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Agenda

• How does the federal budget impact low-income tenants? What is at risk in FY 18 and FY 19?
• What programmatic changes is HUD proposing? How will those proposed changes impact low-income tenants?
• What can you do about these terrible proposals?
Understanding the Impact of the Federal Budget
How does the federal budget impact low-income tenants?

• The federal budget directly impacts:
  • Housing conditions and repairs
  • Rental assistance for millions of low-income seniors and families in HUD and RD housing
  • Availability of affordable housing in your community
  • Service coordinators and other resources
  • Cross-sector federal efforts to reduce homelessness
  • Funds for federal agency staffing to implement programs

Not to mention the many other programs that low-income seniors and families rely upon (Medicaid, SNAP, Meals on Wheels, etc.)!
• Current Continuing Resolution expires March 23rd
• Recent budget deal increases total amount of funding for non-military programs ($579 billion total in 2018)
  • To be divided up among all non-military programs
  • Will need to account for increased costs of rental assistance tied to market rate rents
  • THUD and Agriculture appropriations subcommittees negotiating final numbers now
President's FY 19 Budget Proposal

• President proposes 18% cut in HUD funding, including:

  • 48% cut in public housing funds
  • 9% reduction in Housing Choice Vouchers
  • >$300 million cuts to Project-Based Rental Assistance
  • No funding for HOME, CDBG, Choice Neighborhoods
  • >$4 million cut to Section 811 housing for people w/ disabilities
  • $26 million cut to Housing Opportunities for People with HIV/AIDS (HOPWA)
  • $54 million cut to Native American Housing Block Grant
  • ~$114 million increase to Section 202 housing for the elderly
  • No increase in homeless assistance funding
  • Elimination of U.S. Interagency Council to End Homelessness (USICH)
  • Elimination of National Housing Trust Fund, Self-Help Homeownership Opportunity Program
President’s FY 19 Budget Proposal

- **USDA Rural Development (RD) programs:**
  - Cut Rural Rental Assistance (Section 521) by $1.4 million
  - Merge Rural Rental Assistance and Rural Voucher programs
  - Eliminate:
    - Section 502 direct single family housing loans
    - Section 504 housing repair loans and grants
    - Section 533 housing preservation grants
    - Section 523 mutual and self-help housing grants
    - Section 515 direct rural rental housing loans
    - Section 514 farm labor housing loans, Section 516 farm labor housing grants
    - Rural Business-Cooperative Service
    - Multi-Family Housing Revitalization Demonstration Program (MPR)
  - Proposes $50 minimum rent/month for tenants in Section 515 multifamily or Section 514 farm labor housing

- **US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) programs:**
  - Eliminates Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) and Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)
HUD’s Programmatic Proposals
HUD’s Programmatic Proposals

Three categories of changes proposed:

1. Raise rents on vulnerable tenants
2. Impose harmful work requirements
3. Decrease accountability of HUD and owners
Category #1: Raise Rents on Vulnerable Tenants

- **Create different rent structures** for families and elderly/disabled tenants
  - Increases risk of incorrect rent calculations by PHAs + owners
  - Administratively burdensome
- **Increase family rents** from 30% of *adjusted* income to 35% of *gross* income
  - Raises rents by > $2 billion/year on 1.8 million low-income families
- **Eliminate income deductions** for medical expenses, elderly/disabled tenants, minors/students, and child care expenses
  - Especially hurts elderly/disabled tenants w/ significant medical expenses and working parents with children in child care
  - Recently increased and retained in unanimously passed HOTMA
- **Triple family minimum rent** to $152.25/month
  - Impacts the poorest families
  - Eliminates local discretion
Category #1: Raise Rents on Vulnerable Tenants

• **Retains current rent hardship exemption** process
  • HUD has not complied w/ 2016 directive to ensure hardship exemptions
• **Raise threshold** for when families can request **income recertifications** if their income decreases
  • Subjects tenants to high rents without relief if they lose their job or work hours
• **Raise the age** for a tenant to be considered “elderly” from 62 to 65 years old
  • For rent only
• **Changes definitions** of “family,” “elderly person,” “near-elderly person,” “head of household”
  • Elderly/disabled tenants would pay higher rents if they have non-elderly/disabled household members
• **Increase minimum + maximum rents** for tenants in the Housing Choice Voucher, Enhanced Voucher, and homeownership programs
## Category #1: Raise Rents on Vulnerable Tenants

### TABLE 1

**Impact of Rent Changes in Administration Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Households Affected</th>
<th>% Increase in Rent for Affected Households</th>
<th>Average Annual Rent Increase Per Household</th>
<th>Total Annual Rent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$4,482,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>60,600</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td>$74,559,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>36,100</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$42,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>$14,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$12,308,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>$1,190</td>
<td>$29,163,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$53,042,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$8,232,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$1,540</td>
<td>$38,502,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>46,900</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$1,490</td>
<td>$70,017,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>51,900</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$59,987,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>$34,073,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$35,826,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category #2: Impose Harmful Work Requirements

- Allows PHAs and property owners to establish **minimum work requirements** up to 32 hours/week for *each* non-elderly/disabled adult
  - 74% of working-age, non-disabled HUD tenants either work or are already subject to work requirements for another federal benefit
  - How to define “non-elderly/disabled” adult, documentation needed
  - Low-wage jobs with highly variable hours
- **Narrowly defines “work”** as employment, vocational training, or education that leads to a degree or certificate
- **Fails to provide resources** to actually help connect people to jobs
  - Jobs Plus, Family Self Sufficiency programs
  - Eliminates child care income deduction
Category #3: Decrease Accountability of HUD and Owners

• Permits the HUD Secretary to establish alternative rent structures, income certification, and minimum rents unilaterally without Congressional action
• Redefines “project-based rental assistance” in a manner that will likely limit tenant organizing in project-based voucher properties
• Retains current rent hardship requirements without adequate oversight by HUD
What can I do?

Don Saunders, National Legal Aid & Defender Association
Judith Goldiner, The Legal Aid Society (NYC)
Lucy Newman, The Legal Aid Society (NYC)
Zebulon Beilke-McCallum, Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence
LSC-Restricted Activities

Don Saunders

National Legal Aid & Defender Association
Advocacy Without LSC Restrictions
Judith Goldiner and Lucy Newman
The Legal Aid Society (NYC)
Who is your target?

• Who are you meeting with and why?
  • House of Representatives or Senate?
  • Be strategic and consider the meeting part of a campaign, not the culmination of the campaign

• Learn about the elected
  • Getting to know their district
    • Impact of proposed budget and/or bill on constituents
  • Getting to know the elected
    • What committees do they sit on?
    • What is their voting record on legislation?
Preparation for the Meeting

• Make an appointment with the elected where you will present your case + have a specific ask
  • All successful advocacy efforts have some level of metrics – a measure of accountability the lawmaker is held to

• Research data and use it
  • The lobbyist imparts her information with the help of graphs, charges, polls, and reports that she has found or created
  • All elected officials rely on individuals with unique knowledge about how issues affect communities

You may not feel like an expert, but you are because you can communicate how policies impact people’s lives – and that’s incredibly more valuable than the best research report!
The Meeting

• Treat lawmakers the way you treat judges
  • Be respectful, polite and show gratitude for past assistance

• Always bring a fact sheet
  • Electeds and their staffers appreciate when you’ve done their work for them
  • Make sure the fact sheet is clear and readable

• Never make up information.
  • If you don’t know the answer to a question, tell the elected you will try to find out and then provide the information promptly

• Listen carefully

• Press for a commitment
• Say thank you earlier and often
• Don’t forget the staff!
  • Sometimes the most important person in the room is the staff member
• Be strategic
  • Is this person in leadership?
  • Can this person move your issue?
• Don’t burn bridges
  • No matter how difficult the elected is or how ignorant, you need to keep the relationship going
• Persistence pays off
• Bring cards to the meeting and get cards of the participants
After the Meeting

• Make note of what the elected said and what your next steps are

• Make note of who was at the meeting

• If you promised to follow up with additional information, follow up

• Consider attending press conferences on your issues or town hall meetings

• Re-introduce yourself to the elected and the staffers when you see them so that they get to know you
Other Activities

- Postcard campaigns
- Calls to elected’s office
- Candidate forums
- Op-eds/letters to editor of local newspapers in elected’s district
Lessons Learned from Iowa
Zebulon Beilke-McCallum
Iowa Coalition Against Domestic Violence
This is going to be a tough fight and it’s going to take all of us engaging right now
Iowa’s bill: SF. 2370/HF 2428

- The Senate bill establishes quarterly eligibility checks (income/work) drug testing, work requirements, residency requirements and limitations on food purchases with SNAP

- The House bill was more limited establishing quarterly eligibility checks and work requirements

- Exempt groups included: children under 19, individuals over 64, medical disability that prevents work, pregnant, parents of an infant (1 year old or less), a caretaker of a child with disability, individual receiving unemployment, an individual in a drug treatment program.
Who was in our Public Benefits Coalition

• Administration officials
• Nonprofits
• United way
• Benefit recipients
• Tenants
Our Talking Points

• Solutions in search of a problem (likely impact 7% of population)
• The cost of implementation would be large the Dep Human Services admin said costs would exceed a million dollars and require up to 100 new FTEs
  • “I would just want us all to be sure that the juice is worth the squeeze here,”
• DHS has fraud protection measures already in place and they work
• The vast majority of SNAP/foodstamps & Medicaid participants are in working families
• Missing standard exemptions for at risk populations such as DV victims and that such requirements can create safety risks
Our Talking Points

• Most nonelderly Medicaid adults already are working or face significant barriers to work

• State Medicaid agencies are not equipped to develop, provide or administer work requirement programs

• This proposal creates multiple barriers for participants (childcare, transportation, training) that will have a disproportionate impact on rural areas
Next Steps
Questions?
Contact Information
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