

Sherron Duncan
09/14/99 09:49:05 AM

HUD
budget

Record Type: Record

To: Paul J. Weinstein Jr./OPD/EOP@EOP

cc: Lisa Green/OPD/EOP@EOP, Andrea Kane/OPD/EOP@EOP, Elizabeth J. Potter/OVP@OVP, Francis S. Redburn/OMB/EOP@EOP

Subject: Budget Hearing

Per your request Mr. Weinstein a meeting on Outstanding Issues regarding HUD and other agency-related matters has been scheduled for Wednesday, September 22 at 1:00 pm until 2:00 pm. Should you have any questions please call Dianne Ham at 5-3120.

Thanks

Difference in Total

IG, PDR,

\$300 million difference
in savings

\$1.6 billion - HUD

\$1.9 billion - OMB

BACKGROUND NOTES ON BUDGET PROJECTIONS

Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS and Emergency Shelter Grant

Each of these formula programs were allocated to local government recipients by the program-specific formula, and then these local government amounts were summed to the State level.

Continuum of Care

The distribution of Continuum of Care funds was based on the “need amount” component of the scoring system used in the competition for these funds. Adjustments were made based on actual awards for FY 1998. These funds will be awarded by a competition, thus these figures are illustrative only.

Regional Connections

Funds for Regional Connections, Brownfields, and Abandoned Buildings Initiatives were distributed to cities and states on the CDBG formula. In practice, these funds would be made available on a competitive level; thus, the figures in this report are illustrative only. Note that these are new initiatives.

Public and Indian Housing Operating Subsidies

The FY 1999 and FY 2000 Operating Subsidy estimates reflect the same percentage received by Public Housing Authorities in the FY 1997 allocations. The estimate for an Entitlement Community represents the cumulative subsidies received by Public Housing Authorities in that Entitlement Community.

Vouchers

The FY 2000 estimate for New Incremental Vouchers for an individual Public Housing Authority is based on an overall percentage of its Section 8 funds to the total Section 8 tenant-based portfolio. The estimates for an Entitlement Community represents the cumulative amount of new incremental vouchers for Public Housing Authorities in that Entitlement Community (a cap of 700 vouchers per Public Housing Authority was applied per the FY 1999 NOFA). Additionally, the Incremental Vouchers in FY 1999 are renewed in the FY 2000 Budget; therefore the FY 2000 estimate represents a net increase. In practice, these funds will be distributed competitively; thus, the figures in this report are illustrative only.

Omb Housing Branch

**Department of Housing and Urban Development
FY 2000 Appropriations
Preliminary Scoring**

08/24/99 06:06:28 PM

Hud Budget

	<u>FY1999 Enacted</u>	<u>FY 2000 Request</u>	<u>House Committee</u>	<u>House v. 2000 Request</u>	<u>Percent Change from Request</u>
PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING					
Housing Certificate Fund	8,326,542.00	11,522,095.00	10,540,135.00	(981,960.00)	-8%
(By Transfer)	0.00	[183,000]	[183,000]	0.00	0.00
Housing Set-Asides					
Expiring Section 8 Contracts	[9,600,000]	[10,640,135]	[10,540,135]	[-100,000]	-1%
Section 8 relocation assistance	[433,542]	[156,000]	0.00	[-156,000]	-100%
Regional Opportunity Counseling	[10,000]	[20,000]	0.00	[-20,000]	-100%
Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers	[283,000]	[144,400]	0.00	[-144,400]	-100%
Contract Administration	0.00	[209,000]	0.00	[-209,000]	-100%
Incremental Vouchers	0.00	[346,560]	0.00	[-346,560]	-100%
Administrative Fee Change	0.00	[6,000]	0.00	[-6,000]	-100%
Section 8 Rescission	[2,000,000]	0.00	0.00	[0]	0.00
Public Housing Capital Fund	3,000,000.00	2,555,000.00	2,555,000.00	0.00	0.00
Public Housing Operating Fund	2,818,000.00	3,003,000.00	2,818,000.00	(185,000.00)	-6%
Drug Elimination Grants for Low-Income Housing	310,000.00	310,000.00	290,000.00	(20,000.00)	-6%
Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI)	625,000.00	625,000.00	575,000.00	(50,000.00)	-8%
Indian Housing Block Grant	620,000.00	620,000.00	620,000.00	0.00	0.00
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Program	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	0.00	0.00
Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	[68,881]	[71,956]	[71956]	0.00	0.00
TOTAL PIH	15,705,542.00	18,641,095.00	17,404,135.00	(1,236,960.00)	-7%
COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT					
Rural Housing and Economic Development	25,000.00	20,000.00	0.00	(20,000.00)	-100%
HOPWA	215,000.00	240,000.00	215,000.00	(25,000.00)	-10%
Additional Provisions-P.L. 105-277	10,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Department of Housing and Urban Development
FY 2000 Appropriations
Preliminary Scoring

08/24/99 06:06:28 PM

	<u>FY1999 Enacted</u>	<u>FY 2000 Request</u>	<u>House Committee</u>	<u>House v. 2000 Request</u>	<u>Percent Change from Request</u>
CDBG	4,750,000.00	4,775,000.00	4,500,200.00	(274,800.00)	-6%
Emergency Funding	20,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Section 108 Loan Guarantees					
Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	[1,261,000]	[1,261,000]	[1,087,000]	[-174,000]	-14%
Credit Subsidy	29,000.00	29,000.00	25,000.00	(4,000.00)	-14%
Administrative Expenses	1,000.00	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00	0.00
Brownfields	25,000.00	50,000.00	20,000.00	(30,000.00)	-60%
Regional Connections	0.00	50,000.00	0.00	(50,000.00)	-100%
Regional EZ and EC	0.00	50,000.00	0.00	(50,000.00)	-100%
Additional provisions P.L. 105-277	45,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
APICs:					
Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	0.00	[1,000,000]	0.00	[-1,000,000]	-100%
Credit Subsidy	0.00	37,000.00	0.00	(37,000.00)	-100%
Redevelopment of Abandoned Buildings	0.00	50,000.00	0.00	(50,000.00)	-100%
HOME	1,600,000.00	1,610,000.00	1,580,000.00	(30,000.00)	-2%
Homeless Assistance Grants	975,000.00	1,020,000.00	970,000.00	(50,000.00)	-5%
Homeless Assistance Demonstration Project	0.00	5,000.00	0.00	(5,000.00)	-100%
TOTAL CPD	7,695,000.00	7,937,000.00	7,311,200.00	(625,800.00)	-8%
HOUSING PROGRAMS					
Housing for Special Populations	854,000.00	854,000.00	854,000.00	0.00	0.00
Housing for the Elderly	[660,000]	[660,000]	[660,000]	0.00	0.00
Housing for the Disabled	[194,000]	[194,000]	[194,000]	0.00	0.00
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION					
FHA-Mutual Mortgage Insurance Program Account:					
Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	[140,000,000]	[140,000,000]	[140,000,000]	0.00	0%

Department of Housing and Urban Development
FY 2000 Appropriations
Preliminary Scoring

08/24/99 06:06:28 PM

	<u>FY1999 Enacted</u>	<u>FY 2000 Request</u>	<u>House Committee</u>	<u>House v. 2000 Request</u>	<u>Percent Change from Request</u>
Limitation on Direct Loans	[100,000]	[50,000]	[50,000]	0.00	0.00
Administrative Expenses	328,888	331,000.00	328,888.00	(2,112.00)	-1%
Offsetting Receipts	(529,000)	0 00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FHA- General and Special Risk Program Account:					
Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	[18,100,000]	[18,100,000]	[18,100,000]	0.00	0.00
Limitation on Direct Loans	[50,000,000]	[50,000,000]	[50,000,000]	0.00	0.00
Administrative Expenses	211,455.00	64,000.00	64,000.00	0.00	0.00
Administrative Expenses (unobligated balances)	0 00	[147,000]	[147,000]	0.00	0.00
Negative Subsidy	(125,000.00)	(75,000.00)	(75,000.00)	0.00	0.00
Subsidy	81,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Subsidy (unobligated balances)	0 00	[153,000]	[153,000]	0.00	0.00
TOTAL FHA	(32,657)	320,000	317,888	(2,112)	-1%

GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:

Limitation on Guaranteed Loans	[200,000,000]	[200,000,000]	[200,000,000]	0.00	0.00
Administrative Expenses	9,383.00	15,383.00	9,383.00	(6,000.00)	-40%
Offsetting Receipts	(370,000)	(422,000)	(422,000)	0.00	0.00

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH

Research and Technology	47,500.00	50,000.00	42,500.00	(7,500.00)	-15%
-------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	------

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

Fair Housing Activities	40,000.00	47,000.00	37,500.00	(9,500.00)	-20%
-------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------	------

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

Department of Housing and Urban Development
FY 2000 Appropriations
Preliminary Scoring

08/24/99 06:06:28 PM

	<u>FY1999 Enacted</u>	<u>FY 2000 Request</u>	<u>House Committee</u>	<u>House v. 2000 Request</u>	<u>Percent Change from Request</u>
Lead Hazard Reduction	80,000.00	80,000.00	70,000.00	(10,000.00)	-13%
MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and Expenses	456,843.00	502,000.00	456,843.00	(45,157.00)	-9%
By Transfer, Limitation on FHA Corporate Funds	[518,000]	[518,000]	[518,000]	0.00	0.00
By Transfer, GNMA	[9,383]	[9,383]	[9,383]	0.00	0.00
By Transfer, Community Planning and Development	[1,000]	[1,000]	[1,000]	0.00	0.00
By Transfer, Title VI	[200]	[150]	[150]	0.00	0.00
By Transfer, Indian Housing	[400]	[200]	[200]	0.00	0.00
Y2K Conversion (Emergency Funding)	12,200.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL					
Office of Inspector General	49,567.00	38,000.00	40,000.00	2,000.00	5%
By Transfer, Limitation on FHA Corporate Funds	[22,343]	[22,343]	[22,343]	0.00	0.00
By Transfer, from Drug Elimination Grants	[10,000]	[10,000]	[10,000]	0.00	0.00
OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT					
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	16,000.00	19,493.00	19,493.00	0.00	0.00
Offsetting Receipts	(16,000)	(19,493)	(19,493)	0.00	0.00
ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS					
Establish Minimum Rents	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Relax Preference Rules	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Eliminate Shopping Incentives	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Enhanced Vouchers	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Single Family Property Disposition	(400,000)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Department of Housing and Urban Development
FY 2000 Appropriations
Preliminary Scoring

08/24/99 06:06:28 PM

	<u>FY1999 Enacted</u>	<u>FY 2000 Request</u>	<u>House Committee</u>	<u>House v. 2000 Request</u>	<u>Percent Change from Request</u>
Sec. 212, Calculation of Downpayment	15,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FHA Increase in Loan Amounts	(83,000)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GSE User Fee	0.00	(10,000)	0.00	10,000.00	-100%
Sec. 214, General Transfer Authority	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sec. 208 FHA	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Section 212 Rescission	0.00	0.00	(74,400)	(74,400.00)	100%
Program Reform	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Annual Contribution (transfer out)	0.00	[-79,000]	[-79,000]	0.00	0.00
Annual Contribution (transfer out)	0.00	[-104,000]	[-104,000]	0.00	0.00
National Cities in Schools	0.00	0.00	5,000	5,000.00	100%
Moving to Work Demonstration Program	0.00	0.00	5,000	5,000.00	100%
 TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS	 (468,000.00)	 (10,000.00)	 (64,400.00)	 (54,400.00)	 5.4 times the Reque
 TOTAL TITLE II HUD	 24,079,378.00	 28,052,478.00	 26,057,049.00	 (1,995,429.00)	 -7%
 Rescissions					
Section 235 Rescission	0.00	0.00	(22,975)	(22,975.00)	100%
HOPE Rescission	0.00	0.00	(11,400)	(11,400.00)	100%
Annual Contributions Rescissions:					
PIH Modernization	0.00	0.00	(30,552)	(30,552.00)	100%
Late disbursements (over 5 years)	0.00	0.00	(3,048)	(3,048.00)	100%
Non-Profit Sponsor Assistance Account Rescission	0.00	0.00	(6,400)	(6,400.00)	100%
 TOTAL RESCISSIONS	 0	 0	 (74,375.00)	 (74,375.00)	 100%

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
ALABAMA	Callahan, Sonny	1	225-4931	2466	\$4,664,000	300	186	17	117
ALABAMA	Everett, Terry	2	225-2901	2312	3,557,000	196	180	16	92
ALABAMA	Riley, Bob	3	225-3261	322	2,920,000	129	193	17	76
ALABAMA	Aderholt, Robert B.	4	225-4876	1007	2,718,000	111	182	15	74
ALABAMA	Cramer, Robert E., Jr.	5	225-4801	2350	3,992,000	253	154	12	106
ALABAMA	Bachus, Spencer	6	225-4921	442	2,800,000	196	130	13	64
ALABAMA	Hilliard, Earl F.	7	225-2665	1314	8,101,000	442	331	38	228
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$28,752,000	1,627	1,356	128	758
ALASKA	Young, Don	At Large	225-5765	2111	4,600,000	260	125	12	139
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$4,600,000	260	125	12	139
ARIZONA	Salmon, Matt	1	225-2635	115	2,642,000	298	192	20	17
ARIZONA	Pastor, Ed	2	225-4065	2465	4,960,000	423	300	43	76
ARIZONA	Stump, Bob	3	225-4576	211	3,314,000	182	177	20	84
ARIZONA	Shadegg, John B.	4	225-3361	430	2,343,000	208	168	32	29
ARIZONA	Kolbe, Jim	5	225-2542	2266	2,881,000	215	175	19	52
ARIZONA	Hayworth, J. D.	6	225-2190	1023	3,683,000	168	184	18	104
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$19,823,000	1,493	1,197	153	361
ARKANSAS	Berry, Marion	1	225-4076	1113	3,982,000	371	219	19	55
ARKANSAS	Snyder, Vic	2	225-2506	1319	3,858,000	376	173	18	57
ARKANSAS	Hutchinson, Asa	3	225-4301	1535	2,860,000	288	159	12	35
ARKANSAS	Dickey, Jay	4	225-3772	2453	3,167,000	273	190	16	48
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$13,867,000	1,308	742	65	195
CALIFORNIA	Thompson, Mike	1	225-3311	415	3,282,000	379	173	24	13
CALIFORNIA	Herger, Wally	2	225-3076	2433	3,992,000	460	198	28	18
CALIFORNIA	Ose, Doug	3	225-5716	1508	3,782,000	415	215	26	23
CALIFORNIA	Doolittle, John T.	4	225-2511	1526	2,017,000	184	134	19	14
CALIFORNIA	Matsui, Robert T.	5	225-7163	2308	4,556,000	472	217	48	55
CALIFORNIA	Woolsey, Lynn C.	6	225-5161	439	3,115,000	442	122	12	12
CALIFORNIA	Miller, George	7	225-2095	2205	5,289,000	730	180	19	28
CALIFORNIA	Pelosi, Nancy	8	225-4965	2457	6,063,000	418	494	400	79
CALIFORNIA	Lee, Barbara	9	225-2661	414	10,297,000	1,222	358	134	102
CALIFORNIA	Tauscher, Ellen O	10	225-1880	1239	3,289,000	489	96	11	11
CALIFORNIA	Pombo, Richard W	11	225-1947	2411	3,151,000	319	224	18	28
CALIFORNIA	Lantos, Tom	12	225-3531	2217	2,554,000	271	203	76	15

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
CALIFORNIA	Stark, Fortney Pete	13	225-5065	239	2,021,000	262	160	16	5
CALIFORNIA	Eshoo, Anna G.	14	225-8104	205	2,286,000	317	139	8	3
CALIFORNIA	Campbell, Tom	15	225-2631	2442	2,416,000	318	139	20	5
CALIFORNIA	Lofgren, Zoe	16	225-3072	318	4,255,000	572	245	40	6
CALIFORNIA	Farr, Sam	17	225-2861	1221	3,746,000	407	234	30	18
CALIFORNIA	Condit, Gary A.	18	225-6131	2234	5,109,000	607	233	28	30
CALIFORNIA	Radanovich, George	19	225-4540	123	3,958,000	420	243	21	32
CALIFORNIA	Dooley, Calvin M.	20	225-3341	1201	4,556,000	454	308	30	36
CALIFORNIA	Thomas, William M.	21	225-2915	2208	2,793,000	300	223	17	14
CALIFORNIA	Capps, Lois	22	225-3601	1118	4,509,000	590	191	18	21
CALIFORNIA	Gallegly, Elton	23	225-5811	2427	3,665,000	486	184	13	14
CALIFORNIA	Sherman, Brad	24	225-5911	1524	1,491,000	90	167	39	19
CALIFORNIA	McKeon, Howard P. "Buck"	25	225-1956	2242	1,284,000	94	168	20	10
CALIFORNIA	Berman, Howard L.	26	225-4695	2330	2,932,000	156	328	87	42
CALIFORNIA	Rogan, James E.	27	225-4176	126	2,561,000	280	231	25	8
CALIFORNIA	Dreier, David	28	225-2305	237	2,051,000	209	186	14	12
CALIFORNIA	Waxman, Henry A.	29	225-3976	2204	2,560,000	212	238	52	26
CALIFORNIA	Becerra, Xavier	30	225-6235	1119	3,758,000	187	429	117	55
CALIFORNIA	Martinez, Matthew G.	31	225-5464	2269	2,788,000	242	357	26	14
CALIFORNIA	Dixon, Julian C.	32	225-7084	2252	3,247,000	178	360	94	45
CALIFORNIA	Roybal-Allard, Lucille	33	225-1766	2435	4,361,000	353	442	71	37
CALIFORNIA	Napolitano, Grace F.	34	225-5256	1407	2,793,000	301	256	17	13
CALIFORNIA	Waters, Maxine	35	225-2201	2344	3,798,000	323	377	68	32
CALIFORNIA	Kuykendall, Steven T.	36	225-8220	512	2,207,000	236	169	26	14
CALIFORNIA	Millender-McDonald, Juanit	37	225-7924	419	3,829,000	373	381	49	20
CALIFORNIA	Horn, Stephen	38	225-6676	2331	2,898,000	351	248	19	5
CALIFORNIA	Royce, Edward R.	39	225-4111	1133	1,943,000	244	153	9	4
CALIFORNIA	Lewis, Jerry	40	225-5861	2112	3,452,000	391	196	14	29
CALIFORNIA	Miller, Gary G.	41	225-3201	1037	2,314,000	268	181	13	9
CALIFORNIA	Brown, George E., Jr.	42	225-6161	2300	1,492,000	109	213	13	10
CALIFORNIA	Calvert, Ken	43	225-1986	2201	1,778,000	178	173	75	5
CALIFORNIA	Bono, Mary	44	225-5330	516	3,547,000	440	230	18	12
CALIFORNIA	Rohrabacher, Dana	45	225-2415	2338	1,684,000	209	159	9	2
CALIFORNIA	Sanchez, Loretta	46	225-2965	1529	5,275,000	710	313	74	3
CALIFORNIA	Cox, Christopher	47	225-5611	2402	1,968,000	271	132	11	1
CALIFORNIA	Packard, Ron	48	225-3906	2372	2,960,000	431	142	11	3
CALIFORNIA	Bilbray, Brian P.	49	225-2040	1530	3,378,000	416	200	65	12
CALIFORNIA	Fiener, Bob	50	225-8045	2463	4,198,000	520	277	69	13
CALIFORNIA	Cunningham, Randy "Duke"	51	225-5452	2238	2,370,000	323	142	20	4
CALIFORNIA	Hunter, Duncan	52	225-5672	2265	2,766,000	343	167	21	7
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$172,384,000	18,972	11,929	2,199	1,045

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION						POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)			
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
COLORADO	DeGette, Diana	1	225-4431	1339	5,013,000	436	292	76	75
COLORADO	Udall, Mark	2	225-2161	128	2,580,000	357	135	7	6
COLORADO	McInnis, Scott	3	225-4761	320	2,981,000	342	160	8	20
COLORADO	Schaffer, Bob	4	225-4676	212	2,714,000	340	152	8	11
COLORADO	Hefley, Joel	5	225-4422	2230	1,919,000	205	117	8	15
COLORADO	Tancredo, Thomas G.	6	225-7882	1123	1,354,000	178	96	5	4
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$16,561,000	1,857	952	111	131
CONNECTICUT	Larson, John B	1	225-2265	1419	6,550,000	648	217	84	105
CONNECTICUT	Gejdenson, Sam	2	225-2076	2304	2,377,000	193	178	23	30
CONNECTICUT	DeLauro, Rosa L.	3	225-3661	436	4,518,000	480	209	78	51
CONNECTICUT	Shays, Christopher	4	225-5541	1126	5,866,000	400	200	14	153
CONNECTICUT	Maloney, James H.	5	225-3822	1213	3,051,000	289	152	15	44
CONNECTICUT	Johnson, Nancy L	6	225-4476	2113	2,315,000	193	143	18	33
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$24,677,000	2,204	1,099	232	416
DELAWARE	Castle, Michael N.	At Large	225-4165	1227	4,295,000	333	180	44	89
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$4,295,000	333	180	44	89
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Norton, Eleanor Holmes	Delegate	225-8050	1424	13,903,000	633	536	355	417
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$13,903,000	633	536	355	417
FLORIDA	Scarborough, Joe	1	225-4136	127	2,543,000	256	167	22	23
FLORIDA	Boyd, Allen	2	225-5235	107	2,478,000	198	171	30	33
FLORIDA	Brown, Corrine	3	225-0123	2444	4,518,000	435	212	76	62
FLORIDA	Fowler, Tillie K.	4	225-2501	106	2,766,000	259	133	33	40
FLORIDA	Thurman, Karen L.	5	225-1002	440	2,292,000	195	169	27	27
FLORIDA	Stearns, Cliff	6	225-5744	2227	2,132,000	195	136	29	23
FLORIDA	Mica, John L.	7	225-4035	2445	1,157,000	84	127	13	12
FLORIDA	McCollum, Bill	8	225-2176	2109	2,288,000	210	157	65	23
FLORIDA	Bilirakis, Michael	9	225-5755	2369	2,274,000	273	119	10	16
FLORIDA	Young, C. W. Bill	10	225-5961	2407	2,964,000	362	129	9	23
FLORIDA	Davis, Jim	11	225-3376	418	5,758,000	451	188	91	126
FLORIDA	Canady, Charles T.	12	225-1252	2432	1,717,000	123	165	14	23
FLORIDA	Miller, Dan	13	225-5015	102	2,207,000	201	132	18	31
FLORIDA	Goss, Porter J.	14	225-2536	108	1,911,000	142	134	23	34
FLORIDA	Weldon, Dave	15	225-3671	332	1,648,000	128	132	15	25

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
FLORIDA	Foley, Mark	16	225-5792	113	1,641,000	132	134	31	18
FLORIDA	Meek, Carrie P.	17	225-4506	401	5,589,000	360	349	179	111
FLORIDA	Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana	18	225-3931	2160	8,530,000	664	327	263	172
FLORIDA	Wexler, Robert	19	225-3001	213	1,988,000	237	141	11	8
FLORIDA	Deutsch, Peter	20	225-7931	204	1,342,000	120	137	34	9
FLORIDA	Diaz-Balart, Lincoln	21	225-4211	404	2,321,000	210	245	19	13
FLORIDA	Shaw, E. Clay, Jr.	22	225-3026	2408	3,126,000	356	196	115	17
FLORIDA	Hastings, Alcee L.	23	225-1313	2235	3,978,000	423	213	199	35
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$67,168,000	6,013	4,013	1,326	904
GEORGIA	Kingston, Jack	1	225-5831	1034	4,360,000	303	209	22	97
GEORGIA	Bishop, Sanford D., Jr.	2	225-3631	1433	3,030,000	206	209	19	58
GEORGIA	Collins, Mac	3	225-5901	1131	3,223,000	215	163	14	74
GEORGIA	McKinney, Cynthia A.	4	225-1605	124	2,589,000	321	137	11	14
GEORGIA	Lewis, John	5	225-3801	343	10,477,000	976	338	184	184
GEORGIA	Isakson, Johnny	6	225-4501	2428	663,000	23	78	8	13
GEORGIA	Barr, Bob	7	225-2931	1207	1,970,000	136	139	15	35
GEORGIA	Chambliss, Saxby	8	225-6531	1019	4,357,000	338	196	17	91
GEORGIA	Deal, Nathan	9	225-5211	2437	2,136,000	157	130	14	39
GEORGIA	Norwood, Charlie	10	225-4101	1707	4,746,000	387	224	22	89
GEORGIA	Linder, John	11	225-4272	2447	2,044,000	93	150	15	52
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$39,595,000	3,153	1,972	341	746
HAWAII	Abercrombie, Neil	1	225-2726	1502	2,073,000	239	185	24	2
HAWAII	Mink, Patsy T.	2	225-4906	2135	6,259,000	669	229	27	84
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$8,332,000	909	413	51	86
IDAHO	Chenoweth, Helen	1	225-6611	1727	2,364,000	301	137	7	8
IDAHO	Simpson, Michael K	2	225-5531	1440	2,069,000	257	132	6	7
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$4,433,000	558	269	13	15
ILLINOIS	Rush, Bobby L.	1	225-4372	2416	6,841,000	205	511	78	198
ILLINOIS	Jackson, Jesse L., Jr.	2	225-0773	313	5,300,000	311	349	49	117
ILLINOIS	Lipinski, William O.	3	225-5701	1501	2,515,000	192	177	20	42
ILLINOIS	Gutierrez, Luis V.	4	225-8203	2438	7,910,000	220	613	91	230
ILLINOIS	Blagojevich, Rod R.	5	225-4061	331	4,709,000	175	341	51	128
ILLINOIS	Hyde, Henry J.	6	225-4561	2110	1,236,000	162	75	5	3
ILLINOIS	Davis, Danny K	7	225-5006	1222	6,982,000	255	527	77	187

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION						POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)			
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
ILLINOIS	Crane, Philip M	8	225-3711	233	1,809,000	234	91	6	9
ILLINOIS	Schakowsky, Janice D.	9	225-2111	515	4,512,000	133	386	53	123
ILLINOIS	Porter, John Edward	10	225-4835	2373	1,922,000	243	84	5	14
ILLINOIS	Weller, Jerry	11	225-3635	424	2,604,000	187	162	15	51
ILLINOIS	Costello, Jerry F.	12	225-5661	2454	4,612,000	288	215	16	112
ILLINOIS	Biggert, Judy	13	225-3515	508	875,000	106	68	5	3
ILLINOIS	Hastert, J. Dennis	14	225-2976	2263	1,980,000	186	133	8	26
ILLINOIS	Ewing, Thomas W	15	225-2371	2417	3,076,000	209	217	13	58
ILLINOIS	Manzullo, Donald A.	16	225-5676	409	3,232,000	217	157	14	74
ILLINOIS	Evans, Lane	17	225-5905	2335	2,410,000	64	204	13	66
ILLINOIS	LaHood, Ray	18	225-6201	329	3,151,000	183	191	15	71
ILLINOIS	Phelps, David D.	19	225-5201	1523	2,755,000	124	213	16	63
ILLINOIS	Shimkus, John	20	225-5271	513	2,571,000	134	188	13	56
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$71,002,000	3,826	4,905	564	1,631
INDIANA	Visclosky, Peter J	1	225-2461	2313	3,842,000	231	260	17	86
INDIANA	McIntosh, David M.	2	225-3021	1610	2,707,000	280	186	13	24
INDIANA	Roemer, Tim	3	225-3915	2352	2,824,000	263	193	14	34
INDIANA	Souder, Mark E.	4	225-4436	109	2,365,000	238	164	14	20
INDIANA	Buyer, Stephen E	5	225-5037	227	1,893,000	170	160	12	18
INDIANA	Burton, Dan	6	225-2276	2185	1,666,000	165	120	15	14
INDIANA	Pease, Edward A.	7	225-5805	119	2,596,000	250	189	14	25
INDIANA	Hostettler, John N.	8	225-4636	1507	3,415,000	348	210	16	35
INDIANA	Hill, Baron P.	9	225-5315	1208	1,714,000	115	150	12	26
INDIANA	Carson, Julia	10	225-4011	1541	4,162,000	461	228	41	36
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$27,184,000	2,521	1,863	167	317
IOWA	Leach, James A.	1	225-6576	2186	2,744,000	339	212	12	5
IOWA	Nussle, Jim	2	225-2911	303	2,816,000	356	215	10	3
IOWA	Boswell, Leonard L	3	225-3806	1029	1,413,000	112	188	9	4
IOWA	Ganske, Greg	4	225-4426	1108	3,222,000	376	246	15	11
IOWA	Latham, Tom	5	225-5476	324	1,969,000	193	216	12	4
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$12,164,000	1,375	1,076	57	26
KANSAS	Moran, Jerry	1	225-2715	1519	1,395,000	35	212	10	21
KANSAS	Ryun, Jim	2	225-6601	330	1,908,000	116	202	11	27
KANSAS	Moore, Dennis	3	225-2865	506	2,857,000	248	168	10	47
KANSAS	Tiahrt, Todd	4	225-6216	428	2,257,000	204	186	11	22

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$8,417,000	603	768	41	117
KENTUCKY	Whitfield, Ed	1	225-3115	236	3,700,000	379	193	15	45
KENTUCKY	Lewis, Ron	2	225-3501	223	2,941,000	268	174	14	41
KENTUCKY	Northup, Anne M.	3	225-5401	1004	7,050,000	631	342	30	115
KENTUCKY	Lucas, Ken	4	225-3465	1237	3,871,000	373	208	18	52
KENTUCKY	Rogers, Harold	5	225-4601	2470	3,193,000	296	190	16	42
KENTUCKY	Fletcher, Ernie	6	225-4706	1117	3,583,000	319	183	15	57
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$24,338,000	2,266	1,290	108	353
LOUISIANA	[Livingston, Bob]	1	225-3015	2406	2,356,000	216	180	20	25
LOUISIANA	Jefferson, William J.	2	225-6636	240	9,039,000	797	494	127	137
LOUISIANA	Tauzin, W. J. (Billy)	3	225-4031	2183	2,170,000	117	233	21	35
LOUISIANA	McCreary, Jim	4	225-2777	2104	3,042,000	249	247	23	37
LOUISIANA	Cooksey, John	5	225-8490	317	3,549,000	313	239	22	48
LOUISIANA	Baker, Richard H.	6	225-3901	434	2,391,000	181	214	18	30
LOUISIANA	John, Christopher	7	225-2031	1504	3,745,000	324	267	25	48
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$26,292,000	2,197	1,873	257	360
MAINE	Allen, Thomas H.	1	225-6116	1717	4,085,000	423	231	12	42
MAINE	Baldacci, John Elias	2	225-6306	1740	4,523,000	472	276	12	46
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$8,608,000	895	507	25	88
MARYLAND	Gilcrest, Wayne T.	1	225-5311	2245	2,897,000	233	132	13	55
MARYLAND	Ehrlich, Robert L., Jr	2	225-3061	315	2,209,000	322	95	7	3
MARYLAND	Cardin, Benjamin L.	3	225-4016	104	6,488,000	426	249	83	162
MARYLAND	Wynn, Albert Russell	4	225-8699	407	2,745,000	334	143	15	17
MARYLAND	Hoyer, Steny H.	5	225-4131	1705	1,948,000	222	109	8	14
MARYLAND	Bartlett, Roscoe G.	6	225-2721	2412	3,186,000	338	164	8	36
MARYLAND	Cummings, Elijah E.	7	225-4741	1632	12,945,000	689	480	185	370
MARYLAND	Morella, Constance A.	8	225-5341	2228	2,391,000	281	96	16	22
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$34,809,000	2,845	1,468	333	680
MASSACHUSETTS	Olver, John W.	1	225-5335	1027	3,567,000	356	264	20	33
MASSACHUSETTS	Neal, Richard E.	2	225-5601	2236	3,953,000	407	279	23	32
MASSACHUSETTS	McGovern, James P.	3	225-6101	416	4,597,000	412	276	27	63
MASSACHUSETTS	Frank, Barney	4	225-5931	2210	4,712,000	436	300	23	60
MASSACHUSETTS	Meehan, Martin T.	5	225-3411	2434	3,923,000	315	209	24	69

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
MASSACHUSETTS	Tierney, John F.	6	225-8020	120	3,385,000	369	250	19	21
MASSACHUSETTS	Markey, Edward J.	7	225-2836	2108	3,757,000	409	250	17	31
MASSACHUSETTS	Capuano, Michael E.	8	225-5111	1232	13,239,000	900	570	109	310
MASSACHUSETTS	Moakley, John Joseph	9	225-8273	235	7,124,000	501	306	60	163
MASSACHUSETTS	Delahunt, William D.	10	225-3111	1317	3,193,000	327	216	19	28
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$51,450,000	4,432	2,920	341	810
MICHIGAN	Stupak, Bart	1	225-4735	2348	2,429,000	227	168	14	22
MICHIGAN	Hoekstra, Peter	2	225-4401	1124	2,005,000	158	173	12	24
MICHIGAN	Ehlers, Vernon J.	3	225-3831	1714	2,120,000	225	179	14	12
MICHIGAN	Camp, Dave	4	225-3561	137	2,265,000	210	162	14	20
MICHIGAN	Barcia, James A.	5	225-8171	2419	2,859,000	223	249	18	35
MICHIGAN	Upton, Fred	6	225-3761	2333	2,048,000	149	184	15	25
MICHIGAN	Smith, Nick	7	225-6276	306	2,713,000	246	211	14	28
MICHIGAN	Stabenow, Debbie	8	225-4872	1039	1,964,000	152	155	12	27
MICHIGAN	Kildee, Dale E.	9	225-3611	2187	2,408,000	152	237	17	38
MICHIGAN	Bonior, David E.	10	225-2106	2207	1,352,000	114	150	9	13
MICHIGAN	Knollenberg, Joe	11	225-5802	2349	769,000	82	85	5	2
MICHIGAN	Levin, Sander M.	12	225-4961	2268	419,000	0	122	7	3
MICHIGAN	Rivers, Lynn N.	13	225-6261	1724	2,135,000	203	161	14	22
MICHIGAN	Conyers, John, Jr.	14	225-5126	2426	3,636,000	195	551	75	27
MICHIGAN	Kilpatrick, Carolyn C.	15	225-2261	503	4,442,000	233	674	93	34
MICHIGAN	Dingell, John D.	16	225-4071	2328	1,542,000	95	194	13	18
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$35,106,000	2,666	3,654	345	350
MINNESOTA	Gutknecht, Gil	1	225-2472	425	1,631,000	124	154	8	18
MINNESOTA	Minge, David	2	225-2331	1415	1,389,000	77	152	8	19
MINNESOTA	Ramstad, Jim	3	225-2871	103	755,000	82	76	5	2
MINNESOTA	Vento, Bruce F.	4	225-6631	2413	7,710,000	924	274	20	78
MINNESOTA	Sabo, Martin Olav	5	225-4755	2336	6,644,000	429	418	64	138
MINNESOTA	Luther, Bill	6	225-2271	117	1,034,000	111	93	5	6
MINNESOTA	Peterson, Collin C.	7	225-2165	2159	1,825,000	138	175	9	21
MINNESOTA	Oberstar, James L.	8	225-6211	2365	2,499,000	174	261	17	28
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$23,487,000	2,059	1,605	138	310
MISSISSIPPI	Wicker, Roger F.	1	225-4306	206	2,108,000	146	181	16	32
MISSISSIPPI	Thompson, Bennie G.	2	225-5876	1408	3,468,000	279	270	23	46
MISSISSIPPI	Pickering, Charles W.	3	225-5031	427	1,933,000	134	166	14	29
MISSISSIPPI	Shows, Ronnie	4	225-5865	509	3,522,000	388	199	16	30

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
MISSISSIPPI	Taylor, Gene	5	225-5772	2311	4,545,000	456	205	14	66
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$15,576,000	1,402	1,021	84	203
MISSOURI	Clay, William (Bill)	1	225-2406	2306	6,746,000	546	478	86	97
MISSOURI	Talent, James M.	2	225-2561	1022	1,271,000	157	72	5	7
MISSOURI	Gephardt, Richard A.	3	225-2671	1226	4,226,000	335	307	52	61
MISSOURI	Skelton, Ike	4	225-2876	2206	1,895,000	190	130	10	17
MISSOURI	McCarthy, Karen	5	225-4535	1330	4,949,000	526	270	70	49
MISSOURI	Danner, Pat	6	225-7041	2262	2,919,000	307	193	23	24
MISSOURI	Blunt, Roy	7	225-6536	217	2,759,000	319	151	13	23
MISSOURI	Emerson, Jo Ann	8	225-4404	132	2,388,000	239	164	13	21
MISSOURI	Hulshof, Kenny C.	9	225-2956	412	2,649,000	302	132	9	24
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$29,802,000	2,921	1,897	281	322
MONTANA	Hill, Rick	At Large	225-3211	1609	5,032,000	360	238	11	111
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$5,032,000	360	238	11	111
NEBRASKA	Bereuter, Doug	1	225-4806	2184	2,602,000	317	161	11	11
NEBRASKA	Terry, Lee	2	225-4155	1728	4,017,000	431	189	13	46
NEBRASKA	Barrett, Bill	3	225-6435	2458	1,371,000	70	188	9	16
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$7,990,000	819	538	34	73
NEVADA	Berkley, Shelley	1	225-5965	1505	3,859,000	343	192	67	62
NEVADA	Gibbons, Jim	2	225-6155	100	4,155,000	402	172	28	62
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$8,014,000	745	365	95	124
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Sununu, John E.	1	225-5456	316	3,094,000	261	181	40	49
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Bass, Charles F.	2	225-5206	218	2,160,000	232	151	9	15
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$5,254,000	494	332	48	64
NEW JERSEY	Andrews, Robert E.	1	225-6501	2439	3,606,000	141	194	25	110
NEW JERSEY	LoBiondo, Frank A.	2	225-6572	222	7,945,000	734	213	39	144
NEW JERSEY	Saxton, Jim	3	225-4765	339	1,177,000	112	94	9	12
NEW JERSEY	Smith, Christopher H.	4	225-3765	2370	3,086,000	175	183	17	74
NEW JERSEY	Roukema, Marge	5	225-4465	2469	3,180,000	340	130	21	34
NEW JERSEY	Pallone, Frank, Jr.	6	225-4671	420	2,996,000	196	139	8	77

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ²	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NEW JERSEY	Franks, Bob	7	225-5361	225	1,209,000	45	153	39	22
NEW JERSEY	Pascrell, Bill, Jr.	8	225-5751	1722	5,119,000	428	280	73	88
NEW JERSEY	Rothman, Steven R	9	225-5061	1607	4,278,000	343	285	44	66
NEW JERSEY	Payne, Donald M.	10	225-3436	2209	7,608,000	380	454	225	191
NEW JERSEY	Frelinghuysen, Rodney P.	11	225-5034	228	1,356,000	127	105	11	12
NEW JERSEY	Holt, Rush D.	12	225-5801	1630	2,107,000	230	83	13	22
NEW JERSEY	Menendez, Robert	13	225-7919	405	10,010,000	524	459	190	274
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$53,677,000	3,773	2,772	714	1,126
NEW MEXICO	Wilson, Heather	1	225-6316	226	3,273,000	407	159	13	20
NEW MEXICO	Skeen, Joe	2	225-2365	2302	2,724,000	250	181	16	34
NEW MEXICO	Udall, Tom	3	225-6190	502	2,522,000	211	183	17	34
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$8,519,000	869	523	47	88
NEW YORK	Forbes, Michael P.	1	225-3826	125	450,000	11	98	9	2
NEW YORK	Lazio, Rick	2	225-3335	2244	1,011,000	100	99	71	3
NEW YORK	King, Peter T.	3	225-7896	403	958,000	23	168	13	12
NEW YORK	McCarthy, Carolyn	4	225-5516	1725	1,229,000	32	212	17	15
NEW YORK	Ackerman, Gary L.	5	225-2601	2243	3,907,000	61	181	70	149
NEW YORK	Meeks, Gregory W	6	225-3461	1710	8,460,000	106	300	156	345
NEW YORK	Crowley, Joseph	7	225-3965	1517	10,374,000	130	368	192	423
NEW YORK	Nadler, Jerrold	8	225-5635	2334	10,611,000	133	377	196	432
NEW YORK	Weiner, Anthony D.	9	225-6616	501	8,779,000	110	312	162	358
NEW YORK	Towns, Edolphus	10	225-5936	2232	14,128,000	177	502	261	576
NEW YORK	Owens, Major R.	11	225-6231	2305	12,825,000	161	455	237	522
NEW YORK	Velazquez, Nydia M.	12	225-2361	2241	15,530,000	194	551	287	633
NEW YORK	Fossella, Vito	13	225-3371	431	7,789,000	97	276	144	317
NEW YORK	Maloney, Carolyn B.	14	225-7944	2430	7,043,000	88	250	130	287
NEW YORK	Rangel, Charles B	15	225-4365	2354	15,279,000	191	542	283	622
NEW YORK	Serrano, Jos. E.	16	225-4361	2342	17,449,000	218	619	323	711
NEW YORK	Engel, Eliot L.	17	225-2464	2303	10,780,000	261	434	178	394
NEW YORK	Lowe, Nita M	18	225-6506	2421	4,736,000	194	262	67	139
NEW YORK	Kelly, Sue W	19	225-5441	1122	1,420,000	115	165	13	12
NEW YORK	Gilman, Benjamin A	20	225-3776	2449	1,071,000	82	137	11	8
NEW YORK	McNulty, Michael R.	21	225-5076	2161	6,510,000	531	338	31	116
NEW YORK	Sweeney, John E	22	225-5614	437	3,559,000	412	193	22	24
NEW YORK	Boehlert, Sherwood L.	23	225-3665	2246	4,817,000	514	292	30	40
NEW YORK	McHugh, John M.	24	225-4611	2441	4,278,000	506	221	29	25
NEW YORK	Walsh, James T.	25	225-3701	2351	4,695,000	411	269	22	72
NEW YORK	Hinchey, Maurice D	26	225-6335	2431	4,023,000	415	285	27	32

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NEW YORK	Reynolds, Thomas M.	27	225-5265	413	2,986,000	334	182	21	19
NEW YORK	Slaughter, Louise McIntosh	28	225-3615	2347	4,543,000	378	332	50	63
NEW YORK	LaFalce, John J.	29	225-3231	2310	5,696,000	436	368	34	99
NEW YORK	Quinn, Jack	30	225-3306	229	6,628,000	480	421	42	125
NEW YORK	Houghton, Amo	31	225-3161	1110	4,063,000	416	284	27	35
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$205,627,000	7,317	9,494	3,155	6,609
NORTH CAROLINA	Clayton, Eva M.	1	225-3101	2440	4,995,000	482	189	16	81
NORTH CAROLINA	Etheridge, Bob	2	225-4531	1641	2,966,000	272	126	12	49
NORTH CAROLINA	Jones, Walter B.	3	225-3415	422	3,067,000	266	140	12	54
NORTH CAROLINA	Pnce, David E.	4	225-1784	2162	2,777,000	228	132	28	53
NORTH CAROLINA	Burr, Richard	5	225-2071	1513	3,599,000	354	120	10	60
NORTH CAROLINA	Coble, Howard	6	225-3065	2468	3,049,000	267	119	10	57
NORTH CAROLINA	McIntyre, Mike	7	225-2731	1605	2,894,000	279	114	9	46
NORTH CAROLINA	Hayes, Robin	8	225-3715	130	2,329,000	215	143	12	30
NORTH CAROLINA	Myrick, Sue Wilkins	9	225-1976	230	3,032,000	288	115	18	50
NORTH CAROLINA	Ballenger, Cass	10	225-2576	2182	2,695,000	287	107	10	34
NORTH CAROLINA	Taylor, Charles H.	11	225-6401	231	3,446,000	318	145	12	57
NORTH CAROLINA	Watt, Melvin L.	12	225-1510	1230	7,602,000	651	207	26	166
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$42,451,000	3,906	1,657	177	738
NORTH DAKOTA	Pomeroy, Earl	At Large	225-2611	1533	5,137,000	468	185	8	94
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$5,137,000	468	185	8	94
OHIO	Chabot, Steve	1	225-2216	129	7,497,000	497	395	48	167
OHIO	Portman, Rob	2	225-3164	238	2,077,000	189	135	12	25
OHIO	Hall, Tony P.	3	225-6465	1432	3,837,000	241	257	18	81
OHIO	Oxley, Michael G.	4	225-2676	2233	2,669,000	292	192	13	16
OHIO	Gillmor, Paul E.	5	225-6405	1203	1,902,000	169	153	12	17
OHIO	Strickland, Ted	6	225-5705	336	2,372,000	210	196	15	21
OHIO	Hobson, David L.	7	225-4324	1514	2,870,000	294	194	14	25
OHIO	Boehner, John A.	8	225-6205	1011	1,483,000	134	168	10	9
OHIO	Kaptur, Marcy	9	225-4146	2366	4,200,000	308	275	20	75
OHIO	Kucinich, Dennis J.	10	225-5871	1730	6,682,000	371	370	38	168
OHIO	Jones, Stephanie Tubbs	11	225-7032	1516	10,283,000	551	556	55	271
OHIO	Kasich, John R.	12	225-5355	1111	3,895,000	390	154	23	57
OHIO	Brown, Sherrod	13	225-3401	201	3,254,000	357	147	10	36
OHIO	Sawyer, Thomas C.	14	225-5231	1414	5,407,000	374	278	19	121
OHIO	Pryce, Deborah	15	225-2015	221	3,727,000	366	141	22	58

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
OHIO	Regula, Ralph	16	225-3876	2309	2,627,000	184	215	14	44
OHIO	Traficant, James A., Jr.	17	225-5261	2446	4,403,000	345	267	21	76
OHIO	Ney, Robert W	18	225-6265	1024	2,853,000	273	196	14	29
OHIO	LaTourette, Steven C.	19	225-5731	1224	1,225,000	128	102	7	8
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$73,263,000	5,675	4,390	386	1,305
OKLAHOMA	Largent, Steve	1	225-2211	426	4,050,000	412	150	12	61
OKLAHOMA	Coburn, Tom A.	2	225-2701	429	2,430,000	212	129	15	38
OKLAHOMA	Watkins, Wes	3	225-4565	1401	2,687,000	243	136	15	41
OKLAHOMA	Watts, J. C., Jr.	4	225-6165	1210	2,082,000	199	129	10	27
OKLAHOMA	Istook, Ernest J., Jr.	5	225-2132	2404	2,593,000	229	130	11	43
OKLAHOMA	Lucas, Frank D.	6	225-5565	438	3,076,000	268	167	15	49
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$16,918,000	1,563	842	78	259
OREGON	Wu, David	1	225-0855	510	2,952,000	359	154	17	18
OREGON	Walden, Greg	2	225-6730	1404	3,681,000	496	159	9	13
OREGON	Blumenauer, Earl	3	225-4811	1406	4,670,000	481	274	53	48
OREGON	DeFazio, Peter A.	4	225-6416	2134	3,897,000	516	156	10	22
OREGON	Hooley, Darlene	5	225-5711	1130	4,252,000	589	144	9	20
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$19,452,000	2,442	886	98	121
PENNSYLVANIA	Brady, Robert A.	1	225-4731	216	12,309,000	480	634	107	378
PENNSYLVANIA	Fattah, Chaka	2	225-4001	1205	10,032,000	331	549	98	317
PENNSYLVANIA	Borski, Robert A.	3	225-8251	2267	8,546,000	267	468	84	275
PENNSYLVANIA	Klink, Ron	4	225-2565	2448	3,081,000	209	241	19	52
PENNSYLVANIA	Peterson, John E.	5	225-5121	307	2,336,000	178	202	17	29
PENNSYLVANIA	Holden, Tim	6	225-5546	1421	2,915,000	185	240	19	51
PENNSYLVANIA	Weldon, Curt	7	225-2011	2452	2,030,000	186	179	14	18
PENNSYLVANIA	Greenwood, James C.	8	225-4276	2436	1,638,000	204	90	6	9
PENNSYLVANIA	Shuster, Bud	9	225-2431	2188	3,046,000	252	233	20	37
PENNSYLVANIA	Sherwood, Don	10	225-3731	1223	3,742,000	259	268	21	67
PENNSYLVANIA	Kanjorski, Paul E.	11	225-6511	2353	3,798,000	265	317	24	59
PENNSYLVANIA	Murtha, John P.	12	225-2065	2423	3,966,000	269	252	21	77
PENNSYLVANIA	Hoeffel, Joseph M.	13	225-6111	1229	1,369,000	123	153	8	10
PENNSYLVANIA	Coyne, William J.	14	225-2301	2455	11,043,000	574	579	67	294
PENNSYLVANIA	Toomey, Patrick J	15	225-6411	511	3,766,000	233	242	17	83
PENNSYLVANIA	Pitts, Joseph R.	16	225-2411	504	2,269,000	218	167	13	22
PENNSYLVANIA	Gekas, George W.	17	225-4315	2410	3,584,000	211	223	17	82
PENNSYLVANIA	Doyle, Michael F.	18	225-2135	133	4,374,000	304	314	22	81

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
PENNSYLVANIA	Goodling, William F.	19	225-5836	2107	2,834,000	278	183	12	32
PENNSYLVANIA	Mascara, Frank	20	225-4665	314	3,139,000	238	262	21	43
PENNSYLVANIA	English, Phil	21	225-5406	1410	3,524,000	221	257	25	68
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$93,341,000	5,487	6,053	651	2,084
RHODE ISLAND	Kennedy, Patrick J.	1	225-4911	312	3,747,000	237	233	21	80
RHODE ISLAND	Weygand, Robert A.	2	225-2735	215	3,465,000	234	229	29	68
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$7,212,000	471	462	50	148
SOUTH CAROLINA	Sanford, Marshall "Mark"	1	225-3176	1233	3,144,000	323	172	21	35
SOUTH CAROLINA	Spence, Floyd	2	225-2452	2405	2,158,000	172	140	21	33
SOUTH CAROLINA	Graham, Lindsey O.	3	225-5301	1429	2,160,000	179	171	24	26
SOUTH CAROLINA	DeMint, Jim	4	225-6030	507	3,200,000	300	160	12	52
SOUTH CAROLINA	Spratt, John M., Jr.	5	225-5501	1536	2,196,000	193	165	24	24
SOUTH CAROLINA	Clyburn, James E.	6	225-3315	319	5,016,000	450	221	26	86
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$17,874,000	1,618	1,029	130	255
SOUTH DAKOTA	Thune, John R.	At Large	225-2801	1005	5,050,000	254	224	11	146
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$5,050,000	254	224	11	146
TENNESSEE	Jenkins, William L.	1	225-6356	1708	2,823,000	228	135	10	55
TENNESSEE	Duncan, John J., Jr.	2	225-5435	2400	4,691,000	341	132	9	119
TENNESSEE	Wamp, Zach	3	225-3271	423	3,743,000	224	150	13	100
TENNESSEE	Hilleary, Van	4	225-6831	114	2,199,000	151	145	12	41
TENNESSEE	Clement, Bob	5	225-4311	2229	6,343,000	361	146	35	194
TENNESSEE	Gordon, Bart	6	225-4231	2368	2,188,000	178	130	10	36
TENNESSEE	Bryant, Ed	7	225-2811	408	1,613,000	91	122	9	35
TENNESSEE	Tanner, John S.	8	225-4714	1127	2,924,000	207	157	14	62
TENNESSEE	Ford, Harold E., Jr.	9	225-3265	325	5,565,000	388	232	42	130
TOTAL FOR STATE					\$32,089,000	2,168	1,347	155	771
TEXAS	Sandlin, Max	1	225-3035	214	3,251,000	343	188	16	30
TEXAS	Turner, Jim	2	225-2401	208	2,207,000	169	187	17	27
TEXAS	Johnson, Sam	3	225-4201	1030	1,654,000	191	129	16	9
TEXAS	Hall, Ralph M.	4	225-6673	2221	2,331,000	229	179	15	19
TEXAS	Sessions, Pete	5	225-2231	1318	4,069,000	475	211	42	31
TEXAS	Barton, Joe	6	225-2002	2264	1,498,000	176	101	13	6

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
TEXAS	Archer, Bill	7	225-2571	1236	1,547,000	136	149	47	10
TEXAS	Brady, Kevin	8	225-4901	1531	1,451,000	142	159	11	7
TEXAS	Lampson, Nick	9	225-6565	417	4,333,000	499	232	16	38
TEXAS	Doggett, Lloyd	10	225-4865	328	3,275,000	278	215	57	45
TEXAS	Edwards, Chet	11	225-6105	2459	2,431,000	212	196	15	26
TEXAS	Granger, Kay	12	225-5071	435	2,795,000	299	192	34	19
TEXAS	Thornberry, Mac	13	225-3706	131	4,161,000	459	268	21	29
TEXAS	Paul, Ron	14	225-2831	203	2,102,000	130	228	19	27
TEXAS	Hinojosa, Rub.n	15	225-2531	1032	4,281,000	393	418	30	29
TEXAS	Reyes, Silvestre	16	225-4831	514	4,315,000	352	302	23	63
TEXAS	Stenholm, Charles W	17	225-6605	1211	2,372,000	190	219	18	24
TEXAS	Jackson-Lee, Sheila	18	225-3816	410	3,759,000	342	316	134	29
TEXAS	Combest, Larry	19	225-4005	1026	2,323,000	227	186	15	18
TEXAS	Gonzalez, Charles A.	20	225-3236	327	6,235,000	566	288	43	102
TEXAS	Smith, Lamar S.	21	225-4236	2231	1,738,000	132	149	14	22
TEXAS	DeLay, Tom	22	225-5951	341	1,199,000	87	165	34	8
TEXAS	Bonilla, Henry	23	225-4511	1427	3,348,000	276	297	25	35
TEXAS	Frost, Martin	24	225-3605	2256	4,138,000	499	226	40	24
TEXAS	Bentsen, Ken	25	225-7508	326	2,740,000	279	225	71	17
TEXAS	Armey, Richard K.	26	225-7772	301	1,746,000	178	120	26	16
TEXAS	Ortiz, Solomon P.	27	225-7742	2136	4,559,000	393	327	25	60
TEXAS	Rodriguez, Ciro D.	28	225-1640	323	4,846,000	419	284	35	72
TEXAS	Green, Gene	29	225-1688	2429	3,231,000	301	301	93	20
TEXAS	Johnson, Eddie Bernice	30	225-8885	1511	4,702,000	478	273	79	49
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$92,637,000	8,850	6,729	1,042	909
UTAH	Hansen, James V.	1	225-0453	242	1,926,000	167	182	18	14
UTAH	Cook, Merrill	2	225-3011	1431	1,219,000	113	123	9	9
UTAH	Cannon, Chris	3	225-7751	118	3,082,000	351	229	19	14
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$6,227,000	632	534	46	37
VERMONT	Sanders, Bernard	At Large	225-4115	2202	3,649,000	415	220	14	26
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$3,649,000	415	220	14	26
VIRGINIA	Bateman, Herbert H.	1	225-4261	2211	2,766,000	313	107	9	30
VIRGINIA	Pickett, Owen B.	2	225-4215	2133	3,130,000	202	160	46	71
VIRGINIA	Scott, Robert C.	3	225-8351	2464	8,432,000	586	276	41	214
VIRGINIA	Sisisky, Norman	4	225-6365	2371	3,324,000	318	144	10	54
VIRGINIA	Goode, Virgil H., Jr.	5	225-4711	1520	2,660,000	310	149	11	18

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
VIRGINIA	Goodlatte, Bob	6	225-5431	2240	3,447,000	334	146	13	52
VIRGINIA	Bliley, Tom	7	225-2815	2409	1,488,000	108	110	13	26
VIRGINIA	Moran, James P.	8	225-4376	2239	2,984,000	373	134	11	21
VIRGINIA	Boucher, Rick	9	225-3861	2329	2,762,000	323	148	13	17
VIRGINIA	Wolf, Frank R.	10	225-5136	241	1,390,000	162	92	8	6
VIRGINIA	Davis, Thomas M.	11	225-1492	224	1,211,000	134	89	7	8
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$33,594,000	3,162	1,553	182	516
WASHINGTON	Inslee, Jay	1	225-6311	308	2,016,000	206	110	15	24
WASHINGTON	Metcalf, Jack	2	225-2605	1510	2,964,000	353	143	12	23
WASHINGTON	Baird, Brian	3	225-3536	1721	1,452,000	130	123	11	14
WASHINGTON	Hastings, Doc	4	225-5816	1323	2,686,000	238	185	16	33
WASHINGTON	Nethercutt, George R., Jr	5	225-2006	1527	2,710,000	301	204	17	14
WASHINGTON	Dicks, Norman D	6	225-5916	2467	3,847,000	433	172	16	39
WASHINGTON	McDermott, Jim	7	225-3106	1035	6,578,000	488	346	108	128
WASHINGTON	Dunn, Jennifer	8	225-7761	432	1,553,000	154	86	10	20
WASHINGTON	Smith, Adam	9	225-8901	116	2,686,000	280	138	16	30
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$26,492,000	2,583	1,507	221	325
WEST VIRGINIA	Mollohan, Alan B.	1	225-4172	2346	3,635,000	359	239	10	41
WEST VIRGINIA	Wise, Robert E., Jr.	2	225-2711	2367	4,356,000	433	218	12	56
WEST VIRGINIA	Rahall, Nick J., II	3	225-3452	2307	3,248,000	304	226	13	36
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$11,239,000	1,096	683	35	133
WISCONSIN	Ryan, Paul	1	225-3031	1217	2,636,000	304	208	13	9
WISCONSIN	Baldwin, Tammy	2	225-2906	1020	1,800,000	190	138	12	11
WISCONSIN	Kind, Ron	3	225-5506	1713	1,385,000	75	191	12	13
WISCONSIN	Klecza, Gerald D	4	225-4572	2301	3,302,000	359	230	21	26
WISCONSIN	Barrett, Thomas M.	5	225-3571	1214	5,052,000	435	400	43	60
WISCONSIN	Petri, Thomas E.	6	225-2476	2462	1,060,000	39	165	10	11
WISCONSIN	Obey, David R.	7	225-3365	2314	1,459,000	73	188	11	18
WISCONSIN	Green, Mark	8	225-5665	1218	2,874,000	369	160	10	9
WISCONSIN	Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr	9	225-5101	2332	730,000	23	128	8	7
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$20,298,000	1,866	1,807	141	165
WYOMING	Cubin, Barbara	At Large	225-2311	1114	1,803,000	172	103	5	24
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$1,803,000	172	103	5	24

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS -- MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Congressional District)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION					POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
STATE	REPRESENTATIVE	DISTRICT	PHONE	ROOM	TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
PUERTO RICO	Romero-Barcelo, Carlos A.	Resident	225-2615	2443	36,536,000	1,889	3,004	533	761
	TOTAL FOR STATE				\$36,536,000	1,889	3,004	533	761
	TOTAL FOR COUNTRY				\$1,626,000,000	128,421	97,106	15,835	27,884

¹ Includes voucher dollars lost, and assumes \$5,700 per unit cost--national average.

² Includes CDBG and BEDI, and assumes \$2626 cost per job created--national average for CDBG entitlement communities from 94 GPR (most recent cost figure available).

³ Includes COC, ESG, and HOPWA, and assumes \$1080 cost per person served for the COC portion (approx. 85% of the homeless dollars lost) (cost from '98 applications) and \$284 cost per person for the ESG portion (approx. 15% of the homeless dollars lost).

⁴ Includes HOME, and assumes \$17,520 cost per unit--average of national average for HOME rental assistance (\$19,951) and HOME homeowner rehab (\$15,088). Also includes Public Housing Capital and HOPE VI, and assumes \$18,510 cost per unit--national average from Abt study of public housing modernization needs (as of June 1999).

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
ALABAMA	ANNISTON	\$228,000	0	18	1	9
ALABAMA	BESSEMER	361,000	0	21	1	16
ALABAMA	BIRMINGHAM	5,494,000	289	189	31	164
ALABAMA	DECATUR	627,000	58	12	1	14
ALABAMA	DOTHAN	575,000	49	17	1	13
ALABAMA	FLORENCE	653,000	58	11	1	15
ALABAMA	GADSDEN	399,000	0	31	1	16
ALABAMA	HOOVER	15,000	0	6	0	0
ALABAMA	HUNTSVILLE	1,326,000	70	40	2	43
ALABAMA	MOBILE	2,997,000	221	78	7	76
ALABAMA	MONTGOMERY	2,093,000	111	66	5	64
ALABAMA	TUSCALOOSA	875,000	79	32	1	18
ALABAMA	JEFFERSON COUNTY	1,237,000	125	63	5	16
ALABAMA	ALABAMA (other areas)	11,872,000	568	772	73	295
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$28,752,000	1,627	1,356	128	758
ALASKA	ANCHORAGE	205,000	0	52	9	1
ALASKA	ALASKA (other areas)	4,395,000	260	73	3	138
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$4,600,000	260	125	12	139
ARIZONA	CHANDLER	400,000	43	28	1	4
ARIZONA	FLAGSTAFF	303,000	32	16	1	4
ARIZONA	GILBERT	22,000	0	8	0	0
ARIZONA	GLENDALE	631,000	79	45	2	3
ARIZONA	MESA	877,000	104	79	7	0
ARIZONA	PEORIA CITY	55,000	0	13	1	1
ARIZONA	PHOENIX	4,835,000	402	352	74	64
ARIZONA	SCOTTSDALE	396,000	58	25	1	0
ARIZONA	TEMPE	611,000	87	43	2	0
ARIZONA	TUCSON	2,890,000	290	174	18	32
ARIZONA	YUMA	638,000	79	22	1	7
ARIZONA	MARICOPA COUNTY	1,544,000	139	79	7	24
ARIZONA	PIMA COUNTY	539,000	52	67	7	0
ARIZONA	ARIZONA STATE (other areas)	6,082,000	128	247	29	222
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$19,823,000	1,493	1,197	153	361

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
ARKANSAS	CONWAY	64,000	0	8	0	2
ARKANSAS	FAYETTEVILLE	334,000	37	14	1	4
ARKANSAS	FORT SMITH	731,000	107	21	1	3
ARKANSAS	JACKSONVILLE	20,000	0	7	0	0
ARKANSAS	JONESBORO	603,000	93	14	1	2
ARKANSAS	LITTLE ROCK	1,606,000	176	52	8	22
ARKANSAS	NORTH LITTLE ROCK	791,000	89	20	1	12
ARKANSAS	PINE BLUFF	553,000	74	26	1	3
ARKANSAS	ROGERS	16,000	0	6	0	0
ARKANSAS	SPRINGDALE	19,000	0	7	0	0
ARKANSAS	TEXARKANA	170,000	0	9	0	8
ARKANSAS	WEST MEMPHIS	319,000	29	12	0	6
ARKANSAS	ARKANSAS (other areas)	8,642,000	703	546	51	132
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$13,867,000	1,308	742	65	195
CALIFORNIA	ALAMEDA	929,000	143	30	2	2
CALIFORNIA	ALHAMBRA	122,000	0	43	2	1
CALIFORNIA	ANAHEIM	2,388,000	348	107	8	1
CALIFORNIA	ANTIOCH	43,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	APPLE VALLEY	34,000	0	13	1	0
CALIFORNIA	BAKERSFIELD	246,000	0	64	5	1
CALIFORNIA	BALDWIN PARK	572,000	80	41	2	0
CALIFORNIA	BELLFLOWER	68,000	0	23	1	0
CALIFORNIA	BERKELEY	1,415,000	183	90	16	2
CALIFORNIA	BUENA PARK	62,000	0	23	1	0
CALIFORNIA	BURBANK	664,000	101	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	CAMARILLO	27,000	0	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	CARLSBAD	322,000	50	14	1	0
CALIFORNIA	CARSON	83,000	0	31	1	0
CALIFORNIA	CERRITOS	33,000	0	12	0	0
CALIFORNIA	CHICO	828,000	131	20	1	1
CALIFORNIA	CHINO	42,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	CHULA VISTA	132,000	0	46	3	1
CALIFORNIA	COMPTON	611,000	63	66	5	1
CALIFORNIA	CONCORD	67,000	0	25	2	0
CALIFORNIA	CORONA	66,000	0	25	1	0
CALIFORNIA	COSTA MESA	90,000	0	31	1	0
CALIFORNIA	DALY	96,000	0	36	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
CALIFORNIA	DAVIS	62,000	0	21	1	0
CALIFORNIA	DOWNEY	85,000	0	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	EL CAJON	90,000	0	30	2	1
CALIFORNIA	EL MONTE	298,000	0	79	6	1
CALIFORNIA	ENCINITAS	35,000	0	13	1	0
CALIFORNIA	ESCONDIDO	108,000	0	37	2	0
CALIFORNIA	FAIRFIELD	424,000	66	18	1	0
CALIFORNIA	FONTANA	91,000	0	32	1	0
CALIFORNIA	FOUNTAIN VALLEY	26,000	0	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	FREMONT	101,000	0	37	3	0
CALIFORNIA	FRESNO	2,885,000	300	190	14	26
CALIFORNIA	FULLERTON	109,000	0	38	2	0
CALIFORNIA	GARDENA	58,000	0	22	1	0
CALIFORNIA	GARDEN GROVE	1,891,000	292	60	5	1
CALIFORNIA	GILROY CITY	32,000	0	12	1	0
CALIFORNIA	GLENDALE	353,000	0	92	7	1
CALIFORNIA	GLENDORA CITY	26,000	0	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	HAWTHORNE	470,000	64	36	2	0
CALIFORNIA	HAYWARD	106,000	0	39	3	0
CALIFORNIA	HEMET	35,000	0	13	1	0
CALIFORNIA	HESPERIA	44,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	HUNTINGTON BEACH	109,000	0	38	2	1
CALIFORNIA	HUNTINGTON PARK	189,000	0	50	4	1
CALIFORNIA	INGLEWOOD	809,000	100	63	5	1
CALIFORNIA	IRVINE	65,000	0	24	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LAGUNA NIGUEL	18,000	0	7	0	0
CALIFORNIA	LA HABRA	43,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LAKE FOREST	24,000	0	9	0	0
CALIFORNIA	LAKEWOOD	43,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LA MESA	35,000	0	13	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LANCASTER	72,000	0	27	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LIVERMORE	396,000	64	11	1	0
CALIFORNIA	LOMPOC	1,664,000	246	14	1	12
CALIFORNIA	LONG BEACH	3,856,000	531	215	18	3
CALIFORNIA	LOS ANGELES	18,136,000	900	2,068	566	268
CALIFORNIA	LYNWOOD	128,000	0	45	2	0
CALIFORNIA	MADERA	411,000	53	18	1	3
CALIFORNIA	MERCED	955,000	134	32	1	6
CALIFORNIA	MILPITAS CITY	41,000	0	15	0	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
CALIFORNIA	MISSION VIEJO	29,000	0	11	0	0
CALIFORNIA	MODESTO	2,326,000	340	57	4	10
CALIFORNIA	MONTEBELLO	86,000	0	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	MONTEREY	16,000	0	6	0	0
CALIFORNIA	MONTEREY PARK	94,000	0	33	1	0
CALIFORNIA	MORENO VALLEY	94,000	0	34	1	0
CALIFORNIA	MOUNTAIN VIEW	57,000	0	20	1	0
CALIFORNIA	NAPA CITY	734,000	122	15	1	0
CALIFORNIA	NATIONAL CITY	684,000	104	32	2	0
CALIFORNIA	NEWPORT BEACH	30,000	0	11	1	0
CALIFORNIA	NORWALK	474,000	64	39	2	0
CALIFORNIA	OAKLAND	7,680,000	842	235	118	100
CALIFORNIA	OCEANSIDE	706,000	102	42	2	1
CALIFORNIA	ONTARIO	216,000	0	57	4	1
CALIFORNIA	ORANGE	90,000	0	32	1	0
CALIFORNIA	OXNARD	1,217,000	146	70	5	7
CALIFORNIA	PALMDALE	59,000	0	22	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PALM SPRINGS	37,000	0	14	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PALO ALTO	44,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PARADISE	17,000	0	6	0	0
CALIFORNIA	PARAMOUNT CITY	85,000	0	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PASADENA	983,000	133	58	8	1
CALIFORNIA	PETALUMA	20,000	0	7	0	0
CALIFORNIA	PICO RIVERA	340,000	47	28	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PITTSBURG	466,000	74	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	PLEASANTON CITY	18,000	0	7	1	0
CALIFORNIA	POMONA	779,000	88	74	6	1
CALIFORNIA	PORTERVILLE	44,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	RANCHO CUCAMONGA	57,000	0	22	1	0
CALIFORNIA	REDDING	1,115,000	185	21	1	0
CALIFORNIA	REDLANDS	41,000	0	15	0	0
CALIFORNIA	REDONDO BEACH	369,000	59	12	1	0
CALIFORNIA	REDWOOD CITY	62,000	0	21	1	0
CALIFORNIA	RIALTO	68,000	0	26	1	0
CALIFORNIA	RICHMOND	1,189,000	159	35	3	10
CALIFORNIA	RIVERSIDE	378,000	0	81	70	1
CALIFORNIA	ROSEMEAD	97,000	0	34	1	0
CALIFORNIA	ROSEVILLE	272,000	43	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	SACRAMENTO	3,485,000	357	149	42	46

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
CALIFORNIA	SALINAS	1,917,000	287	56	5	4
CALIFORNIA	SAN BERNARDINO	344,000	0	89	7	1
CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	6,607,000	784	418	142	27
CALIFORNIA	SAN FRANCISCO	7,104,000	491	577	469	92
CALIFORNIA	SAN JOSE	3,427,000	404	289	54	3
CALIFORNIA	SAN LEANDRO	49,000	0	18	2	0
CALIFORNIA	SAN MATEO	64,000	0	22	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTA ANA	1,831,000	187	189	68	1
CALIFORNIA	SANTA BARBARA	941,000	148	32	2	1
CALIFORNIA	SANTA CLARA	76,000	0	26	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTA CLARITA	56,000	0	21	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTA CRUZ	50,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTA MARIA	78,000	0	29	2	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTA MONICA	691,000	103	35	1	1
CALIFORNIA	SANTA ROSA	627,000	96	27	2	0
CALIFORNIA	SANTEE	28,000	0	10	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SEASIDE	34,000	0	13	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SIMI VALLEY	48,000	0	18	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SOUTH GATE	600,000	65	61	5	1
CALIFORNIA	SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	44,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	STOCKTON	436,000	0	114	9	1
CALIFORNIA	SUNNYVALE	88,000	0	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	THOUSAND OAKS	48,000	0	18	1	0
CALIFORNIA	TORRANCE	478,000	69	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	TULARE	42,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	TURLOCK	41,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	TUSTIN	43,000	0	16	1	0
CALIFORNIA	UNION CITY	46,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	UPLAND	415,000	59	16	1	2
CALIFORNIA	VACAVILLE	446,000	72	14	1	0
CALIFORNIA	VALLEJO	814,000	127	31	1	0
CALIFORNIA	SAN BUENAVENTURA	649,000	103	22	1	0
CALIFORNIA	VICTORVILLE	46,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	VISALIA	1,253,000	204	30	1	0
CALIFORNIA	VISTA	69,000	0	26	2	0
CALIFORNIA	WALNUT CREEK	24,000	0	9	1	0
CALIFORNIA	WATSONVILLE	46,000	0	17	1	0
CALIFORNIA	WEST COVINA	81,000	0	31	1	0
CALIFORNIA	WESTMINSTER	86,000	0	30	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
CALIFORNIA	WHITTIER	66,000	0	23	1	0
CALIFORNIA	WOODLAND	786,000	123	13	1	3
CALIFORNIA	YORBA LINDA	19,000	0	7	0	0
CALIFORNIA	YUBA	387,000	60	12	0	1
CALIFORNIA	ALAMEDA COUNTY	3,125,000	513	46	5	4
CALIFORNIA	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY	3,992,000	558	89	14	25
CALIFORNIA	FRESNO COUNTY	2,205,000	236	134	10	20
CALIFORNIA	KERN COUNTY	2,390,000	255	166	12	18
CALIFORNIA	LOS ANGELES COUNTY	11,631,000	1,250	864	67	73
CALIFORNIA	MARIN COUNTY	1,346,000	181	40	6	11
CALIFORNIA	ORANGE COUNTY	4,618,000	736	111	9	1
CALIFORNIA	RIVERSIDE COUNTY	4,726,000	633	230	17	15
CALIFORNIA	SACRAMENTO COUNTY	2,859,000	307	178	14	24
CALIFORNIA	SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY	4,539,000	547	183	14	40
CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO COUNTY	5,007,000	776	148	15	3
CALIFORNIA	SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY	2,400,000	286	88	7	24
CALIFORNIA	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY	1,072,000	142	59	4	3
CALIFORNIA	SAN MATEO COUNTY	2,605,000	399	84	7	1
CALIFORNIA	SANTA CLARA COUNTY	3,854,000	612	60	5	8
CALIFORNIA	SONOMA COUNTY	1,361,000	200	57	5	1
CALIFORNIA	VENTURA COUNTY	1,706,000	242	56	4	7
CALIFORNIA	CALIFORNIA (other areas)	14,083,000	1,002	1,039	182	111
CALIFORNIA	CNSRT-SANTA BARBARA CO	19,000	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$172,384,000	18,972	11,929	2,199	1,045
COLORADO	ARVADA	328,000	50	15	1	0
COLORADO	AURORA	628,000	84	47	2	1
COLORADO	BOULDER	761,000	112	26	1	3
COLORADO	COLORADO SPRINGS	1,281,000	142	73	6	11
COLORADO	DENVER	4,664,000	392	266	75	74
COLORADO	FORT COLLINS	394,000	52	26	1	1
COLORADO	GRAND JUNCTION	312,000	48	11	1	0
COLORADO	GREELEY	564,000	86	21	1	1
COLORADO	LAKEWOOD	539,000	74	24	1	3
COLORADO	LONGMONT	260,000	40	11	1	0
COLORADO	LOVELAND	220,000	32	8	0	1
COLORADO	PUEBLO	1,060,000	131	46	2	10
COLORADO	WESTMINSTER	40,000	0	15	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
COLORADO	ADAMS COUNTY	845,000	124	45	2	1
COLORADO	ARAPAHOE COUNTY	92,000	0	32	1	0
COLORADO	JEFFERSON COUNTY	575,000	86	29	2	0
COLORADO	COLORADO (other areas)	3,998,000	402	257	13	24
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$16,561,000	1,857	952	111	131
CONNECTICUT	BRIDGEPORT	3,504,000	251	97	9	90
CONNECTICUT	BRISTOL	377,000	32	15	1	8
CONNECTICUT	DANBURY	438,000	42	15	1	8
CONNECTICUT	EAST HARTFORD	244,000	0	14	1	11
CONNECTICUT	FAIRFIELD	39,000	0	15	1	0
CONNECTICUT	GREENWICH	153,000	0	26	1	4
CONNECTICUT	HAMDEN TOWN	31,000	0	12	1	0
CONNECTICUT	HARTFORD	5,015,000	507	113	74	86
CONNECTICUT	MANCHESTER	277,000	29	16	1	4
CONNECTICUT	MERIDEN	608,000	61	24	1	10
CONNECTICUT	MIDDLETOWN	581,000	57	11	1	12
CONNECTICUT	MILFORD TOWN	96,000	0	14	1	3
CONNECTICUT	NEW BRITAIN	933,000	68	51	4	19
CONNECTICUT	NEW HAVEN	3,000,000	335	111	68	33
CONNECTICUT	NEW LONDON	184,000	0	26	1	6
CONNECTICUT	NORWALK	756,000	57	26	1	19
CONNECTICUT	NORWICH	135,000	0	27	1	3
CONNECTICUT	STAMFORD	1,293,000	81	27	1	39
CONNECTICUT	STRATFORD	129,000	0	17	1	4
CONNECTICUT	WATERBURY	1,335,000	125	62	5	21
CONNECTICUT	WEST HARTFORD	425,000	57	30	1	1
CONNECTICUT	WEST HAVEN	769,000	100	18	1	8
CONNECTICUT	CONNECTICUT (other areas)	4,355,000	402	333	60	28
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$24,677,000	2,204	1,099	232	416
DELAWARE	DOVER	86,000	0	7	0	4
DELAWARE	WILMINGTON	2,103,000	93	69	30	67
DELAWARE	NEW CASTLE COUNTY	1,156,000	160	60	6	1
DELAWARE	DELAWARE (other areas)	950,000	80	44	8	17
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$4,295,000	333	180	44	89

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	WASHINGTON	13,903,000	633	536	355	417
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$13,903,000	633	536	355	417
FLORIDA	BOCA RATON	281,000	44	11	0	0
FLORIDA	BOYNTON BEACH	33,000	0	12	1	0
FLORIDA	BRADENTON	783,000	99	13	1	10
FLORIDA	CAPE CORAL	36,000	0	13	2	0
FLORIDA	CLEARWATER	749,000	92	23	1	9
FLORIDA	COCOA	19,000	0	7	0	0
FLORIDA	CORAL SPRINGS	42,000	0	16	0	0
FLORIDA	DAVIE	30,000	0	11	0	0
FLORIDA	DAYTONA BEACH	842,000	55	24	1	24
FLORIDA	DELRAY BEACH	385,000	49	14	1	4
FLORIDA	FT LAUDERDALE	1,337,000	111	62	198	14
FLORIDA	FT MYERS	1,158,000	117	19	3	23
FLORIDA	FORT PIERCE	683,000	70	20	1	12
FLORIDA	FORT WALTON BEACH	329,000	44	5	0	3
FLORIDA	GAINESVILLE	883,000	101	36	2	11
FLORIDA	HIALEAH	1,909,000	216	124	10	12
FLORIDA	HOLLYWOOD	368,000	46	36	2	0
FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE-DUVAL	5,084,000	533	195	60	67
FLORIDA	LAKELAND	789,000	74	20	1	16
FLORIDA	LARGO	32,000	0	12	1	0
FLORIDA	LAUDERHILL	40,000	0	15	1	0
FLORIDA	MARGATE	25,000	0	9	0	0
FLORIDA	MELBOURNE	43,000	0	16	1	0
FLORIDA	MIAMI	11,926,000	900	293	412	276
FLORIDA	MIAMI BEACH	1,746,000	249	64	5	5
FLORIDA	NAPLES	9,000	0	3	0	0
FLORIDA	NORTH MIAMI	64,000	0	24	1	0
FLORIDA	OCALA	709,000	106	16	1	3
FLORIDA	ORLANDO	1,961,000	208	56	85	25
FLORIDA	PALM BAY	37,000	0	14	1	0
FLORIDA	PANAMA CITY	379,000	42	12	0	6
FLORIDA	PEMBROKE PINES	37,000	0	14	1	0
FLORIDA	PENSACOLA	1,175,000	170	24	1	7
FLORIDA	PLANTATION	28,000	0	11	0	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
FLORIDA	POMPAÑO BEACH	511,000	72	28	1	1
FLORIDA	PORT ST LUCIE	28,000	0	11	1	0
FLORIDA	PUNTA GORDA	62,000	0	2	0	3
FLORIDA	ST PETERSBURG	1,718,000	200	68	5	17
FLORIDA	SARASOTA	623,000	57	15	1	13
FLORIDA	SUNRISE	36,000	0	14	1	0
FLORIDA	TALLAHASSEE	1,013,000	106	49	4	12
FLORIDA	TAMPA	4,971,000	360	113	86	126
FLORIDA	TITUSVILLE	26,000	0	10	0	0
FLORIDA	WEST PALM BEACH	1,260,000	138	26	123	14
FLORIDA	WINTERHAVEN	73,000	0	7	0	3
FLORIDA	BREVARD COUNTY	1,094,000	108	40	3	19
FLORIDA	BROWARD COUNTY	2,568,000	333	144	11	8
FLORIDA	DADE COUNTY	1,931,000	0	515	40	4
FLORIDA	ESCAMBIA COUNTY	250,000	0	63	5	1
FLORIDA	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	1,564,000	179	145	12	1
FLORIDA	LEE COUNTY	148,000	0	47	7	1
FLORIDA	ORANGE COUNTY	1,143,000	104	129	10	4
FLORIDA	PALM BEACH COUNTY	1,940,000	206	153	12	11
FLORIDA	PASCO COUNTY	802,000	87	70	5	3
FLORIDA	PINELLAS COUNTY	2,003,000	267	79	6	10
FLORIDA	POLK COUNTY	346,000	0	92	7	1
FLORIDA	SARASOTA COUNTY	96,000	0	36	3	0
FLORIDA	SEMINOLE COUNTY	218,000	0	61	4	0
FLORIDA	VOLUSIA COUNTY	763,000	72	71	6	5
FLORIDA	FLORIDA (other areas)	8,030,000	397	781	182	115
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$67,168,000	6,013	4,013	1,326	904
GEORGIA	ALBANY	222,000	0	38	1	6
GEORGIA	ATHENS-CLARKE	639,000	0	36	4	28
GEORGIA	ATLANTA	9,413,000	900	280	180	161
GEORGIA	AUGUSTA	2,065,000	185	65	5	40
GEORGIA	COLUMBUS-MUSCOGEE	1,923,000	123	63	5	52
GEORGIA	MACON	1,889,000	162	45	2	44
GEORGIA	MARIETTA	1,182,000	157	13	0	13
GEORGIA	ROSWELL	17,000	0	7	0	0
GEORGIA	SAVANNAH	2,116,000	135	76	8	56
GEORGIA	WARNER ROBINS	118,000	0	12	1	5

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
GEORGIA	CLAYTON COUNTY	105,000	0	40	2	0
GEORGIA	COBB COUNTY	293,000	0	67	7	3
GEORGIA	DE KALB COUNTY	2,365,000	301	115	9	12
GEORGIA	FULTON COUNTY	950,000	35	60	5	28
GEORGIA	GWINNETT COUNTY	221,000	0	61	4	0
GEORGIA	GEORGIA (other areas)	16,077,000	1,155	994	106	298
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$39,595,000	3,153	1,972	341	746
HAWAII	HONOLULU	3,378,000	390	301	39	3
HAWAII	HAWAII (other areas)	4,954,000	519	112	12	83
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$8,332,000	909	413	51	86
IDAHO	BOISE	931,000	145	29	1	1
IDAHO	NAMPA	528,000	85	11	0	1
IDAHO	POCATELLO	285,000	43	14	1	0
IDAHO	IDAHO (other areas)	2,689,000	285	216	11	13
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$4,433,000	558	269	13	15
ILLINOIS	ARLINGTON HTS	23,000	0	9	0	0
ILLINOIS	AURORA	668,000	60	30	1	13
ILLINOIS	BELLEVILLE	51,000	0	19	0	0
ILLINOIS	BERWYN	104,000	0	39	1	0
ILLINOIS	BLOOMINGTON	494,000	43	18	1	10
ILLINOIS	CHAMPAIGN	57,000	0	21	1	0
ILLINOIS	CHICAGO	33,975,000	900	2,530	397	1,015
ILLINOIS	CHICAGO HEIGHTS	45,000	0	17	0	0
ILLINOIS	CICERO	117,000	0	44	2	0
ILLINOIS	DECATUR	1,037,000	88	41	3	22
ILLINOIS	DE KALB	277,000	39	12	0	1
ILLINOIS	DES PLAINES	19,000	0	7	0	0
ILLINOIS	DOWNERS GROVE	17,000	0	6	0	0
ILLINOIS	EAST ST LOUIS	1,468,000	29	55	4	57
ILLINOIS	ELGIN	578,000	78	22	1	4
ILLINOIS	EVANSTON	201,000	0	54	4	0
ILLINOIS	JOLIET	947,000	74	26	2	24
ILLINOIS	KANKAKEE	468,000	57	17	1	5

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
ILLINOIS	MOLINE	253,000	0	23	1	10
ILLINOIS	MOUNT PROSPECT	22,000	0	8	0	0
ILLINOIS	NAPERVILLE	26,000	0	10	0	0
ILLINOIS	NORMAL	31,000	0	12	0	0
ILLINOIS	NORTH CHICAGO	289,000	41	8	1	2
ILLINOIS	OAK LAWN	20,000	0	7	0	0
ILLINOIS	OAK PARK	489,000	42	52	4	3
ILLINOIS	PEKIN	32,000	0	12	1	0
ILLINOIS	PEORIA	1,737,000	136	55	5	40
ILLINOIS	RANTOUL	25,000	0	10	0	0
ILLINOIS	ROCKFORD	1,966,000	115	60	6	57
ILLINOIS	ROCK ISLAND	691,000	33	36	1	21
ILLINOIS	SCHAUMBURG VILLAGE	23,000	0	9	0	0
ILLINOIS	SKOKIE	38,000	0	14	1	0
ILLINOIS	SPRINGFIELD	918,000	89	36	2	17
ILLINOIS	URBANA	735,000	83	12	1	12
ILLINOIS	WAUKEGAN	504,000	54	20	1	7
ILLINOIS	WHEATON CITY	20,000	0	8	0	0
ILLINOIS	COOK COUNTY	6,736,000	900	288	23	30
ILLINOIS	DU PAGE COUNTY	1,425,000	192	84	6	2
ILLINOIS	KANE COUNTY	68,000	0	26	2	0
ILLINOIS	LAKE COUNTY	1,555,000	206	64	5	8
ILLINOIS	MCHENRY COUNTY	581,000	87	28	2	1
ILLINOIS	MADISON COUNTY	1,449,000	91	86	6	32
ILLINOIS	ST CLAIR COUNTY	1,719,000	195	50	4	22
ILLINOIS	WILL COUNTY	120,000	0	42	4	0
ILLINOIS	ILLINOIS (other areas)	8,984,000	193	878	69	216
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$71,002,000	3,826	4,905	564	1,631
INDIANA	ANDERSON	769,000	110	26	1	4
INDIANA	BLOOMINGTON	803,000	117	24	1	4
INDIANA	EAST CHICAGO	760,000	63	41	1	15
INDIANA	ELKHART	470,000	46	21	1	8
INDIANA	EVANSVILLE	1,558,000	145	84	6	22
INDIANA	FORT WAYNE	1,424,000	160	75	6	13
INDIANA	GARY	2,080,000	94	108	8	60
INDIANA	GOSHEN	20,000	0	7	0	0
INDIANA	HAMMOND	711,000	55	66	5	8

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
INDIANA	INDIANAPOLIS	4,935,000	552	264	49	42
INDIANA	KOKOMO	588,000	64	27	1	8
INDIANA	LAFAYETTE	493,000	75	21	1	0
INDIANA	MISHAWAKA	35,000	0	13	1	0
INDIANA	MUNCIE	664,000	63	39	1	10
INDIANA	NEW ALBANY	341,000	0	19	1	15
INDIANA	SOUTH BEND	1,573,000	156	82	6	20
INDIANA	TERRE HAUTE	985,000	82	55	4	16
INDIANA	WEST LAFAYETTE	30,000	0	11	0	0
INDIANA	LAKE COUNTY	108,000	0	38	2	0
INDIANA	INDIANA (other areas)	8,831,000	738	841	72	70
INDIANA	CNSRT-ELKHART COUNTY	6,000	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$27,184,000	2,521	1,863	167	317
IOWA	CEDAR FALLS	209,000	32	9	0	0
IOWA	CEDAR RAPIDS	742,000	113	35	2	0
IOWA	COUNCIL BLUFFS	362,000	50	29	1	0
IOWA	DAVENPORT	512,000	56	49	4	1
IOWA	DES MOINES	2,109,000	267	117	8	9
IOWA	DUBUQUE	993,000	159	32	1	0
IOWA	IOWA CITY	686,000	107	21	1	1
IOWA	SIOUX CITY	754,000	97	54	4	0
IOWA	WATERLOO	603,000	84	40	2	1
IOWA	IOWA (other areas)	5,194,000	410	691	34	13
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$12,164,000	1,375	1,076	57	26
KANSAS	KANSAS CITY	1,496,000	81	74	5	40
KANSAS	LAWRENCE	376,000	41	24	1	4
KANSAS	LEAVENWORTH	37,000	0	10	0	1
KANSAS	OVERLAND PARK	38,000	0	14	1	0
KANSAS	TOPEKA	980,000	94	56	4	13
KANSAS	WICHITA	1,600,000	187	86	6	12
KANSAS	JOHNSON COUNTY	808,000	122	35	2	1
KANSAS	KANSAS (other areas)	3,082,000	77	467	21	47
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$8,417,000	603	768	41	117

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
KENTUCKY	ASHLAND	410,000	49	19	1	4
KENTUCKY	COVINGTON	1,124,000	107	50	6	17
KENTUCKY	HENDERSON	428,000	65	8	0	2
KENTUCKY	HOPKINSVILLE	344,000	42	11	0	4
KENTUCKY	LEXINGTON-FAYETTE	1,533,000	129	61	5	30
KENTUCKY	LOUISVILLE	5,020,000	330	273	24	112
KENTUCKY	OWENSBORO	201,000	0	17	1	8
KENTUCKY	JEFFERSON COUNTY	2,214,000	331	73	6	3
KENTUCKY	KENTUCKY (other areas)	13,064,000	1,213	777	64	172
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$24,338,000	2,266	1,290	108	353
LOUISIANA	ALEXANDRIA	720,000	81	23	1	10
LOUISIANA	BATON ROUGE	1,683,000	151	134	10	18
LOUISIANA	BOSSIER CITY	103,000	0	17	1	3
LOUISIANA	HOUMA-TERREBONNE	511,000	40	44	2	9
LOUISIANA	KENNER	414,000	57	23	1	2
LOUISIANA	LAFAYETTE	783,000	67	57	4	10
LOUISIANA	LAKE CHARLES	1,344,000	188	29	1	10
LOUISIANA	MONROE	1,199,000	162	33	1	10
LOUISIANA	NEW ORLEANS	8,539,000	723	453	129	140
LOUISIANA	SHREVEPORT	1,674,000	195	88	7	13
LOUISIANA	SLIDELL	224,000	30	5	0	2
LOUISIANA	THIBODAUX	20,000	0	7	0	0
LOUISIANA	JEFFERSON PARISH	1,553,000	180	115	8	6
LOUISIANA	LOUISIANA (other areas)	7,525,000	324	846	90	128
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$26,292,000	2,197	1,873	257	360
MAINE	AUBURN	333,000	42	17	1	3
MAINE	BANGOR	485,000	34	28	1	11
MAINE	LEWISTON	644,000	76	29	1	7
MAINE	PORTLAND	1,452,000	148	57	4	21
MAINE	MAINE (other areas)	5,694,000	595	376	18	47
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$8,608,000	895	507	25	88
MARYLAND	ANNAPOLIS	499,000	0	9	0	25
MARYLAND	BALTIMORE	18,202,000	900	674	269	541

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
MARYLAND	CUMBERLAND	207,000	0	29	1	7
MARYLAND	FREDERICK	385,000	44	10	0	6
MARYLAND	HAGERSTOWN	876,000	95	25	1	14
MARYLAND	ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY	1,202,000	113	57	5	18
MARYLAND	BALTIMORE COUNTY	2,898,000	433	111	8	2
MARYLAND	HARFORD COUNTY	516,000	73	29	2	1
MARYLAND	HOWARD COUNTY	395,000	56	26	2	0
MARYLAND	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	3,355,000	395	134	22	32
MARYLAND	PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY	2,618,000	324	154	12	11
MARYLAND	MARYLAND (other areas)	3,656,000	411	210	11	24
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$34,809,000	2,845	1,468	333	680
MASSACHUSETTS	ARLINGTON	327,000	42	33	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	ATTLEBORO	34,000	0	13	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	BARNSTABLE	250,000	37	9	1	1
MASSACHUSETTS	BOSTON	14,963,000	896	572	144	400
MASSACHUSETTS	BROCKTON	966,000	79	39	2	21
MASSACHUSETTS	BROOKLINE	617,000	62	42	1	8
MASSACHUSETTS	CAMBRIDGE	2,197,000	174	89	7	46
MASSACHUSETTS	CHICOPEE	394,000	39	33	1	4
MASSACHUSETTS	FALL RIVER	2,028,000	217	81	6	26
MASSACHUSETTS	FITCHBURG	110,000	0	31	2	1
MASSACHUSETTS	FRAMINGHAM	434,000	63	14	1	2
MASSACHUSETTS	GLOUCESTER	383,000	51	20	1	2
MASSACHUSETTS	HAVERHILL	77,000	0	29	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	HOLYOKE	1,081,000	96	38	1	23
MASSACHUSETTS	LAWRENCE	1,099,000	86	53	5	22
MASSACHUSETTS	LEOMINSTER	32,000	0	12	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	LOWELL	1,529,000	86	65	8	42
MASSACHUSETTS	LYNN	1,150,000	111	75	6	13
MASSACHUSETTS	MALDEN	747,000	67	40	1	14
MASSACHUSETTS	MEDFORD	669,000	58	48	4	8
MASSACHUSETTS	NEW BEDFORD	1,828,000	153	83	6	34
MASSACHUSETTS	NEWTON	232,000	0	61	4	1
MASSACHUSETTS	NORTHAMPTON	71,000	0	20	1	1
MASSACHUSETTS	PITTSFIELD	473,000	57	41	1	2
MASSACHUSETTS	QUINCY	877,000	83	56	4	10
MASSACHUSETTS	SALEM	451,000	60	31	1	1

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
MASSACHUSETTS	SOMERVILLE	992,000	103	83	7	6
MASSACHUSETTS	SPRINGFIELD	1,938,000	196	116	8	21
MASSACHUSETTS	TAUNTON	429,000	47	23	1	5
MASSACHUSETTS	WALTHAM	365,000	45	28	1	2
MASSACHUSETTS	WESTFIELD	30,000	0	11	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	WEYMOUTH	76,000	0	19	1	1
MASSACHUSETTS	WORCESTER	2,254,000	161	132	13	45
MASSACHUSETTS	YARMOUTH	12,000	0	5	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	MASSACHUSETTS (other areas)	12,300,000	1,361	875	96	46
MASSACHUSETTS	CNSRT-PEABODY	26,000	0	0	0	1
MASSACHUSETTS	CNSRT-BARNSTABLE COUNTY	9,000	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$51,450,000	4,432	2,920	341	810
MICHIGAN	ANN ARBOR	636,000	78	31	4	6
MICHIGAN	BATTLE CREEK	359,000	31	38	1	4
MICHIGAN	BAY CITY	271,000	0	42	1	8
MICHIGAN	BENTON HARBOR	233,000	0	15	1	10
MICHIGAN	CANTON TWP	25,000	0	10	0	0
MICHIGAN	CLINTON TWP	65,000	0	14	1	1
MICHIGAN	DEARBORN	257,000	0	57	4	3
MICHIGAN	DEARBORN HEIGHTS	71,000	0	27	1	0
MICHIGAN	DETROIT	7,622,000	401	1,179	165	53
MICHIGAN	EAST LANSING	52,000	0	20	1	0
MICHIGAN	FARMINGTON HILLS	25,000	0	9	0	0
MICHIGAN	FLINT	1,421,000	92	128	9	23
MICHIGAN	GRAND RAPIDS	1,411,000	153	109	9	8
MICHIGAN	HOLLAND	25,000	0	10	0	0
MICHIGAN	JACKSON	448,000	37	42	1	6
MICHIGAN	KALAMAZOO	202,000	0	53	4	1
MICHIGAN	LANSING	971,000	70	55	4	19
MICHIGAN	LINCOLN PARK	69,000	0	21	1	1
MICHIGAN	LIVONIA	321,000	47	12	1	1
MICHIGAN	MIDLAND	20,000	0	8	0	0
MICHIGAN	MUSKEGON	151,000	0	30	1	4
MICHIGAN	MUSKEGON HTS	127,000	0	13	0	5
MICHIGAN	NORTON SHORES	10,000	0	4	0	0
MICHIGAN	PONTIAC	646,000	46	46	3	13
MICHIGAN	PORTAGE	16,000	0	6	0	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOB ² CREATED	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
MICHIGAN	PORT HURON	363,000	36	25	1	5
MICHIGAN	REDFORD	293,000	41	23	1	0
MICHIGAN	ROCHESTER HILLS	20,000	0	7	0	0
MICHIGAN	ROSEVILLE	219,000	31	12	1	1
MICHIGAN	ROYAL OAK	91,000	0	34	1	0
MICHIGAN	SAGINAW	987,000	83	76	6	12
MICHIGAN	ST CLAIR SHORES	88,000	0	24	1	1
MICHIGAN	SOUTHFIELD	35,000	0	13	1	0
MICHIGAN	STERLING HEIGHTS	67,000	0	16	1	1
MICHIGAN	TAYLOR	292,000	40	18	1	1
MICHIGAN	TROY CITY	24,000	0	9	0	0
MICHIGAN	WARREN	74,000	0	26	2	0
MICHIGAN	WATERFORD TOWNSHIP	29,000	0	11	1	0
MICHIGAN	WESTLAND	279,000	37	24	1	0
MICHIGAN	WYOMING	324,000	45	12	1	2
MICHIGAN	GENESEE COUNTY	243,000	0	63	5	1
MICHIGAN	KENT COUNTY	100,000	0	38	3	0
MICHIGAN	MACOMB COUNTY	124,000	0	44	2	0
MICHIGAN	OAKLAND COUNTY	397,000	0	93	8	3
MICHIGAN	WAYNE COUNTY	697,000	0	84	6	21
MICHIGAN	MICHIGAN (other areas)	14,906,000	1,397	1,024	88	136
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$35,106,000	2,666	3,654	345	350
MINNESOTA	BLOOMINGTON	322,000	50	12	1	0
MINNESOTA	DULUTH	1,184,000	118	81	6	11
MINNESOTA	MINNEAPOLIS	6,531,000	429	389	62	138
MINNESOTA	MOORHEAD	49,000	0	10	0	1
MINNESOTA	PLYMOUTH	19,000	0	7	0	0
MINNESOTA	ROCHESTER	271,000	39	14	1	1
MINNESOTA	ST CLOUD	401,000	61	15	1	1
MINNESOTA	ST PAUL	7,291,000	876	230	18	77
MINNESOTA	ANOKA COUNTY	110,000	0	41	2	0
MINNESOTA	DAKOTA COUNTY	1,293,000	190	45	2	5
MINNESOTA	HENNEPIN COUNTY	311,000	0	80	6	1
MINNESOTA	RAMSEY COUNTY	86,000	0	32	2	0
MINNESOTA	ST LOUIS COUNTY	310,000	0	71	5	3
MINNESOTA	MINNESOTA (other areas)	5,309,000	297	578	30	73

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$23,487,000	2,059	1,605	138	310
MISSISSIPPI	BILOXI	315,000	0	17	1	14
MISSISSIPPI	GULFPORT	2,591,000	356	23	1	26
MISSISSIPPI	HATTIESBURG	142,000	0	23	1	4
MISSISSIPPI	JACKSON	2,507,000	357	83	6	9
MISSISSIPPI	MOSS POINT	20,000	0	8	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	PASCAGOULA	26,000	0	10	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	MISSISSIPPI (other areas)	9,975,000	689	858	75	150
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$15,576,000	1,402	1,021	84	203
MISSOURI	COLUMBIA	1,059,000	141	23	1	10
MISSOURI	FLORISSANT	17,000	0	6	0	0
MISSOURI	INDEPENDENCE	517,000	65	24	1	4
MISSOURI	JOPLIN	516,000	77	21	1	1
MISSOURI	KANSAS CITY	4,897,000	513	262	79	50
MISSOURI	LEES SUMMIT	21,000	0	8	0	0
MISSOURI	ST CHARLES	38,000	0	9	0	1
MISSOURI	ST JOSEPH	748,000	86	54	4	3
MISSOURI	ST LOUIS	7,996,000	505	636	127	143
MISSOURI	SPRINGFIELD	967,000	115	42	6	10
MISSOURI	ST LOUIS COUNTY	3,392,000	454	149	11	14
MISSOURI	MISSOURI (other areas)	9,634,000	964	662	51	86
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$29,802,000	2,921	1,897	281	322
MONTANA	BILLINGS	297,000	29	20	1	4
MONTANA	GREAT FALLS	213,000	0	23	1	8
MONTANA	MISSOULA	41,000	0	15	1	0
MONTANA	MONTANA (other areas)	4,481,000	330	180	9	99
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$5,032,000	360	238	11	111
NEBRASKA	LINCOLN	1,795,000	276	50	5	2
NEBRASKA	OMAHA	3,714,000	416	147	11	42
NEBRASKA	NEBRASKA (other areas)	2,481,000	126	341	17	29
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$7,990,000	819	538	34	73

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NEVADA	HENDERSON	49,000	0	18	1	0
NEVADA	LAS VEGAS	2,203,000	153	92	69	48
NEVADA	NORTH LAS VEGAS	767,000	104	27	1	5
NEVADA	RENO	1,336,000	170	43	2	13
NEVADA	SPARKS	33,000	0	13	1	0
NEVADA	CLARK COUNTY	2,013,000	211	105	9	23
NEVADA	NEVADA (other areas)	1,607,000	107	67	13	34
NEVADA	CNSRT-LYON COUNTY	6,000	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$8,014,000	745	365	95	124
NEW HAMPSHIRE	DOVER	153,000	0	10	28	5
NEW HAMPSHIRE	MANCHESTER	1,437,000	132	50	5	26
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NASHUA	480,000	56	19	1	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	PORTSMOUTH	167,000	0	16	1	6
NEW HAMPSHIRE	ROCHESTER	101,000	0	8	0	4
NEW HAMPSHIRE	NEW HAMPSHIRE (other areas)	2,916,000	305	229	13	16
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$5,254,000	494	332	48	64
NEW JERSEY	ASBURY PARK	497,000	0	11	0	24
NEW JERSEY	ATLANTIC CITY	1,737,000	70	44	1	63
NEW JERSEY	BAYONNE	786,000	0	52	4	31
NEW JERSEY	BLOOMFIELD	90,000	0	34	1	0
NEW JERSEY	BRICK TOWNSHIP	111,000	0	9	1	5
NEW JERSEY	BRIDGETON	196,000	0	14	0	8
NEW JERSEY	CAMDEN	2,163,000	0	85	12	96
NEW JERSEY	CHERRY HILL	26,000	0	10	0	0
NEW JERSEY	CLIFTON	111,000	0	42	1	0
NEW JERSEY	DOVER TOWNSHIP	53,000	0	12	1	1
NEW JERSEY	EAST ORANGE	826,000	68	46	2	16
NEW JERSEY	EDISON	108,000	0	14	1	4
NEW JERSEY	ELIZABETH	1,866,000	107	65	5	53
NEW JERSEY	GLOUCESTER TWP	89,000	0	7	1	4
NEW JERSEY	HAMILTON	38,000	0	14	1	0
NEW JERSEY	IRVINGTON	325,000	0	30	1	13
NEW JERSEY	JERSEY CITY	4,672,000	261	200	119	122
NEW JERSEY	LONG BRANCH	627,000	38	15	1	19

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NEW JERSEY	MIDDLETOWN	54,000	0	8	0	2
NEW JERSEY	MILLVILLE	23,000	0	9	0	0
NEW JERSEY	NEWARK	5,684,000	271	266	288	150
NEW JERSEY	NEW BRUNSWICK	875,000	69	22	1	22
NEW JERSEY	NORTH BERGEN TOWNSHIP	613,000	42	23	1	16
NEW JERSEY	OLD BRIDGE TOWNSHIP	22,000	0	8	1	0
NEW JERSEY	PARSIPPANY-TROYHILLS	17,000	0	6	0	0
NEW JERSEY	PASSAIC	1,145,000	122	33	1	19
NEW JERSEY	PATERSON	2,904,000	243	76	59	62
NEW JERSEY	PERTH AMBOY	780,000	33	21	1	28
NEW JERSEY	SAYREVILLE	12,000	0	4	0	0
NEW JERSEY	TRENTON	1,367,000	0	88	6	55
NEW JERSEY	UNION CITY	655,000	58	37	1	12
NEW JERSEY	UNION	50,000	0	19	1	0
NEW JERSEY	VINELAND	400,000	30	15	1	10
NEW JERSEY	WAYNE TOWNSHIP	14,000	0	5	0	0
NEW JERSEY	WOODBIDGE	228,000	0	15	32	8
NEW JERSEY	BERGEN COUNTY	3,504,000	335	288	21	29
NEW JERSEY	BURLINGTON COUNTY	132,000	0	46	3	1
NEW JERSEY	CAMDEN COUNTY	253,000	0	65	9	1
NEW JERSEY	ESSEX COUNTY	628,000	0	170	13	1
NEW JERSEY	GLOUCESTER COUNTY	1,102,000	150	41	2	7
NEW JERSEY	HUDSON COUNTY	2,304,000	134	115	8	59
NEW JERSEY	MIDDLESEX COUNTY	660,000	64	45	2	9
NEW JERSEY	MONMOUTH COUNTY	1,118,000	125	85	6	5
NEW JERSEY	MORRIS COUNTY	678,000	63	60	5	5
NEW JERSEY	OCEAN COUNTY	1,077,000	124	54	4	9
NEW JERSEY	SOMERSET COUNTY	99,000	0	35	2	0
NEW JERSEY	UNION COUNTY	1,259,000	60	144	12	21
NEW JERSEY	NEW JERSEY (other areas)	11,685,000	1,306	265	78	135
NEW JERSEY	CNSRT-MERCER COUNTY	7,000	0	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	CNSRT-ATLANTIC COUNTY	7,000	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$53,677,000	3,773	2,772	714	1,126
NEW MEXICO	ALBUQUERQUE	2,805,000	373	123	10	12
NEW MEXICO	LAS CRUCES	704,000	99	27	1	4
NEW MEXICO	SANTA FE	336,000	46	17	1	1
NEW MEXICO	NEW MEXICO (other areas)	4,674,000	350	356	35	70

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS—MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOB ² CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$8,519,000	869	523	47	88
NEW YORK	ALBANY	1,979,000	115	103	8	49
NEW YORK	AMHERST TOWN	54,000	0	16	1	1
NEW YORK	AUBURN	94,000	0	28	1	1
NEW YORK	BABYLON TOWN	100,000	0	35	2	0
NEW YORK	BINGHAMTON	740,000	43	68	5	13
NEW YORK	BUFFALO	8,967,000	697	487	52	168
NEW YORK	CHEEKTOWAGA TOWN	52,000	0	19	1	0
NEW YORK	CLAY TOWN	21,000	0	8	0	0
NEW YORK	COLONIE TOWN	27,000	0	10	1	0
NEW YORK	DUNKIRK	110,000	0	16	0	4
NEW YORK	ELMIRA	239,000	0	38	1	7
NEW YORK	GLENS FALLS	381,000	52	15	0	2
NEW YORK	GREECE	31,000	0	12	1	0
NEW YORK	HAMBURG TOWN	29,000	0	11	1	0
NEW YORK	HUNTINGTON TOWN	67,000	0	25	2	0
NEW YORK	IRONDEQUOIT	62,000	0	23	1	0
NEW YORK	ISLIP TOWN	881,000	100	53	68	3
NEW YORK	JAMESTOWN	150,000	0	37	1	3
NEW YORK	MIDDLETOWN	40,000	0	15	1	0
NEW YORK	MOUNT VERNON	631,000	77	51	5	1
NEW YORK	NEWBURGH	299,000	34	24	1	2
NEW YORK	NEW ROCHELLE	762,000	98	45	2	5
NEW YORK	NEW YORK CITY	143,708,000	1,801	5,100	2,661	5,853
NEW YORK	NIAGARA FALLS	1,337,000	61	76	6	37
NEW YORK	POUGHKEEPSIE	519,000	55	30	1	7
NEW YORK	ROCHESTER	4,304,000	370	269	46	62
NEW YORK	ROME	322,000	35	31	1	2
NEW YORK	SARATOGA SPRINGS	97,000	0	10	0	4
NEW YORK	SCHENECTADY	1,561,000	155	73	6	21
NEW YORK	SYRACUSE	3,546,000	285	174	14	67
NEW YORK	TONAWANDA TOWN	122,000	0	46	2	0
NEW YORK	TROY	1,116,000	44	57	4	34
NEW YORK	UNION TOWN	98,000	0	37	1	0
NEW YORK	UTICA	1,184,000	88	90	7	19
NEW YORK	WEST SENECA	18,000	0	7	0	0
NEW YORK	WHITE PLAINS	292,000	39	27	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS—MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NEW YORK	YONKERS	1,685,000	110	101	10	36
NEW YORK	DUTCHESS COUNTY	115,000	0	39	2	1
NEW YORK	ERIE COUNTY	514,000	0	77	6	12
NEW YORK	MONROE COUNTY	136,000	0	46	3	1
NEW YORK	NASSAU COUNTY	2,220,000	42	403	31	28
NEW YORK	ONONDAGA COUNTY	526,000	58	51	4	1
NEW YORK	ORANGE COUNTY	133,000	0	44	3	1
NEW YORK	ROCKLAND COUNTY	523,000	46	51	4	4
NEW YORK	SUFFOLK COUNTY	368,000	0	96	9	1
NEW YORK	WESTCHESTER COUNTY	663,000	0	152	14	6
NEW YORK	NEW YORK (other areas)	24,626,000	2,912	1,270	165	145
NEW YORK	CNSRT-JEFFERSON COUNTY	178,000	0	0	0	9
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$205,627,000	7,317	9,494	3,155	6,609
NORTH CAROLINA	ASHEVILLE	1,322,000	113	35	1	31
NORTH CAROLINA	BURLINGTON	120,000	0	10	0	5
NORTH CAROLINA	CHAPEL HILL	149,000	0	10	0	6
NORTH CAROLINA	CHARLOTTE	3,133,000	239	105	28	71
NORTH CAROLINA	CONCORD	296,000	38	7	0	3
NORTH CAROLINA	DURHAM	1,983,000	157	40	2	51
NORTH CAROLINA	FAYETTEVILLE	1,329,000	149	25	1	21
NORTH CAROLINA	GASTONIA	801,000	107	16	1	8
NORTH CAROLINA	GOLDSBORO	435,000	0	13	1	21
NORTH CAROLINA	GREENSBORO	1,944,000	130	44	2	57
NORTH CAROLINA	GREENVILLE	672,000	60	19	1	15
NORTH CAROLINA	HICKORY	633,000	88	7	0	6
NORTH CAROLINA	HIGH POINT	1,205,000	117	18	1	25
NORTH CAROLINA	JACKSONVILLE	332,000	53	12	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	KANNAPOLIS	31,000	0	12	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	LENOIR	96,000	0	5	0	4
NORTH CAROLINA	MORGANTON	100,000	0	3	0	5
NORTH CAROLINA	RALEIGH	1,840,000	171	54	22	34
NORTH CAROLINA	ROCKY MOUNT	645,000	58	17	1	14
NORTH CAROLINA	SALISBURY	143,000	0	9	0	6
NORTH CAROLINA	WILMINGTON	1,634,000	147	21	1	39
NORTH CAROLINA	WINSTON SALEM	3,081,000	341	42	2	53
NORTH CAROLINA	CUMBERLAND COUNTY	198,000	0	52	4	1
NORTH CAROLINA	WAKE COUNTY	200,000	0	38	2	5

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
NORTH CAROLINA	NORTH CAROLINA (other areas)	20,116,000	1,939	1,045	105	256
NORTH CAROLINA	CNSRT-SURRY COUNTY	7,000	0	0	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	CNSRT-ORANGE COUNTY	6,000	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$42,451,000	3,906	1,657	177	738
NORTH DAKOTA	BISMARCK	582,000	88	10	1	3
NORTH DAKOTA	FARGO	661,000	100	19	1	2
NORTH DAKOTA	GRAND FORKS	569,000	94	13	1	0
NORTH DAKOTA	NORTH DAKOTA (other areas)	3,325,000	186	143	6	89
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$5,137,000	468	185	8	94
OHIO	AKRON	4,992,000	353	194	14	119
OHIO	ALLIANCE	51,000	0	19	1	0
OHIO	BARBERTON	56,000	0	21	1	0
OHIO	BOWLING GREEN	25,000	0	9	0	0
OHIO	CANTON	1,714,000	122	84	7	37
OHIO	CINCINNATI	7,372,000	427	383	49	184
OHIO	CLEVELAND	16,042,000	892	699	82	437
OHIO	CLEVELAND HEIGHTS	114,000	0	43	1	0
OHIO	COLUMBUS	5,916,000	599	197	38	92
OHIO	DAYTON	3,590,000	241	190	14	80
OHIO	EAST CLEVELAND	85,000	0	29	1	0
OHIO	ELYRIA	42,000	0	16	1	0
OHIO	EUCLID	72,000	0	27	1	0
OHIO	FAIRBORN	26,000	0	10	0	0
OHIO	HAMILTON CITY	117,000	0	41	1	0
OHIO	KENT	26,000	0	10	0	0
OHIO	KETTERING	29,000	0	11	1	0
OHIO	LAKEWOOD	212,000	0	59	4	0
OHIO	LANCASTER	442,000	67	15	1	1
OHIO	LIMA	94,000	0	33	1	0
OHIO	LORAIN	2,019,000	251	34	1	26
OHIO	MANSFIELD	858,000	138	24	1	0
OHIO	MARIETTA	32,000	0	12	0	0
OHIO	MASSILLON	55,000	0	21	1	0
OHIO	MENTOR	15,000	0	6	0	0
OHIO	MIDDLETOWN	318,000	48	18	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS" REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOB CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
OHIO	NEWARK	434,000	63	23	1	1
OHIO	PARMA	253,000	31	22	1	1
OHIO	SPRINGFIELD	980,000	100	58	4	11
OHIO	STEUBENVILLE	550,000	49	23	1	11
OHIO	TOLEDO	3,538,000	250	219	16	69
OHIO	WARREN	967,000	81	36	1	21
OHIO	YOUNGSTOWN	2,126,000	146	127	11	43
OHIO	BUTLER COUNTY	88,000	0	33	2	0
OHIO	CUYAHOGA COUNTY	303,000	0	75	5	2
OHIO	FRANKLIN COUNTY	1,071,000	93	50	4	19
OHIO	HAMILTON COUNTY	1,356,000	184	80	6	1
OHIO	LAKE COUNTY	666,000	90	34	2	3
OHIO	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	224,000	0	58	4	1
OHIO	STARK COUNTY	114,000	0	38	2	1
OHIO	SUMMIT COUNTY	108,000	0	38	2	0
OHIO	OHIO (other areas)	16,171,000	1,451	1,268	99	145
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$73,263,000	5,675	4,390	386	1,305
OKLAHOMA	BROKEN ARROW	29,000	0	11	0	0
OKLAHOMA	EDMOND	27,000	0	10	0	0
OKLAHOMA	ENID	43,000	0	16	1	0
OKLAHOMA	LAWTON	124,000	0	26	1	3
OKLAHOMA	MIDWEST CITY	36,000	0	13	1	0
OKLAHOMA	NORMAN	547,000	78	22	1	2
OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA CITY	3,353,000	304	145	11	57
OKLAHOMA	SHAWNEE	369,000	42	12	0	5
OKLAHOMA	TULSA	3,467,000	365	109	8	52
OKLAHOMA	OKLAHOMA (other areas)	8,910,000	775	477	56	139
OKLAHOMA	CNSRT-TULSA COUNTY	13,000	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$16,918,000	1,563	842	78	259
OREGON	ASHLAND	13,000	0	5	0	0
OREGON	BEAVERTON	29,000	0	11	1	0
OREGON	EUGENE	1,656,000	233	35	2	12
OREGON	GRESHAM	40,000	0	15	1	0
OREGON	MEDFORD	757,000	122	14	1	1
OREGON	PORTLAND	5,112,000	531	279	60	54

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
OREGON	SALEM	1,970,000	308	32	2	7
OREGON	SPRINGFIELD	41,000	0	15	1	0
OREGON	CLACKAMAS COUNTY	1,085,000	122	56	4	10
OREGON	MULTNOMAH COUNTY	23,000	0	9	1	0
OREGON	WASHINGTON COUNTY	1,192,000	157	54	5	5
OREGON	OREGON (other areas)	7,534,000	969	361	21	31
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$19,452,000	2,442	886	98	121
PENNSYLVANIA	ABINGTON	56,000	0	21	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	ALLENTOWN	1,351,000	92	74	5	29
PENNSYLVANIA	ALTOONA	844,000	80	58	4	9
PENNSYLVANIA	BENSALEM TOWNSHIP	25,000	0	10	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	BETHLEHEM	852,000	40	44	2	26
PENNSYLVANIA	BRISTOL TOWNSHIP	40,000	0	15	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	CARLISLE	586,000	86	10	0	3
PENNSYLVANIA	CHESTER	1,531,000	122	43	2	38
PENNSYLVANIA	EASTON	311,000	0	26	1	13
PENNSYLVANIA	ERIE	1,501,000	93	102	12	31
PENNSYLVANIA	HARRISBURG	1,678,000	49	65	5	61
PENNSYLVANIA	HAVERFORD	66,000	0	25	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	HAZLETON	354,000	35	26	1	5
PENNSYLVANIA	JOHNSTOWN	1,236,000	50	48	4	40
PENNSYLVANIA	LANCASTER	828,000	77	52	4	10
PENNSYLVANIA	LEBANON	327,000	32	23	1	4
PENNSYLVANIA	LOWER MERION	83,000	0	31	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	MCKEESPORT	932,000	48	36	1	29
PENNSYLVANIA	MILLCREEK TOWNSHIP	19,000	0	7	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	NORRISTOWN	70,000	0	26	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	PENN HILLS	44,000	0	17	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	PHILADELPHIA	28,833,000	900	1,579	285	927
PENNSYLVANIA	PITTSBURGH	9,889,000	487	490	61	277
PENNSYLVANIA	READING	1,272,000	49	90	7	35
PENNSYLVANIA	SCRANTON	1,434,000	90	95	8	30
PENNSYLVANIA	SHARON	365,000	0	18	1	16
PENNSYLVANIA	STATE COLLEGE	63,000	0	22	1	0
PENNSYLVANIA	UPPER DARBY	199,000	0	55	5	0
PENNSYLVANIA	WILKES-BARRE	756,000	47	54	4	15
PENNSYLVANIA	WILLIAMSPORT	603,000	35	37	1	16

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
PENNSYLVANIA	YORK	1,244,000	133	46	2	19
PENNSYLVANIA	ALLEGHENY COUNTY	5,586,000	420	429	33	86
PENNSYLVANIA	BEAVER COUNTY	1,229,000	60	107	8	26
PENNSYLVANIA	BERKS COUNTY	640,000	55	72	5	4
PENNSYLVANIA	BUCKS COUNTY	1,496,000	196	61	4	8
PENNSYLVANIA	CHESTER COUNTY	1,196,000	115	74	6	14
PENNSYLVANIA	DELAWARE COUNTY	1,930,000	207	105	9	19
PENNSYLVANIA	LANCASTER COUNTY	760,000	76	88	6	1
PENNSYLVANIA	LUZERNE COUNTY	1,428,000	85	137	10	23
PENNSYLVANIA	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	1,491,000	161	94	7	12
PENNSYLVANIA	WASHINGTON COUNTY	1,199,000	83	122	10	15
PENNSYLVANIA	WESTMORELAND COUNTY	1,905,000	164	113	8	29
PENNSYLVANIA	YORK COUNTY	247,000	0	66	5	0
PENNSYLVANIA	PENNSYLVANIA (other areas)	16,842,000	1,321	1,336	120	211
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$93,341,000	5,487	6,053	651	2,084
RHODE ISLAND	CRANSTON	152,000	0	29	1	4
RHODE ISLAND	EAST PROVIDENCE	75,000	0	20	1	1
RHODE ISLAND	PAWTUCKET	950,000	68	58	5	19
RHODE ISLAND	PROVIDENCE	2,816,000	185	169	33	59
RHODE ISLAND	WARWICK	269,000	34	21	1	1
RHODE ISLAND	WOONSOCKET	661,000	33	36	3	18
RHODE ISLAND	RHODE ISLAND (other areas)	2,289,000	151	131	7	47
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$7,212,000	471	462	50	148
SOUTH CAROLINA	AIKEN	315,000	33	6	0	6
SOUTH CAROLINA	ANDERSON	300,000	33	21	1	3
SOUTH CAROLINA	CHARLESTON	1,212,000	110	38	1	25
SOUTH CAROLINA	COLUMBIA	1,959,000	175	33	2	45
SOUTH CAROLINA	FLORENCE	725,000	60	12	0	18
SOUTH CAROLINA	GREENVILLE	1,557,000	186	31	1	21
SOUTH CAROLINA	MYRTLE BEACH	279,000	46	6	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	ROCK HILL	346,000	41	13	1	4
SOUTH CAROLINA	SPARTANBURG	1,165,000	102	21	1	28
SOUTH CAROLINA	SUMTER	507,000	69	14	1	4
SOUTH CAROLINA	CHARLESTON COUNTY	1,769,000	214	65	5	16
SOUTH CAROLINA	GREENVILLE COUNTY	225,000	0	59	5	1

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
SOUTH CAROLINA	SPARTANBURG COUNTY	93,000	0	35	2	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	SOUTH CAROLINA (other areas)	7,409,000	549	675	109	83
SOUTH CAROLINA	CNSRT-SUMTER COUNTY	13,000	0	0	0	1
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$17,874,000	1,618	1,029	130	255
SOUTH DAKOTA	RAPID CITY	664,000	89	15	1	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	SIOUX FALLS	806,000	129	22	2	1
SOUTH DAKOTA	SOUTH DAKOTA (other areas)	3,580,000	35	187	8	139
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$5,050,000	254	224	11	146
TENNESSEE	BRISTOL	85,000	0	6	0	4
TENNESSEE	CHATTANOOGA	2,374,000	134	57	5	73
TENNESSEE	CLARKSVILLE	202,000	0	21	1	8
TENNESSEE	JACKSON	778,000	64	17	1	19
TENNESSEE	JOHNSON CITY	575,000	45	14	1	14
TENNESSEE	KINGSPORT	594,000	74	12	0	7
TENNESSEE	KNOXVILLE	3,597,000	248	57	4	103
TENNESSEE	MEMPHIS	6,227,000	435	256	47	145
TENNESSEE	MURFREESBORO	404,000	57	13	1	2
TENNESSEE	NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON	6,190,000	350	135	34	191
TENNESSEE	OAK RIDGE	44,000	0	6	0	1
TENNESSEE	KNOX COUNTY	424,000	50	31	1	3
TENNESSEE	SHELBY COUNTY	155,000	0	36	2	3
TENNESSEE	TENNESSEE (other areas)	10,440,000	709	687	58	197
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$32,089,000	2,168	1,347	155	771
TEXAS	ABILENE	493,000	61	32	1	3
TEXAS	AMARILLO	1,793,000	278	55	4	1
TEXAS	ARLINGTON	1,449,000	210	66	5	1
TEXAS	AUSTIN	3,000,000	262	186	54	41
TEXAS	BAYTOWN CITY	451,000	60	25	1	2
TEXAS	BEAUMONT	1,283,000	162	53	4	9
TEXAS	BROWNSVILLE	1,799,000	214	94	7	13
TEXAS	BRYAN	1,129,000	175	24	1	3
TEXAS	CARROLLTON	44,000	0	17	1	0
TEXAS	COLLEGE STATION	78,000	0	27	1	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
TEXAS	CONROE	32,000	0	12	1	0
TEXAS	CORPUS CHRISTI	1,414,000	83	113	9	28
TEXAS	DALLAS	8,816,000	900	440	159	102
TEXAS	DENISON	28,000	0	11	0	0
TEXAS	DENTON	639,000	100	24	1	0
TEXAS	EDINBURG	529,000	69	21	1	4
TEXAS	EL PASO	4,180,000	347	285	21	61
TEXAS	FORT WORTH	3,598,000	440	176	44	22
TEXAS	GALVESTON	953,000	99	41	2	15
TEXAS	GARLAND	624,000	87	45	2	0
TEXAS	GRAND PRAIRIE	724,000	112	30	1	0
TEXAS	HARLINGEN	513,000	53	30	1	7
TEXAS	HOUSTON	9,847,000	900	805	359	78
TEXAS	IRVING	195,000	0	51	4	1
TEXAS	KILLEEN	95,000	0	23	1	2
TEXAS	LAREDO	1,099,000	95	99	7	11
TEXAS	LEWISVILLE	28,000	0	11	1	0
TEXAS	LONGVIEW	400,000	58	23	1	0
TEXAS	LUBBOCK	847,000	76	73	5	8
TEXAS	MC ALLEN	752,000	87	59	4	2
TEXAS	MARSHALL	337,000	52	12	0	1
TEXAS	MESQUITE	637,000	101	23	1	0
TEXAS	MIDLAND	268,000	33	30	1	0
TEXAS	MISSION	493,000	67	22	1	3
TEXAS	MISSOURI CITY	19,000	0	7	0	0
TEXAS	NEW BRAUNFELS	30,000	0	10	0	0
TEXAS	NORTH RICHLAND HILLS	22,000	0	8	0	0
TEXAS	ODESSA	630,000	87	37	1	2
TEXAS	ORANGE	580,000	74	12	0	6
TEXAS	PASADENA	654,000	92	46	2	0
TEXAS	PHARR	449,000	50	30	1	4
TEXAS	PLANO	67,000	0	23	1	0
TEXAS	PORT ARTHUR	1,238,000	178	42	1	6
TEXAS	RICHARDSON	33,000	0	12	1	0
TEXAS	ROUND ROCK	33,000	0	9	0	0
TEXAS	SAN ANGELO	398,000	50	31	1	2
TEXAS	SAN ANTONIO	10,171,000	900	462	71	174
TEXAS	SAN BENITO	103,000	0	15	1	3
TEXAS	SAN MARCOS	68,000	0	16	1	1

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS* REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
TEXAS	SHERMAN	470,000	69	9	0	3
TEXAS	TEMPLE	45,000	0	17	1	0
TEXAS	TEXARKANA	1,239,000	177	13	1	10
TEXAS	TEXAS CITY	38,000	0	14	1	0
TEXAS	TYLER	544,000	81	29	1	0
TEXAS	VICTORIA	351,000	35	22	1	5
TEXAS	WACO	1,267,000	151	51	4	12
TEXAS	WICHITA FALLS	663,000	70	40	2	8
TEXAS	BEXAR COUNTY	871,000	116	52	4	1
TEXAS	BRAZORIA COUNTY	127,000	0	45	2	0
TEXAS	DALLAS COUNTY	1,243,000	197	43	3	0
TEXAS	FORT BEND COUNTY	133,000	0	48	2	0
TEXAS	HARRIS COUNTY	1,775,000	140	261	20	2
TEXAS	HIDALGO COUNTY	1,231,000	70	201	15	6
TEXAS	MONTGOMERY COUNTY	105,000	0	40	2	0
TEXAS	TARRANT COUNTY	306,000	0	81	6	1
TEXAS	TEXAS (other areas)	19,167,000	1,134	1,962	189	240
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$92,637,000	8,850	6,729	1,042	909
UTAH	CLEARFIELD	20,000	0	7	0	0
UTAH	LAYTON	25,000	0	9	0	0
UTAH	OGDEN	578,000	74	36	1	3
UTAH	OREM	45,000	0	17	1	0
UTAH	PROVO	1,000,000	146	45	2	2
UTAH	SALT LAKE CITY	1,311,000	128	111	8	10
UTAH	SANDY CITY	34,000	0	13	0	0
UTAH	TAYLORSVILLE	28,000	0	11	2	0
UTAH	WEST JORDAN	28,000	0	10	0	0
UTAH	WEST VALLEY	326,000	45	26	1	0
UTAH	SALT LAKE COUNTY	1,331,000	156	72	3	10
UTAH	UTAH (other areas)	1,501,000	83	175	26	12
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$6,227,000	632	534	46	37
VERMONT	BURLINGTON	840,000	116	23	3	6
VERMONT	VERMONT (other areas)	2,809,000	299	196	11	20
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$3,649,000	415	220	14	26

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
VIRGINIA	ALEXANDRIA	1,269,000	161	27	2	14
VIRGINIA	BRISTOL	129,000	0	8	0	6
VIRGINIA	CHARLOTTESVILLE	50,000	0	15	1	1
VIRGINIA	CHESAPEAKE	763,000	89	35	1	9
VIRGINIA	COLONIAL HEIGHTS	7,000	0	2	0	0
VIRGINIA	DANVILLE	605,000	64	27	1	9
VIRGINIA	FREDERICKSBURG	15,000	0	6	0	0
VIRGINIA	HAMPTON	1,593,000	187	31	1	23
VIRGINIA	HOPEWELL	164,000	0	6	0	8
VIRGINIA	LYNCHBURG	401,000	47	21	2	4
VIRGINIA	NEWPORT NEWS	2,323,000	218	49	4	47
VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	4,184,000	245	150	13	117
VIRGINIA	PETERSBURG	254,000	0	17	1	11
VIRGINIA	PORTSMOUTH	1,724,000	115	50	4	46
VIRGINIA	RICHMOND	3,812,000	193	137	36	114
VIRGINIA	ROANOKE	1,616,000	112	48	4	42
VIRGINIA	SUFFOLK	488,000	56	17	1	7
VIRGINIA	VIRGINIA BEACH	618,000	55	70	38	1
VIRGINIA	ARLINGTON COUNTY	825,000	109	53	4	1
VIRGINIA	CHESTERFIELD COUNTY	88,000	0	31	2	0
VIRGINIA	FAIRFAX COUNTY	2,328,000	270	141	11	15
VIRGINIA	HENRICO COUNTY	100,000	0	34	2	0
VIRGINIA	PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY	109,000	0	38	3	0
VIRGINIA	VIRGINIA (other areas)	10,129,000	1,241	539	50	43
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$33,594,000	3,162	1,553	182	516
WASHINGTON	AUBURN	24,000	0	9	1	0
WASHINGTON	BELLEVUE	42,000	0	16	1	0
WASHINGTON	BELLINGHAM	623,000	86	20	1	4
WASHINGTON	BREMERTON	783,000	94	13	1	11
WASHINGTON	EVERETT	856,000	123	21	1	5
WASHINGTON	FEDERAL WAY	35,000	0	13	1	0
WASHINGTON	KENNEWICK	343,000	49	13	1	2
WASHINGTON	OLYMPIA	467,000	78	9	0	0
WASHINGTON	PASCO	127,000	0	14	1	5
WASHINGTON	RICHLAND	253,000	40	7	0	0
WASHINGTON	SEATTLE	6,402,000	459	345	112	127

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
WASHINGTON	SPOKANE	1,860,000	250	104	9	3
WASHINGTON	TACOMA	2,120,000	255	77	7	20
WASHINGTON	VANCOUVER	960,000	137	17	1	7
WASHINGTON	YAKIMA	427,000	56	23	2	2
WASHINGTON	CLARK COUNTY	124,000	0	41	3	1
WASHINGTON	KING COUNTY	3,643,000	342	149	17	60
WASHINGTON	KITSAP COUNTY	317,000	31	32	3	3
WASHINGTON	PIERCE COUNTY	1,450,000	183	100	8	2
WASHINGTON	SNOHOMISH COUNTY	1,298,000	165	77	7	4
WASHINGTON	SPOKANE COUNTY	123,000	0	43	3	1
WASHINGTON	WASHINGTON (other areas)	4,206,000	237	363	31	67
WASHINGTON	CNSRT-LONGVIEW	9,000	0	0	10	0
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$26,492,000	2,583	1,507	221	325
WEST VIRGINIA	CHARLESTON	2,153,000	220	56	5	36
WEST VIRGINIA	HUNTINGTON	1,011,000	87	62	4	15
WEST VIRGINIA	PARKERSBURG	784,000	112	30	1	4
WEST VIRGINIA	WEIRTON	326,000	46	13	0	1
WEST VIRGINIA	WHEELING	444,000	0	43	1	17
WEST VIRGINIA	WEST VIRGINIA (other areas)	6,521,000	632	479	23	59
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$11,239,000	1,096	683	35	133
WISCONSIN	APPLETON	320,000	49	16	1	0
WISCONSIN	BELOIT	409,000	57	18	1	2
WISCONSIN	EAU CLAIRE	311,000	38	20	1	2
WISCONSIN	GREEN BAY	1,703,000	284	27	2	1
WISCONSIN	JANESVILLE	295,000	45	15	1	0
WISCONSIN	KENOSHA	511,000	74	30	1	0
WISCONSIN	LA CROSSE	82,000	0	29	1	0
WISCONSIN	MADISON	854,000	89	58	6	7
WISCONSIN	MILWAUKEE	6,576,000	542	508	59	85
WISCONSIN	NEENAH	15,000	0	6	0	0
WISCONSIN	OSHKOSH	84,000	0	24	1	1
WISCONSIN	RACINE	779,000	97	58	5	1
WISCONSIN	SHEBOYGAN	72,000	0	27	1	0
WISCONSIN	SUPERIOR	196,000	0	25	1	7
WISCONSIN	WAUKESHA	328,000	52	11	0	0

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOB CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
WISCONSIN	WAUSAU	244,000	33	19	1	0
WISCONSIN	WAUWATOSA	79,000	0	30	1	0
WISCONSIN	WEST ALLIS	352,000	45	35	1	0
WISCONSIN	DANE COUNTY	538,000	82	25	2	0
WISCONSIN	MILWAUKEE COUNTY	1,167,000	184	39	2	1
WISCONSIN	WAUKESHA COUNTY	78,000	0	25	2	1
WISCONSIN	WISCONSIN (other areas)	5,305,000	194	760	52	57
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$20,298,000	1,866	1,807	141	165
WYOMING	CASPER	549,000	88	12	0	1
WYOMING	CHEYENNE	558,000	85	13	0	2
WYOMING	WYOMING (other areas)	696,000	0	78	4	21
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$1,803,000	172	103	5	24
PUERTO RICO	AGUADILLA MUNICIPIO	214,000	0	58	4	0
PUERTO RICO	ARECIBO MUNICIPIO	815,000	85	90	7	0
PUERTO RICO	BAYAMON MUNICIPIO	1,370,000	142	151	11	1
PUERTO RICO	CAGUAS MUNICIPIO	1,012,000	106	110	8	1
PUERTO RICO	CANOVANAS MUNICIPIO	104,000	0	39	2	0
PUERTO RICO	CAROLINA MUNICIPIO	739,000	50	121	9	1
PUERTO RICO	CAYEY MUNICIPIO	116,000	0	44	2	0
PUERTO RICO	FAJARDO MUNICIPIO	81,000	0	30	2	0
PUERTO RICO	GUAYNABO MUNICIPIO	425,000	34	62	5	0
PUERTO RICO	HUMACAO MUNICIPIO	180,000	0	50	4	0
PUERTO RICO	MANATI MUNICIPIO	99,000	0	37	2	0
PUERTO RICO	MAYAGUEZ MUNICIPIO	760,000	74	90	7	1
PUERTO RICO	PONCE MUNICIPIO	1,489,000	143	182	13	1
PUERTO RICO	RIO GRANDE MUNICIPIO	110,000	0	41	2	0
PUERTO RICO	SAN JUAN MUNICIPIO	3,731,000	381	330	299	4

POTENTIAL BUDGET IMPACTS--MARK VS. FY 99 ENACTED
(by Entitlement Community)

POTENTIAL IMPACTS REFLECT DOLLARS ALLOCATED FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAMS (see endnotes)*

STATE	ENTITLEMENT COMMUNITY	POTENTIAL IMPACT (see note above)				
		TOTAL DOLLARS LOST	HOUSING VOUCHERS ¹	JOBS CREATED ²	HOMELESS and PERSONS WITH AIDS ³	PRIVATE & PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS REHABBED ⁴
PUERTO RICO	TOA ALTA MUNICIPIO	107,000	0	40	2	0
PUERTO RICO	TOA BAJA MUNICIPIO	261,000	0	71	5	0
PUERTO RICO	TRUJILLO ALTO MUNICIPIO	122,000	0	46	2	0
PUERTO RICO	VEGA BAJA MUNICIPIO	196,000	0	54	4	0
PUERTO RICO	PUERTO RICO (other areas)	24,605,000	874	1,356	145	751
	TOTAL FOR STATE	\$36,536,000	1,889	3,004	533	761
	TOTAL FOR COUNTRY	\$1,626,000,000	128,421	97,106	15,835	27,884

¹ Includes voucher dollars lost, and assumes \$5,700 per unit cost--national average.

² Includes CDBG and BDI, and assumes \$2626 cost per job created--national average for CDBG entitlement communities from 94 GPR (most recent cost figure available).

³ Includes COC, ESG, and HOPWA, and assumes \$1080 cost per person served for the COC portion (approx. 85% of the homeless dollars lost) (cost from '98 applications) and \$284 cost per person for the ESG portion (approx. 15% of the homeless dollars lost).

⁴ Includes HOME, and assumes \$17,520 cost per unit--average of national average for HOME rental assistance (\$19,951) and HOME homeowner rehab (\$15,088). Also includes Public Housing Capital and HOPE VI, and assumes \$18,510 cost per unit--national average from Abt study of public housing modernization needs (as of June 99).

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
Legislative Reference Division
Labor-Welfare-Personnel Branch

1/ND
Budget
Lmer

Telecopier Transmittal Sheet



FROM: Bennie Rogers PHONE: 395-7754
DATE: 08/25/99 TIME: 2:55

Pages sent (including transmittal sheet): 20 pages
COMMENTS:

Per your request here
is the H.R. 202 packet.

TO: Lisa Green

PLEASE CALL THE PERSON(S) NAMED ABOVE FOR IMMEDIATE PICK-UP.

August 24, 1999

NOTE TO: Janet Forsgren, OMB

mjm

FROM: Mike Moran, HUD

SUBJECT: Request for Clearance on HUD Position on H.R. 202
Discussion Draft

Attached is the politically-cleared final form of a chart that you received in draft form by e-mail on July 23. The chart sets forth HUD's position on the provisions in the June 29 "Discussion Draft" of H.R. 202, "Preserving Affordable Housing for Senior Citizens and Families into the 21st Century Act".

We understand that there is likely to be an effort in the House to include the HR 202 provisions in the appropriations Act for FY 2000. Therefore, we request expedited OMB clearance of the chart so that HUD can transmit its official position to the House in time to be considered before any action on H.R. 202 provisions.

Please contact Don Alexander or me at 708-1793 if you need any further information.

*Ben -
I discussed briefly
w/ Mike on 08/24.
Please talk to
Melinda or Bob,
then call Mike to
setup a timeline.
(He's supposed to
e-mail to you, as well.)*

Age

HUD comments on 6/29/99 "Discussion Draft" substitute for HR 202
Revised 8/24/99

Title I--CONVERSION OF FINANCING AND REFINANCING FOR SECTION 202
SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Disc. Draft. section</u>	<u>Orig. bill</u>	<u>Comparison to original bill</u>	<u>Comments</u>
Conversion of section 202 financing to "new" program--general	101(a)	101 of HR 202	• change in line 8 • clarifying new sentence beg. line 16 sets forth meaning of conversion	Need a savings provision preventing displacement of nonelderly disabled or non-very low income residents who would not meet requirements of sec. 202 capital advance/PRAC program. If this is not done, need clear guidance on how to deal with displacees upon conversion.
Forgiveness of section 202 loan upon conversion	101(b)	102 of HR 202	• debt forgiveness mandatory (line 11) • cancellation spread out over remaining loan term (lines 17-23)	Scoring problem remains, possibly making proposal unworkable. Also need to deal with forgiveness of HUD debt to Treasury. There would also be significant administrative difficulties with calculating, allocating, and monitoring loan forgiveness in annual increments. Original provision preferred.

cellation of section 8 contracts upon conversion; use of unexpended section 8 funds; use of residual receipts	101(c)	103 of HR 202	• section 8 cancellation mandatory (line 13) • extensive new specific directions beginning page 4, line 18 on use of unexpended section 8 funds • includes credit against loan cancellation as new use ahead of retrofit/renovation	Reuse of section 8 unexpended funds for PRAC and loan forgiveness means no advantage to project, and no funds freed up for renovation retrofit. Therefore, original provision preferred.
Third party processing of conversion	101(d)	104 of HR 202	none	Would 3rd parties have control over reuse of funds? Presents a risk factor. How will 3rd parties be paid?
Waiver authority for conversions	101(e)	105 of HR 202	none	No objection.
Prepayment and refinancing of section 202 project	102	3(a) of HR 1426	none	No objection but some changes in mechanics are needed.

Title II--AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPORTIVE HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Authorization for section 202 approps	201	201 of HR 202	• authorizes such sums as may be necessary for section 202 program for FYs 2003-4 • adds limit of \$20 million for each FY for matching grant (see new program in DD sec. 301(a))	No objection. Would permit funding of HUD request of \$660 mil. for FY 2000.
Authorization for section 811 approps	202	202 of HR 202	• authorizes such sums as may be necessary for section 811 program for FYs 2003-4 • adds limit of \$20 million for each FY for matching grant (see new program in DD sec. 301(b))	No objection. Would permit funding of HUD request of \$194 mil. for FY 2000.
Authorization for approps for grants for (1) service coordinators and (2) congregate services [not public housing]	203(a)	4(a) of HR 1624	none	No objection.

4

Authorization for approps for service cocrdinators and congregate service for public housing-- (1) Renewals of FY 98 grants not renewed, (2) Renewals of 98 grants for FY 99, and (3) Renewals for FY 2000	203(b)	4 (b) of HR 1624	none	Should only fund extensions of existing congregate services contracts per previous budget policy.
---	--------	------------------	------	---

Title III--EXPANDING HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE ELDERLY AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Matching grants for section 202 program	301(a)	NEW	n/a	No objection. Program could be more useful if project owner permitted to be for-profit lim. p'ship with NP general partner in order to permit use of LIH tax credits.
Matching grants for section 811 program	301(b)	NEW	n/a	No objection. Program could be more useful if project owner permitted to be for-profit LP with NP general partner in order to permit use of LIH tax credits
Section 202 loans for acquired structures	302	301 of HR 202	none	No objection.

Funding for section 202 projects from other Federal sources	303(a)	302(a) of HR 202	none	No objection.
Funding for section 811 projects from other Federal sources	303(b)	302(a) of HR 202		No objection.
Low-income elderly in high-vacancy section 202 projects	304	303 of HR 202	none	No objection.
Tenant-based assistance under section 811	305	NEW	n/a	25% maximum on funds available for TBA should be changed to 50%. No objection to allowing non-profits to administer TEA, but language could be clearer that exception from section 8 rules is narrow and only intended to address conflicts raised by NP status.
Service coordinators providing assistance for elderly/disabled in vicinity of project	306(a) and (b)	4(c) and (d) of HR 1624	none	No objection.

Grants for conversion of non-202 elderly projects to assisted living facilities	307	2 of HR 1624	Authorizes such sums as may be necessary for FYs 2000-2005 instead of \$100 million for 2000 and "such sums" for FYs 2001-2.	No objection if: (1) firm commitment for funding of services is required, (2) grant funds can be available for uses for elderly projects other than conversion activities (e.g., renovation or retrofit), (3) selection factor list is amended to reflect requirement for firm commitment of services.
Use of section 8 assistance for projects converted to assisted living facilities	308	5 of HR 1624	Various changes limit TBA to "converted" assisted living facilities, (as defined on page 30, beg. line 19) instead of all assisted living facilities	Should not be limited to converted projects. The ordinary payment standard for vouchers should also apply to vouchers for assisted living. Need to make sure tenants can be required to accept some services as condition of residency.

Annual HUD inventory of assisted housing for elderly	309	NEW	none	Good information is needed in this area, but proposal needs refinement to ensure cost and burden commensurate with benefit. Section could be deleted because of similar language in House committee report on appropriations bill.
--	-----	-----	------	--

Title IV--RENEWAL OF EXPIRING RENTAL ASSISTANCE CONTRACTS AND PROTECTION OF RESIDENTS

Findings and purposes	401	2 of HR 1336	none	No objection.
Renewal of expiring section 8 project-based assistance contracts; enhanced vouchers for project residents if opt-out SEE SEPARATE CHART ON SECTION 402(a)	402(a)	Revises sec. 524 of MAHRA with all NEW language except: new 524(b) is current 524(a)(2), and new 524(d) is based on sec. 3 of HR 1336	Section 524(d) adds families with children to list of "covered residents" entitled to enhanced vouchers	SEE SEPARATE CHART ON SECTION 402(a)

LIHPRA and restructuring demonstration projects ineligible for Mark-to-Market program	402 (b)	NEW	n/a	No objection, provided that section 524(e) (2) is changed as discussed on page 17.
State projects eligible for Mark-to-Market absent conflict with law or agreements applicable to project	402 (c)	NEW	n/a	No objection.
Refinancing eligible use of section 236(s) IRF grant	403 (a)	5 of 1336	none	Language is unclear. Is this limited to refinancing of existing rehabilitation loans? Current provisions limiting grant expenditures to rate and amount for recaptured IRP may not work with refinancing, depending on what is intended.
Authority to permit owners of all uninsured section 236 projects to retain excess income for project purposes	403 (b)	6 of 1336	none	No objection <u>if</u> uninsured projects allowed to keep excess rents only after a HUD determination that this will contribute to maintaining the supply of affordable housing.

Matching grants to States for affordable housing preservation	404	secs. 3-11 of 425 (404(b) is new; technical change)	• new matching grant program is amendment to 1987 Act instead of free-standing act • limited to projects (1) that are for elderly or disabled, (2) with units of 3 or more bedrooms for large families, (3) in rural area with inadequate supply of comparable housing, or (4) in neighborhood or submarket where vouchers would be difficult to use • restrictions must run at least 5 years after other program restrictions expire • amount of HUD match is reduced--100% match if State uses only non-Federal sources and 50% match • authorized approps limited to \$20 • future priority to States without grants in first year.	No objection to a grant program to match State funds for affordable housing preservation. More consideration of targeting may be needed to ensure best use of limited funds. Not clear how allocation limit based on need in new sec. 263 (p. 56) works with the limitation on uses in new sec. 262 (pp. 52-53) or with the priority in new sec. 266(b) on page 58. Needs-based allocation could work if not complicated by other limitations such as these.
---	-----	---	---	--

Title V--MORTGAGE INSURANCE FOR HEALTH CARE FACILITIES

Section 223(f) insurance for purchase of hospitals and other health care facilities; extension of section 223(f) to new "health care facility" category (see sec. 502)	501	NEW	n/a	HUD has some concerns, but specific comments will be provided separately.
Section 232 insurance extended to broadly-defined "health care facility"	502	NEW	n/a	See above.
Section 242 to include hospital providing 50%+ chronic care, and "health care facility" (see sec. 502) under common ownership with hospital; revised test for need	503	NEW	n/a	See above.

HUD Comments on Section 402(a) of Discussion Draft

MAHRA sec.

524 designation

What it does

Comments

(a) (1)	Renewal required at owner request (except restructured project)	No objection, if clarified regarding exception for restructuring projects. Instead of parenthetical language excepting projects "subject to" restructuring plans, exception should be for projects eligible for plan but without approved plan, if HUD determines a plan is necessary (i.e., if mortgage restructuring as well as rent reduction is needed for viable project). Once restructured, project should be handled as exception project, subject to guarantee of OCAP adjustments in sec. 514(e) (2) of MAHRA.
(a) (2)	HUD may elect to not renew for "bad owners" or "bad projects" per section 516	No objection, but technical change is needed to clarify that Secretary makes the determination under section 516(a) (4) of MAHRA (project in bad condition).
(a) (3)	Contracts renewed with rents marked up to market must be for at least 5 years	No objection.

(a) (4) (A)	If current rent not above market, renewals must be at market if no income restrictions except sec. 8, good condition, and (i) elderly or disabled, (ii) at least one 3+ bedroom unit for large family, (iii) in rural area with inadequate supply of comparable housing, or (iv) in low-vacancy area. (236/221(d)BMIR must also meet special requirements.)	No objection, if the following matters are addressed: • In clause (ii), substitute related language from HUD notice. • Clause (iv) should be deleted. If intent is to address complications presented by two subsidy sources for older assisted projects, should be handled separately. • Clause (v) should not limit mandatory marking up to class of projects as defined. Instead of (v) (I)-(III), the projects should be defined as those with rents over 110% on assisted units. (Low-vacancy projects in (v) (IV) OK.) • Non-profit projects should be excluded. • Rent should be marked up to lesser of market or 150% of FMR. (v), substitute position from Housing Notice that provides for marking up to higher of market rent or 150% of FMR for projects with current rents over 110% of FMR. Can keep low-vacancy area language from (v) (IV).
(a) (4) (B)	If current rent above market and no restructuring plan, renewals must be at rents not to exceed market rents	No objection.

(a) (4) (C)	If not covered by (A) or (B), renewals must be at rents at least equal to existing rents (with OCAF adjustment if positive) and not more than market.	No objection.
(b)	Exception projects (same group as current sec. 524(a) (2) of MAHRA) must be renewed at request of owner at lesser of: (1) existing rents (with OCAF adjustment if positive), (2) budget-based rents including budget-based adjustment. Ends special treatment for mod. rehab projects.	No objection for projects that are not mod. rehab or restructured projects. For mod. rehab projects, current law on rent adjustment should be retained because PHAs do not have experience to calculate and apply budget-based adjustments. For restructured projects, should not require budget-based adjustment if lesser than adjustment through OCAF because restructuring plan must allow OCAF adjustment.

(c)	Requires annual rent adjustment using OCAP (if positive). Each 3 years (or each 5 years where 5 year contract mandatory), rent must be compared to market rents.	The following changes should be made: • The owner should not be able to require a budget-based adjustment. Owner request for budget-basing should need HUD agreement. • Mandatory comparison with market rent should be every 5 years in all cases, except that HUD should have discretion to make comparison and adjustment to market more frequently if needed.
(d) (1)	If contract not renewed, subject to appropriations, HUD <u>shall</u> make enhanced vouchers available to covered resident of covered project, and HUD <u>may</u> make enhanced vouchers to other low-income families in assisted dwelling unit in covered project	Entitlement to enhanced vouchers should not be limited to "covered residents" as defined in bill and should be available for all opt-outs and other contract terminations.

(d) (2)	Enhanced voucher defined: for as long as family continues to reside in a unit in the same project, payment standard is set at existing rent if reasonable and above normal payment standard.	No objection.
(d) (3)	Assisted dwelling unit, covered project, and covered resident defined. Covered resident is elderly, disabled or family with children residing in project.	Per above, delete definition of "covered resident". Also, modify definition of "assisted dwelling unit" to include unit occupied by a voucher holder.
(d) (4)	Such sums as may be necessary authorized for appropriations for enhanced vouchers under subsection (d).	No objection.

(e) (1)	Notwithstanding any other provision of subtitle A of MAHRA, upon expiration of section 8 contract for a preservation project with plan of action, HUD must (at request of owner and to extent sufficient amounts are available in approps Act) provide benefits to owner comparable to those in plan of action	No objection, if clearly made subject to section 516 for bad owners/projects.
---------	--	---

(e) (2)	Notwithstanding any other provision of subtitle A of MAHRA, upon request section 8 contract for portfolio reengineering demonstration project, HUD must (at request of owner and to extent sufficient amounts are available in approps Act) provide benefits comparable to those in section 8 contract. Any section 8 contract will be at existing rents with OCAF adjustment (if positive). Annual adjustments shall be through OCAF (if positive) or on budget basis if requested by owner. (No market rent limitation).	No objection to subparagraph (A), if clearly made subject to section 516 for had owners/projects <u>and</u> if limited to demo. projects that have had debt restructuring in addition to rent restructuring. Regarding subparagraph (E) on rent adjustments: • Rents should be limited to market levels. • HUD rather than owner should decide if budget-based adjustment is needed.
---------	---	--

18

(f)	Preempts State or local law limiting distributions to less than allowed by HUD regs for any project with section 8 contract renewed under sec. 524	Need for section is unclear, but there is no objection.
(g)	Defines low-vacancy area as submarket area where HUD determines vouchers difficult to use. Term relates to enhanced vouchers and mandatory marking up.	No objection.

h:\gl1\2000.app\202chart



press release

HUD News

HUD No. 99-132

Further information:

In the Washington, DC area: 202/708-0885

Or contact your local HUD office

For Release

Friday

July 30, 1999

CUOMO CALLS ON PRESIDENT CLINTON TO VETO BILL THAT MAKES DEVASTATING CUTS TO HUD'S BUDGET

WASHINGTON - Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo said he will recommend that President Clinton veto legislation setting HUD's Fiscal Year 2000 Budget if it remains in the form being considered today by the House Appropriations Committee.

The HUD Budget is part of a bill that also covers the Department of Veterans' Affairs, NASA and other agencies. The House Appropriations Committee was considering \$2 billion in cuts to the HUD Budget below the level proposed by the President. The cuts were approved by a subcommittee earlier this week.

"It is bizarre to favor a tax cut for the richest of the rich while cutting crumbs for the poorest of the poor," Cuomo said. "I will urge the President to veto this bill."

"When the President proposed his budget for HUD, we said it would open doors for more Americans," Cuomo added. "Devastating cuts would instead slam doors shut on families struggling to work their way out of poverty and to find desperately needed affordable housing."


The cuts being considered by the House Appropriations Committee to the \$28 billion budget that President Clinton proposed for HUD would wipe out most of the \$2.5 billion increase that the President requested. The Committee's consideration of the HUD Budget followed severe budget restrictions imposed by the Congressional Budget Resolution.

Cuomo said that the cuts would:

- Fail to fund the Administration's request for 100,000 incremental rental assistance vouchers at a time when worst-case housing needs remain at an all-time high. A record 5.3 million low-income households in this country have worst-case housing needs -- defined as spending over 50 percent of their income on rent.
- Cut other housing and economic development activity under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program by \$275 million from the Administration's request. As a result, about 33,000 fewer people would get housing rehabilitation, construction, and homebuyer assistance. About 10,000 fewer jobs would be created by CDBG. Another 7,000 to 10,000 people would not get job opportunities because of cuts in the Section 108 Loan Guarantee program. The HOME program would be cut by \$30 million from the Administration's request.
- Cut help for homeless people by \$55 million compared with the Administration's request, resulting in approximately 43,000 homeless people -- including 15,000 homeless children -- being denied desperately needed services. These services include transitional and permanent housing, mental health counseling, job training and drug treatment. In addition, more than 30,000 homeless people would lose access to shorter-term emergency services such as homeless prevention and emergency shelter beds. More than

2,200 beds for homeless people would be lost -- forcing many of these people out on the street. Approximately 12,000 people with disabilities and 6,500 homeless veterans would not receive HUD homeless assistance.

- **Reduce the protection against housing discrimination.** The 20 percent cut in fair housing programs below the Administration's request would deny the assistance needed by state and local fair housing agencies to process more than 800 fair housing complaints. The cuts would also deny funds to local communities that want to establish new private fair housing organizations where local public agencies do not exist.
- **Increase physical problems with public housing.** Since public housing authorities would be forced to respond to funding cuts by reducing maintenance, the 6 percent cut in operating subsidies compared with the funding proposed by the Administration is likely to result in tens of thousands of additional public housing units developing moderate or severe physical problems because of inadequate maintenance.
- **Severely restrict the operating expenses for HUD that are critical for:** improved monitoring and evaluation of assisted housing; the development of new financial systems designed to streamline and improve customer access to HUD programs; and statutorily required analyses of fair market rents, fair housing compliance, and unregulated mortgage companies.



The White House
OFFICE OF CABINET AFFAIRS

Date: 8/26

To: Lisa Green

Fax: 62878

From: Setti Warren

Pages: 9 (Including this cover sheet)

Comments:

OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING ♦ ROOM 160 ♦ WASHINGTON, DC 20502

TELEPHONE (202) 456-2572 ♦ FACSIMILE (202) 456-6704

Losing Ground: The Impact of HUD Budget Cuts on America's Communities

August 1999



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Andrew Cuomo, Secretary

LOSING GROUND: THE IMPACT OF PROPOSED HUD BUDGET CUTS ON AMERICA'S COMMUNITIES

"At a time of unprecedented national prosperity, Congress should not rob the poorest Americans to provide reckless tax cuts and create a new deficit. Now is the time to invest in a brighter future for people and places left behind."

—Andrew Cuomo, Secretary

In February of this year, the President submitted to Congress a budget to build on last year's bipartisan budget for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. The President's budget would have increased vital investments in families and communities by \$2 billion. In July of this year, the House of Representatives completed a "mark-up" of the HUD budget rendering deep cuts in funding that would hurt our Nation's ability to provide safe, affordable housing and economic opportunities for all Americans. For example, the House Appropriations Committee's mark-up of the FY2000 HUD/VA bill would fail to fund any incremental housing vouchers and would impose a 5 percent cut in the critical Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) program. *If passed by the full Congress, these cuts would have a devastating impact on families and communities nationwide.* Overall, the cuts represent an estimated 156,000 fewer housing units for low-income families in America at a time when worst case housing needs are at an all-time high; 16,000 homeless families and persons with AIDS who

LOSING GROUND

will not receive vital housing and related services; and 97,000 jobs that will not be generated in communities that need them.

Specifically, the House mark would:

HOUSING FOR DISADVANTAGED FAMILIES

- Fail to fund the Administration's request for 100,000 incremental housing vouchers at a time when worst case housing needs remain at an all-time high and time on waiting lists for housing assistance is growing. Despite a booming economy, the number of families with worst case housing needs—defined as paying over 50 percent of their income on rent—remains at an all-time high of 12.5 million people, including 4.5 million children, 1.5 million elderly, and 3.5 million persons in families on welfare. Families in the transition from welfare to work have a special need for assistance since housing is typically their greatest financial burden. In addition, the amount of time that families wait for public housing and Section 8 housing vouchers has increased substantially in selected cities around the country from 1996 to 1998, according to HUD's recent report *Waiting in Vain*. For the largest public housing authorities, the average wait for public housing increased by 50 percent to more than 2 ½ years. Nationally, the average waiting time for a Section 8 housing voucher has increased to more than 2 years. *The proposed cuts would result in a total of over 128,000 families being denied housing vouchers.* It would also eliminate the Regional Opportunities

LOSING GROUND

Counseling program, which provides critical assistance to families trying to move out of areas with high concentrations of poverty.

- **Fail to fund the rehabilitation of almost 28,000 units of rehabilitation to create quality housing for low- and moderate-income renter and owner families.** The HOME Investment Partnerships program, a flexible block grant that helps communities build and rehabilitate housing, would be cut by \$20 million compared to FY1999 levels. The HOPE VI program to replace severely distressed public housing with well-designed, mixed-income communities would be cut by \$50 million, and public housing capital funds would be cut by \$445 million, despite the huge backlog of rehab and repair needs in the Nation's housing of last resort.
- **Slow down the fight against housing discrimination.** The 6 percent cut in the Fair Housing Assistance and Fair Housing Initiatives Programs would deny the assistance needed by State and local fair housing agencies to process fair housing complaints and would deny funds to local communities who want to establish new private fair housing organizations where local public agencies do not exist.
- **Increase disadvantaged children's exposure to lead paint poisoning.** Lead poisoning is the foremost environmental health risk to American children, especially poor children and those living in older, poorly-maintained housing. The \$10 million cut in the Lead Hazard Control Grant program will mean that

LOSING GROUND

about 900 private homes will not be made lead safe, putting at least 600 low-income children under 6 years of age at risk of permanent developmental and health problems from elevated blood lead.

HOMELESS AND PERSONS WITH AIDS

- **Deny assistance to almost 16,000 homeless families and persons with AIDS.**
Help for homeless individuals and families would be cut by \$5 million compared with 1999 levels. Ten million would be cut from the **Housing Assistance for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)**, despite the fact that housing is perhaps the most critical unmet need for those suffering with AIDS. Combined, these cuts would result in almost 16,000 homeless people and persons with AIDS being denied essential services, including transitional and permanent housing, mental health counseling, job training and drug treatment.

JOBS

- **Significantly under-fund job creation nationwide.** Community and economic development activity under the **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)** program would be cut by \$250 million from the level enacted in 1999, and \$5 million would be cut from the job-generating **Brownfields Economic Development Initiative**. This means that approximately 97,000 jobs that could be created by these programs would not be. CDBG is a flexible source of funds used by local officials to create jobs, construct or rehab shelters for battered

LOSING GROUND

spouses and the homeless, make buildings accessible to the elderly and handicapped, help working families become first-time homeowners, and other vital community development activity. The Brownfields program provides grants that leverage significant private dollars to redevelop formerly contaminated commercial and industrial sites.

- * Included in the CDBG cut are drastic cuts from the Administration's requests for critical programs—the **Community Empowerment Fund** to develop and expand businesses in distressed areas; **Youthbuild** to prepare young people for careers through empowering construction and rehabilitation experience in their communities; and the **Community Outreach Partnership Centers Program** that allows colleges and universities to act as community building partners. And the House mark-up completely eliminated funding for vital technical assistance and information systems improvement.
- In addition to cuts as compared to FY1999 enacted levels, the innovative, newly-proposed **America's Private Investment Companies (APIC)** program is not funded in the Committee mark-up. Modeled after a highly successful **Small Business Administration** program, APIC would stimulate \$1.5 billion in private investment in large-scale businesses in distressed areas, both urban and rural,

LOSING GROUND

every year—at very modest cost to the taxpayer (\$37 million for credit subsidy and program operations).

The proposed cuts would come at a time when too many communities are not sharing in our booming economy:

- **Some communities still struggle in the slow lane of the Nation's strong economy.** As HUD reported in *Now Is The Time: Places Left Behind in the New Economy* earlier this year, close to one in three central cities had poverty rates of 20 percent or more in 1995—50 percent higher than the national rate. One out of six central cities had an unemployment rate 50 percent or more above the national rate. In fact, one in seven central cities faces “double trouble”—continued high unemployment relative to the Nation as a whole plus either significant long-run population loss or persistently high poverty rates or both. These problems confront all regions of the country, cities, and counties, both large and small (66 percent of the doubly burdened cities are small or mid-sized with populations of 100,000 or less). Many rural communities are struggling as well, especially Appalachia, the Mississippi Delta, Indian Country, and the borderland Colonias.

These proposed budget cuts would move America in exactly the wrong direction. Despite our unprecedented prosperity, there are significant unmet needs in our Nation's communities. We should be expanding, not cutting, programs that meet

LOSING GROUND

these vital housing and economic development needs. Congress should fully fund the HUD budget, including 100,000 new Section 8 vouchers, America's Private Investment Companies (APIC) and other important initiatives.

DRAFT

September 21, 1999
(Senate Floor)

**S. 1596 -- DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2000**

(Sponsors: Stevens (R), Alaska; Bond (R), Missouri)

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the Veterans, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 2000, as approved by the Senate Committee. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

The Administration issued a senior advisers veto threat on the House version of this legislation due to deep cuts in science and technology programs, reductions in essential housing and environmental programs, inadequate funding for National Service, inadequate funding for FEMA disaster relief and cuts in other important programs. The Administration appreciates the Senate Committee's efforts to develop a bill that makes important improvements to the House bill. However, there continue to be significant problems with the Senate Committee bill that must be satisfactorily addressed before it is presented to the President. Regrettably, the Committee bill under funds important programs for our nations's cities, for the environment, for disaster relief and for National Service. Unless these concerns are addressed in a satisfactory manner in a conference agreement, the President's senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

The Administration strongly objects to the Committee's failure to fund the critical housing needs of low-income families and Administration initiatives to invest in our nation's cities. Most importantly, the Administration objects to the Committee's decision not to fund new incremental Section 8 housing assistance vouchers in FY 2000 and to the elimination of the Community Builders Program. If forced to terminate these employees, HUD would have to eliminate local service in almost two dozen communities, leaving up to seven States without any HUD presence.

The Administration also opposes the Committee's decision not to fund a number of the Administration's critical investment initiatives, including the New Markets Initiative, Regional Connections, Regional Empowerment Zones, and the redevelopment of abandoned buildings. In addition, the bill also under-funds Administration priorities such as the Corporation for National and Community Service, Revitalization of Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI), Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI), Brownfields redevelopment, Community Empowerment Fund, and Housing Opportunities for Persons With AIDS (HOPWA). Finally, the Administration would like to work with the Congress to secure the funding requested for the Round II Empowerment Zone program.

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's \$186 million reduction to the request for the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Operating Programs, including the \$114 million cut to the Climate Change Technology Initiative (CCTI), elimination of funding for the Montreal Protocol, and the \$35 million cut in personnel costs. The Administration also opposes the \$100 million reduction to Superfund and the elimination of funding for the Clean Air Partnership Fund. In addition to these severe reductions, the Administration opposes spending \$197 million on the 123 earmarked projects in the Committee bill, which were not requested by the President and would come at the expense of important environmental programs. These reductions would severely hamper EPA's efforts to protect public health and the environment and should be restored.

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's failure to fund the request for \$2.5 billion in contingent emergency funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) disaster relief fund. This reduction would hinder FEMA's ability to respond quickly and appropriately to disasters as they occur.

Detailed discussions of certain of these issues, as well as additional Administration concerns with the Committee bill, are provided in the attachment. We look forward to working with the Congress to address our mutual concerns.

Attachment

**DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS/HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT/
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 2000**
(AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE)

Housing and Urban Development

The Committee's decision to not provide for a single new incremental housing voucher leaves fundamental housing needs unmet, at a time when 5.3 million families have severe housing needs. President Clinton's request for 100,000 new incremental housing vouchers builds on the positive, yet modest, action taken by the Congress and the Administration in FY1999 to provide an additional 50,000 Section 8 housing vouchers. The Administration believes that it is essential to provide incremental vouchers in FY 2000.

The Committee bill contains a punitive provision that would fire 410 Housing and Urban Development (HUD) employees -- HUD's Community Builders. Community Builders have been key to the reinvigoration of HUD and a key component of the new outreach to aid our communities. The Committee further restricts HUD's management flexibility with an unusual limitation on staff and contractors and an unrealistic cut in HUD's administrative funding. These provisions would unreasonably hamper efforts to correct management weaknesses identified by the Congress and others.

The Committee bill does not fund the President's New Markets Initiative and other economic development programs. The President has requested a multifaceted national New Markets Initiative and other programs for economic revitalization to take advantage of the strength of the economy and help those areas left behind in our economic boom. The Committee has not funded the President's \$37 million request for America's Private Investment Companies, which would stimulate \$1.5 billion in private investment in these communities.

The Revitalization of Distressed Public Housing (HOPE VI) program is funded at \$500 million, \$125 million below the requested level. This decrease would impair the Administration's ability to remove and replace the Nation's worst public housing.

The Committee's \$3.5 million reduction to the President's request of \$19.5 million for the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight (OFHEO) would delay implementation of the risk-based capital regulation and strain OFHEO's capacity to conduct its risk-based examinations of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac effectively. This could have serious implications for the safety and soundness of these large Government-sponsored enterprises.

The Administration strongly urges the Senate to fully fund the President's request for Fair

Housing initiatives, which are critical to ending housing discrimination in this country.

Corporation for National and Community Service

The Administration appreciates the funding provided for the Corporation for National and Community Service in the Committee bill. However, the amount provided for AmeriCorps and other programs is inadequate. The Administration strongly urges that additional funding be provided to the Corporation. In its current form, the Committee bill would cut AmeriCorps Grants by \$13 million below the FY 1999 level and \$78 million below the President's request. This would deny 17,000 Americans the opportunity to join AmeriCorps and serve their communities while earning an educational award. The Administration opposes the Committee's reduction to the Corporation's program administration. This reduction would jeopardize the Corporation's ability to make managerial improvements that the Congress and the Administration believe are critical. In addition, the \$80 million rescission from the National Service Trust Fund could endanger the Corporation's ability to pay educational awards earned by AmeriCorps members in the future. We also urge the Senate to adopt the Administration's proposed appropriation language, which would remove the numerous current earmarks and limits that constrain the Corporation's ability to manage its programs efficiently and effectively.

Community Development Financial Institutions

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's decision to fund the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund at \$80 million, \$45 million below the request and \$15 million below the FY 1999 enacted level. This would result in approximately 50 fewer banks and 65 fewer CDFIs receiving grants, which would severely reduce the Fund's ability to provide and leverage investments, loans, technical assistance, and financial services in the country's most distressed communities. Likewise, the Administration opposes the Committee's decision not to fund the Program for Investment in Microentrepreneurs initiative, which would provide funding for micro-enterprise development.

Environmental Protection Agency

The Administration appreciates the Committee's effort to fully fund the Clean Water Action Plan, the Brownfields initiative, and the Children's Environmental Health Initiative. However, we have several major concerns with the funding provided for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the Committee bill. In particular, the Administration strongly opposes the \$186 million reduction to the request for EPA's Operating Program, which is the backbone of the Nation's environmental protection efforts. Likewise, we strongly oppose the Committee's reductions of \$114 million to the request for EPA's component of the Climate Change Technology Initiative (CCTI), elimination of funding for the Montreal Protocol, and termination of the final installment of funds to complete the construction of the state-of-the-art research center in North Carolina. The Committee bill would restrict EPA's flexibility in administering environmental programs by including a funding level for personnel of \$900 million, a \$35 million reduction from the President's request. This reduction to personnel costs would require reducing EPA by more than 400 positions, preventing EPA from undertaking initiatives designed to improve the quality of the Nation's air, water, and food supply.

The Administration objects to the elimination of funding for the new Clean Air Partnership Fund, which would provide grants to State and local governments for innovative projects that reduce multiple pollutants, such as air toxics, pollutants that produce soot and smog, and greenhouse gases. We also oppose the Committee's \$100 million reduction to the request for the Superfund program, which under this Administration has operated at a record pace to clean up toxic waste dumps. This reduction would needlessly jeopardize the public health for citizens living near affected sites. The Administration further objects to the Committee's proposal to finance half of the Superfund appropriation from general revenue. Such financing is contrary to the "polluter pays" principle and would be unfair to the general public, who would be forced to pay for the irresponsible actions of polluters.

The Administration objects to the exceptionally high number of earmarked projects included in the Committee bill for EPA, and the corresponding reduction or elimination of several high-priority environmental programs and initiatives: EPA's Operating Program, CCTI, the Montreal Protocol, the Mexican border wastewater treatment funding program, and Sustainable Development Challenge Grants. We will work with the Congress to restore requested funding as the bill moves forward. We urge the Congress to reduce unrequested funding for lower-priority projects.

The Committee bill includes a rider prohibiting implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. Since the Administration has stated that it does not intend to implement the Kyoto Protocol until it is ratified by the Senate, we believe that the language is unnecessary. However, the Administration notes the Committee's commitment to the agreement reached last year on this issue.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

The Administration appreciates the Committee's full funding of the President's request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). We strongly object, however, to the \$120 million reduction in NASA's Space Science programs. As evidenced by the spectacular returns from missions like the Hubble Space Telescope and Mars Pathfinder, Space Science is a top performer and core research function at NASA. We believe that this reduction would cause serious harm to ongoing and planned efforts. We strongly urge the restoration of Space Science funding.

The Administration is concerned with the increased number of appropriations accounts for Space Station and other activities. We are dedicated to controlling Space Station costs while also providing the flexibility necessary to deal with unanticipated requirements. We are also concerned about the large number of unrequested, site-specific earmarks, which would have the effect of circumventing the competitive peer-review process. Finally, we strongly object to bill language that would mandate termination, without allowance for further review on the merits, of any program or activity that exceeds its annual budget request or total estimated cost by 15 percent. This mandatory termination requirement could cause ill-advised program management tradeoffs that could place safety and reliability concerns second to small additional cost considerations. This would likely result in program terminations that are not in the best interest of the Government.

National Science Foundation

The Administration appreciates the Committee's full funding the President's request for the National Science Foundation (NSF). We are concerned, however, that the Committee's report directs NSF to provide \$25 million to the Arctic Research Commission to support arctic logistics activities. The Arctic Research and Policy Act of 1984 established the Commission to promote Arctic research and policy. The Act also designated NSF as the lead agency responsible for implementing Arctic research policy. NSF currently has the support infrastructure -- including staff -- and ongoing relationships with other agencies and contractors to support Arctic research. It would be inefficient to move all NSF logistics funding to the Arctic Research Commission. It is also inconsistent with the Act's establishment of responsibilities for the two agencies.

FEMA (Emergency Food and Shelter Program)

The Administration is concerned that the Committee has provided \$15 million less than requested for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) Emergency Food and Shelter Program. Funding for this program has been frozen at \$100 million since FY 1996, when it was cut from its previous level of \$130 million. While the 10-percent increase provided by the Committee is helpful, this reduction from the President's request would prevent FEMA from providing almost four million meals and 600,000 shelter nights for less fortunate Americans needing food and shelter. The Administration appreciates the Committee's support of FEMA's mitigation programs but urges the Committee to provide the \$12 million requested for the

National Flood Mitigation Fund. FEMA's mitigation programs have been shown to reduce the costs of future disasters.

Council on Environmental Quality

The Administration urges the Committee to fully fund the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). We strongly believe that in order to allow CEQ to carry out its environmental mission and reinvention efforts, the full requested level should be provided. We also urge the Committee to delete language prohibiting the use of detailees.

American Battle Monuments Commission

The Committee bill includes language stating that the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC) may borrow up to \$65 million from the Treasury for construction of the World War II memorial. This borrowing authority was not proposed by the Administration and would add to the discretionary spending of this bill. The FY 2000 Budget proposed continuation of private contributions as the best approach to completing the World War II Memorial. The Administration opposes this borrowing authority as transition funding because it would undercut solicitation of private contributions. This would undermine rather than expedite the completion of the World War II Memorial. The Administration, however, strongly supports the extension of the authority to establish the Memorial.

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation

The Administration strongly opposes the Committee's decision to fund the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation (NRC) at \$60 million, \$30 million below the request and the FY 1999 enacted level. This cut would eliminate funding for a second round of NRC's "Play-by-the-Rules" homeownership initiative, an initiative designed to create 7,000 additional new homeowners. The cut would also eliminate \$10 million requested to help attract \$600 million in public and private sector investments to create affordable, multi-family housing in distressed neighborhoods.

Selective Service System

The Administration continues to support the peacetime draft registration program of the Selective Service System as the third line of defense after the Armed Services and the Reserve and Guard units. The Administration appreciates the Committee's full restoration of this low-cost insurance program, particularly in light of the recruiting and readiness issues that we are addressing. We believe that the Committee is sending a strong, positive signal to our foreign adversaries by rejecting termination and approving the President's budget request for the Selective Service System.