

MEMO OF MEMBERS

The Weekly Newsletter of the National Low Income Housing Coalition

Volume 8, Issue No. 35 • September 5, 2003

Reminder: All NLIHC memberships expired June 30

If you have not yet renewed your membership in 2003, do so today to avoid missing out on *Memo to Members* and other member services! To renew, visit www.nlihc.org/about/join.htm or call 202-662-1530 x227.

Out Of Reach

Out of Reach To Be Released September 8

Out of Reach 2003, NLIHC's annual report that looks at how much a person working full time has to earn per hour to be able to afford modest rental housing, will be released at an event at the National Press Club on Monday, September 8. Speakers at the event include Sheila Crowley of NLIHC; Economic Policy Institute President Larry Mishel; Alexandria, VA, Mayor William D. Euille; Father Gerry Creedon, Chair of the Virginia Interfaith Center for Public Policy; Washington DC ACORN member George Ware; and Zelna Joseph, President of N Street Village in DC.

Out of Reach will be available at www.nlihc.org, as well as available for purchase beginning September 8. The cost is \$15 for members and \$25 for nonmembers. For details, call 202-662-1530 x227 or visit www.nlihc.org.

Capitol Hill

Senate Appropriators Pass VA-HUD Bill

The Senate Appropriations Committee marked up the VA-HUD Appropriations bill on September 4. HUD received \$36.1 billion, approximately \$91 million less than the House bill, \$877 million above FY03 levels and \$158 million above the Administration's request. Most HUD programs are funded at either FY03 levels or the President's request; exceptions include the Housing Choice Voucher program (see separate article) and HOPE VI.

Once again, public housing programs are shortchanged. The Senate bill provides \$2.6 billion for the public housing capital fund, matching the President's request, but \$71 million less than FY03 funding levels. The committee did not approve HUD's proposal to finance privately the capital needs of public housing, a proposal called Public Housing Reinvestment Initiative (PHRI). In its report, the Committee expressed concern that the PHRI proposal could result in a loss of public housing units. The committee did include language allowing PHAs the flexibility to use public housing funds to leverage private capital to rehabilitate distressed units and develop public housing units in mixed-income housing developments. It is likely that the \$20 billion backlog in public housing capital improvement needs will go unaddressed another year.

The public housing operating fund remains at the FY03 level of \$3.5 billion, \$2.6 million above the President's request. The bill includes language that prohibits the use of operating funds to pay for the operating expenses for a prior fiscal year.

The Senate, as did the House, also rejected the Administration's plan to sunset HOPE VI, the public housing revitalization program. However, the House allocated only \$50 million and the Senate allocated \$195 million to the program. Despite bipartisan acclaim of HOPE VI, funds available to appropriators were so

(See *Capitol Hill* on p. 2)

POINT OF VIEW

by Sheila Crowley, President

In its first week back from summer recess, the Senate Appropriations Committee failed to insure that all low income people who now have housing vouchers will continue to be able to afford their homes after the new fiscal year begins. This follows the House decision in July that similarly shortchanged the voucher program. This is the first time in the nearly 30 years of the housing voucher program that Congress has broken its commitment to provide enough funds to sustain the program at its current level. Appropriators were "forced" to take this extraordinary step for lack of less than \$750 million.

The Senate Appropriations Committee made this decision in the same week that the country learned that the number of people in poverty is growing, that record number of jobs have disappeared never to be seen again, and that the number of poor families who are able to access public aid (TANF) is falling.

The deteriorating economic health of low income families is not news. What makes it so remarkable is its juxtaposition against the stunning expectation by President Bush that Congress will come up with another \$87 billion in supplemental funds for the war in Iraq, on top of the \$79 billion supplemental appropriations bill for Iraq just five months ago. The siphoning of resources away from health and human needs in the United States to give tax breaks to the wealthy and to wage war in Iraq is the choice the Bush Administration

(See *Point of View* on p. 8)



**NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION**

Capitol Hill *(cont'd from p. 1)*

limited this year that neither the House or the Senate could come close to FY03 HOPE VI funding level of \$574 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee directed HUD to find some portion of the \$195 million from recaptured HOPE VI funds awarded in FY97 or earlier and are still incomplete. Recaptured funds are to come from projects that are less than 90% complete and that do not appear able to be completed within the next two years. The Committee also directed HUD to develop a plan to extend the HOPE VI program or create an alternative plan to develop mixed income public housing developments. HUD is also required to develop a plan to meet the needs of tenants in "failed" HOPE VI projects. The committee does not address advocates' concerns surrounding tenant displacement as a result of HOPE VI development.

Under the Senate Appropriations bill, the HOME production and rental assistance program would receive \$1.975 billion, less than both FY03 levels and the President's request. The Committee included \$50 million for the Administration's American Dream Downpayment Fund, considerably less than the \$200 million requested by the Administration. The Administration also requested a separate account for housing counseling, but the committee decided to continue funding housing counseling activities within the HOME program. Housing counseling would receive level funding at \$40 million.

The Community Development Fund would receive \$4.95 billion, with \$4.546 billion going to CDBG. Housing Opportunities for People With AIDS (HOPWA) will receive \$291 million under the Senate bill, less than both the President's request (\$297 million) and the House appropriation of \$302 million. The Committee directs HUD to allocate funds in a manner that would preserve existing HOPWA programs to the extent they are meeting the needs of people with AIDS.

The Senate would fund McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance programs at \$1.325 billion as the President requested, including \$193 million for Shelter Plus Care renewals. There was concern based on the House appropriations that there may not be enough funding to fully fund renewals of all expiring Shelter Plus Care contracts and fund other programs, but advocates report that the \$1.325 billion is adequate. The language also continues to require that no less than 30% of the funds appropriated, except funds for the renewals of Shelter Plus Care contracts, be used for permanent housing. The committee also applauds HUD on its efforts to collect data on the homeless population and charges HUD to report on its progress no later than March 12, 2004.

The Senate bill allocated Section 202 Elderly Housing \$783 million to be used for new development, more than the FY03 level (\$778 million), the President's request (\$774 million), and the House bill (\$773 million). Section 811 Housing for People with Disabilities was allocated \$250 million for new development. Up to 25% of the funds for Section 811 may be for tenant-based rental assistance. The bill also includes new language requiring HUD to include individual line requests for all housing assistance renewal requirements, including the amounts needed for expiring elderly and disabled housing contracts.

The Senate joined the House in once again saving the Rural Housing and Economic Development program at level funding of \$25 million, despite the President's third request to defund it. The Senate also matched the House in continuing the Brownfields program at \$25 million, rejecting the Administration's assertion that Brownfields duplicates efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Native American Housing Block Grant, which provides funding to Indian tribes and tribally designated entities to provide affordable housing in Native American communities, would be funded at \$646 million, the same as the President's request.

Once again, Section 236 interest reduction payments that are supposed to be used to preserve assisted housing would face rescissions under the Senate bill, duplicating the House bill. The proposed rescission would be \$303 million, on top of the \$100 million rescission in FY03.

The Office of Lead Hazard Control would receive \$175 million under the Senate bill, which constitutes level funding, but is \$39 million more than the President's request and \$45 million more than the House bill. In its report, the committee recommends \$50 million for the lead hazard reduction demonstration program, which was established in FY03 to focus on urban areas where children are disproportionately at risk for lead poisoning.

Funding for Fair Housing Activities received an increase of \$4.4 million from last year's budget, identical to the Administration's request and the House bill that provide \$50 million for fair housing.

During the markup there was much discussion over adequate funding for Veterans programs, but little discussion about housing programs. None of the members of the Appropriations Committee indicated any plans to offer amendments on any HUD program. There will be two additional opportunities for Congress to consider FY04 housing funding, on the Senate floor and then in the conference committee when the House and Senate meet to the hammer out their differences.

(See Capitol Hill on p. 4)

Update from the Field

New Rules on Mount Laurel Miss Mark

In the 1970s and 1980s, the Supreme Court's *Mount Laurel* decisions found that New Jersey municipalities had a constitutional obligation to establish zoning that would allow for the construction of affordable housing within those municipalities based on local need and a fair share analysis of regional need. The Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) was established in 1985 as the entity charged with implementing the *Mount Laurel* decisions.

There have been two "rounds" during which COAH has released its evaluation of housing need and rules determining the fair share affordable housing obligations of the state's municipalities. The second round ended in 1999, but COAH had not promulgated new regulations for the next round until this year. The proposed regulations were released on August 25 and caused immediate consternation among housing advocates.

In the first and second rounds, COAH established the number of units required to satisfy the affordable housing need for the state as a whole and then used a formula to divide those units among the municipalities. Prior to the release of the rules for the third round, the Housing and Community Development Network of New Jersey (HCDNNJ), in collaboration with the Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment, issued a series of recommendations. Among HCDNNJ's recommendations was that COAH should use a "growth share" that would base the number of affordable units to be built on new residential and commercial development. HDDNJ also recommended that COAH still require municipalities to fulfill any unmet affordable housing requirements under the first and second rounds, with the growth share model used only for the third round.

COAH adopted the growth share in its proposed regulations for the third round, to last from 1999 to 2014, (See **Update from the Field** on p. 5)

HUD

HUDClips

On September 2, HUD issued Notice H 2003-19, offering guidance on lead-based paint disclosure. The notice applies to the sale of HUD-owned single-family properties constructed before 1978. Homes constructed before 1978 are required to meet requirements set forth in the Lead Disclosure Rule. The requirements are effective 30 days from the date of the notice.

All notices are available at www.hudclips.org.

National Housing Trust Fund

Briefing Educates Staffers

The National Housing Trust Fund Campaign welcomed Congress back to Washington with a briefing for Congressional staff on Wednesday, September 4. Thanks to advocates who encouraged their Members' staffers to attend, a standing-room only crowd of more than 120 people filled the room. Staffers in attendance represented both cosponsors and noncosponsors of H.R. 1102, the National Housing Trust Fund Act of 2003.

Sheila Crowley of NLIHC, Nancy Bernstine of the McAuley Institute, and Patrick McIntyre of the United Way of America gave an overview of the Trust Fund legislation and the Campaign. Other speakers educated attendees on how housing impacts areas including the economy, education, health and rural development.

Don Ryan of the Alliance for Healthy Homes discussed how substandard housing affects children's health. "There is more to the housing crisis than financial," he said. Mr. Ryan explained that more health hazards are found indoors than outdoors, including mold, radon, lead, and carbon monoxide. The worst health hazards are found in housing in the worst condition, and housing in the worst condition is found mostly in low income communities. The number-one environmental health hazard is substandard housing, Mr. Ryan said, and he urged the audience to look at an investment in affordable housing as an investment in people's health.

Chester Hartman of the Poverty & Race Research Action Council discussed the intersection of housing and education, and how housing stability directly affects a child's performance in school. According to a General Accounting Office report, one out of six children has moved at least three times by the end of third grade. "The main reason for school instability is housing instability," he said. Mr. Hartman stated that students who move often do not do well in school, and said the National Housing Trust Fund would reduce mobility by creating more affordable housing so fewer people would have to move.

Blair Sebastian of the New York State Rural Housing Coalition explained how a National Housing Trust Fund could spur development in rural areas. Mr. Sebastian noted that there is hardly any housing stock being built for low income renters in rural New York, and added that many households in rural areas are cost burdened. Mr. Sebastian said that workers in service sector, including hospitality, cannot afford to live in certain parts of rural New York, which in turn makes it hard for businesses to attract workers.



Capitol Hill *(cont'd from p. 2)*

When the bill will go the Senate floor is unclear.

The NLIHC budget chart will be available at www.nlihc.org in the coming week.

Voucher Funding Appropriation Falls Short

The Senate Appropriations Committee actions on the Housing Choice Voucher program for FY04 were under special scrutiny this year. As did their counterparts in the House, the Senate Appropriators rejected the Administration's plan to block grant the voucher program to the states.

The Senate bill provides \$18.4 billion for the Housing Certificate Fund. This includes \$16.2 billion for expiring Section 8 contracts, \$461 million for the central fund at HUD to be used to support Section 8 contracts up to the authorized level for all PHAs, and \$1.3 billion for Section 8 administration.

Advocates consider this amount insufficient to assure full funding for all vouchers currently in use and all authorized vouchers that PHAs are able to use. The latest analysis by the Congressional Budget Office verifies that the President's assessment of needed funding for the voucher program is woefully under what is actually required. While the Committee did not add new funds to the Housing Voucher Program to make up for the shortcomings of the President's request, the Committee allocated \$3 million for an outside auditor who is to work with the Government Accounting Office to assess the current status of all funds within the account. The audit will force HUD to develop a real-time data model, which will identify the actual use of all vouchers and prevent future problems in determining the cost of an individual voucher.

The Committee acknowledges that the President's budget does not properly project the real costs of the voucher program. HUD is expected to use available recaptured funds. The Committee asserts its commitment to the Section 8 program by stating that HUD is expected to come back for supplemental funds if necessary.

When the bill came to vote in the full House, Members voted to add an additional \$150 million to the voucher program, but advocates are not hopeful that a similar amendment will be offered in the Senate. At the mark up, neither Senators Christopher Bond (R-MO) nor Barbara Mikluski (D-MD), the chair and ranking member of the committee, respectively, said they would ask for more funding for the program. Senator Mikluski went so far as to say she had concerns that the Section 8 Program had "soaring costs," which she said was an issue she would look into in more detail.

As the full Senate and the conference committee still need to consider the bill, advocates will continue to press their Senators about the importance of ensuring that HUD create a way to produce accurate data and use all available funds to fully fund all vouchers in use and all authorized vouchers that PHAs are able to use.

Superwaiver May Surface This Week

It has been reported that the Senate Finance Committee may mark up H.R. 4, the TANF reauthorization bill, on Wednesday, September 10. Advocates learned Friday that Senators Olympia Snowe (R-ME) and Charles Grassley (R-IA) negotiated a deal in which Senator Snowe would vote in favor of the current bill with inadequate child care funding, then offer an amendment to increase child care funding on the Senate floor.

There remains the possibility that an amendment to include a "superwaiver" proposal in the TANF legislation may be offered when the Senate Finance Committee marks up the bill. The superwaiver would allow governors, with the permission of cabinet secretaries, to waive federal laws and regulations related to several social service programs, including housing programs. The superwaiver is included in the House version of the TANF bill.

Under Senate rules, if the bill is to be marked up on Wednesday, all amendments have to be filed by Tuesday. With the possibility of a Wednesday mark up, advocates are contacting Members of the Senate Finance Committee to express their opposition to a "superwaiver" proposal.

New Legislation

On September 2, Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL), chair of the Banking Committee, introduced S. 1571, a bill that would increase the Federal Housing Administration home mortgage commitment level under Section 203(b) of the National Housing Act from \$165 billion to \$185 billion. The original cosponsors of the bill are Senator Christopher Bond (R-MO), chair of the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), ranking member of the Banking Committee, and Senator Jack Reed (D-RI), ranking member of the Housing and Transportation Subcommittee. The legislation passed the Senate by unanimous consent on the day it was introduced and was referred to the House Financial Services on September 3.

Senator Bob Graham (D-FL) introduced S.1572 on September 2. This bill would authorize the expansion of the Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA) pilot program on assisted living for veterans to include three additional VA health care regions. The bill was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Update from the Field *(cont'd from p.3)*

but with a framework so flawed and limited that HCDNNJ Executive Director Diane Sterner referred to it as “growth share lite.” HCDNNJ recommended affordability for one-fifth of all residential development and the development of one affordable unit for every five jobs created. In contrast, COAH would only require affordability for one-tenth of all residential units and the development of one affordable unit for every 30 jobs created. COAH based its more limited requirements on a narrower determination of statewide housing need, through which COAH determined that the State needs only 48,637 new affordable units over the 10-year period from 2004 to 2014 – a number which HCDNNJ finds far short of the actual need.

HCDNNJ also has concerns about several other elements of the proposed regulations. First, through a variety of questionable mechanisms – including the filtering of housing stock that has previously been unaffordable – COAH reduced its already insufficient prediction of overall affordable development and rehabilitation need statewide by 97,000 units, on the grounds that that housing would be provided by the market without any other requirements. In addition, COAH would give credits against the growth share in the future to some municipalities it determined had produced more than enough housing in the past, thereby giving credit for 40,000 units that do not exist. For instance, Cherry Hill would receive a credit of 707 units, so that municipality would have no obligation to build affordable units as part of any broader development until after 7,000 units were developed in the community. COAH’s proposed regulations would also shift the type of development, allowing municipalities to develop senior housing to satisfy one-half of their growth share requirements; previously, senior housing could make up only one-quarter of a municipality’s affordable housing development for the purposes of meeting the *Mount Laurel* obligations. This means that a municipality could now meet its housing obligation without building a single non-senior unit.

Under previous regulations, municipalities could meet up to half of their affordable housing obligations by paying another municipality to develop the housing with its borders instead, memorialized in a regional contribution agreement between the municipalities. While COAH’s new regulations would increase the amount paid from \$25,000 to \$35,000, the regulations would no longer require municipalities seeking to pay for affordable housing elsewhere rather than build it within its borders to find another municipality actually willing to build the housing. Instead, municipalities could put the funds into COAH’s affordable housing bank, to be used in the future by some as-yet-uniden-

tified municipality. As a result, the affordable housing may be built long after the broader development is complete in the original municipality.

Ms. Sterner of HCDNNJ said that COAH’s new proposed regulations “will further dilute New Jersey’s ability to meet its constitutional housing obligation and compromise its ability to assist more than a tiny fraction of households who are desperately in need of safe, decent affordable housing.” The regulations will be published as an official proposal on October 6 in the state register. There will be a 60-day comment period, during which time COAH is planning to hold public hearings. HCDNNJ is working in coalition with the religious community, labor organizations and other housing and community development groups to push COAH to withdraw its proposed regulations and develop rules that aim to be more responsive to the real housing need in the state.

Resources

HUD Releases Final Voucher Cost and Utilization Study

HUD’s long-awaited study, “Costs and Utilization in the Housing Choice Voucher Program,” released on the Friday afternoon before the Labor Day weekend, uses data gleaned primarily from site visits and interviews to “provide insights” into the voucher program. According to the report, prepared by Abt Associates Inc., a tight rental market and low quality affordable housing stock are among the key factors affecting public housing agencies (PHAs) with low voucher utilization rates. Another key finding of the report is that PHAs with higher subsidy costs have larger concentrations of extremely low income households and a greater proportion of elderly and disabled households.

The study is based on one- and two-day visits to 48 PHAs across the United States. The PHAs are not identified by name or by location throughout the report. The method used in the report is a comparison of factors in pairs of PHAs with significantly different utilization rates and subsidy costs in environments that were as similar as possible.

By design, the conclusions of the report are based on a sample characterized by extreme cost and utilization characteristics, and it is neither comprehensive nor necessarily representative of the national population of PHAs. The findings of the report must, therefore, be interpreted as applying to PHAs with low or high utilization and normalized subsidy rates rather than PHAs in general. From a list of 2,506 PHAs provided by HUD, 1,069 sites were selected using a series of

(See Resources on p. 6)

Resources *(cont'd from p. 5)*

objective and subjective selection criteria. From this frame, however, only 14 pairs of PHAs were selected, 28 PHAs in all, from a smaller pool of candidates identified by the authors and HUD staff. The final 14 pairs were selected from this pool only if they met two requirements: first, that they served the same or similar housing markets; and second, that they had significantly different voucher utilization rates. It is not clear whether all pairs meeting this requirement were selected. The PHAs in these pairs were then divided into categories based on whether they had high or low utilization rates and whether they had high or low subsidy costs based on HUD standards. To increase the sample size to 48, additional high and low utilization sites were then selected from the smaller pool of candidates to even out the representation across the utilization and cost dimensions as well as geographic area.

Within this framework, the report finds that PHAs with higher utilization rates were also more likely to be well managed; have systematic ways of deciding how many vouchers to issue each month; have higher leasing success rates; and update waiting lists more frequently. PHAs with higher subsidy costs not only served lower income, older and more disabled populations, they also used exception payment standards; had more rigorous enforcement of rent reasonableness; had stricter standards for assigning bedroom sizes; and had higher concentrations of opt-out vouchers.

A difficulty with the report is that it is based on a quantitative assessment of what are largely subjective and qualitative data. The use of these data and techniques in itself should not be considered the problem; indeed given the sheer scope of the report, it may be a necessary and desirable approach. The difficulty is that there is little or no external context given in the report with which to assess the judgments made by the authors in their analysis or their findings. For example, local rental markets are defined as either tight or loose based on “interviews with PHA staff, local real estate experts, and HUD field office staff.” Without any rental market indicators or even a list of experts consulted, readers must take this assessment at face value. This is compounded by the treatment of the PHAs as anonymous data points. Little attempt is made to orientate the reader beyond indicating broad Census regions. While confidentiality was obviously a concern, nowhere is this issue explicitly addressed.

Thus, for those not privy to the underlying process, data, and analysis, the conclusions of this report are likely to be convincing only to the degree that they either appear to make sense or to the degree readers are willing to trust the authors. Still, the report is likely to be important. First, given the scope of the project’s

objectives, it does provide a relatively succinct review of the program and its dynamics. The report also provides some interesting typologies and explicit definitions as well as, in a few places, relatively general statistics based on HUD’s Multifamily Tenant Characteristics System. And no matter how the reader chooses to assess the insights it provides into the Housing Choice Voucher program itself, given the heavy reliance on HUD staff in the formation of the sample and the assessment of the individual PHAs, it more than likely provides insight into how policy makers at HUD view the program.

The report is available at www.huduser.org/publications/pubasst/cost_util_voucher.html.

The Other Side of HOPE VI

The Center for Community Change (CCC) and ENPHRONT, the national organization of public housing residents, have released a report on the HOPE VI Housing program. The report, titled “A HOPE Unseen: Voices from the Other Side of HOPE VI,” looks at the views of residents of HOPE VI projects in various stages of completion and serves as an attempt to document the human impact of the HOPE VI program.

Congress created and funded HOPE VI in 1993 for the purpose of revitalizing distressed public housing communities through the demolition, rehabilitation, or replacement of obsolete public housing projects. According to HUD’s 2002 annual report on HOPE VI, grantees planned to demolish 78,259 units of public housing and replace them with 33,853 new units, for a net loss of 44,406 units. Agencies also planned to rehabilitate 8,470 public housing rental units and construct 3,146 federally subsidized homeowner units.

CCC conducted interviews of residents in seven HOPE VI projects throughout the country. Site leaders in each of the jurisdictions were asked to identify 10 residents for interviewing regarding the effects of HOPE VI on them, their families, and their communities. There was not a scientific sampling of residents, and resource constraints precluded fact checking in regards to residents’ comments. However, comments were valuable in and of themselves because of their reflection of the range of thoughts that people have regarding these projects.

While CCC argues that HOPE VI has the potential to be an effective way to preserve and improve public housing, it also shows that there are many problems with the program as currently constituted. The report focuses on residents’ concerns about the HOPE VI program and also provides recommendations tailored to addressing those concerns. A major recommenda-

(See Resources on p. 7)

Resources *(cont'd from p. 6)*

tion is that there should not be a net loss of 'hard' units targeted to extremely low income households. Additionally, public housing authorities must involve residents in the HOPE VI application and implementation process, as well as support residents in helping with interim housing and services. Households in the original housing projects should also be encouraged to return to the new communities upon completion, and high quality supportive services should be provided.

The report can be downloaded at:
www.communitychange.org/housing/hopeunseenexecsumm.doc.

Improving Education for Mobile Students

The Poverty and Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) has released a report focusing on how to improve educational quality for mobile students. The report, "Fragmented: Improving Education for Mobile Students," serves as a handbook to assist policy makers, educators, advocates, and parents in providing services mobile students need. The report begins by looking at the problems and situations of mobile students. Examples of such students include those who are residentially mobile, homeless, in migrant families, or in the foster care system. The second and third sections focus on policies and practices that can be implemented on the national, state, and local levels, as well as within districts and schools, to improve services for these students. The fourth section looks at specific examples of helpful initiatives. The fifth and final section of the report contains resources such as useful links, organizations, and selected readings. Those interested in the report can contact PRRAC at 202-387-9887 or info@prrac.org.

Fact of the Week Housing Cost Burdens

States With Largest Percentage Increase in the Share of Households Paying 35% or More of Household Income on Gross Rent, 2000-2002

State	Increase
Minnesota	12.7%
Mississippi	7.4%
Oregon	6.7%
Colorado	5.6%
Washington	5.5%
Idaho	5.5%
South Carolina	5.5%
Tennessee	5.4%
North Carolina	5.4%
Alabama	5.1%

Source: 2000 and 2002 American Community Survey,
www.census.gov/acs/www/index.html.

News & Events

Innovative Financing for Community Redevelopment

The 2003 National Summit on Innovative Financing for Community Redevelopment, to be held September 17-19 in San Diego, will provide lessons learned, ideas for funding housing projects and applications for finding redevelopment funds. The conference will offer practical strategies for addressing housing and redevelopment challenges. To register, call 703-894-0481 or visit www.PerformanceWeb.org.

NLIHC Staff

NLIHC Seeks Intern

NLIHC is seeking a research intern for the fall semester who is passionate about social justice issues and who has excellent writing and interpersonal skills. A detailed job description is available at www.nlihc.org. Send a resume and cover letter to:

Internship Coordinator, NLIHC 1012 14th Street NW, Suite 610, Washington DC 20005
 or to info@nlihc.org. Questions? 202-662-1530 x228.

Bills at a Glance

Current information on legislation being tracked by NLIHC is available through NLIHC's new legislative action center, at <http://capwiz.com/nlihc/issues/bills/>.

Tell Your Friends...

NLIHC membership is the best way to stay informed about affordable housing issues, keep in touch with advocates around the country, and support NLIHC's work. Membership information is available at www.nlihc.org, or by fax, mail, or e-mail. Just e-mail membership@nlihc.org or call 202-662-1530 to request membership materials to distribute at meetings and conferences.

Do you currently receive *Memo* by fax? If so, please consider switching to email delivery: You'll receive a higher-quality reproduction each week, and emailing is substantially less expensive than faxing, so you'll help NLIHC reduce costs. To switch, call 202-662-1530 x227 or email memo@nlihc.org.

Point of View *(cont'd from p. 1)*

has made. Do not be surprised when the President asks for even more money for Iraq before too long.

I attended the rally at the Lincoln Memorial last month commemorating the 40th anniversary of the great civil rights march of 1963. There was a man there selling 1960s vintage political buttons, including one I had not seen in a long time. It says "War is not healthy for children and other living things," the slogan of the anti-war group Another Mother for Peace. The slogan's dual meaning echoes loudly today. This war is especially unhealthy for children in low income families who Congress is "forced" to neglect in this year's budget.

NLIHC Staff

Sofia Checa, Field/Communications Intern, x241
Sheila Crowley, President, x224
Julie Eisenhardt, Field Organizer, x223
Katie Fisher, Field Organizer, x222
Melissa Higuchi, Membership Associate, x227
Kirsten Kaufman, Field/Communications Intern, x244
Khara Norris, Executive Assistant, x224
Danilo Pelletiere, Research Director, x237
Irene Basloe Saraf, Associate Director, 202-744-5766
Kim Schaffer, Outreach Director, x230
Michelle Goodwin Thompson, Office Manager, x234
Mark Treskon, Research Analyst, x245
Carol Vance, Receptionist/Office Assistant, x221
Cathy White, Deputy Director, x228
Kim Willis, Policy Analyst, x314



National Low Income Housing Coalition
Memo to Members
September 5, 2003
Vol. 8, No. 35

About NLIHC: Established in 1974, the National Low Income Housing Coalition is dedicated solely to ending America's affordable housing crisis. NLIHC educates, organizes, and advocates to ensure decent, affordable housing within healthy neighborhoods for everyone. NLIHC provides up-to-date information, formulates policy, and educates the public on housing needs and the strategies for solutions.