Developing and acquiring appropriate health and wellness programs for the housing community.
- Developing after-school youth, job readiness, literacy, volunteer, and financial management programs for residents and their families.
- Developing health/wellness and other property-wide outcomes to promote improved health conditions among residents as well as increased independence and financial self-sufficiency.
- Performing other functions to eliminate barriers to enable frail and at-risk low-income elderly, people with disabilities, and families to live with dignity and independence.

Service coordinators are specifically prohibited from directly providing support services, serving as activities directors, and assisting with administrative work at their properties. However, based on the collective needs of the residents of the property or properties where they work, service coordinators will develop health, wellness, financial literacy, after-school programs, and other beneficial group presentations or programs at the property. Additionally, service coordinators assist residents at a property with starting a residents' or tenants' association, and will provide guidance, contacts, and strategies for planning events, conducting effective meetings, and completing tasks. However, they do not conduct or attend these meetings unless they are specifically invited to do so.

Eligible applicants for Service Coordinator in Housing for the Elderly and Disabled funds include owners of HUD-assisted multifamily housing, namely developments built with or subsidized by the following programs: Section

202, project-based Section 8, Section 236, and Section 221(d)(3) Below-Market Interest Rate. All housing must be designed or designated for sole occupancy by elderly persons aged 62 and older, or by people with disabilities aged 18 to 61. Prior to FY14, funds were distributed by national competitive grant processes through HUD Notices of Funding Availability (NOFAs). Beginning with FY14, federal appropriations have been insufficient to allow for new grants in the Service Coordinator in Housing for the Elderly and Disabled program. Currently, federal appropriations for this program are distributed by one-year grant renewal/extension procedures.

Eligible applicants for ROSS Service Coordinator funds include PHAs, tribes/tribally designated housing entities, RAs such as resident management corporations, resident councils, and intermediary resident organizations and nonprofit organizations supported by residents and/or PHAs. Funds are distributed by national competitive grant processes through HUD NOFAs.

Although HUD allows service coordinators to be funded through a property's residual receipts funds or to be incorporated into the property's operations budget, most federally assisted properties and PHAs do not have sufficient resources in their operating budgets or are unable to complete a modest rent increase to staff service coordinators.

Family Self-Sufficiency

The FSS program helps Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) holders and PH residents to build assets, increase their earnings, and achieve other individual goals including homeownership, if desired. FSS supplements stable, affordable housing in two ways: (1) with case management to help families overcome barriers to work and develop individualized skills training and services plans and (2) with escrow accounts that grow as families' earnings rise. The program is voluntary and allows participants up to five years to achieve their goals and "graduate" from the program.

The FSS program is administered through PHAs that elect to participate in FSS by filing an FSS

Action Plan with HUD. Housing agencies may also choose to apply for funding for FSS coordinator costs as part of an annual competitive grant process. Some agencies are required to continue to participate in FSS until they graduate a sufficient number of families to satisfy mandates associated with receipt of incremental housing assistance in the mid-1990s. For all other agencies and for mandated agencies, participation is voluntary once they satisfy their mandate.

Each family participating in the FSS program works with an FSS coordinator who assists the family in developing an individual training and services plan and helps the family access work-promoting services in the community, such as résumé building, job search, job counseling, and education and training. The nature of the services varies based on families' needs and local program offerings.

A significant component of the FSS program is the escrow account that serves as both a work incentive and an asset-building tool. Like most families in public or assisted housing, participants in the FSS program must pay higher rental payments if their incomes increase. FSS participants, however, have an opportunity to obtain a refund of some or all of these increased rent payments. As the rent of an FSS participant increases due to increased earnings, an amount generally equal to the rent increase is deposited into an escrow account monthly. Upon graduation, the participant receives all of the escrowed funds to meet a need he or she has identified. If the housing agency agrees, the participant may also make an interim withdrawal when needed to meet expenses related to work or other goals specified in the participant's FSS plan. A participant who fails to successfully complete the FSS program loses the funds in his or her escrow account.

Congress has appropriated funds for FSS grants, but private multifamily projects that have a project-based Section 8 Housing Assistance Payment contract are not applicable. However, owners who participate in FSS may now use residual receipts to hire FSS coordinators.

FUNDING

For FY20, Congress appropriated \$100 million for the Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly and Disabled grant program. This is \$10 million more than the FY19 appropriation. However, the additional funding is expected to be put toward the renewal of existing grants and will not result in a new Notice of Funding Availability.

ROSS service coordinators received level funding at \$35 million, as did the FSS program which received \$80 million.

A new provision in the FY20 spending bill provides \$500,000 for a collaboration between HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. The agencies are directed to determine how Medicare and Medicaid funds could be used to support senior housing programs and services that improve resident health outcomes and decrease health care costs. Service coordination programs have been shown to do both.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly and Disabled Grant Program

There continues to be a need for a multifaceted strategy for funding service coordinators that includes maintaining the service coordinator grant programs and increasing the ability for routine staffing of service coordinators from a property's operating budget through modest rent adjustments or through the property's residual receipts. Although statutory authority exists to allow HUD-subsidized properties to fund service coordinators, many senior housing facilities continue to be unable to secure the necessary rent adjustments to accommodate them. Currently, there are more than 12,000 properties for low-income elderly that are eligible for a service coordinator. However, less than half (approximately 5,000) of the eligible properties have a service coordinator on staff. There is a critical need for service coordinators in these properties to aid with accessing benefits and supportive social and health/wellness services to maintain independence as well as improve the

health outcomes for these low-income elderly tenants.

A promising initiative is ongoing and is anticipated to provide evidence-based data on the benefits of an "enhanced" form of service coordination in improving health/wellness outcomes for low-income, frail elderly residents in multifamily housing. On January 20, 2016, HUD announced the availability of \$15 million (from FY14 appropriations) for a Supportive Services Demonstration/Integrated Wellness in Supportive Housing. This three-year demonstration is testing the model of housing with services that demonstrate the potential to delay or avoid the need for nursing home care. The demonstration is expected to produce evidence about the impact of housing with an expanded and "enhanced" service coordinator role and a wellness nurse on site on aging in place, transitions to institutional care, housing stability, well-being and improved health/wellness outcomes, and proactive health care utilization. Forty properties in seven states are currently part of the "treatment group" that received grant funding to hire resident wellness directors and wellness nurses. There are also 40 properties in an "active control group" that did not receive grant funding but received stipends to participate in the evaluation. Forty-four properties are in a "passive control group" that did not receive grant funding or stipends. Initial evaluation findings are scheduled for release in early 2020.

There is also a need to expand the funding for housing-based service coordinators to assist frail seniors and non-elderly people with disabilities in the surrounding community where the property is located. Even though Section 851 of the "American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000" (Public Law 106-569) granted authority to enable service coordinators to assist residents in the surrounding community, there are insufficient funds to enable service coordinators to effectively assist these residents, especially as the needs of this population are increasing as residents age in place.

Additionally, Section 515 of the “American Housing Act of 1949” (Public Law 81-171) provided preliminary language for the use of service coordinators at rural multifamily housing developments administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). In the 515 program, the service coordinator can be funded through the property’s operations budget. Again, lack of sufficient resources in the operations budgets at these properties has prevented many of them from staffing a service coordinator. If a Section 515 Rural Housing property has a Section 8 contract, they are also eligible to apply for Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled new grant funds, if available, and are eligible for one-year extension funding for existing grants.

Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Service Coordinator Grant Program

The need for service coordination in PHAs continues to be a critical concern as older adults are becoming the predominant residents of public housing properties. For the past few funding cycles, the Operating and Capital Funds appropriated to PHAs have decreased to the point that funds are insufficient to meet PH operating and repair needs, much less fund a service coordinator. It is imperative that PHA residents have access to the information, assistance, and case management of a service coordinator that would enable them to gain or maintain their independence, improve their health outcomes, and achieve economic self-sufficiency. If a \$45 million funding level could be achieved without any carve-outs for other initiatives, there would be a modest amount available to fund new ROSS Service Coordinators in additional PHAs.

Family Self-Sufficiency Grant Program

For the FSS program, the key issue is expanding and making effective use of the FSS program to help families build assets and make progress toward self-sufficiency. There is no limit to the number of families that may be enrolled in FSS, so one key goal for local advocacy is expansion of current programs to serve additional families. For housing agencies without an FSS program,

advocates may wish to focus on starting a new FSS program at a multifamily property operated by a nonprofit housing organization.

At the same time, there is a limit to the number of families that can be effectively served with a given number of coordinators. There is no formal caseload standard, but HUD generally uses 50 families per coordinator as a rule of thumb. Caseloads vary dramatically from agency to agency, and in some cases, it may be more important to add FSS coordinator staff to reduce caseloads to manageable levels at the outset and then work to expand the number of enrolled families. Advocates should work collaboratively with local housing agencies to find local in-kind or cash resources to expand the number of FSS program coordinators to serve additional families.

The key federal advocacy issue related to FSS is funding stability, principally for FSS coordinators. Congress should renew and expand funding for FSS coordinators. AASC continues to advocate for a change in the program’s funding restrictions and an increase in funding for FSS coordinators to cover the costs of training, computer equipment, and case management software for FSS coordinators. It should be noted that shortfalls in Section 8 and PH funding hurt FSS by making it more difficult for housing agencies to rely on HUD funding to cover the costs of escrow deposits for FSS participants.

In previous congressional sessions, a number of legislative proposals have sought to streamline the FSS program and stabilize its funding, including S. 454, the “Family Self-Sufficiency Act” sponsored by Sen. Jack Reed (D-RI). In addition to simplifying the funding, these proposals would open funding to additional housing types and agencies that wanted to start or expand their FSS programs. Unfortunately, S. 454 did not make significant progress through the federal legislative process of the 113th Congress and was never enacted into law.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly and Disabled Grant Program

Advocates are encouraged to contact their members of Congress with the message that Service Coordinators in Multifamily Housing for the Elderly/Disabled save taxpayer dollars by keeping frail, low-income seniors living independently in cost-effective housing instead of being placed in costly institutional (nursing home) care. Funding for service coordinators remains very limited despite the critical need in eligible properties without a service coordinator on staff. The supportive services demonstration and new Standards for Success reporting will provide evidence-based data on the cost-effective impact service coordinators have on maintaining low-income, frail elderly with multiple chronic medical conditions in stable, subsidized housing in the community with access to adequate care and treatment in lieu of more costly nursing home settings.

Members of Congress should be urged to:

- Appropriate \$30 million in additional new funding to support service coordinators in more than 100 additional Section 202 communities. Support funding for programs that place service coordinators in community settings with the goal of improving wellness outcomes and increasing the number of residents capable of aging in place.
- Recognize the opportunity for service coordinators to be a workforce solution as the nation faces a social worker shortage and a sharp increase in the number of older adults who must age in place because of a severe lack of senior housing.
- Fully fund Section 8, Project Rental Assistance Contracts, other rent subsidies, and project operating funds to permit the staffing of a service coordinator as a routine part of the housing property's operating budget. Just like the property manager and maintenance person, the service coordinator should be considered essential staff for the operation of

affordable housing for the elderly. The service coordinator position not only saves funds for the residents on fixed incomes, but also saves taxpayer dollars by keeping residents in less costly, independent living environments as opposed to assisted living or even more costly nursing home care.

- Appropriate a minimum of \$10 million to fund a competitive grant for service coordinators in Section 514, 515, and 516 programs under USDA.
- Direct HUD and its regional hub offices to provide necessary budget adjustments and regulatory relief to remove any barriers restricting the staffing of service coordinators through a property's operating budget.

Resident Opportunities and Self-Sufficiency Service Coordinator Grant Program

Advocates are urged to contact their Members of Congress with the message that service coordination in PH is as critical a need as it is in multifamily housing for the elderly. Residents of PHAs should be afforded access to information, assistance, and linkages to community-based supports and services afforded by a service coordinator to enable them to gain or maintain their independence, improve health/wellness outcomes, and achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Members of Congress should be urged to restore the \$45 million funding level as a stand-alone appropriations line item for ROSS Service Coordinator grants without any carve-outs for other programs. This would ensure that existing ROSS grants are maintained and would allow more PHAs to have access to grant funds for service coordinators.

Family Self-Sufficiency Coordinators Grant Program

Advocates should speak to the person in the office of their member of Congress who deals with housing policy with the message that:

- HUD's FSS program is critical for helping families in subsidized housing to build assets and make progress toward self-sufficiency and economic independence.

- To better support FSS in the near term and moving forward, Congress should appropriate funding for FSS program coordinators at the \$100 million level to include training for FSS coordinators as well as needed case management tools and equipment as allowable expenses.
- Congress should pass legislation that strengthens the FSS program and stabilizes funding for FSS coordinators, their training, and necessary equipment to effectively perform their duties.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

American Association of Service Coordinators,
614-848-5958, www.servicecoordinator.org

HUD's Office of Public and Indian Housing's ROSS
and FSS website, <http://1.usa.gov/1gxezRs>

HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Program's
Service Coordinator's website,
<http://1.usa.gov/1qzWOTf>

HUD's Service Coordinator in Multifamily
Housing Program Resource Guide,
<https://bit.ly/2Qf0V2x>

HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Program's
Notice H-2016-08 implementing FSS in private,
HUD-assisted housing, <http://bit.ly/2mlUgTF>

The HUD report Multifamily Property Managers'
Satisfaction with Service Coordination,
<http://bit.ly/XoZo5d>

Section 3: Job Training, Employment, and Business Opportunities Related to HUD Funding

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Section 3 of the “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968,” titled “Economic Opportunities for Low- and Very-Low Income Persons,” requires recipients of HUD housing and community development funding to provide, “to the greatest extent feasible,” job training, employment, and contracting opportunities for low- and very low-income (VLI) residents, as well as eligible businesses.

The Section 3 obligation is too often ignored by the recipients of HUD funds and not enforced by HUD; therefore, Section 3’s potential benefits for low-income and VLI people and for qualified businesses is not fully realized. At the beginning of the Obama Administration in 2009, both lawmakers and HUD officials expressed interest in strengthening the program. Proposed improvements to the Section 3 regulations were published on March 27, 2015, but a final rule was not sent to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) as the Obama Administration ended. On May 9, 2018, HUD’s spring Regulatory Agenda removed the 2015 proposed rule. The new HUD Secretary, Ben Carson, has publicly expressed support for Section 3. On October 10, 2018, an OIRA webpage indicated that OIRA had received a proposed regulation for review. As of the date this *Advocates’ Guide* went to press, a final rule has not been published. In the meantime, Section 3 continues to limp along with the interim regulations from 1994.

ADMINISTRATION

Oversight responsibility for Section 3 rests with HUD’s Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO). HUD is charged with monitoring and determining whether local

recipients of HUD housing and community development funds are meeting their obligations. In addition, those local recipients have the responsibility to ensure that the obligations and goals of Section 3 are met by subrecipients and contractors.

HISTORY

The Section 3 obligation was created as part of the “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.” The Section 3 statute has been amended four times; each time the amendments primarily sought to expand the reach of Section 3 and to better benefit low-income households. After statutory amendments in 1992, revised regulations were proposed and ultimately an interim set of regulations published on June 30, 1994. The potential of this program has largely been ignored throughout its history.

SUMMARY

Section 3 is a federal obligation tied to HUD funding. Section 3 states that recipients of HUD housing and community development funding must provide, “to the greatest extent feasible,” job training, employment, and contracting opportunities for low-income and VLI residents and “Section 3 businesses.” A “recipient” is an entity that receives Section 3-covered funds directly from HUD, such as a public housing agency, a state, city, or county.

Section 3 applies to all HUD funding for public housing and Indian housing, such as the public housing operating fund and capital fund, Resident Opportunity and Self-Sufficiency grants, Family Self-Sufficiency grants, and the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. Section 3 also applies to other housing and community development funding including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG),

HOME Investment Partnerships, National Housing Trust Fund, and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA).

Section 3 Goals and Preferences

HUD regulations set numerical goals for all entities subject to Section 3. Low-income and VLI individuals should be given a preference for at least 30% of all new hires that arise from HUD funding. Low income is defined as income less than 80% of the metropolitan area median income (AMI), while VLI is defined as income less than 50% of AMI. There are also goals for allocating at least 10% of the total dollar amount of all Section 3 contracts for building trades work and 3% of all other contracts for Section 3 businesses. A Section 3 business is defined as a business owned by low-income individuals, one that hires a substantial number of low-income individuals, or one that commits to contract at least 25% of the dollars awarded to Section 3 businesses. Building trades work is not defined, but probably includes obvious professions such as bricklaying, plumbing, and painting; “other” types of contracts might be carpet installation, pest control, or bookkeeping (for a construction company).

The Section 3 regulations spell out orders of preference that should be given to residents and businesses. A preference should mean that if the Section 3 individual meets the job qualifications or a Section 3 business meets the bid requirements, the individual should be hired or the business should get the contract. The order of resident preferences for Section 3 activities at public housing is: residents of the public housing development that is assisted; residents of other public housing developments in the service area of the public housing agency (PHA); YouthBuild participants; and finally, other low-income people in the metropolitan area (or nonmetropolitan county). The order of resident preference for other housing and community development activities is: low-income people living in the service area or neighborhood where the assisted project is located, YouthBuild participants, homeless people in the service area or neighborhood of the assisted project, and finally,

other low-income people in the metropolitan area (or nonmetropolitan county). There are also orders of preferences regarding Section 3 businesses pertaining separately to public housing and to other housing and community development projects.

When Does Section 3 Apply?

For both public housing and other housing and community development funding, the Section 3 obligation applies to the entire project regardless of the amount of funding subject to Section 3. For example, a project may receive funds from many sources, public and private, but if there are any public housing funds in the project, the Section 3 obligation applies to the entire project.

For public and Indian housing funding, Section 3 applies to any jobs and contracting opportunities that arise in administration, management, service, maintenance, and construction. For the other housing and community development funding, Section 3 applies only to jobs that arise in connection with construction or rehabilitation, and only if the funding is more than established thresholds. Examples of eligible types of other housing and community development projects include housing construction or rehabilitation; public works projects, such as waterfront redevelopment; retail and restaurant development; development of entertainment facilities; and other related infrastructure. The way HUD has established thresholds for contractors enables recipients and contractors to avoid Section 3 by making sure that they break up all construction activities (such as housing rehabilitation) into small contracts less than the \$100,000 threshold, even if the contractor is receiving much more HUD money to do the same construction work (for example, rehabilitating many homes).

Until recently, the HUD Notice implementing the public housing Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) limited Section 3 to construction, rehabilitation, and repair work generated by the conversion of public housing and Moderate Rehabilitation units to project-based vouchers or to project-based Section 8. Until a new Notice

was issued on September 5, 2019, once the conversion was complete, future rehabilitation or repair work was not subject to Section 3. The new Notice (REV-4) provides that if any funds, not just HUD funds, are used for rehabilitation or new construction after RAD conversion, then jobs and contracts arising from the rehabilitation or new construction are subject to Section 3 with first priority consideration given to public housing residents or residents assisted with Section 8 vouchers or project-based rental assistance. However, as was the case before, RAD employment opportunities after conversion are not available for PHA staff who had performed various tasks at the public housing development, such as central office employees, painters, grounds crews, etc.

One HUD administrative decision regarding the program is of special note. In April 2004, HUD issued a decision finding that the City of Long Beach, California violated Section 3 because Section 3 new hires worked significantly less than 30% of the hours worked by all new hires. This decision is important because the regulation's standard of 30% of new hires can be easily manipulated with a hiring surge at the end of the contract period, undermining the purpose of Section 3. Using a standard of 30% of the hours worked each year by the new hires would be much better and is consistent with the Section 3 goal of creating employment opportunities for low-income individuals to the "greatest extent feasible."

There is a HUD-established complaint procedure for individuals and businesses to use for violations of Section 3. Complaints are filed with FHEO Regional offices. HUD has responded favorably to some complaints that have been filed.

Summary of the Proposed Improvements Dropped by the Trump Administration

In 1994, HUD published an interim rule updating the Section 3 regulations in response to changes made by the "Housing and Community Development Act of 1992." On March 27, 2015, HUD published long-anticipated amendments

to the interim Section 3 regulations. On May 9, 2018, HUD's spring Regulatory Agenda removed the 2015 proposed rule. Three of the proposed rule's key provisions are discussed here because they illustrate the limitations of the 1994 interim rule.

1. The proposed rule would have changed the dollar threshold for recipients that directly receive federal housing and community development funds (recipients are cities, counties, states, or PHAs). The text of the existing rule is confusing, leading some recipients to incorrectly apply the \$200,000 recipient threshold on a per-project basis rather than on a per-recipient basis. As a result, some recipients avoid Section 3 obligations on projects that have less than \$200,000 of HUD assistance. The proposed rule would have had unambiguous language and would have established a new \$400,000 recipient threshold. The proposed rule clearly stated that once the \$400,000 threshold is reached, Section 3 obligations apply to all Section 3 projects and activities funded with any amount of HUD housing and community development funds. In addition, the requirements would apply to the entire project, regardless of whether the project is partially or fully funded with HUD funds.
2. The proposed rule would have eliminated the \$100,000 threshold for contractors and subcontractors. This improvement could have resulted in greater employment and subcontracting opportunities for Section 3 residents and businesses. Under the existing regulation, contractors and subcontractors do not have to comply with Section 3 if a contract for construction work on a project is less than \$100,000. Consequently, it has been HUD policy to exempt contractors and subcontractors awarded significant amounts of Section 3 covered funds in a single year spent on small, discreet activities, such as homeowner housing rehabilitation, from meeting their Section 3 obligations. Cumulatively, such contractors and subcontractors can receive far more than

\$100,000 in covered funds, yet do not have to hire Section 3 residents or subcontract with Section 3 businesses because each component activity (e.g., rehabilitating a single home) costs less than \$100,000.

3. The proposed rule would have revised the definition of “new hire.” The existing rule sets a goal of having 30% of new hires at a project be “Section 3 residents.” The rule has no provision concerning how long the Section 3 resident is employed. Advocates have long asserted that the rule’s lack of a provision considering hours worked as well as the duration of employment is a loophole, allowing contractors to hire Section 3 residents for a short period of time. In the proposed rule, HUD proposed to redefine a new hire as someone who works a minimum of 50% of the average hours worked for a specific job category for which the person was hired, throughout the duration of time that the work is performed on the project. The preamble to the proposed rule offered an example: If a typical painter works 40 hours per week, then a Section 3 new hire must work a minimum of 20 hours per week for as long as a typical painter would work at the project.

Although advocates welcomed HUD’s attempt to address the concern about the duration of employment, the proposed rule insufficiently addressed the first problem (hours worked) and did not address the second concern (duration). For years, advocates have suggested to HUD that the Section 3 employment goal obligation should not be measured by counting the number of Section 3 workers who are “new hires.” Using “new hire” as a measure allows contractors and subcontractors to place any new hires on their non-Section 3 covered projects and thus evade Section 3. Instead of “new hire,” compliance should be assessed by the number of hours worked by Section 3 residents as a percentage of total hours worked by all employees of a given job category. In other words, to meet Section 3 goals, Section 3 residents for each job category should be working at least 30% of the total number

of hours worked by all employees in that job category.

Advocates commented that if HUD was not willing to accept the above recommendation, HUD’s definition of a “new hire” should at least increase from 50% to 100%, the average number hours worked for a specific job category for which the Section 3 resident was hired. The 50% standard would encourage hiring Section 3 residents for part-time work and render Section 3 employees as second-class employees. In addition, this would likely hinder skill building because an employer could rationalize that a Section 3 employee will not be around long enough.

Summary of the Trump Administration’s Proposed Section 3 Regulations

Potential Positive Changes

- Instead of using a “new hires” standard, HUD proposes to use “labor hours worked.” However, HUD asks PHAs whether they prefer to use “labor hours” or “new hires.” Depending on feedback during the public comment period, HUD will determine whether PHAs can continue to use new hires or will be required to switch to labor hours worked.
- The proposed rule would create a “Targeted Section 3 worker,” intended to give PHAs and jurisdictions an incentive to focus on reaching workers given priority in the statute and providing contracts to Section 3 businesses that are primarily owned or controlled by low-income people, or that hire a substantial number of low-income people. However, the Section 3 business option could result in people who are not low-income being counted as Section 3 workers. NLIHC proposed a modified definition.
- HUD would establish “benchmarks” indicating that 30% of all labor hours worked are by “Section 3 workers” (25%) and “Targeted Section 3 workers” (5%), replacing the current rule’s 30% employment “goals”. Because “Section 3 workers” and “Targeted Section 3 workers” are defined in ways that could include people who are not low-income,

NLIHC proposed separate, significantly modified benchmarks.

- Residents with Section 8 vouchers or living in Section 8 properties with project-based rental assistance are added to the second-level priorities for employment and contracting opportunities. Section 8 residents would also be included among “Targeted Section 3 workers” in a PHA context.

Potential Negative Changes

- HUD would remove Section 3 monitoring and enforcement from FHEO, shifting monitoring and enforcement to the Office of Public and Indian Housing and to the Office of Community Planning and Development. However, it appears that a separate HUD office would have overall responsibility for Section 3 – the Office of Field Policy and Management.
 - HUD would eliminate any Section 3-specific complaint process.
 - In place of the interim rule’s term “Section 3 resident,” the proposed rule would create the term “Section 3 worker.”
 - Public housing residents would no longer be specifically identified.
 - There would be three options to determine whether someone was a Section 3 worker; two of the options could result in someone who is not low-income being counted as a Section 3 worker.
 - HUD would establish a \$200,000 per project threshold before a contractor or subcontractor would have to comply with Section 3. Jurisdictions, contractors, and subcontractors could avoid Section 3, even if a contractor or subcontractor is getting a lot more HUD money to do construction work, by breaking up construction activities (such as single-family rehabilitation or road repaving projects) into small contracts of less than \$200,000 each.

Performance Reporting

Starting in 2009, HUD increased its efforts to get recipients of HUD funds subject to Section 3

to report compliance on form HUD 60002. HUD later reported that nearly 80% of all recipients filed these reporting forms. However, as noted in a June 2013 HUD Office of Inspector General (OIG) report, HUD did not verify the accuracy of the forms or follow up on clearly non-compliant information, leading OIG to conclude that for 2011, some 1,650 PHAs “could be falsely certifying compliance.”

In December 2013, FHEO announced in a webinar that it had revised the HUD 60002 form to address these problems for PHAs and all HUD grant recipients. FHEO stated that it had created a system that would prevent the submission of clearly non-compliant or inaccurate information. Unfortunately, HUD suspended the roll out in January 2014 due to unforeseen technical difficulties. On August 24, 2015, FHEO announced the relaunch of the Section 3 Performance Evaluation and Registry System (SPEARS) for the submission of form HUD 60002 annual summary reports, requiring retroactive reporting for the 2013 and 2014 reporting periods by December 15, 2015.

Regarding HUD 60002 reports from PHAs and jurisdictions, advocates should monitor how HUD responds to local agency reports that do not reasonably explain why there were no or too few new Section 3 hires, or no or too few dollars under contract with Section 3 businesses. In addition, advocates should monitor how HUD works to secure compliance from those local agencies that have completely ignored prior reporting requirements. Will HUD establish, as recommended by the OIG, a system of remedies and sanctions for PHAs (and presumably other HUD grant recipients) that do not submit HUD-60002 forms?

FUNDING

There is no independent funding for Section 3. The number of jobs created, or contracts provided to Section 3 individuals or businesses, depends upon the level of funding for the applicable public housing or housing or community development program.

FORECAST FOR 2020

As of the date this *Advocates' Guide* went to press, a final rule had not been published in the *Federal Register*. It is likely that a final rule will be published sometime in 2020. Check [NLIHC's public housing webpage](#) to learn whether the final rule has been published and to see NLIHC's summary and analysis.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

The successes of Section 3 are almost exclusively attributed to oversight, monitoring, and advocacy by local advocates and community groups, as well as some local staff of recipient agencies implementing the goals.

Advocates should contact resident organizations, local unions, minority and women-owned businesses, community development corporations, and employment and training organizations to discuss how they and their members or clients can use the Section 3 goals and preferences to increase employment and contracting opportunities for the targeted low-income and VLI individuals and Section 3 businesses.

In addition, advocates should meet with local PHAs and other local recipients of housing and community development dollars (generally cities and counties) to discuss whether they are meeting their Section 3 obligations with respect to public housing funds or the CDBG, HOME, and RAD programs. Advocates should create or improve upon a local plan to fully implement Section 3 and seek information on the number of low-income and VLI individuals trained and hired in accordance with Section 3 and the dollar amounts contracted with Section 3 businesses. Advocates should ask local recipients of HUD funds or HUD for copies of the submitted form HUD 60002 and take any necessary action. Compliance with Section 3 should be addressed in the annual PHA plan process or the Annual Action Plan updates to the Consolidated Plan process.

If compliance is a problem, urge HUD to monitor and conduct a compliance review of the non-

complying recipients of federal dollars for public housing or housing and community development. Low-income persons and businesses with a complaint about recipients of HUD funds or contractors' failure to comply with or meet Section 3 goals should consider filing an official complaint with HUD.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should speak to legislators about the connection between HUD funding and jobs. Advocates should recommend that the Section 3 requirements that currently apply to PHA staff involved in the PHA's day to day operations be extended to properties that convert to RAD beyond post-conversion rehabilitation or construction.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

HUD's FHEO Section 3 website, <https://bit.ly/2pSnTR1>

HUD's Section 3 Frequently Asked Questions, <http://portal.hud.gov/hudportal/documents/huddoc?id=11secfaqs.pdf>

NLIHC's Outline of Section 3 Obligations, <http://bit.ly/2hsa7v5>

NLIHC's Summary and Analysis of HUD's Proposed Section 3 Rule Changes, <https://bit.ly/34o9gDX>

National Housing Law Project, <http://bit.ly/2j0oSLs>, especially *An Advocate's Guide to the HUD Section 3 Program: Creating Jobs and Economic Opportunity* from the National Housing Law Project <https://www.nhlp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/3-NHLP-Advocates-Guide-to-Section-3.pdf>

Chapter 8: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES

Capital Magnet Fund

By Mark Kudlowitz, Federal Policy Director, Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Administering Agency: Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund at the U.S. Department of the Treasury.

Year Started: 2008 (with five funding rounds to date: FY10, FY16, FY17, FY18, and FY19).

Number of Persons/Households Served: To date, 11,700 rental units and 1,616 owner-occupied units, with more than 52,000 more rental units and 7,000 owner-occupied units committed.

Population Targeted: Households with income less than 120% area median income (AMI); at least 51% with income less than 80% AMI.

Funding: In FY18, \$142.9 million was awarded to 38 organizations.

See Also: For related information, refer to the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund section of this guide.

The Capital Magnet Fund (CMF) provides competitive enterprise-level grants to community development financial institutions (CDFIs) and nonprofit housing developers to finance and develop housing for low- and moderate-income households, as well as community facilities and economic development projects that support housing. CMF grants are used to fund financing tools such as loan loss reserves or loan guarantees and must be matched at least 10 to 1 with funding from other sources. Moving forward, the Administration should support funding for the CMF under current law, and Congress should preserve the program as the housing finance reform system evolves.

HISTORY

The CMF was created as part of the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act (HERA) of 2008” to provide flexible public funds to attract private

investment into housing projects for low- and moderate-income households. As originally envisioned, the CMF (along with the national Housing Trust Fund, HTF) would have received funding through an assessment on new business of the Government Sponsored Enterprises (GSE) Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. However, in the fall of 2008, financial losses at the GSEs caused them to be placed in conservatorship and their obligation to contribute to the CMF and to the HTF was suspended. The suspension of contributions of assessments on new business of the GSEs was lifted at the end of 2014; contributions began on January 1, 2015 and have been distributed to the CMF and HTF since March 2016.

The legislation creating the CMF also allowed it to be funded through regular appropriations, which occurred in FY10 with an appropriation of \$80 million to kick off the program. Until the FY16 funding round, the FY10 round was the only funding provided to the CMF. For the FY10 round, the CDFI Fund received applications requesting more than \$1 billion. In October 2010, the CDFI Fund announced the inaugural CMF awardees. Out of 230 applicants, 23 organizations received awards; 13 were nonprofit housing developers, nine were CDFIs, and one was a tribal housing authority. According to the CDFI Fund, the \$80 million appropriation for CMF grants resulted in each \$1 of CMF funding attracting more than \$22 in other capital for affordable housing. Thus, \$80 million in CMF grants created upwards of \$1.8 billion in investment in affordable housing and community facilities, creating more than 6,800 homes.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The CMF is administered by the Treasury’s CDFI Fund as a competitive grant program to attract private capital for high-performing organizations to develop, preserve, rehabilitate, or purchase housing for low-income families. Unlike other federal programs such as HOME, the CMF is not

a block grant to state or local governments or housing authorities.

A minimum of 70% of an awardee's CMF money must be used for housing. One hundred percent of housing project costs must be for units for households with incomes less than 120% of AMI; at least 51% of housing project costs must be for units for households with incomes less than 80% of AMI. If CMF finances rental housing, then at least 20% of the units must be occupied by households with incomes less than 80% of AMI. CMF award recipients normally commit to utilizing the award for deeper income targeting than the minimum standards described. For instance, 95% of all housing units to be developed from the FY18 CMF funding round are for households with incomes less than 80% of AMI. Maximum rent is fixed at 30% of either 120% AMI, 80% AMI, 50% AMI, or 30% AMI, depending on the household's income. For example, if an assisted household has income at 120% AMI, its maximum rent is 30% of 120% AMI. CMF funded housing must meet affordability requirements for at least 10 years.

In order to leverage funds, CMF dollars may be used to provide loan loss reserves, loan guarantees, capitalize a revolving loan fund or an affordable housing fund, or make risk-sharing loans. The CMF can also finance economic development activities or community service facilities, such as daycare centers, workforce development centers, and healthcare clinics, which in conjunction with affordable housing activities implement a concerted strategy to revitalize low-income or underserved rural areas.

Eligible recipients are Treasury-certified CDFIs or nonprofit organizations that include the development or management of affordable housing as at least one of their purposes. Applications for the competitive grants are required to include a detailed description of the types of housing and economic and community revitalization projects for which the entity would use the grant, and the anticipated timeframe in which they intend to use the grant. No institution can be awarded more than 15% of all CMF funds available for grants in a given year, and those receiving grants must commit the funds

within two years of the date they were received. All projects funded with CMF awards must be completed within five years.

Prohibited uses include political activities, advocacy, lobbying, counseling services, travel expenses, and endorsement of a particular candidate or party. Each grantee must track its funds by issuing periodic financial and project reports and by fulfilling audit requirements.

FUNDING

The CMF's funding source was designed to come from a percentage of new business of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Under current law there is to be a 4.2 basis point assessment on each enterprise's new business, with the CMF receiving 35% and the HTF receiving 65%. However, these assessments were previously suspended due to the government conservatorship. In December 2014, the Federal Housing Finance Agency lifted the suspension and the assessment has been collected for the last four calendar years. Sixty days after the close of the calendar year, the Treasury is to distribute funds to the CMF and HTF.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The Capital Magnet Fund faces both short-term and long-term threats. In the short-term, recent leadership changes at the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) may result in FHFA suspending GSE contributions to the program. The FHFA has the authority to suspend GSE contributions based on certain criteria outlined in HERA. The program may also be at risk if, and when, Congress begins GSE reform efforts.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

If housing finance reform debate returns in 2020, advocates need to ensure that any subsequent reforms of the housing finance system include a continued source of funding for the CMF.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The CDFI Fund, 202-653-0421, www.cdfifund.gov
Local Initiatives Support Corporation, 202 739-9279, <http://www.lisc.org>

Community Development Block Grant Program

By Ed Gramlich, Senior Advisor, NLIHC

Administering Agency: HUD's Office of Community Planning and Development

Year Started: 1974

Population Targeted: Households with income less than 80% of the area median income (AMI)

Funding: FY20 funding is \$3.4 billion, up slightly from \$3.3 billion in FY19

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Consolidated Planning Process* section of this guide.

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is a federal program intended to strengthen communities by providing funds to improve housing, living environments, and economic opportunities, principally for persons with low and moderate incomes. At least 70% of CDBG funds received by a jurisdiction must be spent to benefit people with low and moderate incomes (less than 80% of the AMI).

HISTORY

The CDBG program was established under Title I of the "Housing and Community Development Act of 1974," which combined several existing programs, including Urban Renewal and Model Cities, into one block grant. This change was designed to provide greater local flexibility in the use of federal dollars.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The primary objective of the CDBG program is to have viable communities by providing funds to improve housing, living environments, and economic opportunities principally for persons with low and moderate income. The regulations for entitlement jurisdictions are at 24 CFR Part 570, and the states and small cities regulations are at 24 CFR Part 570, Subpart I.

Eligible Activities

CDBG funds can be used for a wide array of activities, including: rehabilitating housing (through loans and grants to homeowners, landlords, nonprofits, and developers); constructing new housing (but only by certain neighborhood-based nonprofits); providing down payment assistance and other help for first-time home buyers; detecting and removing lead-based paint hazards; purchasing land and buildings; constructing or rehabilitating public facilities such as shelters for people experiencing homelessness or domestic violence survivors; making buildings accessible to those who are elderly or disabled; providing public services such as job training, transportation, healthcare, and childcare (public services are capped at 15% of a jurisdiction's CDBG funds); building the capacity of nonprofits; rehabilitating commercial or industrial buildings; and making loans or grants to businesses.

Formula Allocation

The program's emphasis on people with low incomes is reinforced by the formulas that determine how much money local jurisdictions and states receive. The formulas are based on factors heavily weighted by the degree of poverty and indicators of poor housing conditions in a jurisdiction. Seventy percent of each annual appropriation is automatically distributed to cities with populations of more than 50,000 and counties with populations of more than 200,000; these are called entitlement jurisdictions. The remaining 30% goes to states for distribution to small towns and rural counties.

Beneficiaries

At least 70% of CDBG funds received by a jurisdiction must be spent to benefit people with low and moderate incomes (referred to as "lower-income"). The remaining 30% can also benefit people with lower incomes, or it can be used to aid in the prevention or elimination of slums

and blight (often used by local governments to justify downtown beautification) or to meet an urgent need such as a hurricane, flood, or earthquake relief. Major hurricane, flood, wildfire, or earthquake needs are generally addressed by special congressional appropriations referred to as CDBG-Disaster Relief (DR) that usually have much less rigorous provisions regarding eligible uses and income targeting.

Low- and moderate-income is defined as household income equal to or less than 80% of the AMI, which can be quite high. In FY19, for instance, 80% of the AMI in Chicago was \$71,300. AMI in some jurisdictions is so high (like in the Lowell, MA, metropolitan area where the AMI was \$107,600) that HUD caps the qualifying household income at the national median income, which in FY19 was \$75,500 for a four-person household. However, HUD does adjust upward in high-cost areas such as the Boston metropolitan area which had an AMI of \$113,300 in FY19, allowing CDBG to benefit four-person households with income up to \$89,200.

A CDBG activity is counted as benefiting people with low and moderate incomes if it meets one of four tests:

1. **Housing Benefit.** If funds are spent to improve a single-family home, the home must be occupied by a low- or moderate-income household. In multifamily buildings, at least 51% of the units must be occupied by low- or moderate-income households. In addition, the housing must be affordable, as defined by the jurisdiction. In FY19 only 24% of CDBG was allocated for some type of housing program, which is typical. Key housing-related uses included 12% for single-unit rehabilitation, 3% for code enforcement, 3% for rehabilitation administration, 2.0% for multi-unit rehabilitation, 0.4% for new construction, 0.02% lead hazard abatement, and 0.1% for energy efficiency improvements.
2. **Area Benefit.** Some CDBG-eligible projects, such as road and park improvements, can be used by anyone. To judge whether such a project primarily benefits people with lower

incomes, HUD looks at the project's service area. If 51% of the residents in the activity's service area are people with lower incomes, then HUD assumes people with lower incomes will benefit. The regulations provide several ways to challenge that assumption. The primary challenge is to show that "the full range of direct effects" of the activity do not benefit people with lower incomes.

3. **Limited Clientele.** A service or facility assisted with CDBG funds must be designed so that at least 51% of its users have lower incomes. The three most common ways to meet this test are to: (a) limit participation to people with lower incomes; (b) show that at least 51% of the beneficiaries are lower income; or (c) serve a population that HUD presumes is lower income, including abused children, domestic violence survivors, people with disabilities, illiterate individuals, migrant farm workers, and seniors. Advocates can challenge a presumed benefit claim if an activity does not actually benefit people with low incomes.
4. **Job Creation or Retention.** If job creation or retention is used to justify spending CDBG money, then at least 51% of the resulting jobs on a full-time-equivalent basis must be filled by or be available to people with lower incomes. "Available to" means either the job does not require special skills or a particular level of schooling, or the business agrees to hire and train people with lower incomes. Those with lower incomes must receive first consideration for the jobs.

Public Participation

Every jurisdiction must have a public participation plan that describes how the jurisdiction will provide for and encourage involvement by people with lower incomes. Public hearings are required at all stages of the CDBG process. Hearings must give residents a chance to articulate community needs, review the proposed uses of CDBG funds, and comment on past uses of these funds. There must be adequate public notice to people who are likely to be affected by CDBG-funded projects,

and people must have reasonable and timely access to information. Since the creation of the Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) in 1994, the CDBG public participation process is the statutory basis for and is merged into the ConPlan public participation process. To effectively participate in this process, advocates should get a copy of the draft Annual Action Plan of the ConPlan and the latest Grantee Performance Report (GPR). Many jurisdictions will try to deny the public copies of the GPR but it must be made available. The GPR also goes by the name IDIS Report PR03. It is not part of the larger Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.

FUNDING

The FY19 appropriation for the CDBG formula program was \$3.3 billion, the same as FY18 but up from FY17. The FY17 amount was a 25% reduction from FY10's \$3.99 billion. For FY20, the president again proposed eliminating CDBG, but the House proposed \$3.6 billion and the Senate proposed \$3.3 billion. The final FY20 appropriation is \$3.4 billion.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The Administration's fall 2019 Regulatory Agenda indicates that it will propose a number of changes to the CDBG regulations, including:

- Expanding the definition of “slums and blight” – something advocates should be very wary of.
- Adding several eligibility provisions.
- Allowing CDBG to be used for targeting emerging markets – something advocates should carefully monitor.
- Modernizing provisions regarding public participation requirements.
- Revising the criteria for national objectives in mixed-use developments – something advocates should be wary of.
- Simplifying the public benefits standards for economic development activities – something advocates should carefully monitor.
- Updating the program's purposes to allow

prioritized funding of projects in Opportunity Zones – something that could foster gentrification and displacement.

- Streamlining the Consolidated Planning process.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Because only 70% of CDBG funds must benefit people with low or moderate incomes, and because all funding could benefit people with moderate incomes, many of the lowest-income households realize little benefit from the program. Locally, people can organize to get 100% of a jurisdiction's CDBG dollars to be used for activities that benefit people with low incomes and can strive to have more of the dollars used to benefit people with extremely low incomes (income less than 30% of the AMI).

The public participation process can be used to organize and advocate for more CDBG dollars to be used for the types of projects people with low incomes really want in their neighborhoods and then to monitor how funds are actually spent. To do this, advocates should obtain and study the jurisdiction's Annual Action Plan, which lists how a jurisdiction spends CDBG funds in the upcoming year and the Grantee Performance Report (C04PR03), which lists how CDBG money was spent the previous year. These documents must be available to the public from the staff in charge of CDBG in local jurisdictions.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

NLIHC, 202-662-1530, www.nlihc.org

There are two HUD CDBG web platforms. One is the traditional site, https://www.hud.gov/program_offices/comm_planning/communitydevelopment/programs

Most of the information has migrated to the HUD Exchange site: <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/cdbg>

The Entitlement Program page is <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/cdbg-entitlement> and the State Program page is <https://www.hudexchange.info/programs/cdbg-state>

Community Development Financial Institutions Fund

By Jonathan Harwitz, Director of Federal Policy, Low Income Investment Fund

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of the Treasury

Year Started: 1994

Funding: \$250 million in FY19; \$262 million in FY 2020

See Also: For related information, refer to the *Capital Magnet Fund* section of this guide.

The Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund comprises seven programs designed to expand the capacity of financial institutions to provide credit, capital, and financial services to underserved populations and communities.

HISTORY

The CDFI Fund was created by the “Riegle Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.”

OVERVIEW

CDFIs are specialized private sector financial institutions that serve economically disadvantaged communities and consumers. As of November 30, 2018, there were 1,066 CDFIs according to the CDFI Fund. CDFIs assume different forms, including banks (165), credit unions (285), depository institutions (56), loan funds (544), and venture capital funds (16). CDFI customers include small business owners, nonprofits, affordable housing developers, and low-income individuals. Nearly 70% of CDFI customers are low-income persons, 59% are racial minorities, and 52% are women. CDFIs operate in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

United by a primary mission of community development, CDFIs work where conventional financial institutions do not by providing financial

services coupled with financial education and technical assistance to help alleviate poverty for economically disadvantaged people and communities. CDFIs offer innovative financing that banks would not typically offer. CDFIs also provide basic financial services to people who are unbanked, offering alternatives to predatory lenders. CDFIs implement capital-led strategies to fight poverty and to tackle economic infrastructure issues such as quality affordable housing, job creation, wealth building, financial literacy and education, community facility financing, and small business development and training.

PROGRAM SUMMARIES

The CDFI Fund operates seven primary programs designed to both build the capacity of CDFIs and increase private investment in distressed communities nationwide. These programs are: the CDFI program, the Native Initiatives program, the Bank Enterprise Award program, the New Markets Tax Credit program, the Capital Magnet Fund (CMF) program, the Healthy Food Financing Initiative, and the CDFI Bond Guarantee program. The CDFI Fund is the largest single source of funding for CDFIs and plays an important role in attracting and securing non-federal funds for CDFIs.

The CDFI Fund is unique among federal programs because it aims to strengthen institutions rather than fund specific projects. CDFIs match the federal investment from the CDFI Fund multiple times over with private money, using these funds to help revitalize communities through investment in affordable housing, small businesses, and community facilities and by providing retail financial services to low-income populations.

CDFI Program

The CDFI Program has two components: Financial Assistance (FA) and Technical

Assistance (TA). Through these two components, the CDFI Program provides loans and grants to CDFIs to support their capitalization and capacity building, enhancing their ability to create community development opportunities in underserved markets. CDFIs compete for federal support based on their business plans, market analyses, and performance goals.

FA awards are for established, certified CDFIs and may be used for economic development, affordable housing, and community development financial services. FA awards must be matched at least one-to-one with non-federal funds. TA awards are for startup or existing CDFIs and are used to build capacity to serve a target market through the acquisition of goods and services such as consulting services, technology purchases, and staff or board training. The FY19 funding level for this program was \$160 million and the FY 20 funding level was \$165.5 million.

Native Initiatives Program

The CDFI Fund's Native Initiatives are designed to overcome identified barriers to financial services in Native communities (including Native American, Native Alaskan, and Native Hawaiian populations). Through TA and FA, the CDFI Fund seeks to foster the development of new Native CDFIs and strengthen the capacity of existing Native CDFIs. Financial education and asset building programs, such as matched savings accounts, are particularly important to Native communities.

Though founded in 1994, the first TA grants were not made until 2002 after a comprehensive study of the capital and credit needs of Native communities had been performed. FA followed in 2004. The CDFI Fund continues to collaborate with tribal governments and tribal community organizations through ongoing research and analysis that informs the recommendations for Native CDFIs. The FY18 funding level for the Native Initiatives program was \$16 million.

Bank Enterprise Award Program

The Bank Enterprise Award (BEA) program was created in 1994 to support Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)-insured financial

institutions around the country dedicated to financing and supporting community and economic development activities. The BEA program complements the community development activities of insured depository institutions (i.e., banks and thrifts) by providing financial incentives to expand investments in CDFIs and to increase lending, investment, and service activities within economically distressed communities. Providing monetary awards for increasing community development activities leverages the fund's dollars and puts more capital to work in distressed communities. The FY19 and FY20 funding level for the BEA program was \$25 million.

New Markets Tax Credit Program

Congress established the New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) program as part of the "Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2001" to encourage investments in low-income communities that traditionally lack access to capital for developing small businesses and revitalizing neighborhoods. The NMTC provides financial institutions, corporations, and other investors with a tax credit for investing in a Community Development Entity (CDE). The investor takes a tax credit over a seven year period equal to 39% of the original amount invested. CDEs are domestic partnerships or corporations that are intermediaries that use capital derived from the tax credits to make loans to or investments in businesses and projects in low-income communities. A low-income community is one with census tracts that have a poverty rate of at least 20% or that have a median family income less than 80% of the area median income (AMI).

The NMTC program is administered by the CDFI Fund which allocates tax credit authority, the amount of investment for which investors can claim a tax credit, to CDEs that apply for and obtain allocations. To date, the CDFI Fund has made 1,178 allocation awards totaling \$57.5 billion in NMTC allocations, which has leveraged nearly \$500 billion in private investment. Between 2003 and 2015, NMTC investments created over one million jobs at a cost to the federal government of under \$20,000 per job.

Since its inception, the NMTC Program has supported the construction of 51 million square feet of manufacturing space, 89 million square feet of office space, and 65 million square feet of retail space.

Congress extended the authorization of the NMTC program for \$5 billion through 2020, an increase of \$1.5 billion over its most recent extension from 2015-2019.

Capital Magnet Fund Program

(See the separate *Advocates' Guide* section for more detail on the Capital Magnet Fund Program).

The Capital Magnet Fund (CMF) was created through the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008.” Through the CMF, the CDFI Fund provides competitively awarded grants to CDFIs and qualified nonprofit housing organizations. CMF awards can be used to finance housing for low- and moderate-income households as well as related economic development activities and community service facilities. Awardees utilize financing tools such as loan loss reserves, loan funds, risk-sharing loans, and loan guarantees to produce eligible activities with aggregate costs at least 10 times the size of the award amount.

A minimum of 70% of an awardee’s CMF money must be used for housing. One hundred percent of housing-eligible project costs must be for units for households with income below 120% of the AMI); at least 51% of housing eligible project costs must be for units for households with income below 80% of AMI. If CMF finances rental housing, then at least 20% of the units must be occupied by households with income below 80% of AMI. Maximum rent is fixed at 30% of either 120% AMI, 80% AMI, 50% AMI, or 30% AMI, depending on the household’s income. For example, if an assisted household has income at 120% AMI, their maximum rent is 30% of 120% AMI. Assisted housing must meet the above affordability requirements for at least 10 years.

As with the national Housing Trust Fund (HTF), funding for the CMF is intended to be provided in part by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. Because Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac went into conservatorship soon after the authorizing statute

creating those programs became law and the collection of the contributions was suspended, in FY10 the Administration requested, and Congress approved, an initial appropriation of \$80 million to capitalize the CMF. Two hundred and thirty CDFIs and nonprofit housing organizations applied, requesting more than \$1 billion. Twenty-three awards were made, which leveraged at least \$1.6 billion for the financing of housing within underserved communities and helped put underserved neighborhoods on the path to recovery and revitalization. There have been no further appropriated funds for the CMF. The suspension of contributions of assessments on new business of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac was lifted at the end of 2014; contributions began January 1, 2015 and the CMF received \$91.5 million for 2016 and \$119.5 million in 2017.

The FY 2017 award round was the third round in the Capital Magnet Fund’s history. The inaugural round was held in FY 2010 when the Capital Magnet Fund awarded \$80 million to 23 CDFIs and qualified non-profit organizations serving 38 states. From that one award round, the Capital Magnet Fund has:

- Created 13,325 affordable homes, including 11,727 affordable rental homes and 1,598 homeowner-occupied homes.
- Supported the creation of nearly 16,000 jobs.
- Generated nearly \$1.8 billion in private and public leverage; \$22 of investment for every \$1 in Capital Magnet Fund funding.

In the FY 2018 funding round, 38 awardees plan to deploy \$142.9 million in grants to:

- Develop more than 25,700 Affordable Housing Units, including 23,000 Rental Units and 2,700 Homeownership Units
- Leverage more than \$5.5 billion in additional investment, more than 75% from the private sector.

CDFI Healthy Foods Financing Initiative

The CDFI Healthy Food Financing Initiative, launched in 2011 as part of the multi-agency Healthy Food Financing Initiative (HFFI), provides

grants to CDFIs focused on developing solutions for increasing access to affordable healthy foods in low-income communities. The HFFI is an interagency initiative involving the Treasury, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. HFFI represents the federal government's first coordinated step to eliminate "food deserts" by promoting a wide range of interventions that expand the supply of and demand for nutritious foods, including increasing the distribution of agricultural products, developing and equipping grocery stores, and strengthening producer-to-consumer relationships. The FY19 and FY20 funding level for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative was \$22 million.

CDFI Bond Guarantee Program

Enacted through the "Small Business Jobs Act of 2010," the Treasury may issue up to \$1 billion each year in fully guaranteed bonds to support CDFI lending and investment. Long-term, patient capital such as this is difficult for CDFIs to obtain. The program experienced regulatory delays related to making it cost-neutral to the federal government. To date, the CDFI fund has guaranteed \$1.1 billion in bond loans. The CDFI Bond Guarantee Program is authorized through FY20 at \$500 million, but advocates are encouraging Congress to extend it to \$1 billion as allowed by the statute.

Authorized uses of the loans financed may include a variety of financial activities, such as: supporting commercial facilities that promote revitalization, community stability, and job creation/retention; community facilities; the provision of basic financial services; housing that is principally affordable to low-income people; businesses that provide jobs for low-income people or are owned by low-income people; and community or economic development in low-income or underserved rural areas. Since the bonds have a minimum size of \$100 million that is larger than most CDFIs can readily invest, groups of CDFIs can put in joint applications.

FUNDING

The appropriation for the CDFI Fund in FY19 was \$250 million. The Administration's FY20 budget requested \$14 million, a \$236 million decrease from the FY19 enacted level. Congress, however, chose to provide a record \$262 million, reflecting the strong bipartisan support for the Fund in Congress.

Applications for CDFI Fund awards consistently exceed the supply of funds. Since 1996, applicants to the CDFI Program have requested more than four times the amount awarded. The CDFI Fund received 230 applications for the 2017/2018 round of the NMTC Program, representing \$16.2 billion in NMTCs; five times the available funding.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Given the fiscally constrained environment, it is good news that the FY20 CDFI Fund appropriation was a record level. But advocates fully expect the Trump administration FY 2021 budget request once again to propose to cut funding dramatically.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should contact members of Congress, especially members of the Senate and House Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittees, to encourage continued support for at least \$50 million in FY19 and FY20 for the CDFI Fund and an extension of the CDFI Bond Guarantee Program and New Markets Tax Credits to help meet the demand for financial services and capital in low-income communities.

Finally, CDFIs design innovative below-market products that banks would not offer, providing homeownership and financial opportunities to underserved individuals and communities. Advocates play an active role in helping to communicate the positive role of CDFIs in low-wealth markets.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

The CDFI Fund, 202-653-0300,
<https://www.cdfifund.gov/Pages/default.aspx>

CDFI Coalition, 202-393-5225, www.cdfi.org

Opportunity Finance Network, 215-923-4754,
www.ofn.org

Housing Partnership Network, 617-720-1999,
<http://www.housingpartnership.net>

Opportunity Zones

By Sarah Brundage, Senior Policy Director, Enterprise Community Partners

Administering Agency: U.S. Department of the Treasury

Year Enacted: 2017

Number of Persons/Households Served:

There are 8,700 certified Opportunity Zones nationwide, encompassing 35 million people.

Population Targeted: Low-income census tracts with an individual poverty rate of at least 20% and median family income no greater than 80% of the area median income (AMI). Each state, territory, and Washington, D.C. was eligible to nominate up to 25% of its total eligible census tracts. Up to 5% of that 25% could be comprised of contiguous census tracts that are adjacent to a low-income community as long as the adjacent census tracts had a median family income that did not exceed 125% of the median family income of the adjacent low-income community.

The Opportunity Zones tax incentive is designed to drive long-term equity capital in a diverse range of activities in designated low-income census tracts.

HISTORY

The Opportunity Zones tax incentive was originally conceptualized in the “Investing in Opportunity Act.” This bipartisan, bicameral legislation was sponsored by Senators Tim Scott (R-SC) and Cory Booker (D-NJ) and Representatives Pat Tiberi (R-OH) and Ron Kind (D-WI) in the 115th Congress. The law was enacted as part of the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act” in December 2017.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

The Opportunity Zones tool is technically not a program, but a tax incentive. The Treasury has certified 8,700 Opportunity Zones; these are low-

income communities and adjacent census tracts that are now eligible to receive private investment through Opportunity Funds.

Opportunity Funds are a new private sector investment vehicle that must invest at least 90% of its assets in qualifying Opportunity Zone businesses and/or business property. There are three tiers of tax incentives to encourage taxpayers to invest capital gains into a Qualified Opportunity Fund:

- A temporary tax deferral for capital gains reinvested in an Opportunity Fund. The deferred gain must be recognized on the earlier of the date on which the Opportunity Zone investment is sold or December 31, 2026.
- A step-up in basis for capital gains reinvested in an Opportunity Fund. The basis of the original investment is increased by 10% if the investment in the qualified Opportunity Zone Fund is held by the taxpayer for at least five years, and by an additional 5% if held for at least seven years, excluding up to 15% of the original gain from taxation.
- A permanent exclusion from taxable income of capital gains from the sale or exchange of an investment in a qualified Opportunity Zone fund, if the investment is held for at least ten years. (Note: this exclusion applies to the gains accrued from an investment in an Opportunity Fund, not the original gains).

Certain activities, known as “sin businesses,” are not eligible for Opportunity Fund investments. These include operating a country club, golf course, massage parlor, hot tub facility, suntan facility, racetrack or other gambling facility, or liquor store. Other than these prohibited items, eligible investments opportunities are broad and flexible.

FUNDING

The Opportunity Zones tax benefit is not funded through federal appropriations; it is a tax expenditure, meaning that the federal government forgoes tax revenue in order to incent an activity. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates that Opportunity Zone tax expenditures will total \$16.9 billion over the course of 2019 through 2023. Recent estimates suggest that upwards of \$6 trillion in unrealized capital gains currently sit on the books of U.S. taxpayers.

FORECAST FOR 2020

The Department of the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service (IRS) released the final regulations in December 2019. The regulations combine and update the prior two tranches of proposed regulations (previously released in October 2018 and April 2019). The final regulations are expected to be effective after March 13, 2020. The final regulations provide technical clarification for stakeholders interested in making Opportunity Zone investments and/or managing a Qualified Opportunity Fund.

However, the final regulations do not directly address the broader concerns from low-income community advocates about the potential consequences of these private investments. There are no provisions in the statute nor final regulations specifying that investments must benefit low-income people, build affordable housing, employ low-income residents, or provide affordable capital for local small businesses or minority-owned or women-owned businesses. Nor are there protections to prevent the displacement of low-income people or local small businesses as a result of new investments in distressed communities. Also not included in the final regulations are data collection and reporting requirements that would allow Opportunity Zone stakeholders to assess the outcomes of the new tax incentive.

The Opportunity Zone legislation requires investments to be made by December 31, 2019 to be eligible for the maximum 15% reduction in

capital gains for holding investments seven years. While there is currently no single, comprehensive log of Opportunity Funds and investment activity, several third-parties have created resources to collect volunteered investment information. As of December 2019, the National Council of State Housing Agencies' (NCSHA's) Opportunity Zone Fund Directory listed 196 funds representing nearly \$45 billion in anticipated investments. NCSHA's directory estimates that 64% of the funds plan to invest in affordable or workforce housing or community revitalization. The Novogradac Opportunity Funds Listing is tracking 366 funds, representing \$65.77 billion in community development investment capacity, with nearly \$4.5 billion raised as of December 2019. Opportunity Zone investments will continue in 2020.

Meanwhile, the administration will likely continue to propose and implement incentives to prioritize Opportunity Zones through other federal policies and programs. President Trump signed an Executive Order on December 12, 2018 establishing the White House Opportunity and Revitalization Council chaired by HUD Secretary Ben Carson. The primary purpose of the Council is to target existing federal programs to Opportunity Zones. The Council will assess actions each federal agency can take under existing authorities to focus federal programs in Opportunity Zones. It will also assess actions each agency can take to minimize regulatory and administrative costs. As of December 2019, the White House Opportunity and Revitalization Council has identified more than 190 federal programs that could target or provide preference or additional support to Opportunity Zones. As of December 20, 2019, the Council has already taken action on 183 grants or programs, which are detailed in a public memo on completed program targeting actions.

In November 2019, three bills were introduced in Congress that would tighten the statute that created Opportunity Zones. These bills S. 2787, H.R. 5042, and H.R. 4999, were introduced by Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR), and Representatives James Clyburn (D-SC) and Hank Johnson (D-GA),

respectively. All together they would limit the Opportunity Zone tax benefit associated with any housing projects to those occupied by either very-low or extremely low-income residents, remove census tracts that are not low-income from an Opportunity Zone, require advisory boards appointed by local elected officials, and require some diversity in investment. A fourth bill (H.R. 5252) introduced by Representative Rashida Tlaib (D-MI) would repeal the provision in the Internal Revenue Code authorizing Opportunity Zones.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Opportunity Funds should be required to report on their investment activity to ensure accountability of federal resources. The “Investing in Opportunity Act” included language requiring the Treasury Department to report on the impacts and outcomes of Opportunity Fund investments; however, when the tax incentive was ultimately enacted as part of the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017,” reporting requirements were not included.

Since the Opportunity Zone tax incentive was enacted, Enterprise has been urging Congress and the Administration to commit to reporting public data on investments in Opportunity Zones. Enterprise believes that the Opportunity Zone tax incentive should be used to advance equitable and inclusive growth, and that an important part of assessing this new tax incentive is transparency and accountability through data and reporting requirements. Enterprise believes that the federal government must require public data collection and reporting on Opportunity Fund investments and outcomes, allowing Congress and the public to evaluate whether this new tax incentive is driving equitable investments.

In May 2019, Senators Cory Booker (D-NJ), Tim Scott (R-SC), Todd Young (R-IN), and Maggie Hassan (D-NH) introduced a bill, S. 1344, that would require the Secretary of the Treasury to collect data and issue a report on the Opportunity Zones tax incentive. Since then, several other related proposals have been introduced.

Advocates should urge Members of Congress to enact meaningful reporting requirements on Opportunity Zones investments, similar to those outlined in S.1344.

More broadly, any future opportunities to reform or modify Opportunity Zones should consider the impact on the designated low-income communities above all. If implemented with local needs and priorities in mind, Opportunity Zones have the potential to catalyze investments that revitalize distressed communities and connect local residents to opportunity. If implemented without a commitment to direct and sustained community benefits to existing low-income residents and businesses, there is a danger that local residents and businesses could be displaced if Opportunity Zone investments cause property values and costs of living to rise.

Successful implementation of Opportunity Zones should include many of the same best practices that the affordable housing and community development industry has developed over the past several decades. The Low-Income Housing Tax Credit and New Markets Tax Credit, two proven and effective tools that use a tax credit to encourage activity that otherwise would not occur, provide a model for successful public-private partnerships that benefit low-income residents.

A statutory requirement to collect and publicly report meaningful data on Opportunity Zone investments is the first critical step necessary toward strengthening the accountability and transparency of this new tax incentive.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Enterprise Community Partners, 202-649-3410, www.opportunityzonesinfo.org

The IRS Opportunity Zone webpage, <https://bit.ly/2Etdce>

Chapter 9: INCOME PROGRAMS AND LAWS

Earned Income Tax Credit

Roxy Caines, EITC Campaign Director, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Administering Agency: Internal Revenue Service (IRS)

Year Started: 1975

Number of Persons/Households Served: 25 million tax filers in 2019

Population Targeted: low- and moderate-income workers

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a federal tax credit benefitting working people with low to moderate incomes. EITC benefits are particularly valuable for workers raising children. Very low-income workers not raising children may also qualify for a smaller credit.

HISTORY

Congress established the EITC in 1975 under Section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code. Congress has expanded the EITC several times with the support of both Republican and Democratic presidents. In 2009, a substantial expansion of the EITC was enacted in the “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).” Important expansions of the Child Tax Credit and a higher education credit were also enacted through ARRA. The “Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes (PATH) Act of 2015” made all those expansions permanent. The “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) of 2017” brought significant changes to the Child Tax Credit, which is frequently claimed by EITC-eligible families.

The EITC was designed to offset the payroll and income tax burdens of workers with low incomes raising children. Expansion of the EITC now delivers an income supplement to such workers earning very low wages, thereby providing a work incentive.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

According to analysis of Census data by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), in 2018 the EITC lifted 5.6 million people above the poverty line, including 3 million children. The EITC lifts more children in working families out of poverty than any other program or category of programs. It also enables near-poor parents and children to maintain incomes above poverty line.

The EITC is received as a refund from the IRS. The amount varies according to workers’ earnings and number of children. Below are guidelines for 2019:

Number of children:	Single workers with income less than:	Married workers with income less than:	EITC up to:
3 or more	\$50,162	\$55,952	\$6,557
2 children	\$46,703	\$52,493	\$5,828
1 child	\$41,094	\$46,884	\$3,526
No children	\$15,570	\$21,370	\$529

Workers who claim children for the EITC must file a tax return with the IRS using Form 1040, “Schedule EIC.” Workers who do not claim children for the EITC must be between 25 and 64 years old at the end of 2019 and are not required to file the Schedule EIC with their tax forms.

In addition to sons and daughters, qualifying children may include grandchildren, stepchildren, adopted children, brothers and sisters (or their descendants), and foster children officially placed with workers by an authorized agency.

To claim the EITC, workers cannot have investment income (such as taxable interest, tax-exempt interest, or capital gain distributions) greater than \$3,600 in 2019. Claiming public benefits like cash assistance, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Medicaid, or federal housing assistance does not affect eligibility for the EITC. The EITC is not counted as income to determine eligibility for any federally funded programs and does not count against resource limits for 12 months after receipt.

Thirty states, including the District of Columbia, have state EITCs. The credit is refundable in 24 states. Additionally, New York City, San Francisco, and Montgomery County, MD, offer local EITC.

Child Tax Credit

Many workers who claim the EITC may also qualify for the Child Tax Credit (CTC). The TCJA brings three major changes to this credit. First, the CTC is now worth up to \$2,000 for each qualifying child under age 17. Up to \$1,400 of the credit is refundable. To be eligible, workers must have taxable earned income above \$2,500. Low-income families who owe little to no income tax miss out on the benefit of the doubled credit maximum.

Second, while taxpayers and spouses can use an Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) or a Social Security Number (SSN) to get the CTC, children claimed for this credit are required to have an SSN. Previously, children could have an SSN or an ITIN. This eligibility change will end the CTC for an estimated one million children.

Third, the TCJA brings a new \$500 non-refundable tax credit for other dependents who don't qualify for the CTC. There is no SSN requirement for this credit.

Under the TCJA, these three changes to the CTC will expire after 2025.

As with the EITC, CTC refunds are not counted as income in determining eligibility for any federally funded programs and do not count toward resource limits for 12 months after receipt.

Higher Education Tax Credit

The American Opportunity Tax Credit was first enacted by ARRA as a revised version of the HOPE credit for higher education expenses and made permanent as part of the "PATH Act" in December 2015. It is worth a total of \$2,500 compared to \$1,800 for the HOPE credit. Up to \$1,000 of the credit can be claimed even if the individual does not earn enough to owe income tax, benefitting lower-income parents of college students and adult students. Filers cannot claim the HOPE credit.

Premium Tax Credit

This credit can help some individuals and families with incomes between 100% and 400% of the federal poverty line pay for health insurance purchased through the federal marketplace or through state marketplaces. The amount of the credit is figured on a sliding scale, so people do not have to pay more than 2.08%-9.86 % of their adjusted gross income in 2019.

FUNDING

The EITC and other tax credits are components of the Internal Revenue Code. Consequently, the benefits of those credits do not require annual appropriations decisions. Funding for EITC administration is part of the IRS budget and is not separately appropriated. In 2019, 25 million lower- and moderate-income workers earned \$61 billion from the EITC.


FORECAST FOR 2020

For the fourth year a major change to the tax filing process will likely impact a substantial number of EITC claimants. The “PATH Act” calls upon the IRS to delay release of tax refunds that include the EITC or the refundable part of the CTC (the ACTC) until February 15, 2020. This will enable the IRS to verify income reported on those returns to help prevent identity theft and erroneous refunds. The IRS warns that refunds released on February 15 may not reach taxpayers until about two weeks later, due to the weekend, holidays, and bank processing of direct deposits.

The TCJA did not change EITC eligibility rules, but CTC eligibility was restricted. While the value of the CTC has doubled to \$2,000 per child, most lower- and moderate-wage families will not see a significant increase in their credit, especially since the refundable portion is capped at \$1,400. Additionally, since children are now required to have an SSN to be claimed for the CTC, many working immigrant families will no longer benefit from the credit. In 2020, expect efforts to prevent the CTC changes and other provisions impacting low-income families in the TCJA from extending beyond the 2025 expiration.

As in previous years, 2020 will likely involve proposals to strengthen and expand the EITC for low-wage childless workers. The “Working Families Tax Relief Act” (S.1138 and H.R. 3157) introduced by Senators Sherrod Brown (D-OH), Michael Bennet (D-CO), Richard Durbin (D-IL), and Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Representatives Dan Kildee (D-MI) and Dwight Evans (D-PA) would expand both the EITC and CTC to improve the economic well-being of 46 million households. The bill would:

- Increase the EITC for families with children by 25%.
- Expand the EITC for workers without children by increasing the maximum credit to \$2,070, raising the qualifying income limit to \$25,000, and expanding the age range for eligible workers to 19-67.
- Make the CTC fully refundable so that all families receive the full amount of the credit regardless of how much they earn.
- Create a \$3,000 Young Child Tax Credit that provides \$1,000 in addition to a family’s CTC.



THE FEDERAL EITC IN TAX YEAR 2019

- No Children
- 1 Child
- 2 Children
- 3 or More Children
- - - Married Filing Jointly

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

CBPP closely monitors congressional action on the EITC and the other tax credits, publishes analyses of proposals, and issues legislative action alerts to advocates.

Although participation in the EITC is higher than in public benefit programs with more burdensome eligibility procedures, each year several million eligible workers do not claim their EITC. More than half of EITC recipients pay commercial tax preparers to do their tax returns, draining hundreds of dollars from their refunds and risking exposure to predatory refund loan practices.

Resources for helping people to claim EITC include:

- The IRS sponsored Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) and the Tax Counseling for the Elderly (TCE) programs, which provide free tax filing assistance by trained community volunteers at local community sites. Search for VITA and TCE locations by ZIP code at <http://irs.treasury.gov/freetaxprep>.
- CBPP's Get It Back Campaign, which provides local organizations with resources, training, and technical assistance to conduct tax credit outreach campaigns that promote the EITC and VITA. Popular resources such as customizable flyers in 24 languages, outreach materials, a tax credit outreach kit, an EITC Estimator, a tax guide for Uber and Lyft drivers, a self-employment payments calculator, and other tools are available at www.eitcoutreach.org.
- Prosperity Now coordinates a Taxpayer Opportunity Network that provides support to organizations running VITA programs. Learn more at www.prosperitynow.org.
- Resources are also available from the IRS (www.eitc.irs.gov). The IRS and HUD partner to promote tax credits and the VITA program.
- Community organizations and local agencies may qualify to apply for annual Community VITA grants, a matching grant program administered by the IRS to expand VITA to underserved communities (search for "VITA Grants" at www.irs.gov).

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

The EITC reduces poverty by supplementing the earnings of workers with low wages and low earnings. There is bipartisan agreement that a two-parent family with two children with a full-time, minimum-wage worker should not have to raise its children in poverty. At the federal minimum wage's current level, such a family can move above the poverty line only if it receives the EITC as well as SNAP (food stamp) benefits.

The EITC is designed to encourage and reward work. Beginning with the first dollar, a worker's EITC grows with each additional dollar of earnings until the credit reaches the maximum value. This creates an incentive for people to work and for lower-wage workers to increase their work hours.

For young children, moving out of poverty is particularly important. Research has found that lifting income in early childhood not only tends to improve a child's immediate educational outcome, but also improves health outcomes, the likelihood of college attendance, and higher earnings in adulthood.

The EITC must be strengthened for low-wage childless workers who are taxed into poverty. A full-time, minimum-wage childless worker who earns \$14,500 annually will receive an EITC of only \$80 after filing his or her 2019 tax return. This does little to offset the more than \$1,000 he or she owes in income and payroll taxes.

Many low-income working families are struggling to stay afloat as costs have risen faster than their pay over several decades. The "Working Families Tax Relief Act" would begin to fix our tax laws to help working people with low-wage jobs support themselves and their families.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080, www.cbpp.org.

The Minimum Wage

By David Cooper, Senior Economic Analyst, Economic Policy Institute

The Federal Minimum Wage: \$7.25 (effective July 24, 2009)

STATE MINIMUM WAGES FOR 2020

State minimum wages range from \$5.15 in Wyoming and Georgia (where the federal minimum wage applies) to \$13.50 in Washington state. Five states (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Tennessee) have no state minimum wage; the federal minimum wage applies in these states. The District of Columbia has a minimum wage of \$14.00 that will increase to \$15.00 on July 1, 2020.

Since 2017, two dozen states and the District of Columbia have passed minimum wage increases, many of which will continue to gradually take effect in the coming years. In some cases, the increases were established by legislation, such as in California, Connecticut, Illinois, New Jersey, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and the District of Columbia, where the statewide minimum wage will reach \$15.00 per hour. In other cases, the increases were passed directly by voters through ballot referenda, as was the case in Arkansas (where the minimum wage will be \$11.00 in 2021) and Missouri (where the minimum wage will be \$12.00 in 2023).

In New York and Oregon, the state minimum wage law establishes separate wage floors for different regions of the states. In New York City, the minimum wage rose to \$15 in 2019 and in Nassau, Suffolk, and Westchester counties the minimum wage will be \$13.00 in 2020. Upstate New York will have a minimum wage of \$11.80. In the urban area encompassing Portland, Oregon, the minimum wage will be \$13.25 in 2020, while other groups of counties in the state will have minimum wages of \$11.50 and \$12.00.

As of January 2020, some 51 cities and counties adopted minimum wages ordinances that established wage floors above their state

minimum wages. However, in Alabama, Kentucky, Missouri, and Iowa, minimum wage ordinances that were passed at the local level were subsequently reversed by the state legislature. There are now 25 states that have enacted “preemption” laws prohibiting local government from establishing a minimum wage that differs from the state minimum. Notably, in 2019, the Colorado legislature repealed that state’s minimum wage preemption, which had been in effect since 1999, clearing the way for cities and counties in state to establish their own wage floors.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The federal minimum wage was established in 1938 during the Great Depression as a measure to prevent the exploitation of workers and to combat income inequality. Established by the “Fair Labor Standards Act,” the minimum wage set a floor on hourly wages at a level intended to allow even the lowest paid worker in the United States to afford basic needs. Over time, as prices have gone up and the minimum wage was too often left unchanged, its buying power eroded, resulting in millions of workers who struggle to make ends meet.

In the first 40 years after its inception, lawmakers raised the minimum wage many times. Yet since 1980, these increases have been woefully infrequent and inadequate. The federal minimum wage reached its highest buying power in 1968 at \$10.34 in 2019 dollars (inflation adjusted using the Consumer Price Index Research Series Using Current Methods). Throughout the 1970s, the minimum wage was regularly raised but in the face of high inflation, the minimum wage’s buying power began to fall. Throughout the 1980s, the minimum wage was left unchanged, resulting in a steep decline in the value of a minimum wage paycheck. In the mid-1990s, the federal wage floor was raised modestly, but then left to erode again for another 10 years.

In 2007, after a decade of inaction on this issue, Congress passed a three-step increase to the federal minimum wage, raising it from \$5.15 to \$5.85 in 2007 to \$6.55 in 2008 and to \$7.25 in 2009. This restored some of the buying power of the minimum wage but did not fully undo the erosion in value that had occurred in the 1980s and 1990s and its real value has continued to erode with each passing day since. At the start of 2020, the federal minimum wage is worth more than 16% less than when it was last increased in 2009 and more than 30% less than at its inflation-adjusted peak value in 1968.

ISSUE SUMMARY

Federal minimum wage legislation ensures that employers, both private and public, provide their employees with a minimum level of compensation for each hour worked. Almost all workers are covered by this law, with exemptions for teenagers during their first 90 days of employment, some seasonal workers, workers at businesses with gross receipts of less than \$500,000 that do not engage in interstate commerce, and several other small occupational groups.

The U.S. Department of Labor enforces federal minimum wage laws, while state labor departments handle the enforcement of state wage laws. However, many states defer enforcement to the U.S. Department of Labor and not all states, even those with higher minimum wages, have a state department of labor. Researchers estimate that violations of minimum wage laws cost low-wage workers more than \$15 billion in unpaid wages each year (see *Employers steal billions from workers' paychecks each year*).

At \$7.25 per hour, a full-time worker earning the federal minimum wage takes home just \$15,080 a year – an annual income below the federal poverty line for any worker with at least one child. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in 2018 there were about 1.7 million workers who were paid exactly the federal minimum wage or less and just under half (47.1%) were age 24 or younger. However, these statistics can be misleading because they do not describe the

workforce being paid state minimum wage above the federal minimum wage nor do they consider workers earning just above the federal minimum wage, such as those with wages of \$7.50 or \$8.00 per hour.

Indeed, research by the Economic Policy Institute shows that among a broader definition of low-wage workers (namely, workers earning less than \$15 per hour), 88% are age 20 or older and 61% are 25 or older. Moreover, more than a quarter of these workers have children and more than half work full time. On average, workers earning less than \$15 per hour earn half their family's total income. These are workers whose earnings are critical for their family's well-being; setting adequate minimum wages is essential for ensuring they can live a decent life.

As NLIHC's report *Out of Reach* shows, there is no jurisdiction in the United States in which a worker earning the federal minimum wage can afford even a one-bedroom apartment at fair market rent (FMR). According to the 2014 edition of *Out of Reach*, a minimum wage worker would have to work 104 hours a week, the equivalent to 2.6 full-time jobs, in order to afford a two-bedroom apartment at the national average FMR.

FORECAST FOR 2020

A lot has happened since President Obama indicated in his 2013 State of the Union address that he supported raising the federal minimum wage to \$9. Since then, 27 states and the District of Columbia have passed state minimum wage increases, many of which will reach or exceed \$12 within the next year. Additionally, 51 cities and counties have passed local wage floors as of January 2019 (although some of these have been subsumed by state increases or reversed by state legislatures). These local ordinances have set minimum wages as high as \$16.34 in SeaTac, WA.

On July 18, 2019, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the "Raise the Wage Act of 2019", a bill that would raise the federal minimum wage in seven steps to \$15 by 2025. The bill, introduced by Representative Bobby Scott (D-CA) in the House and Senator Bernie

Sanders (I-VT) in the Senate, garnered more initial co-sponsors than any previous minimum wage legislation since the last federal minimum wage bill was passed in 2007. Despite passage in the House, the bill has not been brought forward for debate even in committee in the Senate. The longer that Congress waits to approve any increase, inflation will reduce the real value of the eventual target wage level. For this reason, lawmakers may ultimately target an even higher minimum than the current proposal, phased-in over the course of a longer time period, in order to achieve the desired inflation-adjusted value. The “Raise the Wage Act” would also gradually increase the federal tipped minimum wage, the base wage that employers of tipped workers must pay workers who receive tips, until it reaches parity with the regular minimum wage. The tipped minimum wage has remained unchanged at \$2.13 since 1991.

Indexing the Minimum Wage

The lack of an adequate minimum wage contributes to growing inequality. Workers today are better educated and more productive than ever before, but real wages for minimum-wage workers are now dramatically lower than they were 50 years ago. At the historical high point of the minimum wage in the 1960s, a minimum wage worker was paid roughly half of the wages of a typical middle-class worker. Today, the minimum wage is equal to less than a third of the wages of typical U.S. workers.

This decline in minimum wage value not only makes it hard for workers to make ends meet, it means that workers starting out in the workforce at the minimum wage are much farther from the middle class than their counterparts a generation ago. Raising the minimum wage will help working families support themselves, and by shrinking the gap between workers at the bottom and those at the middle it eases the path for more families to enter the middle class.

One simple way to ensure that the minimum wage is not left to erode in the future is to enact automatic annual adjustments, or “indexing”, based on the growth in overall wages or growth

in prices. Eighteen states and the District of Columbia have adopted minimum wage indexing based on price inflation. This ensures that the real value of the minimum wage does not decline over the course of time. In addition to maintaining a constant purchasing power of the minimum wage, indexing also ensures that each increase is small and predictable.

Rather than indexing to changes in prices, the minimum wage could also be indexed to changes in wages. In fact, the federal “Raise the Wage Act” that passed in the House of Representatives would index the minimum wage to overall wage growth. This has advantages over simply indexing to prices: wage growth tends to be more stable than price growth, which would make minimum wage changes less volatile. It would also help combat growth in inequality by ensuring that the wages for the lowest paid workers never fall too far from the wages of middle-class workers.

Strengthening Government Assistance Programs

Many low-wage workers (many of whom work full time) are paid so little that they must turn to public assistance programs in order to make ends meet. As the value of the minimum wage is left to erode and more workers’ wages slip to levels that are insufficient to afford basic necessities, it places greater stress on government assistance programs that must take up the slack in workers’ earnings. Accordingly, if the minimum wage were raised, it would lift the labor earnings of many low-wage workers such that they would no longer need public assistance or would still be better off even if their benefits were reduced. An Economic Policy Institute study, *Balancing paychecks and public assistance*, describes how raising the federal minimum wage would generate billions in annual savings to public assistance programs; funds that could then be used to strengthen anti-poverty programs or make long-needed investments in education, public infrastructure, or other key policy priorities.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

As the federal minimum wage stagnated from 1984 to 2007, many states decided to take up this issue and set their own minimum wages higher

than the federal minimum. In 1984, only one state, Alaska, had a minimum wage higher than the federal minimum. By the end of 2007, some 31 states and the District of Columbia had set their minimum wages above the federal level. In addition, many of these states have indexed their minimum wage so that the purchasing power of the minimum wage does not decline with time. This strategy has proven successful at the state and local level and should be adopted at the federal level as well.

Advocates interested in fair wages in their states or localities can contact the groups listed below to connect with campaigns to enact a higher state or local minimum wage. Between 2013 and 2019, there were 25 states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, Washington, and West Virginia that either passed legislation or approved ballot initiatives to increase the minimum wage. There were also successful local campaigns in a multitude of cities and counties throughout California, including Alameda, Belmont, Berkeley, Cupertino, El Cerrito, Emeryville, Fremont, Los Altos, Los Angeles, Malibu, Milpitas, Mountain View, Oakland, Palo Alto, Pasadena, Redwood City, Richmond, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Leandro, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Monica, Sunnyvale; as well as Chicago, IL.; Flagstaff, AZ; Minneapolis and St. Paul, MN; Johnson, Polk, and Wapello Counties, IA; Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, MD.; Portland, ME; Kansas City, and St. Louis, MO.; Lexington and Louisville, KY; Albuquerque, and Las Cruces, NM; Seattle, and Tacoma, WA; and the District of Columbia.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should urge their Members of Congress and state elected officials to increase the minimum wage. Working Americans should be fairly compensated for their labor with a wage that allows them to provide for their families. It has been over ten years since the last increase in

the federal minimum wage. Its inflation-adjusted value is now vastly lower than historic levels and even with recent state and local minimum wage changes, most of the country still has minimum wages that make it nearly impossible for low-wage workers to pay for basic necessities, including housing.

Advocates should tell their federal and state legislators that the way forward has two steps: first, increase the minimum wage to a livable level. Second, index it to protect against inflation and further inequality.

Increasing the minimum wage, at either the federal or state level, not only improves affected workers' well-being, it also puts more money in the hands of people likely to spend those additional earnings quickly, thereby spurring additional economic activity and promoting growth. The 2008 and 2009 increases to the federal minimum wage boosted consumer spending by approximately \$8.6 billion.

Increasing the minimum wage improves the well-being of low-income workers while improving the economy for all. Increasing the minimum wage is smart public policy.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Economic Policy Institute, 202-775-8810, www.epi.org

National Employment Law Project, 212-285-3025, www.nelp.org

Supplemental Security Income

By Kathleen Romig, Senior Policy Analyst, and Katie Windham, Intern, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

Supplemental Security Income (SSI) is a means-tested program that provides cash benefits for low-income people who are disabled, blind, or elderly. The Social Security Administration (SSA) runs the program.

HISTORY

Congress created SSI in 1972 to replace the former program of grants to states to aid the aged, blind, or disabled.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

SSI provides monthly cash assistance to persons who are unable to work due to age or medical conditions and have little income and few assets. In 2019, the basic monthly SSI benefit is \$771 for an individual and \$1,157 for a couple. Beneficiaries who live in another person's household and receive in-kind maintenance and support receive one-third less than that amount, while beneficiaries who receive long-term care in a Medicaid-funded institution receive \$30 per month. Many states supplement the federal SSI benefit, although state budget cuts are severely constraining those additional payments.

SSI benefits are reduced when recipients have other sources of income. Each dollar of earnings exceeding \$65 a month (or \$85 for someone with no unearned income) reduces SSI benefits by 50 cents, a provision that is meant to encourage work. Each dollar of other income exceeding \$20 per month, such as Social Security benefits, pensions, or interest income, reduces SSI benefits by one dollar. SSI benefits are unavailable to people whose assets exceed \$2,000 for an individual or \$3,000 for a couple (with certain exceptions).

Although run by the same agency, SSI is distinct from the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Programs commonly known as Social

Security. To collect Social Security, beneficiaries must have worked a certain number of quarters and paid the requisite payroll taxes in addition to meeting certain age or disability requirements. Many SSI recipients have worked long enough to collect Social Security, but their Social Security benefit is low enough that they also qualify for SSI. About a quarter of adult SSI recipients under age 65, and more than half of recipients older than 65, also get Social Security.

In most states, anyone who receives SSI benefits is automatically eligible for Medicaid. More than 60% of SSI recipients also utilize SNAP, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, formerly known as food stamps.

Starting in summer 2019, California residents receiving SSI became eligible for CalFresh, California's version of the SNAP program. Previously, California SSI recipients were ineligible for CalFresh benefits under a policy called "cash-out," under which they received a cash supplement *in lieu* of SNAP. According to the state's estimates, around 225,000 SSI recipients enrolled in CalFresh in the first two months with an additional 175,000 expected to enroll by the end of the year. State legislation provides funding to protect "mixed" households (those that include some members who receive SSI and others who do not) from losing some or all of their CalFresh benefits. The state works closely with state and local stakeholders to enroll newly eligible households in SNAP.

More than 90% of SSI recipients are U.S. citizens. The 1996 welfare reform law eliminated most noncitizens' eligibility for SSI unless they fall into one of three main groups: lawful residents who entered the United States by August 1996; refugees who entered after that date who can receive SSI only on a temporary basis, currently for seven years; or immigrants who entered after August 1996 and have earned 40 quarters of coverage under Social Security.

Individuals may apply for SSI online, by phone, or in person at one of SSA's field offices. SSA will verify the applicant's identity, age, work history, and financial qualifications. In the case of disability applications, state agencies called Disability Determination Services (DDSs) weigh the medical and related evidence to judge whether the applicant meets the criteria set out by law to determine whether they suffer from a severe impairment that will last at least 12 months or result in death that makes it impossible to engage in substantial work. A slightly different definition applies to disabled children under age 18. If DDS initially denies the application, claimants have several levels of appeal and may choose to be represented by an attorney.

Although SSI benefit levels are low, they are critical to obtaining and maintaining housing for many recipients. SSI benefits enable some homeless recipients to qualify for supportive housing programs, subsidized housing vouchers, or units prioritized for people with disabilities. Supportive housing providers may also receive Medicaid reimbursement for certain services provided to clients who qualify for Medicaid via SSI. Still, the benefits are insufficient for many recipients to afford market-rate housing.

While SSI benefits provide critically needed resources to people with disabilities, they can be difficult to obtain. Nationwide, only about one-quarter of adult disability claims are approved at the initial level; about one-third are approved after all appeals. Allowance rates for disabled children are slightly higher. The process is especially challenging for people who are homeless. Barriers include difficulty obtaining medical documentation and in making and keeping appointments. SSA requires evidence of a disability to come from an "acceptable medical source," such as a physician or psychologist. Starting in 2017, physicians' assistants, audiologists, and advanced practice registered nurses became acceptable medical sources given the licensed scope of their practices. The list of acceptable medical sources excludes other providers, such as licensed clinical social

workers, although such professionals often provide supporting documentation.

Disability claimants often face an extended wait for a decision. Initial review of a disability application typically takes three to four months, although there is a fast-track program for certain severe conditions. Appeals to the Administrative Law Judge level typically take about sixteen months to be processed. SSA is working to eliminate the hearings backlog but tight resources have hampered progress. Some states and localities offer interim assistance while an applicant awaits a decision on SSI, eventually recouping the money from any retroactive benefits.

Some initiatives have demonstrated success in increasing SSI access for homeless people with disabilities. The Social Security Outreach and Access to Recovery (SOAR) Program has used a train-the-trainer model combined with technical assistance to teach caseworkers how to conduct outreach and assist homeless applicants. SOAR is an interagency initiative involving SSA, HUD, and the Department of Health and Human Services' Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. Through 2017, clients at SOAR-trained sites in 49 states and the District of Columbia had an average initial approval rate of 64%.

As of October 2019, 8.1 million people received SSI benefits: 1.1 million children under age 18, 4.7 million disabled adults aged 18-64, and 2.3 million people 65 or older.

FUNDING

As an entitlement program, SSI is available to anyone who meets its eligibility requirements. Total SSI expenditures were about \$56 billion in 2019. More than \$9 of every \$10 pay for benefits; the rest covers administrative costs.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Since 2010, the Social Security Administration's operating budget has been severely constrained, even as its workloads and costs have grown substantially. SSA has been forced to make cuts

in customer service by closing field offices, shortening field office hours, and shrinking its staff. These steps have taken their toll, leading to long waits on the phone and in field offices and record-high disability backlogs. Congress reached a budget deal for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 to ease some of the budgetary pressure that led to the cuts, but the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bills do not increase the budget for SSA operations. The Senate bill would provide flat funding while the House bill would barely keep up with inflation, even as the agency faces rising workloads. If SSA does not receive adequate funding, the agency will be forced to freeze hiring, furlough employees, shutter more field offices, or further restrict field office hours, leading to yet longer wait times and backlogs.

As in past years, members of Congress may propose cuts to SSI's already meager benefits or propose modernizing the program's outdated eligibility criteria. However, with divided government, these proposals are unlikely to pass into law.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Advocates should urge Congress to increase the operating budget of the Social Security Administration (part of the Labor, Health and Human Services, and related agencies appropriations bill) in order to improve customer service for their clients. They should also oppose cuts to the program's crucial benefits.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities,
www.cbpp.org

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty,
www.nlchp.org

National Health Care for the Homeless Council,
www.nhchc.org

National Senior Citizens Law Center,
www.nsclc.org

SOAR, www.prainc.com/soar

Social Security Administration,
www.socialsecurity.gov

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

By Elizabeth Lower-Basch, Director, Income and Work Supports, Center for Law and Social Policy and Sharon McDonald, Director for Families and Youth, National Alliance to End Homelessness

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) is a federal block grant program that provides funds for states to assist low-income families. TANF was last reauthorized under the “Deficit Reduction Act of 2005.” The program was scheduled to be reauthorized in 2010. Congress has instead extended authorization for the program under existing statutes through periodic short-term extensions.

HISTORY AND PURPOSE

The “Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996” replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), an entitlement program established by the “Social Security Act of 1935”) with the TANF block grant. TANF is used by states to provide a wide range of benefits and services that promote the four purposes of TANF for low-income families with children.

The first purpose of the TANF program is to “provide assistance to needy families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives.” Other purposes include reducing dependence on cash assistance for low-income families with children by promoting work, job preparation, and marriage; preventing out-of-wedlock pregnancies; and promoting the formation and maintenance of two-parent families.

PROGRAM SUMMARY

TANF dollars are distributed to states based on what states received under AFDC and related programs from 1994 to 1996. States are required to provide their own funding toward meeting the purposes of the block grant; this is known as the

Maintenance of Effort (MOE). To meet the MOE requirement, states must maintain 75% to 80% of their historical spending on programs that benefit low-income families. The programs may be administered by the state- or county-level TANF agency.

Cash Assistance

Under AFDC, states provided monthly cash benefits to poor families with children, primarily single-parent families. All states have continued to operate such programs with their TANF funds, although cash assistance now accounts for only 22.7% of total TANF and MOE spending.

Eligibility criteria for TANF cash assistance and TANF-funded services are largely determined by the state or the county. Typically, households with children and very limited incomes are eligible for TANF cash assistance. However, in all the states and the District of Columbia, a family of three with earnings at nearly 11% or less of the federal poverty line, which is \$2,243, earns too much to qualify for TANF assistance. Also, to maintain eligibility, a family of three that makes 12% or less of FPL (\$2,522 or less) in the first seven months of receipt earns too much to keep assistance. States cannot use federal TANF resources to provide cash assistance to families for more than five years and many states have adopted shorter time limits. Legal resident immigrants cannot receive federally funded TANF assistance unless they have resided in the United States for more than five years. Still, states can choose to use state funds claimed as MOE to support families that don’t or no longer qualify for TANF assistance.

All states impose participation requirements in work-related activities on most adults who receive assistance. States have flexibility in determining whom to exempt and what activities to permit but must meet a federal work participation rate that only counts certain activities. Families that do not meet the required number of hours in work activities may be

sanctioned, which reduces or suspends the families' cash assistance grants. Most states will eventually fully sanction families that do not participate in work activities, meaning that those families lose the entire cash benefit.

TANF cash assistance is an important source of financial support for families without other sources of income. However, in all states, benefit levels are well below what families need to pay for housing. The average cash assistance benefit for a family of three leaves them with incomes below 30% of the poverty level. In 33 states and the District of Columbia, a family of three with no other income receives benefits at or below 30% of the federal poverty line. In 18 of those 33 states, families of three receive benefits at or below 20% of the poverty line, which is \$346. Families served by TANF programs have high rates of housing instability and homelessness, likely due to their very low incomes. The loss of TANF cash assistance due to sanctions or time limits can further increase the risk of housing instability and homelessness.

Nationally, during FY18, a monthly average of 1 million families received cash assistance under TANF; 52% of those families were “no-parent” or “child-only” cases, in which only children received assistance. Children may receive TANF child-only cases if they live with non-needy relative caregivers or if their parents are ineligible due to immigration status, receipt of SSI benefits, and in some states, sanctions or time limits.

In 1995, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) estimated that 84% of eligible families received assistance from AFDC. According to recent data, only 26.3% of eligible families receive assistance from the TANF program and some of the poorest families are not receiving assistance. Approximately 40% of families entering homeless shelters report income from TANF cash assistance. Poor families that are not receiving cash assistance include those that have been sanctioned because they have not complied with program requirements or they have reached their state's time limit. Families who have lost TANF cash assistance through sanctions are more likely than other

families to include a person with a disability that can hinder his or her ability to find or maintain employment.

Use of Funds

States have a great deal of flexibility in the use of TANF funds with few limitations as long as they are used to promote the four goals of TANF. In addition to cash assistance, common uses of TANF and MOE funds include childcare, work activities, refundable state earned income tax credits, and child-welfare related services.

Some states use TANF resources to help meet the short-term and crisis housing needs of low-income families, including eviction prevention assistance, security deposit and first month's rent, and short- or medium-term rental assistance (note that “short-term non-recurrent benefits” that last no longer than four months are not considered “assistance” under TANF and therefore do not trigger the TANF time limits or work participation requirements). In addition to providing rental assistance that can prevent or end homelessness, TANF resources are also used in states to support shelters and transitional housing programs serving families. In February 2013, HHS issued an Information Memorandum (ACF-2013-01) to TANF administrators outlining how states can use TANF resources to meet the housing needs of homeless families.

FUNDING

The TANF block grant provides \$16.5 billion annually to states. States are required to provide their own funding for the purposes of the block grant, known as the MOE. Because the block grant has not been increased to reflect inflation since TANF was first created, its value in real dollars has declined by 38%.

FORECAST FOR 2020

Although there were congressional discussions about TANF reauthorization in 2015 and 2018, TANF continues to be incrementally extended without full reauthorization.

State-level advocates should look for opportunities to preserve and expand financial

support to low-income families under the TANF program. Housing advocates should support state and local efforts to improve TANF for low-income families because a strong performing income and employment support program can help those families access and maintain housing in their community.

State advocates should also explore opportunities to use TANF resources to meet the housing needs of at-risk and homeless families. Advocates may use information outlined in the HHS Information Memorandum (ACF-2013-01) to educate welfare advocates and TANF administrators about opportunities to use TANF resources more effectively in helping families avoid or escape homelessness.

TIPS FOR LOCAL SUCCESS

Local homelessness and housing advocates should develop partnerships with state and local organizations advocating for improved TANF income and employment supports for low-income families. Through collaboration, housing and welfare advocacy organizations can propose solutions that meet the holistic needs of low-income families.

WHAT TO SAY TO LEGISLATORS

Local advocates should educate their congressional delegation about how TANF resources are being used to meet the needs of families in their state and the need for more funding for the TANF block grant.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 202-408-1080, www.cbpp.org

Center on Law and Social Policy, 202-906-8000, www.clasp.org

National Alliance to End Homelessness, 202-638-1526, <http://www.endhomelessness.org>

Funders Together to End Homelessness - Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Fails to Meet Basic Needs Interactive Map provides an interactive map outlining the benefit levels within each state and how they measure up against the fair market rent in that state: http://www.funderstogether.org/map_tanf_fails_to_meet_basic_needs

Chapter 10:

ABOUT NLIHC

Make a Difference: Ways to Engage with and Support the National Low Income Housing Coalition

BECOME A MEMBER OF THE COALITION

The best way to demonstrate commitment to ensuring that the lowest-income people in America have access to decent, affordable homes is to become a member of the Coalition. NLIHC's power to influence change is directly proportional to the active engagement of our members. NLIHC has been a membership organization since our earliest days and it is our large and involved membership that sets us apart.

Anyone can be an NLIHC member. Our membership base is broad and diverse, including low-income renters, professionals who work in the housing field, tenant associations, state and local housing advocacy organizations, community development corporations, housing authorities, and individuals who believe in NLIHC's mission and want to support our work. Our members care about a broad array of affordable housing issues, from accessibility and affordability for people with disabilities to the preservation of resources for homelessness prevention and affordable housing programs, veterans' housing, fair housing, community development, and more.

WHY OUR MEMBERS ARE CRUCIAL

The modest membership contributions from each individual and organization, when multiplied by our many hundreds of members, are important sources of revenue for NLIHC. Members provide invaluable feedback about the housing issues that low-income and homeless people face every day in cities, towns, and rural areas across the country. Most importantly, members are advocates—the people we count on to reach out to their networks, to their local elected officials, to local media, and to Members of Congress about the affordable housing needs

of low-income people. A geographically wide and sizeable membership base brings true power to NLIHC's advocacy efforts.

MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS

In addition to the satisfaction of knowing that you are supporting the most effective national organization working to expand affordable housing for extremely low-income individuals and families, NLIHC members receive:

- *Memo to Members and Partners*, NLIHC's acclaimed weekly newsletter on federal housing issues.
- Discounted rates to NLIHC's annual Housing Policy Forum and Leadership Awards Reception.
- Free or discounted access to our research publications like *Out of Reach: The High Cost of Housing* and *The Gap: A Shortage of Affordable Homes*, educational resources like the *Advocates' Guide*, frequent informational and capacity-building webinars, and tenant resources like the *Tenant Talk* publication.
- Consultations with NLIHC staff on how to most effectively use NLIHC research data.
- Periodic NLIHC Calls to Action and Updates alerting members to issues that need attention and action.
- Telephone resource referrals with links to state and regional networks.
- The opportunity to participate in NLIHC's policy-setting decisions.
- Resources and support for participation in such efforts as the NLIHC-led *Our Homes, Our Voices* National Housing Week of Action, *Our Homes, Our Votes* nonpartisan voter engagement project, the *Opportunity Starts at Home* multi-sector affordable housing

campaign, and the Disaster Housing Recovery Coalition, among many others.

BECOME A MEMBER TODAY

Joining NLIHC is easy. Our membership rates are flexible and tiered by member type. All rates are suggested—you can join at any contribution amount affordable to you. Join at: www.nlihc.org/membership.

You can also contact a housing advocacy organizer for assistance or to learn more about membership by emailing outreach@nlihc.org.

MAKE A DONATION TO NLIHC

NLIHC is unique in that its sole focus is the housing needs of extremely low-income people including those who are homeless. We represent no segment of the housing or affordable housing industry but instead work with and on behalf of low-income people and families. As a nonprofit organization that accepts no government funding of any kind, we rely on our partners to support us in our work for solutions to housing poverty and homelessness. Contributions to NLIHC directly support our research, education, organizing, policy analysis and advocacy, and regulatory efforts. The financial support we receive through donations is crucial to helping us achieve our mission.

WHAT CAN YOU DONATE TO NLIHC?

A contribution at any level makes a difference. You can support our work by making an end-of-year gift, a general contribution, or a donation in honor of our annual Housing Leadership Awards recipients. Your contributions are critical in helping NLIHC end housing poverty and homelessness in America. Individual donations to NLIHC are tax deductible.

YOUR SUPPORT MAKES A DIFFERENCE

The generosity of our donors makes it possible for NLIHC staff to produce and distribute our acclaimed weekly e-newsletter *Memo to Members and Partners*, conduct and publish important research like that presented in *Out of Reach* and *The Gap*, and produce valuable publications like *Tenant Talk* and the *Advocates' Guide*. Your contributions help subsidize low-income membership rates and scholarships to low-income residents who otherwise would not be able to attend our annual Policy Forum. It supports our efforts to build public and policy maker awareness about our nation's affordable housing crisis and for practical solutions; to work with Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle and with each Administration on policies to address homelessness and the lack of affordable housing; to conduct our annual Housing Policy Forum and Capitol Hill Day; to ensure the success of the national Housing Trust Fund and build support for increased funding to the program; to coordinate the annual *Our Homes, Our Voices* National Housing Week of Action and the *Our Homes, Our Votes* nonpartisan candidate and voter engagement project; to lead the *Opportunity Starts at Home* multi-sector affordable housing campaign; to work for equitable and comprehensive disaster housing recovery for those most in need; to ensure that fair housing laws are enforced; and to keep our members informed about the federal budget and appropriations, changing federal regulations, policy developments, and much more. Each contribution makes a powerful difference. Please donate to NLIHC today at www.nlihc.org/donate.

Contact the NLIHC Development Coordinator Catherine Reeves at creeves@nlihc.org for donation questions or assistance.

NLIHC Resources

In addition to the *Advocates' Guide*, NLIHC offers many other resources for advocates, policymakers, students, and others providing information on the most relevant housing and housing-related programs and issues. Here are ways to get the most out of your relationship with NLIHC.

FIELD

Your first point of contact at NLIHC is your Housing Advocacy Organizer. Housing Advocacy Organizers are NLIHC members' best direct resource for questions regarding federal policy or NLIHC membership. The organizers also mobilize advocates from NLIHC's field when there is a federal housing issue that needs attention. NLIHC's Housing Advocacy Organizers are assigned specific states. Find the contact information for your state's Housing Advocacy Organizer at <https://nlihc.org/state-partners> or e-mail outreach@nlihc.org.

Tenant Talk

Tenant Talk is NLIHC's periodic newsletter geared toward low-income renters and their allies. *Tenant Talk* provides NLIHC's low-income resident members and others with updates about the policies affecting them, ways to take action and get involved, tips for effective organizing, local tenant victories, and other resources. *Tenant Talk* is distributed through email and mail. To be added to the mailing list and to view past issues of *Tenant Talk*, visit www.nlihc.org/explore-issues/publications-research/tenant-talk.

Our Homes, Our Voices

Housing Advocacy Organizers work to support advocates throughout the country in planning and executing effective local events during the *Our Homes, Our Voices* National Housing Week of Action. The Week of Action is an effort for communities to join together to call for better federal budget support for affordable housing and community development programs. There were more than 120 local events put on by field

advocates in 2019. The dates for the upcoming *Our Homes, Our Voices* Week of Action in 2020 are May 2-12. More information can be found at www.ourhomes-ourvoices.org.

OUR HOMES, OUR VOTES: 2020

A non-partisan campaign to register, educate, and mobilize more low-income renters and affordable housing advocates to be involved in voting. Renters, especially low-income renters, are underrepresented among voters. To ensure low income housing interests are represented, it is critical that organizations engage these renters and other low-income people in the voting process. More information can be found at <https://www.ourhomes-ourvotes.org/>

POLICY

NLIHC's policy team tracks, analyzes, and advocates for NLIHC's policy priorities. The policy team updates fact sheets on NLIHC's policy initiatives and priority legislation on a monthly basis. NLIHC's policy priorities can be found at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/policy-priorities>.

NLIHC also convenes a Policy Advisory Committee, comprised of NLIHC members and members of the Board of Directors. The Policy Advisory Committee informs NLIHC's policy agenda. Committee information is available online at <https://nlihc.org/take-action/policy-engagement>.

RESEARCH

NLIHC's research team publishes research on housing-related topics throughout the year. Access the latest research and reports at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/publications-research/research>.

Out of Reach

NLIHC's annual research publication, *Out of Reach*, offers a side-by-side comparison of wages and rents for every county, metropolitan area [Metropolitan Statistical Area or HUD Metro

Fair Market Rent (FMR) Area], combined state nonmetropolitan area, and state in the United States. Advocates across the country use the data in this report to show the lack of housing affordability in their communities for low and minimum wage workers, and other low-income households. For each jurisdiction, the report calculates the Housing Wage, which is the hourly wage a full-time worker must earn to afford a rental home priced at the area's FMR, based on the generally accepted affordability standard of paying no more than 30% of income for housing costs. The Housing Wage is available for a range of apartment sizes. *Out of Reach* is available on NLIHC's website at www.nlihc.org/oor. The Housing Wage for metropolitan area ZIP codes is also available online.

The Gap

NLIHC's other annual research publication, *The Gap*, documents the shortage of housing for extremely low-income renter households. For the nation, each state, and the 50 largest metropolitan areas, this yearly report estimates the deficit/surplus of rental homes, cost burdens (households spending more than 30% of their income on housing), and severe cost burdens (households spending more than 50% of their income on housing) for extremely low-income, very low-income and low-income renter households. The report documents the number of additional affordable and available rental homes that are needed for the lowest-income renters. *The Gap* is available on NLIHC's website at <https://reports.nlihc.org/gap>.

State Housing Profiles

NLIHC's State Housing Profiles illustrate the housing needs of low-income renter households for each state in the country. The profiles include visual representations of housing affordability issues as well as key facts about housing in each state. The profiles can be found at <https://nlihc.org/housing-needs-by-state> by selecting the state and then clicking on the Resources tab.

Congressional District Housing Profiles

NLIHC's Congressional District Housing Profiles offer a snapshot of housing needs for each congressional district in the country. Each profile pulls data from a variety of sources and illuminates several dimensions of housing affordability for renter households in each district, the surrounding area, and the state. The profiles can be found at <https://nlihc.org/housing-needs-by-state> by selecting the state and then clicking on the Resources tab.

National Housing Preservation Database

NLIHC and the Public and Affordable Housing Research Corporation maintain an online database of nearly all federally assisted multifamily housing in the country. It includes information on properties subsidized by HUD, the USDA, and the Treasury Department. Advocates can use this database to get a clear picture of the subsidized stock of housing in their community and to identify properties that might be at risk of being lost from the affordable housing stock. The National Housing Preservation Database (NHPD) is the only de-duplicated, geo-coded, extractable, national inventory of federally subsidized properties which links all of a property's subsidies to its main address. The database can be found at www.preservationdatabase.org. Users can also access "Preservation Profiles" on the NHPD website, which provide national and state-level snapshots of preservation needs. The Preservation Profiles are available at <https://preservationdatabase.org/reports/preservation-profiles/>.

For more information on the database, visit www.preservationdatabase.org or email aaurand@nlihc.org or kstater@housingcenter.com.

CONTACT YOUR ELECTED OFFICIALS

To find contact information for your federal elected officials, visit www.govtrack.org, then enter your address in the search box. Access NLIHC's entire Legislative Action Center at www.nlihc.org/take-action.

NLIHC STATE COALITION PARTNERS

NLIHC maintains close ties with our State Coalition Partners, housing and homeless advocacy organizations who serve statewide or regional areas. To find a list of State Coalition Partners and for information on becoming a State Partner, visit www.nlihc.org/explore-issues/projects-campaigns/state-partner-project or email outreach@nlihc.org.

ANNUAL HOUSING POLICY FORUM

NLIHC hosts a forum every spring in Washington, DC. The forum offers federal housing policy plenary sessions and keynote speakers, as well as a Capitol Hill Day, during which advocates have the opportunity to meet with Members of Congress and their staff. For more information, visit www.nlihcforum.org.

NLIHC ON SOCIAL MEDIA

Facebook: Like NLIHC on Facebook and get instant updates on the latest housing news and information at <https://www.facebook.com/NLIHCDC/>.

Twitter: Follow @NLIHC on Twitter for daily updates at <https://twitter.com/NLIHC?lang=en>.

Instagram: Follow @nlihc on Instagram for quick snapshots of information at <https://www.instagram.com/nlihc/?hl=en>.

Blog: NLIHC's blog, *On the Home Front*, features news and analysis from our staff, guest posts from state and national partners, and opinions on the latest developments in housing policy. Join the discussion at www.hfront.org.

NLIHC State Coalition Partners

NLIHC's state coalition project seeks to improve and expand the capacity of state housing and homeless coalitions to advocate for change and promote effective solutions that will end the shortage of affordable and available rental homes in America. NLIHC convenes state partners at twice-yearly meetings in DC and monthly conferences where statewide advocates share new ideas, campaigns, and strategies with one another and stay current on information about efforts at the federal level.

NLIHC's 63 state coalition partners in 43 states and the District of Columbia are an integral part of the work we do. Our state partners are housing and homeless advocacy organizations serving statewide or regional areas and are the organizations with which we work most closely. Please become a member or an active advocate with the partner organizations where you live, as well as NLIHC, in order to strengthen state and national advocacy for more affordable housing.

Alabama

Low Income Housing Coalition of Alabama (c/o Collaborative Solutions)
205-939-0411
www.lihca.org

Alabama Arise
334-832-9060
www.alarise.org

Alaska

Alaska Coalition on Housing and Homelessness
907-523-0660
www.alaskahousing-homeless.org

Arizona

Arizona Housing Coalition
602-340-9393
<http://www.azhousingcoalition.org>

Arkansas

Arkansas Coalition of Housing and Neighborhood Growth for Empowerment
www.achange.org

Housing Arkansas
www.housingar.org
501-410-0113

California

California Coalition for Rural Housing
916-443-4448
www.calruralhousing.org

California Housing Partnership
415-433-6804
www.chpc.net

Housing California
916-447-0503
www.housingca.org

Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California
415-989-8160
www.nonprofithousing.org

Southern California Association of Non Profit Housing
213-480-1249
www.scanph.org

Colorado

Colorado Coalition for the Homeless
303-293-2217
www.coloradocoalition.org

Housing Colorado
303-863-0123
www.housingcolorado.org

Connecticut

Affordable Housing Alliance of Connecticut
860-563-2943
www.ahact.org

Delaware

Housing Alliance Delaware
302-678-2286
www.housingalliancedel.org

District of Columbia

Coalition for Nonprofit Housing & Economic Development
202-745-0902
www.cnhed.org

Florida

Florida Housing Coalition, Inc.
850-878-4219
www.flhousing.org

Georgia

Georgia Advancing Communities Together
404-586-0740
www.georgiaact.org

Hawaii**Hawai'i Appleseed Center for Law & Economic Justice**

808-587-7605
www.hiappleseed.org

Illinois

Housing Action Illinois
312-939-6074
www.housingactionil.org

Indiana

Prosperity Indiana
317-222-1221
www.prosperityindiana.org

Iowa

Iowa Housing Partnership

Kansas

Kansas Statewide Homeless Coalition
785-856-4960
www.kshomeless.com

Kentucky

Homeless and Housing Coalition of Kentucky
502-223-1834
www.hhck.org

Louisiana

HousingLOUISIANA
504-224-8300

Maine

Maine Affordable Housing Coalition
207-245-3341
www.mainehousingcoalition.org

Maryland

Maryland Affordable Housing Coalition
443-758-6270
www.mdahc.org

Massachusetts

Citizens' Housing and Planning Association
617-742-0820
www.chapa.org

Michigan

Community Economic Development Association
of Michigan
517-485-3588
www.cedamichigan.org

Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness
517-485-6536

www.mihomeless.org

Minnesota

Minnesota Coalition for the Homeless
651-645-7332
www.mnhomelesscoalition.org

Minnesota Housing Partnership
651-649-1710
www.mhponline.org

Missouri

Empower Missouri
573-634-2901
www.empowermissouri.org

Nebraska

Nebraska Housing Developers Association
402-435-0315
www.housingdevelopers.org

New Hampshire

Housing Action New Hampshire
603-828-5916
www.housingactionnh.org

New Jersey

Housing and Community Development Network
of New Jersey
609-393-3752
www.hcdnnj.org

New Mexico

New Mexico Coalition to End Homelessness
505-982-9000
www.nmceh.org

New York

Coalition for the Homeless
212-776-2000
www.coalitionforthehomeless.org

Neighborhood Preservation Coalition of New York
State
518-432-6757
www.npcnys.org

New York Housing Conference
646-923-8548
www.thenyh.org

New York State Rural Housing Coalition
518-458-8696
www.ruralhousing.org

Supportive Housing Network of New York
646-619-9640
www.shnny.org

Tenants & Neighbors
212-608-4320
www.tandn.org

North Carolina

North Carolina Coalition to End Homelessness
919-755-4393
www.ncceh.org

North Carolina Housing Coalition
919-881-0707
www.nchousing.org

North Dakota

North Dakota Coalition for Homeless People

Ohio

Coalition on Homelessness and Housing in Ohio
614-280-1984
www.cohhio.org

Oklahoma

Oklahoma Coalition for Affordable Housing
405-418-6224
www.affordablehousingcoalition.org

Oregon

Oregon Housing Alliance
503-226-3001
www.oregonhousingalliance.org

Housing Oregon
503-475-6056
www.housingoregon.org

Pennsylvania

Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania
215-576-7044
www.housingalliancepa.org

Rhode Island

Housing Network of Rhode Island
401-721-5680
www.housingnetworkri.org

Rhode Island Coalition for the Homeless
401-721-5685
www.rhomeless.org

South Carolina

Affordable Housing Coalition of South Carolina
803-808-2980
www.affordablehousingsc.org

Texas

Texas Association of Community Development
Corporations
512-916-0508
www.tacdc.org

Texas Homeless Network
512-482-8270
www.thn.org

Texas Housers (Texas Low Income Housing
Information Service)
512-477-8910
www.texasousers.net

Utah

Utah Housing Coalition
801-364-0077
www.utahhousing.org

Vermont

Vermont Affordable Housing Coalition
802-660-9484
www.vtaffordablehousing.org

Virginia

Virginia Housing Alliance
www.vahousingalliance.org

Washington

Washington Low Income Housing Alliance
206-442-9455
www.wliha.org

West Virginia

West Virginia Coalition to End Homelessness
304-842-9522
www.wvceh.org

Wisconsin

Wisconsin Partnership for Housing Development,
Inc.
608-258-5560
www.wphd.org

Appendix

List of Abbreviated Statutory References

Section 3, “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968,” 12 U.S.C. 1701u, economic opportunities for low- and very low-income persons.

Section 8, “United States Housing Act of 1937,” 42 U.S.C. 1437f, low-income rental housing assistance.

Section 9, “United States Housing Act of 1937,” 42 U.S.C. 1437g, funding for public housing.

Section 18, “United States Housing Act of 1937,” 42 U.S.C. 1437p, demolition and disposition of public housing.

Section 42, Internal Revenue Code of 1986, 26 U.S.C. 42, low-income housing tax credit.

Section 104(d), Title I, “Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,” 42 U.S.C. 5304(d), anti-displacement provisions for Community Development Block Grants (CDBGs) and Home Investment Partnerships.

Section 108, “Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,” 42 U.S.C. 5308, CDBG loan guarantees.

Section 202, “Housing Act of 1959,” 12 U.S.C. 1701q, elderly and handicapped housing.

Section 203, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1709, single-family mortgage insurance.

Section 203k, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1709(k), single-family mortgage insurance for rehabilitation.

Section 207, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1713, multifamily mortgage insurance.

Section 221, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715, multifamily mortgage insurance.

Section 221(d)(3), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715(d)(3), below-market interest rate rental housing mortgage insurance.

Section 221(d)(4), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715(d)(4), mortgage insurance refinancing.

Section 221(g)(4), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715(g)(4), assignment of mortgages to HUD.

Section 223(a)(7), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715n(a)(7), insurance for refinancing.

Section 223(d), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715n(d), insurance for multifamily operating loss loans.

Section 223(f), “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715n(f), mortgage insurance for multifamily refinancing.

Section 231, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715v, mortgage insurance for elderly and handicapped rental housing.

Section 235, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715z, home mortgage interest reduction payments.

Section 236, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715z-1, rental and cooperative housing interest reduction payments.

Section 241, “National Housing Act,” 12 U.S.C. 1715z-6, multifamily supplemental loans.

Section 502, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1472, rural, direct, and guaranteed single-family housing loans.

Section 504, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1474, rural, very low-income home repair loans and grants.

Section 504, “Rehabilitation Act of 1973,” 29 U.S.C. 794, prohibits disability discrimination, requires accessibility standards.

Section 514, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1484, farm labor housing loans.

Section 515, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1485, rural rental and cooperative housing.

Section 516, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1486, farm labor housing grants.

Section 521, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1490a, rural rental assistance.

Section 533, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1490m, rural housing preservation grants.

Section 538, “Housing Act of 1949,” 42 U.S.C. 1490p-2, guaranteed rural rental housing loans.

Section 811, “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act,” 42 U.S.C. 8013, supportive housing for persons with disabilities.

Title V, “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act,” 42 U.S.C. 11411-11412, excess federal properties available to assist the homeless.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

HUD’s list of programs frequently identified by statute: <https://www.hud.gov/sites/dfiles/Main/documents/HUDPrograms2017.pdf>.

Selected List of Major Housing and Housing-Related Laws

- “Age Discrimination Act of 1975,” P.L. 101-336.
- “AIDS Housing Opportunity Act” (Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS), title VIII, subtitle D of the “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act,” P.L. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079.
- “Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990,” P.L. 110-325.
- “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009,” P.L. 111-5, 123 Stat. 115.
- “Civil Rights Act of 1964,” P.L. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241.
- “Fair Housing Act,” title VIII, “Civil Rights Act of 1968,” P.L. 90-284, 82 Stat. 81.
- “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act,” P.L. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079.
- “Department of Housing and Urban Development Act,” P.L. 89-117, 79 Stat. 667.
- “Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010,” P.L. 111-203, 124 Stat. 1376.
- “Emergency Low-Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987” (ELIHPA), P.L. 100-242, 101 Stat. 1877.
- “Frank Melville Supportive Housing Investment Act of 2010,” P.L. 111-374.
- “HOME Investment Partnerships Act,” title II, “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act,” P.L. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079.
- “Home Mortgage Disclosure Act,” P.L. 94-200, 89 Stat. 1125.
- “Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act of 2009,” Division B.
- “Helping Families Save Their Homes Act of 2009,” P.L. 111-222, 123 Stat. 1633.
- “Housing Act of 1949,” P.L. 81-171, 63 Stat. 413.
- “Housing Act of 1959,” P.L. 86-372, 73 Stat. 654.
- “Housing and Community Development Act of 1974,” P.L. 93-383, 88 Stat. 633.
- “Housing and Community Development Act of 1987,” P.L. 100-242, 101 Stat. 1815.
- “Housing and Community Development Act of 1992,” P.L. 102-550, 106 Stat. 3672.
- “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008,” P.L. 110-289, 122 Stat. 2654.
- “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965,” P.L. 89-117, 79 Stat. 451.
- “Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968,” P.L. 90-448, 82 Stat. 476.
- “Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989,” P.L. 101-235, 103 Stat. 1987.
- “Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983,” P.L. 98-181, 97 Stat. 1153.
- “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2016,” P.L. 114-201, 130 Stat. 782.
- “Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act,” P.L. 91-695, 84 Stat. 2078.
- “Low Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990,” P.L. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4249.
- “Multifamily Assistance and Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997,” P.L. 105-65, 111 Stat. 1384.
- “Multifamily Housing Property Disposition Reform Act of 1994,” P.L. 103-233, 108 Stat. 342.
- “National Housing Act,” P.L. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246.
- National Housing Trust Fund, §1338 to the “Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992,” P.L. 102-550, as amended by §1131 of the “Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008,” P.L. 110-289, 122 Stat. 2654.
- “Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act,” Division A, title VII, “Helping Families Save Their Homes

Act of 2009,” P.L. 111-22, 123 Stat. 1633.

“Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998,” P.L. 105-276, 112 Stat. 2461.

“Rehabilitation Act of 1973,” P.L. 93-112, 87 Stat. 355.

Section 202 “Supportive Housing for the Elderly Act of 2010,” P.L. 111-372, 124 Stat. 4077.

“Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act,” P.L. 100-707, 102 Stat. 4689.

“Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act,” P.L. 100-77, 101 Stat. 482.

Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities, Section 811, “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act,” P.L. 101-625, 104 Stat. 4079.

“Uniform Relocation Act,” P.L. 91-644, 84 Stat. 1895.

“United States Housing Act of 1937,” P.L. 75-412, 50 Stat. 888.

“Violence Against Women Act,” P.L. 109-162, 119 Stat. 2960.

“Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013,” P.L. 113-4, 127 Stat. 54.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Key HUD Statutes: <https://www.hud.gov/hudprograms/keystatutes..>

Glossary

ADVANCE APPROPRIATION. Budget authority or appropriation that becomes available in one or more fiscal years after the fiscal year for which the appropriation was enacted. For example, an advance appropriation in the “FY19 Appropriations Act” would become available for programs in FY20 or beyond. The amount is not included in the budget totals of the year for which the appropriation act is enacted but rather in those for the fiscal year in which the amount will become available for obligation.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING. Housing that costs an owner or renter no more than 30% of household income.

AMORTIZE. Decrease an amount gradually or in installments, especially in order to write off an expenditure or liquidate a debt.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAM (AHP).

A program of the Federal Home Loan Bank system, AHP provides subsidized cash advances to member institutions to permit them to make below-market loans for eligible housing activities.

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENT FACTOR. The mechanism for adjusting rents in certain types of Section 8-assisted properties, including Section 8 New Construction/Substantial Rehab. HUD publishes annual percentage factors by unit type and region.

“ANTI-DEFICIENCY ACT.” A federal law forbidding federal employees from spending money or incurring obligations that have not been provided for in an appropriation.

APPROPRIATION. A provision of law providing budget authority that enables an agency to incur obligations and to make payments out of the U.S. Department of the Treasury for specified purposes. Non-entitlement programs are funded through annual appropriations.

AREA MEDIAN INCOME (AMI). The midpoint in the income distribution within a specific geographic area. By definition, 50% of households, families, or individuals earn less than the median income, and 50% earn more.

HUD calculates family AMI levels for different communities annually, with adjustments for family size. AMI is used to determine the eligibility of applicants for both federally and locally funded housing programs.

ASSISTED HOUSING. Housing where the monthly costs to the tenant are subsidized by federal or other programs.

AUTHORIZATION. Legislation that establishes or continues operation of a federal program or agency either indefinitely or for a specific period of time, or that sanctions a particular type of obligation or expenditure within a program.

BELOW MARKET INTEREST RATE (BMIR). See Section 221(d)(3) BMIR.

BLOCK GRANTS. Grants made by the federal government on a formula basis, usually to a state or local government.

BORROWING AUTHORITY. The authority to incur indebtedness for which the federal government is liable, which is granted in advance of the provision of appropriations to repay such debts. Borrowing authority may take the form of authority to borrow from the Treasury or authority to borrow from the public by means of the sale of federal agency obligations. Borrowing authority is not an appropriation since it provides a federal agency only with the authority to incur a debt, and not the authority to make payments from the Treasury under the debt. Appropriations are required to liquidate the borrowing authority.

BROOKE RULE. Federal housing policy that limits a tenant’s contribution to rent in public housing and under the Section 8 program to 30% of income. This amount is considered to be the maximum that one should have to pay for rent without becoming ‘burdened.’ The rule is based on an amendment sponsored by then Senator Edward Brooke (R-MA) to the public housing program in 1971. The original Brooke amendment limited tenant contributions to 25%. The limit was increased from 25% to 30% in 1981.

BUDGET AUTHORITY. The legal authority to enter into obligations that will result in immediate or future outlays of federal funds. Budget authority is provided in appropriations acts.

“BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT” (BEA). An expired 1990 act of Congress credited in part with creating a budget surplus by establishing limits on discretionary spending, maximum deficit amounts, pay-as-you-go rules for revenue and direct spending, new credit budgeting procedures, and other changes in budget practices. Congress has debated the re-establishment of pay-as-you-go rules and whether such rules should apply to both spending and taxation or only to spending.

BUDGET RESOLUTION. A concurrent resolution passed by both houses of Congress that does not require the signature of the president. The budget resolution sets forth various budget totals and functional allocations and may include reconciliation instructions to specific House or Senate committees.

COLONIAS. The rural, mostly unincorporated communities located in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas along the U.S.-Mexico border. *Colonias* are characterized by high poverty rates and substandard living conditions and are defined primarily by what they lack, such as potable drinking water, water and wastewater systems, paved streets, and standard mortgage financing.

COMMUNITY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (CHDO). A federally defined type of nonprofit housing provider that must receive a minimum of 15% of all federal HOME Investment Partnership Funds.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG). The annual formula grants administered by HUD that are distributed to states, cities with populations of 50,000 or more and counties with populations of 200,000 or more. CDBG funds are to be used for housing and community development activities, principally benefiting low- and moderate-income people. The CDBG program is authorized by Title I of the “Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.”

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS (CDCs). Nonprofit, community-based

organizations that work to revitalize the neighborhoods in which they are located by building and rehabilitating housing, providing services, developing community facilities, and promoting or undertaking economic development.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTION (CDFI). A specialized financial institution that works in market niches that have not been adequately served by traditional financial institutions. CDFIs provide a wide range of financial products and services, including mortgage financing, commercial loans, financing for community facilities, and financial services needed by low-income households. Some CDFIs also provide technical assistance. To be certified as a CDFI by the CDFI Fund of Treasury, an institution must engage in community development, serve a targeted population, provide financing, have community representatives on its board, and be a non-governmental organization.

“COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT ACT” (CRA). The act prohibits lending institutions from discriminating against low- and moderate-income and minority neighborhoods. CRA also imposes an affirmative obligation on banks to serve these communities. Banks must proactively assess community needs, conduct marketing and outreach campaigns in all communities, and consult with community stakeholders in developing financing options for affordable housing and economic development activities. CRA has formal mechanisms for banks and regulators to seriously consider community needs and input. Members of the community can comment at any time on a bank’s CRA performance in a formal or informal manner. When federal agencies conduct CRA examinations of banks’ lending, investing, and service activities in low- and moderate-income communities, federal agencies are required to consider the comments of members of the public concerning bank performance. Likewise, federal agencies are required to consider public comments when deciding whether to approve a bank’s application to merge or open and relocate branches.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE (CBO). An organization created by Congress that provides staff assistance to Congress on the federal budget.

CONSOLIDATED PLAN (ConPlan). The ConPlan merges into one process and one document all the planning and application requirements of four HUD block grants: Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships, Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA) grants.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION (CR). A spending bill that provides funds for government operations for a short period of time until Congress and the president agree on an appropriations bill.

CREDIT UNION. A nonprofit financial institution typically formed by employees of a company, labor union, or religious group and operated as a cooperative. Credit unions may offer a full range of financial services and pay higher rates on deposits and charge lower rates on loans than commercial banks. Federally chartered credit unions are regulated and insured by the National Credit Union Administration.

DISCRETIONARY SPENDING. Budget authority, other than for entitlements, and ensuing outlays provided in annual appropriations acts. The Budget Resolution sets limits or caps on discretionary budget authority and outlays.

earmarks. Appropriations that are dedicated for a specific, particular purpose. The funding of the Community Development Fund typically has earmarks as part of the Economic Development Initiative.

“EMERGENCY LOW-INCOME HOUSING PRESERVATION ACT” (ELIHPA). The 1987 statute authorizing the original federal program to preserve federally assisted multifamily housing. The program was active from 1987 to 1992.

ENHANCED VOUCHERS. The tenant-based Section 8 assistance provided to eligible residents when owners prepay their subsidized mortgages or opt out of project-based Section 8 contracts. Rents are set at market comparable levels, instead of the regular voucher payment standard, as long

as the tenant elects to remain in the housing.

ENTITLEMENT JURISDICTION. Under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), cities with populations of 50,000 or more and counties with populations of 200,000 or more are ‘entitled’ to receive funding under the program.

ENTITLEMENTS. Entitlements are benefits available to people if they meet a certain set of criteria. Entitlement programs, such as Social Security, are not constrained by the appropriations process.

EXIT TAX. The taxes paid on the recapture of depreciation and other deductions experienced upon sale of a property. In some affordable housing transactions, sellers may face a significant exit tax even when they do not receive net cash at sale.

EXPIRING USE RESTRICTIONS. The low- and moderate-income affordability requirements associated with subsidized mortgages under Section 221(d)3 BMIR and Section 236, which terminate when the mortgage is prepaid.

EXTREMELY LOW INCOME (ELI). A household income below 30% of area median income (AMI), as defined by HUD.

FAIR MARKET RENTS (FMR). HUD’s estimate of the actual market rent for a modest apartment in the conventional marketplace. FMRs include utility costs (except for telephones). Every year, HUD develops and publishes FMRs for every MSA and apartment type. FMRs are currently established at the 40th percentile rent, the top of the range that renters pay for 40% of the apartments being surveyed, with the exception of some high-cost jurisdictions, where it is set at the 50th percentile.

FANNIE MAE (FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION). A federally chartered government-sponsored enterprise that purchases mortgages from originators to facilitate new mortgage lending. Similar to Freddie Mac.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION (FmHA). The former name of the Rural Housing Service.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE

CORPORATION (FDIC). The federal agency established in 1933 that guarantees (within limits) funds on deposits in member banks and thrift institution, and that performs other functions such as making loans to or buying assets from member institutions to facilitate mergers or prevent failures.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION (FHA).

A part of HUD that insures lenders against loss on residential mortgages. It was founded in 1934 to execute the provisions of the “National Housing Act” in response to the Great Depression.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

(FHFA). Created in 2008 to take over the functions of the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) and the Federal Housing Finance Board (FHFB). OFHEO was the regulator for Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae, and the FHFB regulated the Federal Home Loan Banks.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD (FHFB).

Federal agency created by Congress in 1989 to assume oversight of the Federal Home Loan Bank System from the dismantled Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The FHFB was merged into the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) in 2008. The FHFA also regulates Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD (FRB). The governing board of the Federal Reserve System. Its seven members are appointed by the president, subject to Senate confirmation, and serve 14-year terms. The board establishes Federal Reserve System policies on such key matters as reserve requirements and other bank regulations, sets the discount rates, and tightens or loosens the availability of credit in the economy.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM. The system established by the “Federal Reserve Act of 1913” to regulate the U.S. monetary and banking systems. The Federal Reserve System (“the Fed”) consists of 12 regional Federal Reserve Banks, their 24 branches, and all national and state banks that are part of the system. National banks

are stockholders of the Federal Reserve Bank in their region. The Federal Reserve System’s main functions are to regulate the national money supply, set reserve requirements for member banks, supervise the printing of currency at the mint, act as clearinghouse for the transfer of funds throughout the banking system, and examine member banks’ compliance with Federal Reserve regulations.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTION. An institution that collects funds from the public to place in financial assets such as stocks, bonds, money market instruments, bank deposits, or loans. Depository institutions (banks, savings and loans, saving banks, credit unions) pay interest on deposits and invest the deposit money, mostly in loans. Non-depository institutions (insurance companies, pension plans) collect money by selling insurance policies or receiving employer contributions and pay it out for legitimate claims or for retirement benefits. Increasingly, many institutions are performing both depository and non-depository functions.

FISCAL YEAR (FY). The accounting period for the federal government. The fiscal year for the federal government begins on October 1 and ends the next September 30. It is designated by the calendar year in which it ends; for example, FY16 began on October 1, 2015, and ends on September 30, 2016.

FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY. A direct HUD loan or grant for rehabilitation or operating losses, available to eligible owners of certain HUD-subsidized properties. Owners must continue to operate the project as low- and moderate-income housing for the original mortgage term. Not currently active.

FORECLOSURE. The process by which a mortgage holder who has not made timely payments of principal and interest on a mortgage loses title to the home. The holder of the mortgage, whether it is a bank, a savings and loan, or an individual, uses the foreclosure process to satisfy the mortgage debt either by obtaining the proceeds from the sale of the property at foreclosure or taking the title to the property and selling it at a later date. Foreclosure

processes vary from state to state and can be either judicial or non-judicial.

FORMULA ALLOCATION. The method by which certain programs distribute appropriated funds to state and local governments. The parameters for the formula are established by statute and are generally based on demographics (poverty) and housing conditions (overcrowding) in the jurisdiction. CDBG and HOME are formula allocation programs.

FREDDIE MAC (FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION). A federally chartered government-sponsored enterprise that purchases mortgages from originators to facilitate new mortgage lending. Similar to Fannie Mae.

“FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT” (FOIA). The law providing for a means of public access to documents from HUD or other federal agencies.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE (GAO). Formerly known as the General Accounting Office, the GAO is a Congressional agency that monitors the programs and expenditures of the federal government.

GINNIE MAE (GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION). An agency of HUD, Ginnie Mae guarantees payment on mortgage-backed securities, which represent pools of residential mortgages insured or guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Veterans Administration, or the Rural Housing Service (RHS).

GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISE (GSE). An enterprise established by the federal government but privately owned and operated. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are GSEs, as are the Federal Home Loan Banks.

GUARANTEED LOAN. A loan in which a private lender is assured repayment by the federal government of part or all of the principal, interest, or both, in the event of a default by the borrower.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM (HOME). Administered by HUD’s Office of Community Planning and Development, this program provides formula grants to

states and localities (see also PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS) to fund a wide range of activities that build, buy, and/or rehabilitate affordable housing for rent or homeownership, or to provide direct rental assistance to low-income people. The HOME program is authorized by Title II of the 1990 “Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.”

“HOME MORTGAGE DISCLOSURE ACT” (HMDA). Created in 1975, HMDA requires most financial institutions that make mortgage loans, home improvement loans, or home refinance loans to collect and disclose information about their lending practices.

“HOMELESS EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE AND RAPID TRANSITION TO HOUSING (HEARTH) Act of 2009.” This law revises the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Grant programs and provides communities with new resources and better tools to prevent and end homelessness. The legislation increases priority on homeless families with children, significantly increases resources to prevent homelessness, provides incentives for developing permanent supportive housing, and creates new tools to address homelessness in rural areas.

HOUSING ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS (HAP). HAP is the payment made according to a HAP contract between HUD and an owner to provide Section 8 rental assistance. The term applies to both the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program and Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance Program. The local voucher program is administered by a public housing agency (PHA), whereas a Section 8 contract administrator makes payments in the Multifamily Housing Programs.

HOUSING BONDS. Bonds that are generally issued by states and secured by mortgages on homes or rental properties. Although homeowner housing financed by bonds are typically targeted to families or individuals with incomes below the median for the area or the state, rental housing is targeted to lower income families or individuals.

HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHERS (HCV). Also known as Section 8 or Section 8 vouchers, this

is a rental assistance program funded by HUD. The program helps some families, primarily extremely low-income (ELI) families, rent private housing. Families pay a percentage of their monthly adjusted income toward monthly rent and utilities (generally not more than 30%); the balance of the rent to the owner is paid with the federal subsidy.

HOUSING COSTS. Essentially, they are the costs of occupying housing. Calculated on a monthly basis, housing costs for renters include items such as contract rent, utilities, property insurance, and mobile home park fees. For homeowners, monthly housing costs include monthly payments for all mortgages or installment loans or contracts, as well as real estate taxes, property insurance, utilities, and homeowner association, cooperative, condominium, or manufactured housing park fees. Utilities include electricity, gas, fuels, water, sewage disposal, garbage, and trash collection.

HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY (HFA). The state agency responsible for allocating and administering federal Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) as well as other federal and state housing financing sources.

HOUSING STARTS. An indicator of residential construction activity, housing starts represent the start of construction of a house or apartment building, which means the digging of the foundation. Other measures of construction activity include housing permits, housing completions, and new home sales.

HOUSING TRUST FUNDS. Distinct funds, usually established by state or local governments that receive ongoing public revenues that can only be spent on affordable housing initiatives, including new construction, preservation of existing housing, emergency repairs, homeless shelters, and housing-related services.

HUD INSPECTOR GENERAL. The HUD official appointed by the president who is responsible for conducting audits and investigations of HUD's programs and operations.

INCLUSIONARY ZONING. A requirement or incentive to reserve a specific percentage of units

in new residential developments for moderate income households.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY. An agency of the United States government that is created by an act of Congress and is independent of the executive departments. The Securities and Exchange Commission is an example of an independent agency.

LEVERAGING. The maximization of the effects of federal assistance for a project by obtaining additional project funding from non-federal sources.

“LOW-INCOME HOUSING PRESERVATION AND RESIDENT HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT” (LIHPRHA). The 1990 statute prohibiting the sale of older HUD-assisted properties for market rate use, compensating the owners with financial incentives. The program was active from 1990 to 1996.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDITS (LIHTC). Enacted by Congress in 1986 to provide the private market with an incentive to invest in affordable rental housing. Federal housing tax credits are awarded to developers of qualified projects. Developers then sell these credits to investors to raise capital (equity) for their projects, which reduces the debt that the developer would otherwise have to borrow. Because the debt is lower, a tax credit property can in turn offer lower, more affordable rents. Provided the property maintains compliance with the program requirements, investors receive a dollar-for-dollar credit against their federal tax liability each year throughout a period of 10 years. The amount of the annual credit is based on the amount invested in the affordable housing.

LOW INCOME. As applied to most housing programs, household income below 80% of metropolitan area median, as defined by HUD, is classified as low income. See also EXTREMELY LOW INCOME (ELI), VERY LOW INCOME (VLI).

MARK-TO-MARKET. HUD program that reduces above-market rents to market levels at certain HUD-insured properties that have project-based Section 8 contracts. Existing debt is restructured so that the property may continue to

be financially viable with the reduced Section 8 rents.

MARK-UP-TO-MARKET. A federal program to adjust rents on Section 8 assisted housing up to the market rate.

METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREA (MSA). The basic census unit for defining urban areas and rental markets.

MORTGAGE INTEREST DEDUCTION. The federal tax deduction for mortgage interest paid in a taxable year. Interest on a mortgage to acquire, construct, or substantially improve a residence is deductible for indebtedness of up to \$1 million.

MORTGAGE. The debt instrument by which the borrower (mortgagor) gives the lender (mortgagee) a lien on the property as security for the repayment of a loan. The borrower has use of the property, and the lien is removed when the obligation is fully paid.

MOVING TO WORK (MTW). A demonstration program for public housing agencies (PHAs) that provides them with enormous flexibility from most HUD statutory and regulatory requirements. The flexibilities, regarding key programmatic features such as rent affordability and income targeting requirements, can impact residents in both the public housing and Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Programs. Authorized in 1996, the demonstration program continues even though it has not been evaluated on a broad scale.

“MULTIFAMILY ASSISTED HOUSING REFORM AND AFFORDABILITY ACT” (MAHRA). The 1997 statute authorizing the Mark-to-Market program and renewals of expiring Section 8 contracts.

MULTIFAMILY. A building with five or more residential units.

NON-ELDERLY DISABLED (NED) VOUCHERS. Since 1997, Housing Choice Vouchers (HCVs) have been awarded under different special purpose voucher program types to serve non-elderly persons with disabilities (NED). NED HCVs enable non-elderly disabled families to lease affordable private housing of their choice. NED

vouchers also assist persons with disabilities who often face difficulties in locating suitable and accessible housing on the private market.

NEW CONSTRUCTION/SUBSTANTIAL REHAB. A form of project-based Section 8 assistance used in the original development and financing of some multifamily housing. Projects could be both insured and uninsured (with conventional or state/local bond financing). These contracts were long-term (20-40 years). Active from 1976 to 1985.

NOTICE OF FUNDING AVAILABILITY (NOFA). A notice by a federal agency, including HUD, used to inform potential applicants that program funding is available.

OFFICE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING PRESERVATION. Formerly the Office of Multifamily Housing Assistance Restructuring (OMHAR), HUD established this office to oversee the continuation of the Mark-to-Market program and provide assistance in the oversight and preservation of a wide spectrum of affordable housing programs.

OUTLAYS. Payments made (usually through the issuance of checks or disbursement of cash) to liquidate obligations. Outlays during a fiscal year (FY) may be for payment of obligations incurred in the previous year or in the same year.

PARTICIPATING JURISDICTION (PJ). A HUD-recognized entity that is an eligible recipient of HOME funding.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO or PAYGO. A requirement that Congress offset the costs of tax cuts or increases in entitlement spending with increased revenue or savings elsewhere in the budget.

PAYMENT STANDARD. Payment standards are used to calculate the housing assistance payment (HAP) that a public housing agency (PHA) pays to an owner on behalf of a family leasing a unit. Each PHA has latitude in establishing its schedule of payment standard amounts by bedroom size. The range of possible payment standard amounts is based on HUD's published fair market rent (FMR) for the area in which the PHA has jurisdiction. A PHA may set its payment standard

amounts from 90% to 110% of the published FMRs and may set them higher or lower with HUD approval.

PERFORMANCE FUNDING SYSTEM. Developed by HUD to analyze costs of operating public housing developments, used as the basis for calculating the need for operating subsidies.

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING. Decent, safe, and affordable permanent community-based housing targeted to vulnerable very low-income (VLI) households with serious and long term disabilities that is linked with an array of voluntary and flexible services to support successful tenancies.

PREPAYMENT PENALTY. A fee that may be levied for repayment of a loan before it falls due.

PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS (PBVs). A component of a public housing agency's (PHAs) housing choice voucher program. A PHA can attach up to 20% of its voucher assistance to specific housing units if the owner agrees to either rehabilitate or construct the units, or the owner agrees to set-aside a portion of the units in an existing development for lower income families. In general, no more than 25% of the units in a property can be subsidized with PBVs.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION (RAD). Congress authorized RAD as part of its FY12 and FY15 HUD appropriations bills. There are two RAD components. The first component allows HUD to approve the conversion of up to 185,000 public housing and moderate rehabilitation (Mod Rehab) units into either project-based Section 8 rental assistance (PBRA) contracts or project-based vouchers (PBVs) by September 30, 2018. The second component allows an unlimited number of units in three smaller programs administered by HUD's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs to convert tenant protection vouchers to PBVs or PBRAs. There is no deadline for the three second component programs – Rent Supplement (Rent Supp), Rental Assistance Program (RAP), and Mod Rehab.

REAL ESTATE ASSESSMENT CENTER (REAC). The office within HUD responsible for assessing

the condition of HUD's portfolio, both public housing and private, HUD-assisted multifamily housing. REAC oversees physical inspections and analysis of the financial soundness of all HUD housing, and REAC scores reflect physical and financial condition.

REAL ESTATE INVESTMENT TRUST (REIT).

A business trust or corporation that combines the capital of many investors to acquire or finance real estate, which may include assisted housing. Cash flow generated by the properties is distributed to investors in the form of stock dividends. The REIT can also provide an attractive tax deferral mechanism by enabling investors to exchange their partnership shares for interests in the REIT, a nontaxable transfer.

"REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT" (RESPA). A statute that prohibits kickbacks and referral fees that unnecessarily increase the costs of certain settlement services in connection with real estate transactions and provides for disclosures in connection with such transactions. HUD enforces RESPA.

RECONCILIATION BILL. A bill containing changes in law recommended by House or Senate committees pursuant to reconciliation instructions in a budget resolution.

RENT SUPPLEMENT (Rent Supp). An older HUD project-based rental subsidy program used for some Section 221(d)(3) and Section 236 properties. The subsidy contract is coterminous with the mortgage. Most rent supplement contracts in HUD-insured projects were converted to Section 8 in the 1970s.

RESIDUAL RECEIPTS. Cash accounts maintained under joint control of the owner and HUD [or Housing Finance Agency (HFA)] into which is deposited all surplus cash generated in excess of the allowable limited dividend or profit. The disposition of residual receipts at the end of the Section 8 contract and/or mortgage is governed by the Regulatory Agreement.

RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL. The right of first refusal means the right to match the terms and conditions of a third-party offer to purchase a property, within a specified time period.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT (RD). A mission area of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), RD administers grant and loan programs to promote and support housing, public facilities and services such as water and sewer systems, health clinics, emergency service facilities, and electric and telephone service in rural communities. RD also promotes economic development by supporting loans to businesses and provides technical assistance to help agricultural producers and cooperatives.

RURAL HOUSING SERVICE (RHS). An agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Rural Development (RD), RHS is responsible for administering a number of rural housing and community facilities programs, such as providing loans and grants for single-family homes, apartments for low-income people, housing for farm workers, child care centers, fire and police stations, hospitals, libraries, nursing homes, and schools.

RURAL. As used in this Guide, areas that are not urbanized. The Census Bureau defines an urbanized area as "an incorporated place and adjacent densely settled (1.6 or more people per acre) surrounding area that together have a minimum population of 50,000." The Census Bureau defines rural as an area with a population of less than 2,500. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) definition of rural has several factors, including population: under 20,000 in non-metro areas, under 10,000 in metro areas, or under 35,000 if the area was at one time defined as rural but the populations has grown (a "grandfathered" area).

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION (S&L). A depository financial institution, federally or state chartered, that obtains the bulk of its deposits from consumers and holds the majority of its assets as home mortgage loans. In 1989, responding to a massive wave of insolvencies caused by mismanagement, corruption, and economic factors, Congress passed a savings and loan "bailout bill" that revamped the regulatory structure of the industry under a newly created agency, the Office of Thrift Supervision.

SAVINGS BANK. A depository financial institution that primarily accepts consumer deposits and makes home mortgage loans. Historically, savings banks were of the mutual (depositor-owned) form and chartered in only 16 states; the majority of savings banks were located in the New England states, New York, and New Jersey.

SECONDARY MARKET. The term secondary market refers to the market in which loans and other financial instruments are bought and sold. Fannie Mae (the Federal National Mortgage Association) and Freddie Mac (the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation), for example, operate in the secondary market because they do not deal directly with the borrower, but instead purchase loans from lenders.

SECTION 202. A HUD program created in 1959 to provide direct government loans or grants to nonprofits to develop housing for the elderly and handicapped. Currently, the program provides capital grants and project rental assistance contracts.

SECTION 221(d)(3) BELOW MARKET INTEREST RATES (BMIR). A HUD program under which the federal government provided direct loans at a BMIR (3%) and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage insurance to private developers of low and moderate-income housing. Active from 1963 to 1970.

SECTION 236. A program under which HUD provided interest subsidies (known as Interest Reduction Payments or IRP subsidies) and mortgage insurance to private developers of low- and moderate-income housing. The interest subsidy effectively reduced the interest rate on the loan to 1%. Active from 1968 to 1975.

SECTION 514 LOANS AND SECTION 516 GRANTS. Administered by USDA RD's Rural Housing Service (RHS) and may be used to buy, build, improve or repair housing for farm laborers. Authorized by the "Housing Act of 1949."

SECTION 515 RURAL RENTAL HOUSING PROGRAM. Provides funds for loans made by USDA RD's Rural Housing Service (RHS)

to nonprofit, for profit, cooperatives, and public entities for the construction of rental or cooperative housing in rural areas for families, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, or for congregate living facilities. Authorized by the “Housing Act of 1949.”

SECTION 533 HOUSING PRESERVATION

GRANT PROGRAM (HPG). This program, administered by USDA RD’s Rural Housing Service (RHS), provides grants to promote preservation of Section 515 properties. Authorized by the “Housing Act of 1949.”

SECTION 538 RENTAL HOUSING LOAN

GUARANTEES. U.S. Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) Rural Development (RD) Rural Housing Service (RHS) may guarantee loans made by private lenders for the development of affordable rural rental housing. This program serves a higher income population than that served by the Section 515 program. Authorized the “Housing Act of 1949.”

SECTION 8 PROJECT-BASED RENTAL

ASSISTANCE (PBRA). Administered by HUD’s Office of Multifamily Housing, Section 8 PBRA takes the form of a contract between HUD and building owners who agree to provide housing to eligible tenants in exchange for long-term subsidies. Project-Based Assistance limits tenant contributions to 30% of the household’s adjusted income. Assistance may be provided to some or all of the units in a project occupied by eligible tenants. Assistance is attached to the unit and stays with the unit after the tenant moves.

SECTION 8 PROJECT-BASED VOUCHERS

(PBV). Public housing agencies (PHAs) are allowed to use up to 20% of their housing choice voucher funding allocation to project base, or tie, vouchers to a property. PHAs may contract with property owners to project base vouchers to up to 25% of the units in a property. These vouchers remain with the project even if the assisted tenant moves. The effect is similar to the project-based section 8 program in that the place-based funding helps preserve the affordability of the units. One difference between the two programs is the mobility feature of the project-based voucher

program that allows a tenant to move with continued assistance in the form of a housing choice voucher. This program is administered by HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) and local PHAs.

SECTION 8 VOUCHERS. Administered by HUD’s Office of Public and Indian Housing (PIH) and local public housing agencies (PHAs), housing choice vouchers (HCVs) are allocated to individual households, providing a rent subsidy that generally limits tenant contribution to rent to 30% of adjusted household income. PHAs can attach a limited number of their housing choice vouchers to individual units, thereby ‘project basing’ them. See Section 8 project-based vouchers (PBVs).

SECTION 811. The Section 811 Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities is a federal program that assists the lowest income people with the most significant and long-term disabilities to live independently in the community by providing affordable housing linked with voluntary services and supports. The program provides funds to nonprofit organizations to develop rental housing, with supportive services, for very low-income (VLI) adults with disabilities, and it provides rent subsidies for the projects to help make them affordable. Two new approaches to creating integrated permanent supportive housing were recently introduced: the Modernized Capital Advance/Project Rental Assistance Contract (PRAC) multi-family option and the Project Rental Assistance (PRA) option. Both options require that properties receiving Section 811 assistance limit the total number of units with permanent supportive housing use restrictions to 25% or less. Congress directed that all FY12, FY13, and FY14 funding for new Section 811 units be provided solely through the PRA option.

SEVERE HOUSING PROBLEMS. As used by HUD in defining priorities, severe housing problems are homelessness, displacement, housing cost burden above 50% of income, and occupancy of housing with serious physical problems. Data on severe housing problems drawn from the American Housing Survey measures only cost burden and physical problems.

SINGLE-FAMILY. A single-family property is a residential property with fewer than five units.

“STAFFORD DISASTER RELIEF AND EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT” (STAFFORD ACT, P.L. 100-707). Provides a systemic means of supplying federal natural disaster assistance to state and local governments. The act establishes the presidential declaration process for major emergencies, provides for the implementation of disaster assistance, and sets forth the various disaster assistance programs.

“STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.” Enacted in July 1987, the “McKinney Act,” P.L. 100-77, established distinct assistance programs for the growing numbers of homeless persons. Recognizing the variety of causes of homelessness, the original “McKinney Act” authorized 20 programs offering a multitude of services, including emergency food and shelter, transitional and permanent housing, education, job training, mental health care, primary health care services, substance abuse treatment, and veterans’ assistance services. The act was renamed the “McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act” in 2000 to reflect the late Representative Bruce Vento’s (D-MN) work to improve housing for the poor and homeless. The act was revised in 2002 and again in 2009. See “Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009.”

TAX CREDIT. A provision of the tax code that specifies an amount by which a taxpayer’s taxes will be reduced in return for some specific behavior or action.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF). Provides block grants to states administered under the “Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996,” which established a new welfare system. The TANF block grant replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The chief feature of TANF was the abolition of a federal entitlement to cash assistance.

THRIFT. See SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION (S&L).

VERY LOW INCOME (VLI). A household with income is at or below 50% of area median income (AMI), as defined by HUD.

VOUCHER. A government payment to, or on behalf of, a household to be used solely to pay a portion of the household’s housing costs in the private market. Vouchers are considered tenant-based assistance because they are not typically connected to a particular property or unit (although they may be ‘project based’ in some cases) but are issued to a tenant.

WORST CASE HOUSING PROBLEMS.

Unsubsidized very low-income renter households with severe housing problems. HUD is required to submit a periodic report to Congress on worst case housing problems.

Advocates' Guide Authors

SONYA ACOSTA

Sonya is the policy analyst for NLIHC. She joined NLIHC in June 2018 as a Policy Analyst. Sonya previously worked at NLIHC as a policy intern while completing her graduate studies. She got her start in housing as an AmeriCorps VISTA coordinating outreach, marketing, and education initiatives for a fair housing organization in the Chicago suburbs. After completing two terms of AmeriCorps service, she conducted research and data analysis at Housing Choice Partners in Chicago, an organization dedicated to promoting racial and economic diversity in the region. Sonya grew up in Las Cruces, New Mexico and calls the San Francisco Bay Area her second home. She earned a BA in History and International Studies from the University of New Mexico and a MS in Public Policy & Management from Carnegie Mellon University.

MICHAEL ANDERSON

Michael Anderson is the Director of the Community Change's Housing Trust Fund Project. For more than three decades, the Project has operated as a clearinghouse of information on housing trust funds throughout the country, providing technical and strategic assistance to organizations and agencies working to create or implement these funds.

Based in Portland, Oregon, Michael provides technical assistance and support to state and local coalitions working to establish and strengthen housing trust funds that dedicate public revenue to creating and preserving affordable housing for people with the lowest incomes.

ANDREW AURAND

Andrew Aurand joined NLIHC in July 2015 as Vice President for Research. Andrew has extensive experience in research and affordable housing. He previously served as a faculty member in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Florida State University, where he taught graduate courses in research methods and housing

policy, and where he completed research on the impact of comprehensive planning and land use principles on the supply of affordable housing for low income households. Andrew received his PhD and MSW from the University of Pittsburgh.

OLIVIA BARROW

Olivia Barrow is a policy analyst at Enterprise Community Partners, where she helps lead the organization's tax credit advocacy efforts. Her focus includes federal policy advocacy related to the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (Housing Credit), New Markets Tax Credit, Opportunity Zones tax incentive and Community Reinvestment Act. Olivia also helps manage the ACTION Campaign, a national coalition of over 2,200 organizations supporting the Housing Credit, which Enterprise co-chairs.

Olivia earned both a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from the George Washington University.

TRISTIA BAUMAN

Tristia Bauman combines litigation, legal education, and legislative advocacy strategies to prevent and end homelessness. Her work focuses on combating the criminalization of homelessness and advocating for laws that protect the civil and human rights of homeless people. Tristia also conducts legal trainings around the country, writes reports and other publications related to housing, and serves as a legal resource for homeless advocates.

Tristia began her law career at Legal Services of Greater Miami, Inc. as a housing attorney working with low-income tenants in federally subsidized housing. She later served for several years as an Assistant Public Defender in Miami-Dade County.

RUSTY BENNETT

Dr. Russell Bennett, LGSW PhD, serves as the Chief Executive Officer of Collaborative Solutions, Inc. (CS), with an administrative office in Birmingham, Alabama, providing

organizational management and program implementation services. Dr. Bennett currently serves as the Executive Director of the National AIDS Housing Coalition and Executive Director of the Professional Association of Social Workers in HIV & AIDS since the appointment of Collaborative Solutions as those organizations' management agent providing both administrative and program services. As CEO and founding director of CS, Bennett has developed CS as a leader in the delivery of a comprehensive array of services for nonprofit, state, and local government organizations serving the housing and health needs of vulnerable populations. CS is a designated technical assistance (TA) provider for HUD providing national TA in the areas of HIV/AIDS housing, homelessness, health, and behavioral health among populations and in areas that are especially hard to serve. In addition to his national TA work, Dr. Bennett oversees CS's Rural Supportive Housing Initiative and national initiatives integrating housing and health. Dr. Bennett directs CS' research and evaluation efforts with an emphasis in program evaluation, community- and individual- social determinants of health, special needs housing, rural and macro social work practice. Dr. Bennett is an adjunct faculty member with the University of Alabama School of Social Work, teaching in the areas of social work research, program evaluation, and nonprofit management. With nearly 20 years of experience working with issues related to homelessness, housing, and health for vulnerable populations, he has experience in working with nonprofit organizations and the federal government. In his role with the federal government, first as a President Management Intern and as a career employee, he worked at HUD's Office of HIV/AIDS Housing, which administers the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program that provides more than \$330 million in funding to local communities. Dr. Bennett received his doctorate from the University of Alabama's School of Social Work in 2009.

SARAH BRUNDAGE

Sarah Brundage is the senior director of public policy at Enterprise, where she leads the organization's tax policy and fair housing advocacy. Sarah previously served as Enterprise's state and local policy director in San Francisco, where she led the organization's policy work at the state level and in the Bay Area. Sarah joined Enterprise with policy and research experience covering affordable housing, segregation, community development, and finance topics. Originally from the Washington, D.C. area, Sarah previously worked for the National Low-Income Housing Coalition and spent time with the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance. Sarah holds a master's degree in public policy from the University of California, Berkeley and a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Florida.

ROXY CAINES

Roxy Caines leads Earned Income Tax Credit outreach efforts as the Get It Back Campaign Director for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington-based nonprofit organization that conducts research and policy analysis on issues that impact lower-income Americans. The Center has spearheaded a national public education campaign on tax credits for lower-income workers each year since 1989. Roxy helps local agencies and community groups across the country to organize outreach efforts and promote free tax filing assistance programs.

MICHAEL CALHOUN

Mike Calhoun is president of the Center for Responsible Lending (CRL), the policy affiliate of Self-Help, the nation's largest community development lender. He considers himself "fortunate to work with an extraordinarily talented staff and a dedicated coalition of organizations fighting to provide economic opportunity and advancement for low- and moderate-income families and families of color."

For more than 30 years, Mike has been on the front lines of working for economic justice.

At CRL, he provides management and policy leadership. Based in DC, he often testifies in Congress and appears frequently in national media as an expert on financial issues. Prior to joining CRL in 2002, Mike led several lending divisions at Self-Help, providing responsible consumer loans, mortgages and small business loans, and heading an innovative program to provide national capital for affordable home loans. He has represented families to secure civil rights and consumer protections, including working for ten years as a legal aid attorney. He is a former member and chair of the Federal Reserve Consumer Advisory Committee.

Mike received his BA degree in economics from Duke University, and his JD degree from the University of North Carolina.

DAVID COOPER

David Cooper is a Senior Analyst with the Economic Policy Institute and the Deputy Director of the Economic Analysis and Research Network (EARN) in Washington, DC. He conducts national and state-level research, with a focus on the minimum wage, wage theft, employment and unemployment, poverty, and wage and income trends. He also coordinates and provides support to EARN, a national network of more than 60 state level policy research and advocacy organizations.

David's research on the minimum wage has been used by policymakers in city halls and statehouses across the country, as well as in Congress and the White House. He has testified in many states and cities on the challenges facing low-wage workers and low-income families. David has been interviewed and cited by numerous local and national media, including *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and NPR. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and Government from Georgetown University, and a Master of Public Policy degree from the McCourt School of Public Policy at Georgetown University.

LINDA COUCH

Linda is the Vice President, Housing Policy for LeadingAge, an organization of more than

6,000 nonprofits representing the entire field of aging services. Linda focuses her work on expanding and preserving affordable housing options for very low income seniors. After 12 years with the National Low Income Housing Coalition, Linda rejoined LeadingAge in 2016 to identify and advocate for solutions to America's aging population, which is rapidly growing and becoming poorer. Linda has testified before House and Senate committees and has a special interest in the federal budget and appropriations processes. Linda received her undergraduate degree in philosophy from the George Washington University and a Masters of Public Affairs from the University of Connecticut.

CHANDRA CRAWFORD

Chandra Crawford is a Program and Policy Analyst, with a focus on health care, substance abuse, aging and racial disparities. Prior to joining the Alliance, she worked at Gilead Sciences and developed an evidence-based HIV screening initiative in two southern states heavily impacted by the epidemic. Chandra also served as the Policy Director at UNITY of Greater New Orleans, the HUD designated Continuum of Care, where she successfully led an initiative to secure 3,000 permanent supportive housing vouchers from Congress for poor and disabled residents in the state of Louisiana. In this role, she was also instrumental in the creation of a statewide office designated to coordinate homeless services and the re-establishment of the Louisiana Interagency Council on Homelessness. Chandra is proud to note that her first legislative victory was the enactment of a five-year pilot needle exchange program in the state of Delaware, while she was the Policy Coordinator at the Delaware HIV Consortium. Chandra earned her Ph.D. in public policy from Purdue University.

JAMIE L. CROOK

Jamie is a Senior Staff Attorney for the ACLU Foundation of Northern California, where she litigates impact cases in a range of areas, including racial and economic justice, criminal justice, and immigrants' rights. Jamie was previously an attorney at Relman, Dane & Colfax,

where she practiced civil rights litigation with an emphasis on housing, lending, and employment discrimination. Ms. Crook's better-known cases include *Central Alabama Fair Housing Center v. Magee*, 835 F. Supp. 2d 1165 (M.D. Ala. 2011) and *Anderson Group LLC v. City of Saratoga Springs*, 805 F.3d 34 (2d Cir. 2015). Following her graduation from Berkeley Law School, Jamie clerked for the Honorable Richard A. Paez, Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and completed a fellowship with Altshuler Berzon LLP and the Natural Resources Defense Counsel in San Francisco. She also served as counsel for the Fair Housing and Community Development Project at the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. Her publications include "From *Hernandez v. Texas* to the Present: Doctrinal Shifts in the Supreme Court's Latina/o Jurisprudence," 11 *Harvard Latino Law Review* 19 (2008); "Assessing HUD's Disparate Impact Rule: A Practitioner's Perspective," 49 *Harv. Civil Rights-Civil Liberties L. Rev.* 155 (2014) (co-authored with Michael Allen and John Relman); and "More Than Just Race: Proliferation of Protected Groups and the Increasing Influence of the Act," *Fight for Fair Housing: Causes, Consequences and Future Implications of the 1968 Federal Fair Housing Act* (ed. Squires 2018) (co-authored with Michael Allen).

DAN EMMANUEL

Dan Emmanuel joined the NLIHC staff in November 2013. Dan completed his Master of Social Work degree from Saint Louis University in May 2013 with a concentration in community and organization practice. Since 2008, he has worked in a range of housing and community development contexts involving program evaluation and community needs assessment. Prior to his role as Research Analyst, he served as a Senior Organizer for Housing Advocacy at the Coalition. Dan earned his B.A. in Philosophy and Psychology from the College of William & Mary.

WILL FISCHER

Will Fischer is a Senior Policy Analyst who joined the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities in 2002. His work focuses on federal low-income housing programs, including Section 8 vouchers,

public housing, and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit. This analytic work has been cited in numerous media publications.

Before coming to the Center, he held a position as an analyst at Berkeley Policy Associates, where he worked on evaluations of state TANF programs and several U.S. Department of Labor workforce development initiatives. Earlier, he worked on economic development and other issues at the International City/County Management Association.

Fischer holds a Bachelor of Art from Yale University and a Master's in Public Policy from UC Berkeley's Goldman School of Public Policy.

DEBBIE FOX

Debbie Fox, Senior Policy and Practice Specialist at the National Network Against Domestic Violence (NNEDV), leads national domestic violence related housing policy and provides technical assistance and training to NNEDV's coalition membership and as a part of the Domestic Violence Housing and Technical Assistance Consortium. Debbie has more than 20 years in the field with a focus on fundraising, organizational development, nonprofit administration, and domestic violence population-specific housing and economic justice programming. Prior to joining NNEDV, she shared community leadership in the systems planning and implementation process for the DV system in Portland, Oregon, working with all 13 domestic violence victim service providers to create a coordinated entry process for survivors to access housing, shelter, and eviction prevention and shelter diversion programs.

GLENN GALLO

Glenn is currently a Legislative and Policy Associate at the National Council of State Housing Finance Agencies. Since joining NCSHA in 2014, Glenn Gallo has held a variety of positions in the Policy and Government Affairs department, focusing on homeownership and affordable rural housing issues. Prior to joining NCSHA, Glenn was a Fellow at the Department of Veterans Affairs, helping prepare Department officials

for Congressional hearings in its Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs. He earned a bachelor's degree from the University of St. Andrews studying history and international relations.

LANCE GEORGE

Lance George is the Director of Research and Information at the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). Prior to becoming the HAC's Research Director, Lance served as the organization's Senior Research Associate for 10 years. Before HAC, Lance worked for Frontier Housing, Inc., a nonprofit organization that builds affordable homes for low-income families in Appalachian Eastern Kentucky. Lance's research and policy analysis at HAC encompasses a wide array of issues and topics related to affordable housing; including manufactured housing, poverty and high need rural areas, rural definitions and classifications, mortgage access and finance, and general demography, mapping, and data analysis of rural people and their housing conditions.

SARAH GOODWIN

Sarah Goodwin, Policy Analyst, joined National Center for Healthy Housing (NCHH) in June 2017. She previously served NCHH as a policy intern for a year, where she helped to establish and run Find It, Fix It, Fund It: A Lead Elimination Action Drive and all of its workgroups. She holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in Interdisciplinary Studies: Communications, Legal Institutions, Economics, and Government from American University.

ED GRAMLICH

Ed Gramlich has been at NLIHC since October 2005. For his first two years Ed, staffed the RegWatch Project, an endeavor to expand the Coalition's capacity to monitor federal regulatory and administrative actions, with a focus on preserving the affordable housing stock, both public and assisted. Between October 2007 and January 2010, he was the Director of Outreach. Since 2010 he has led NLIHC's efforts related to affordable housing regulations and has been

NLIHC's expert on regulations related to the national Housing Trust Fund and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. Prior to joining the staff of the Coalition, he worked for 26 years at the Center for Community Change (CCC), where his primary function was to provide technical assistance about CDBG to low income community-based groups. While at CCC, Ed also devoted considerable time to providing technical assistance to groups concerned about the negative impacts of UDAGs in their community.

MELISSA HARRIS

Melissa Harris serves as Government Affairs Manager for the American Association of Service Coordinators, which is celebrating 20 years of providing guidance, training and advocacy to its members. Melissa is responsible for the organization's legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts at the state and federal levels. She also promotes recommended standards of practice for service coordinators and provides technical assistance and training on service coordination fundamentals and policies. Melissa's Other priorities include voting initiatives and efforts to engage members in advocacy. She holds a journalism degree from Kent State University and worked as an Ohio Statehouse news reporter for several years before joining AASC.

JONATHAN HARWITZ

Jonathan Harwitz is the Managing Director Federal Policy and Government Affairs at the Low Income Investment Fund (LIIF). Located in the Washington, D.C. office, Harwitz is responsible for LIIF's efforts in advancing national legislation and programs in the field of poverty alleviation and community capital. Prior to joining LIIF, Harwitz served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Budget and Policy at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As a member of Secretary Shaun Donovan's senior team, Harwitz advised on the department's annual budget requests and major policy initiatives in the areas of homelessness, transforming the HUD-subsidized capital portfolio and neighborhood revitalization. Prior to joining HUD, Harwitz worked on the Majority staff for

two key Congressional Committees for Rep. Maxine Waters and Senator Patty Murray. Harwitz also previously held various positions for the Corporation for Supportive Housing, including Program Director for Federal Policy. Mr. Harwitz holds degrees from Yale and Harvard Law School.

GREG HETRICK

Greg Hettrick leads the Federal Home Loan Bank of Dallas Community Investment team that provides grants to fund gaps in the financial structure of affordable housing, community revitalization projects and small business transactions throughout the Bank's five-state District. FHLB Dallas awards competitive Affordable Housing Program (AHP) grants through member institutions annually to support the development of affordable housing. He also directs several other grant programs that are dedicated for first time homebuyers, owner occupied rehab, wounded warriors, small businesses, disaster rebuilding and community-based organizations. Greg is also responsible for the strategic direction, as well as the approval process, for of the Bank's three community investment advance programs.

Prior to joining the FHLB Dallas, Greg developed affordable housing with Bank of America Community Development Corporation (BACDC) where he acquired, redeveloped and delivered more than 2,700 affordable multifamily rental units and over 225 affordable single family homes. Greg earned both his bachelor's in finance and his masters of business administration degrees from the University of South Carolina.

ELLEN LURIE HOFFMAN

Ellen Lurie Hoffman joined the National Housing Trust in May 2014 as the Federal Policy Director. NHT is a national leader in preserving and improving affordable housing, ensuring that privately owned rental housing remains in our affordable housing stock and is sustainable over time. Ms. Lurie Hoffman is responsible for federal housing policy spanning the HUD Budget, maintaining and improving the Low- Income

Housing Tax Credit, energy efficiency investments, housing finance reform, and fair housing. She represents the Trust before congressional staff, federal officials, and other housing advocates and stakeholders. Ms. Lurie Hoffman facilitates the national Preservation Working Group, a coalition of over 40 nonprofit organizations dedicated to the preservation of affordable rental housing. She leads the Trust's "Where Will We Live?" campaign, a special effort to elevate housing issues at the federal, state, and local level by raising the voices of residents, developing new messaging, creating cross-sector partnerships, and identifying new champions. Ms. Lurie Hoffman also co-directs federal policy engagement within Energy Efficiency for All, a multi-state initiative that works to make multifamily housing healthy and affordable through energy and water efficiency.

Prior to joining the Trust, Ms. Lurie Hoffman worked for the National Council of State Housing Agencies (NCSHA) for nine years, where she analyzed and advocated for federal multifamily housing policy issues on behalf of the nation's state Housing Finance Agencies (HFAs). NCSHA is the leading national nonprofit organization created by state HFAs to coordinate and leverage their federal advocacy efforts for affordable housing. Ms. Lurie Hoffman led NCSHA's legislative campaign to advocate for congressional authorization of Ginnie Mae securitization within the FHA-HFA Risk-Sharing program. Ms. Lurie Hoffman has been engaged on the HUD budget, housing finance reform, HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD), and FHA and USDA multifamily programs. She also promoted a primary role for state agencies in the Section 8 Performance-Based Contract Administration (PBCA) program with HUD and Congress.

Ms. Lurie Hoffman holds a Master in Public Policy degree from Harvard University's John F. Kennedy School of Government and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science from Vassar College.

MELODY IMOH

Melody Imoh joined NHRC as its Policy and Program Director in 2018, bringing several years

of policy and legislative experience specialized in poverty, economic mobility and social inclusion. Prior to her role at NHRC, Melody has served as legislative staff on the state and local levels, and previously supported national and local programs and advocacy initiatives in Washington, DC for disadvantaged Americans, including communities of color. She was previously appointed to serve as a voting member on the Montgomery County Committee on Hate/Violence in Montgomery County, MD, to develop and distribute information about hate/violence, promote educational activities that highlighted ethnic and social diversity, and provide recommendations to reduce the incidences of acts of hate/violence in the county. Melody earned her B.A. in Political Science at the University of South Carolina.

DAVID JACOBS

Dr. David Jacobs is the Chief Scientist at the National Center for Healthy Housing. He also serves as Director of the US Collaborating Center for Research and Training on Housing Related Disease and Injury for the World Health Organization/Pan American Health Organization, an adjunct associate professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago School of Public Health, and a faculty associate at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. He is one of the nation's foremost authorities on childhood lead poisoning prevention and was principal author of the President's Task Force Report on the subject in 2000, and the Healthy Homes Report to Congress in 1999. He has testified before Congress and other legislative bodies and has many peer-reviewed publications. Dr. Jacobs is the former director of HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes, where he was responsible for program evaluations, grants, contracts, public education, enforcement, regulation, and policy related to lead and healthy homes. His current work includes research on asthma, international healthy housing guidelines, lead poisoning prevention, and green sustainable building design. He is a Certified Industrial Hygienist and has degrees in political science, environmental health, technology and science policy, and a

doctorate in environmental engineering.

KIMBERLY JOHNSON

Kimberly Johnson is a policy analyst at the National Low Income Housing Coalition, and is responsible for identifying, analyzing, and advocating for federal policy and regulatory activities related to NLIHC's policy priorities. Her work at the Coalition focuses on housing protections in the Violence Against Women Act, criminal justice reform, and evictions. Before joining NLIHC in 2019, Kimberly earned her master's degree in public policy from George Washington University. During her graduate program, she interned with Stewards of Affordable Housing for the Future and with the Senate Minority Health Committee. She also held a fellowship with the National Network to End Domestic Violence. Before graduate school, Kimberly resided in Harrisonburg, VA, working as an advocate for survivors of sexual and domestic violence. In 2014, she served on an advisory committee to the Obama Administration's White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. She received her B.S. in Psychology and M.A. in Psychological Sciences from James Madison University in Harrisonburg, VA.

PAUL KEALEY

Paul Kealey is the chief operating officer at the National Low Income Housing Coalition, leading the Coalition's planning and evaluation, financial and human resources management, resource development, field outreach and organizing, and communications. Prior to joining NLIHC as its COO in 2014, Mr. Kealey occupied a number of leadership positions, developing and directing programs and operations in international and domestic community development and affordable housing, human services, volunteer service, environmental conservation, and professional development and training. Paul served for 12 years as a senior vice president and division director for NeighborWorks America, overseeing its affordable housing and community development training programs (the NeighborWorks Training Institute), the Achieving Excellence leadership program with Harvard

University, the Success Measures enterprise, and other programs and services. He has also held leadership positions with the Corporation for National and Community Service/AmeriCorps VISTA, World Wildlife Fund, and Peace Corps. After serving as a Peace Corps volunteer with his wife in Guatemala in the 1980s, Mr. Kealey joined the Peace Corps staff as a chief of field operations in Washington, DC, deputy country director in Costa Rica and Paraguay, and country director in Paraguay. Paul earned an MA in Geography at the University of California, Davis, and a B.A. in International Relations at San Francisco State University. Paul is also a graduate of the Harvard University Kennedy School/NeighborWorks 18-month Achieving Excellence Program.

LAUREN BANKS KILLELEA

Lauren Banks Killelea is the Director of Public Policy at Collaborative Solutions and the National AIDS Housing Coalition. She leads the National AIDS Housing Coalition's federal policy and advocacy work focusing on the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program and other housing and healthcare initiatives. Lauren began working on housing issues with the homeless community on the Boston Common and subsequently spent time organizing around economic justice issues in Alabama and serving as Executive Director for a youth-based community service organization. Prior she was the Director of Policy and Advocacy for AIDS Alabama, working on federal, state, and local legislation, implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and advocacy around HOPWA modernization. She also currently serves as the co-chair of the Structural Interventions Working Group of the Federal AIDS Policy Partnership. She obtained her B.S. from the University of Alabama and her MFA from Vermont College of Fine Arts.

MIKE KOPROWSKI

Mike is the National Campaign Director of the *Opportunity Starts at Home* campaign. Mike comes to NLIHC from Dallas, TX where he most recently worked as the executive director of Opportunity Dallas, an organization focused on building local

coalitions to promote greater economic mobility by tackling concentrated poverty and segregation through housing policy. Prior to Opportunity Dallas, Mike was the chief of transformation and innovation in the Dallas school system, where he led the development and execution of the district's Public School Choice initiative focused on socioeconomic school integration. Prior to his career in education and housing, he served in the U.S. Air Force, where he was the chief of intelligence for an F-15E fighter squadron while it was deployed to Afghanistan. He holds degrees from the University of Notre Dame, Duke University, and Harvard University.

MARK KUDLOWITZ

Mark Kudlowitz is a Federal Policy Director at the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). At LISC, Mark advocates for federal policies which support multiple LISC national programs, including: affordable housing, rural development, and transit-oriented development. Before LISC, Mark worked as the Policy Director of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Multifamily Housing Programs and also worked for over seven years at the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund at the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Mark managed affordable housing and community development programs at the District of Columbia's Department of Housing and Community Development and held multiple positions at the Housing Assistance Council, a national rural affordable housing organization. Mark earned his B.A. from the University of Florida and M.S.W. from the University of Michigan.

JOSEPH LINDSTROM

Joey Lindstrom is the field director at NLIHC and first joined the staff in 2013. Joey first worked with NLIHC in 2000 while organizing Wisconsin advocates in support of the National Housing Trust Fund Campaign. He led campaigns in Madison, WI on issues such as the local minimum wage, funding for homeless services, and eliminating housing discrimination against Housing Choice Voucher recipients. In addition to his advocacy and campaign work,

Joey has also worked in various direct service capacities, including as a homeless outreach coordinator, tenant's rights counselor, and workforce development professional. Joey received a bachelor's degree from the University of Wisconsin with majors in political science and religious studies.

ELIZABETH LOWER-BASCH

Elizabeth Lower-Basch directs the Income and Work Supports team at the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP). Her expertise is federal and state programs that help low-income people meet their basic needs, including cash assistance under TANF, SNAP, Medicaid and refundable tax credits. Prior to coming to CLASP, from 1996 to 2006, Ms. Lower-Basch worked for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). Ms. Lower-Basch received a Master of Public Policy from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

LISA MARLOW

Lisa Marlow joined NLIHC in October 2016 as the communications specialist. Lisa worked previously with the American Association of Blood Banks (AABB) as a communications coordinator for the CEO. In this role, she focused on messaging and presentations for the CEO, and revamping the brand of the organization. Prior to AABB, Lisa served as a program associate for PICO National Network—a faith-based, grassroots, nonprofit, where she assisted with web development, managed social media, and coordinated organization-wide events. Lisa also worked at The Endocrine Society as manager of public policy and public affairs where she started the Society's clinical practice guidelines program and published 15 guidelines at the end of her tenure. Lisa graduated from American University with a Master's degree in Strategic Communication after receiving her Bachelor's degree in Mass Communication from Towson University.

KEVIN MARTONE

Kevin Martone, LSW is Executive Director for the Technical Assistance Collaborative, a national consulting organization in Boston. He also serves on the boards of the National Association of Rural Mental Health and the Massachusetts Association for Mental Health. Previously, he served as mental health commissioner for New Jersey, president for the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors and has been CEO for a supportive housing agency. Kevin is a national expert in mental health policy, administration, systems design and financing and focuses much of his work at the intersection of behavioral health, community integration, homelessness and affordable housing.

SHARON MCDONALD

Sharon McDonald is the Senior Fellow for Families and Children at the National Alliance to End Homelessness, where her primary focus is on policy and program strategies to prevent and end family and child homelessness. Before joining the Alliance in 2001, Sharon was a direct practitioner in a Richmond, Virginia, community-based service center for people experiencing homelessness. She has experience providing and supervising the delivery of social work services to families in service-enriched subsidized housing development for low income families. Sharon was the 1999 National Association of Social Workers/Council on Social Work Education Congressional Fellow and served in Senator Paul D. Wellstone's office, where she focused on welfare and housing issues. Sharon holds an M.S.W and a PhD in Social Work and Social Policy from Virginia Commonwealth University.

MONICA MCLAUGHLIN

Monica McLaughlin is the Deputy Director of Public Policy at the National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV), where she works to improve federal legislation and increase resources to address and prevent domestic violence. She leads and co-chairs various national coalitions, educates Congress, implements grassroots strategies and engages various

government agencies to ensure that addressing domestic violence is a national priority.

Monica has led national Appropriations efforts to secure record federal investments in programs that address domestic violence and sexual assault. Monica also directs NNEDV's housing policy work with achievements such as: leading successful efforts to secure life-saving housing protections in the Violence Against Women Act of 2013; advocating for domestic violence survivors' access to housing and homelessness resources in the McKinney-Vento Reauthorization Act of 2009; and drafting housing protections for immigrant survivors in the Senate-passed bill, S. 744. Building on her housing policy work, Monica leads NNEDV's *Collaborative Approaches to Housing for Survivors*, a multi-agency technical assistance consortium designed to improve survivors' access to safe, affordable housing.

MINDY MITCHELL

Mindy Mitchell is a Senior Technical Assistance Specialist at the National Alliance to End Homelessness. In this role, she develops and delivers training and technical assistance on best practices to end homelessness in communities. Mindy previously led the program and policy work of the Alliance as it relates to adults age 18 and over who do not have children with them, including young adults, veterans, and people experiencing crisis, episodic, and chronic homelessness. She also completed a fellowship with the New York State Senate, focused primarily on affordable housing, and worked as a case manager for families experiencing homelessness in Mobile, AL. Mindy received her sociological education at the University of South Alabama and her legal education at CUNY School of Law.

KATHRYN MONET

Kathryn is the Chief Executive Officer of the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans (NCHV). In this role, she focuses on executing NCHV's strategic policy and technical assistance agenda and expanding NCHV's strategic

partnerships to more effectively end veteran homelessness. Kathryn has spent nearly a decade in the public and nonprofit sectors working to address housing instability and homelessness among veterans. Prior to joining NCHV, she was with the National Alliance to End Homelessness focusing on the promotion of data-driven, evidence-based interventions to end homelessness, particularly among veterans. Kathryn also was involved in veteran homelessness in a legislative capacity during her time at the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

NOAH PATTON

Noah is the Housing Policy Analyst at NLIHC. Noah comes to NLIHC from Baltimore, MD, where he worked at the Homeless Persons Representation Project, Inc. (HPRP), helping to advocate for policies to expand public benefit programs and protecting Housing Choice Voucher holders. After working as a campaign and state house staffer in Maryland, Noah received a JD from the University of Baltimore School of Law. While in law school, Noah was heavily involved in coordinating Legal Observers of the National Lawyers Guild to protect the legal rights of Baltimore-area political protestors and served as a Kellogg's Law Fellow at the NAACP Office of the General Counsel working on transit equity and educational policy. Noah received his B.A. in Political Science from McDaniel College in Westminster, MD. He has been a member of the Maryland bar since 2018.

IKRA RAFI

Ikra is NLIHC's creative services specialist. She first worked at NLIHC as a graphic design intern during the 2015-2016 fall and spring semesters. Ikra completed her Bachelor of Fine Arts in Arts and Visual Technology from George Mason University in 2017. Her interest in social justice stems from her freelancing and internships at various nonprofits, including NLIHC.

STEPHANIE REYES

Stephanie Reyes is the State & Local Policy Manager for Grounded Solutions Network, where she, he supports municipalities and community organizations across the country in implementing effective affordable housing policy. Stephanie has over 10 years of experience in policy research, program design and advocacy in the housing and environmental fields. Prior to joining Grounded Solutions, Stephanie held multiple roles at Greenbelt Alliance, where she led the organization's efforts to ensure that San Francisco Bay Area jurisdictions provide sufficient homes at all income levels in sustainable locations. Before that, she held positions in communications and advocacy at HomeFirst, an affordable housing and homeless services provider in Santa Clara County, California. Stephanie received her BS from Brown University.

KATHLEEN ROMIG

Kathleen Romig is a Senior Policy Analyst at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. She works on Social Security, Supplemental Security Income, and other budget issues.

Romig previously worked at the Social Security Administration, Social Security Advisory Board, and Congressional Research Service. She began her career as a Presidential Management Fellow, during which time she completed an assignment at the Office of Management and Budget.

Romig has a master's degree in Social Policy from University College Cork, Ireland, where she was a George J. Mitchell Scholar, and a B.A. from Michigan State University's James Madison College.

JAIMIE A. ROSS

Jaimie Ross, Attorney at Law, is the President and CEO of the Florida Housing Coalition. In 1991, Ms. Ross initiated, and continues to facilitate, the broad-based coalition that successfully advocated the passage of the William E. Sadowski Affordable Housing Act, creating a dedicated revenue source for affordable housing in Florida. Her work includes all forms of legislative and

administrative advocacy and education related to the planning and financing of affordable housing. She is the author of "Creating Inclusive Communities in Florida: a Guidebook for Local Elected Officials and Staff on Avoiding and Overcoming the NIMBY Syndrome" and speaks nationally on avoiding and overcoming NIMBY. She serves on the Board of Grounded Solutions Network, a national nonprofit that promotes inclusionary housing policies. Ms. Ross is the founder of the Florida Community Land Trust Institute, past Chair of the Affordable Housing Committee of the Real Property Probate & Trust Law Section of the Florida Bar, and a former Fannie Mae Foundation James A. Johnson Community Fellow.

DOUG RYAN

Doug Ryan is the Senior Fellow at Prosperity Now, focusing on policy and homeownership, including the Innovations in Manufactured Housing (I'M HOME) initiative. Mr. Ryan has spent his entire career in the affordable housing field, with more than twenty years' experience working in federal and local housing programs. Prior to joining Prosperity Now, Mr. Ryan served as Assistant Director of Federal Programs at the Housing Opportunities Commission of Montgomery County, Maryland, a multifaceted housing provider, developer and lender. Earlier in his career, he worked as a legislative assistant in the U.S. Senate and as a program analyst with the Federal Housing Finance Board, working to expand the lending programs of the Federal Home Loan Banks, including loans for manufactured housing. He also was project manager for the Housing Development Institute, the housing development arm of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York.

Mr. Ryan served for five years on the Montgomery County Commission on Human Rights and currently on the board of Places for People, a Montgomery County housing provider for formerly homeless persons with mental health issues. He is an adjunct instructor at American University's School of Public Affairs and a graduate student advisor and instructor at

Georgetown's School of Continuing Studies.

He holds a Bachelor of Arts from Fordham University and a Master of Public Affairs from New York University.

SARAH SAADIAN

Sarah joined NLIHC as Director of Public Policy in June 2016. Sarah previously worked with Enterprise Community Partners as a Senior Analyst. In that role, she focused on building Congressional support for federal affordable housing and community development appropriations, including funding for programs administered by HUD and U.S. Department of Agriculture. Prior to Enterprise, Sarah served as Policy Counsel at Rapoza Associates, a government affairs and lobbying firm specializing in affordable housing and community development, where she focused largely on rural development. While working as a Legislative and Policy Analyst at the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Sarah's portfolio included expanding access to affordable mortgage and small business credit in low income communities. Sarah graduated from the University of Connecticut, School of Law after receiving her Bachelor's degree from the University of Virginia. She has been a member of the Virginia State Bar since 2009.

BARBARA SARD

Barbara is a consultant and former Vice President for Housing Policy for the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. She previously held the director's position at the Center between 1997 and 2009. She has written extensively on welfare, homelessness, and housing issues, and is considered a leading expert on the housing voucher program, rental assistance, and issues concerning the intersection of housing and welfare policy. *Housing Policy Debate*, the leading journal of housing research, named her to its editorial advisory board in 2015. Prior to working at the Center, she was the Senior Managing Attorney of the Housing Unit at Greater Boston Legal Services, where she worked for more than 19 years. Ms. Sard has a B.A. in Social Studies

from Radcliffe College/Harvard University and a J.D. from the Harvard Law School.

GINA SCHAAK

Gina Schaak is senior associate for Housing Group at the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC). She has over fifteen years' experience helping nonprofit housing and service agencies to navigate federal, state, and local programs in order to access and create more permanent supportive housing for the most vulnerable populations. In addition to being a skilled TA and training provider with extensive experience providing support and consultation to nonprofit homeless and housing organizations, Gina serves as TAC's national policy researcher and public liaison. In this role, she tracks federal congressional activity related to relevant homeless and housing legislation and disseminates information to the public.

KRISTI SCHULENBERG

Kristi Schulenberg is a Senior Technical Assistance Specialist at the National Alliance to End Homelessness. Ms. Schulenberg has more than 20 years of experience in the nonprofit sector, specifically in the areas of organizational planning and development, community outreach/capacity building, government relations, and program implementation/evaluation. As a Technical Assistance Specialist, Ms. Schulenberg develops and delivers training and technical assistance on best practices on ending homelessness, including re-designing emergency shelter, diversion, rapid rehousing, system performance measures, and redesigning and building capacity for coordinated crisis response systems. Prior to joining the Alliance, Ms. Schulenberg served as the Staff Attorney/Project Manager for the Veterans Legal Assistance Project at the Neighborhood Legal Services Program in Washington, DC. Prior to coming to DC, Ms. Schulenberg served as the Deputy Director, Federal Programs, and as a Staff Attorney at HomeBase, The Center for Common Concerns, a national nonprofit public interest law firm dedicated to combating and ending homelessness.

JOSH SILVER

Josh Silver has more than 25 years of experience in the housing and community development field. He is a Senior Advisor at the National Community Reinvestment Coalition (NCRC). He produces white papers on the Community Reinvestment Act and fair lending policy and issues. He serves as an expert and provides advice and resources internally and externally. He came back to NCRC after serving as a Development Manager engaged in fundraising and research at Manna, Inc., a housing nonprofit developer and counseling agency serving the District of Columbia. He also previously served as Vice President of Research and Policy at NCRC for 19 years.

Prior to NCRC, Mr. Silver worked at the Urban Institute for five years. Mr. Silver holds a Master's degree in public affairs from the Lyndon Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas in Austin, and earned a Bachelor's degree in economics from Columbia University in New York City.

LISA SLOANE

Lisa Sloane is senior policy advisor for Housing Group at the Technical Assistance Collaborative (TAC). She has over 30 years of experience working with federal, state, and local governments as well as nonprofit agencies, to address the supportive housing needs of people with disabilities and of individuals and families experiencing homelessness. At TAC, she manages complex consulting projects for state and federal government agencies, including technical assistance for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Lisa has worked with the states of Virginia, Oregon, Louisiana, and Maryland to develop and implement permanent supportive housing programs for people with disabilities and people who are homeless. In Massachusetts, she played a key role in the development of innovative cross-disability housing programs, including a housing locator system, a state housing bond fund, and a state home modification loan program. She is an expert in the area of fair housing.

JORGE ANDRES SOTO

Jorge Andres Soto is director of public policy with the National Fair Housing Alliance (NFHA). Jorge leads NFHA's federal relations and advocates on behalf of its member organizations before Congress and federal agencies and coordinates efforts with advocacy and industry groups on civil rights matters concerning housing and housing finance. Prior to NFHA, Jorge was at Relman, Dane & Colfax PLLC where he worked as a civil rights paralegal on the development and litigation of several housing, lending, and public accommodations cases involving discrimination, as well as on public policy matters concerning employment and contracting diversity in federal financial regulatory agencies. Jorge also previously worked as a labor organizer at Service Employees International Union and community organizer with CRECEN/American Para Todos, Houston, Texas. Jorge earned his B.A. in History and American Studies from Wesleyan University.

MELISSA STEGMAN

Melissa Stegman is a senior policy counsel on CRL's federal policy team. Located in the DC office, Melissa works primarily on mortgage policy, housing finance reform, and debt collection issues. Prior to joining CRL, Melissa was an attorney with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of General Counsel. She worked in the Office of Fair Housing Enforcement on a variety of fair lending and civil rights matters.

Melissa received BA degrees in Anthropology and International Studies from the University of North Carolina and her law degree from North Carolina Central University.

LESLIE STRAUSS

Leslie Strauss is senior housing analyst at the Housing Assistance Council (HAC). She began working at HAC in 1991 as Research and Information Director and has also served as HAC's Communications Director. Currently she is responsible for a variety of policy and information activities, including much of HAC's work on rental

housing preservation. She has a law degree and practiced real estate law for several years before joining HAC. She serves on the board of the National Rural Housing Coalition.

ERIC TARS

Eric Tars currently serves as legal director with the National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty. Before coming to the Law Center, Mr. Tars was a Fellow with Global Rights' U.S. Racial Discrimination Program and consulted with Columbia University Law School's Human Rights Institute and the U.S. Human Rights Network. Mr. Tars currently serves on the Board of the U.S. Human Rights Network, as an adjunct professor at Drexel University's Kline School of Law, and as a field supervisor for the Howard University School of Social Work. Mr. Tars received his J.D. as a Global Law Scholar at the Georgetown University Law Center, his B.A. in Political Science from Haverford College, and studied international human rights at the Institute for European Studies, Vienna, and at the University of Vienna.

ANTHONY WALTERS

Anthony Walters is the Executive Director of the National American Indian Housing Council (NAIHC). Anthony has been with NAIHC since April of 2017, and prior to joining NAIHC served as Staff Director and General Counsel of the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. He also spent time at the Department of the Interior as a policy advisor to the Assistant Secretary Indian Affairs.

Since 1974, NAIHC has provided training and technical assistance to hundreds of Native American Housing Authorities across the National Low Income Housing Coalition 11–25 country. NAIHC also serves as a primary advocate for all tribal housing issues and initiatives, working with Congress, federal agencies, nonprofits and industry partners.

OLIVIA WEIN

Olivia Wein is a staff attorney at the National Consumer Law Center (NCLC) focusing on

affordable energy and utility service for low income consumers. She is co-author of the fifth edition of NCLC's manual "Access to Utility Service," and co-author of "The Rights of Utility Consumers." She has advocated for a strong Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program for more than 18 years. Ms. Wein serves on the Federal Communication Commission's Consumer Advisory Committee, and the Board of Directors for the Universal Services Administrative Company. She was an Economic Justice Fellow at Consumers Union prior to her work at NCLC.

RUTH ANNE WHITE

Ruth White is co-founder and executive director of the National Center for Housing and Child Welfare and former director of Housing and Homelessness for the Child Welfare League of America (CWLA). At the Child Welfare League, she co-edited the landmark issue of the League's journal, *Child Welfare*, documenting the extent to which children are needlessly held in foster care because their parents lack decent housing. Prior to working at CWLA, Ruth managed the front-door family shelter and redesigned the homeless coordinated entry system in Columbus, OH, reducing shelter entries by over 60 percent. Ruth is also certified as an Assisted Housing Manager. Ruth has a Master of Science Degree in Social Administration from Case Western Reserve University and a Bachelor of Science degree in Social Work from Ohio State University. She is currently a Furfey Scholar, doctoral candidate, and professor of social work at the Catholic University of America.

RENEE WILLIS

Renee Willis joined NLIHC in June 2015 as the new Vice President for Field and Communications. In this role, Renee leads all of NLIHC's field and communications efforts in support of our mission, goals, and objectives. Renee brings more than 15 years of experience in affordable housing, including establishing and leading successful community and region-wide initiatives. Renee has extensive experience in strategic planning, financial management, marketing, organizational development, staff

management, and program operations. Renee served as Housing Services Chief with Arlington County, VA, from 2008 to 2015. Prior to her work in Arlington, she served as the Administrator of the Office of Landlord-Tenant Affairs for Montgomery County, MD, from 1999 to 2004, and as an Advocate and Manager for the Public Justice Center's Tenant Advocacy Project in Baltimore, MD, from 1993 to 1999. Renee earned dual Bachelor of Arts degrees in English and Spanish from the University of Maryland. She also holds a Certificate in Public Management from George Washington University.

CHANTELLE WILKINSON

Chantelle is the Housing Campaign Coordinator of the *Opportunity Starts at Home* campaign. Chantelle comes to NLIHC from New York where she worked as a budget analyst for the state legislature. There she assisted with enacting housing and transportation policies. In 2016, she worked on the Breathing Lights Campaign with the Center for Women in Government and Civil Society. The campaign highlighted the issues of dilapidated vacant housing in the capital region of New York State and spurred collaboration from many sectors including the arts, community organizations, neighborhood ambassadors, project administrators, and government officials. Chantelle received her BA in Political Science with minors in Latin American/ Caribbean Studies and Spanish, and her MA in Public Administration, both from the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy at the University at Albany.

KATIE WINDHAM

Katie Windham is an intern at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, where she works on federal fiscal policy. Previously, she interned at Congresswoman Katherine Clark's district office, Prosperity Now, and the Voter Participation Center. She has a B.A. in Political Science and History from Tufts University.

DIANE YENTEL

Diane is the President and CEO of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, a membership organization dedicated solely to achieving socially just public policy that ensures people with the lowest incomes in the United States have affordable and decent homes. Diane is a veteran affordable housing policy expert and advocate with nearly two decades of work on affordable housing and community development issues. Before rejoining NLIHC (where she previously worked as a policy analyst), Diane was Vice President of Public Policy and Government Affairs at Enterprise Community Partners, where she led federal, state and local policy, research and advocacy programs. Prior to Enterprise, Diane was the director of the Public Housing Management and Occupancy Division at the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), where she managed a team overseeing the development and implementation of nationwide public housing policies, procedures and guidelines. She also worked to advance affordable housing policies with Oxfam America and the Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless and served for 3 years as a community development Peace Corps volunteer in Zambia. Diane is frequently cited in media outlets, including the *Washington Post*, *The New York Times*, *Politico*, *Mother Jones*, NPR and *The Guardian*. She serves on the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference, Homes for America, and the Coalition on Human Needs. Diane has a Masters in Social work from the University of Texas at Austin.

Membership Form



MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION

New Membership Membership Renewal

MEMBER TYPE	SUGGESTED DUES AMOUNT
<input type="checkbox"/> Low income individual or student	\$5.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	\$110.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Resident/Tenant Association or Student Organization	\$15.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, <\$250,000 operating budget	\$225.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, \$250K – \$499,999	\$375.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, \$500K – \$999,999	\$550.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, \$1,000,000 – \$2,000,000	\$1,100.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, \$2,000,000 – \$5,000,000	\$2,200.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Organization, > \$5,000,000	\$3,000.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Other Amount	\$ _____

Memo to Members & Partners

NLIHC members can receive our weekly *Memo to Members & Partners* newsletter, which features the most up-to-date housing information and news! Please fill out the opposite side of this form or provide a separate list of additional contacts at your organization who should receive *Memo* and other NLIHC messages. Please specify how you would like to receive *Memo*:

- Please send me *Memo to Members & Partners* by email
 I do not have an email address, please send me *Memo to Members & Partners* via mail
 I do not wish to receive *Memo to Members & Partners*

Advocates' Guide

If you are joining NLIHC for the first time, would you like us to send you NLIHC's *Advocates' Guide* free of charge? The *Advocates' Guide* is a comprehensive resource providing information on housing and community development programs, and other vital tools for advocates. The full *Advocates' Guide* is also available online at <https://nlihc.org/explore-issues/publications-research/advocates-guide>

Yes, please mail me an *Advocates' Guide* No thank you

Did someone refer you for NLIHC Membership?

Name: _____ or Organization Name: _____

CONTACT INFORMATION

Mr. Ms. Other: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Email: _____

Phone: _____ Twitter: @ _____

PAYMENT INFORMATION

Check Enclosed Visa MC Discover AmEx Exp. Date: _____

Credit Card Number: _____ CVV*: _____

Cardholder Name (printed): _____

Cardholder Signature: _____

Would you like to cover our 2.5% credit card processing fee? This will ensure that 100% of your contribution reaches NLIHC.

Would you like to make this an annual recurring contribution? This helps give us a dependable base of membership support. You can cancel at anytime.

*Three-digit code on back of card.

NLIHC is a membership organization open to individuals, organizations, corporations, and government agencies. **EVERY MEMBERSHIP MAKES A DIFFERENCE.**

BENEFITS OF MEMBERSHIP

Memo to Members & Partners:

Receive the nation's most respected housing policy newsletter in your email inbox—or your mailbox—every week.

Calls to Action: Members receive email notification of significant policy developments warranting constituent calls or letters to Congress.

Discounted Forum

Registration: NLIHC hosts an annual policy forum and leadership reception in Washington, DC, which members can attend at a discounted rate. The forum brings together advocates, researchers, academics, government experts, organizers, and individuals to share expertise and insights on the latest federal housing policy initiatives.

Discounted Publications:

NLIHC produces numerous publications each year, including the *Advocates' Guide* and *Out of Reach*. Members can order print copies at a discounted rate.

BECOME A MEMBER
ONLINE AT
[HTTPS://NLIHC.ORG](https://nlihc.org)

Questions? Call 202-662-1530
or e-mail outreach@nlihc.org



DO YOU KNOW FRIENDS OR COLLEAGUES WHO SHOULD BE A MEMBER OF NLIHC?

Let us know and we'll send them free membership materials.

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

DOES YOUR ORGANIZATION HAVE ADDITIONAL CONTACTS WHO SHOULD RECEIVE NLIHC MESSAGES?

Please fill out the address if it does not match that of the primary contact.

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

Name: _____
Organization: _____
Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
Telephone: _____ Email: _____

KNOW

you're making
our community
a better place.



PNC is proud to support the National Low Income Housing Coalition's Advocates Guide. The education you provide makes a huge difference for people who need help and people who provide help on affordable housing issues. Thank you for sharing your expertise.

*Stop by any PNC Branch,
or call 888-PNC-BANK
pnc.com*

 **PNC BANK**
for the achiever in you[®]



The PNC Financial Services Group



NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION

1000 VERMONT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC, 20005
202-662-1530
<https://nlihc.org>