National Affordable Housing Management Association – 400 N. Columbus Street, Suite 203 - Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone 703-683-8630 - Fax 703-683-8634 - www.nahma.org

June 3, 2011 NAHMAnalysis 2011-0603

FY 2012 Budget, Deficit and Debt Reduction Plans Update

Effective Date or Deadline

This NAHMAnalysis discusses budget proposals for Federal Fiscal Year 2012, which begins on October 1, 2011 and ends on September 20, 2012.

Background

On February 14, President Obama submitted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Budget of the United States Government to Congress. The President's budget request describes his comprehensive financial plan for allocating resources across the federal government and within each agency.[1] It is the starting point for discussions with Congress about funding and policy priorities.

After reviewing the President's Budget, Congress is supposed to adopt a Budget Resolution,[2] which serves a congressional planning document. The Budget Resolution establishes target levels for total federal spending, revenues (including taxes), the size of budget deficits or surpluses, and the debt limit. Unlike the President's budget request, which proposes specific funding levels for each agency program, the budget resolution is a "blue print" for allocating resources across nearly 20 budget functions such as income security, transportation, national defense, etc.

The budget resolution does not require the President's approval, because it does not become law. Nevertheless, its budget targets are used to as the basis for *separate* legislation which the President can enact into law. Such legislation includes annual appropriations bills, legislation to control mandatory spending programs (such as Social Security), tax bills, and legislation to increase the U.S. Government's statutory debt limit.

[1] For details regarding the President's original FY 2012 budget request, please see NAHMAnalysis 2011-0222: FY 2012 Budget Request for Affordable Rental Housing Programs, located here: http://www.nahma.org/member/NAHMAAnalysis/NAHMAnalysis%20FY%202012%20Budget%20Request.pdf

[2] The Budget Resolution is the common name of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Unfortunately, Congress is running behind in its work. Both Republicans and Democrats in Congress are pushing for larger reductions in government spending levels over the next decade. However, they disagree on the size and subjects of those cuts. On April 15, 2011, the House passed its budget resolution as H. Con. Res. 34. Hopes for a budget compromise in the Senate ran high when the bipartisan "Gang of Six[3]" set-out to find common ground on deficit reduction, debt reduction and tax reform strategies. Unfortunately by May 18, Senator Tom Coburn had withdrawn from the "Gang's" discussions because of disagreements over his request for additional cuts to Medicare. It is uncertain if Coburn will return to the negotiations or if he will be replaced by another Republican Senator. The "Gang" has not released any draft bill, and it is not likely that they will do so. Nor has the Senate Democratic leadership proposed a budget. Senate Budget Committee Chairman Kent Conrad announced that committee Democrats are waiting for the outcome of budget negotiations led by Vice President Joe Biden among Administration officials and members of Congress chosen by their party leaders in their respective chambers. Senator Conrad issued the following statement on May 19, 2011:

> "Democrats on the Budget Committee are very close to an agreement. We will have a budget. But, after broad consultation, we have decided to defer a budget mark-up because of the high-level bipartisan leadership negotiations that are currently underway. The results of those negotiations may need to be included in a budget resolution that would be offered in the weeks ahead. That was the case for both the 1990 and 1997 deficit reduction plans, where a budget resolution and accompanying reconciliation process were used to implement the agreements."

With no budget proposal from the Democratic Majority, and no consensus on moving forward, the Senate rejected four separate budget proposals. On May 25, the Senate voted down procedural "motions to proceed" which would have begun debate on the following budget resolutions:

- S. Con. Res. 34 –failed 40-57: This was the budget sponsored by Rep. Paul Ryan, which passed the House of Representatives;
- S. Con. Res. 18 – failed 0-97: Senator Jeff Sessions, the Ranking Member on the Senate Budget Committee, converted President Obama's FY 2012 budget request into this resolution;
- S. Con. Res. 20 – failed 7-90: A budget proposed by Senator Rand Paul; and
- S. Con. Res. 21 – failed 42-55: A budget proposed by Senator Pat Toomey.

While Republicans, Democrats, Congressmen and Senators still lack consensus, it is clear that all sides have been influenced by the "The Moment of Truth" report issued by the President's bipartisan Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform in December 2010.[4] The report recommended capping discretionary spending through FY 2020 by gradually reducing spending to FY 2008 levels, reforming the tax code, containing health care costs, reforming subsidy and government pension programs, reforming social security, and reforming the budgetary process. It also suggested streamlining the corporate tax rate, which would eliminate all tax deductions and expenditures for businesses.[5] These eliminations would

---

[3] The original "Gang of Six" consisted of Senators Mark Warner (D-VA), Saxby Chambliss (R-GA), Tom Coburn (R-OK), Mike Crapo (R-ID), Rich Durbin (D-IL), and Kent Conrad (D-ND).

[4] President Obama charged the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform with identifying policies to improve the fiscal situation in the medium term and to achieve fiscal sustainability over the long run. Members of this bipartisan commission were appointed by President Obama. For a copy of "The Moment of Truth" Report, please click here:
http://www.fiscalcommission.gov/sites/fiscalcommission.gov/files/documents/TheMomentofTruth12_1_2010.pdf.

[5] The President's Economic Recovery Advisory Board (PERAB) made a similar proposal in their August 28, 2010 report: "The Report on Tax Reform Options: Simplification, Compliance, and Corporate Taxation."

encompass tax credits that aid in affordable housing development and preservation, including the low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC), New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC), historic rehabilitation tax credits, and energy tax credits.

Summary

To date, there have been four concrete budget proposals for debt and deficit reduction considered by either the House or Senate. They are:

- President Obama's FY 2012 budget guidelines, introduced by Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL);
- The House Budget Committee Republicans' FY 2012 budget resolution;
- Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal; and
- Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal.

Please find a summary matrix of the "Moment of Truth" and the major budget proposals below. **Please note, each proposal's debt and deficit reduction numbers are based on their own assumptions and analyses.** Please also note that the Paul and Toomey plans will not likely be considered by the House.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	**President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request-Converted to S. Con. Res. 18**	**House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34**	**Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20**	**Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21**
Introduced	December 10	May 19	April 5	May 19	May 23
Status	Congress decided not to vote on these guidelines, but several are included in other budget proposals.	House has not voted on, Senate has voted down.	House passed this proposal as its budget resolution on April 15. The Senate has voted this proposal down.	House has not voted on, Senate has voted down.	House has not voted on, Senate has voted down.
Time Period Covered	2012-2020	2012-2021	2012-2021 Claims budget balanced by 2040.	2012-2016 Claims budget balanced by 2016.	2012-2021 Claims budget balanced by 2021.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request- Converted to S. Con. Res. 18	House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34	Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20	Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21
Total Spending	Reduce government spending below 22 percent of projected GDP by 2020.	Reduces government spending by $100 billion in FY 2012 from FY 2011 budget request. But, spending increases in FY 2014 above FY 2011 requested levels.	Cuts government spending to below 20 percent of projected GDP by 2021, relative to the current baseline.	Cuts government spending to 17.9 percent of projected GDP by 2016, relative to the current baseline.	Cuts government spending to 18.5 percent of projected GDP by 2021, relative to the current baseline.
Total Deficit Reduction	Reduces deficit by 2.3% of GDP by 2015, $4 trillion by 2020.	Stabilizes deficit to 3 percent of the projected GDP by 2021, a reduction of $1.1 trillion in deficit spending based on current economic projections.	Bring the U.S. deficit under $1 trillion for FY 2012 & reduce the deficit by $4.4 trillion over the next decade, relative to the Obama Administration's FY 2012 budget.	Significantly decreases and eliminates spending deficits by 2016. Creates a surplus based on economic projections.	Significantly decreases and eliminates spending deficits by 2021. Creates a surplus based on economic projections.
Total Debt Reduction	Reduces debt to 60 % of projected GDP by 2023 and 40 percent by 2035.	Following this budget would actually increase the debt by $5 trillion by 2016 and $11 trillion by 2021.	Reduces the debt by $4.7 trillion over the next decade, relative to the Obama Administration's FY 2012 budget.	Reduces the debt by at least $2.3 trillion over the next five years, relative to the current federal debt.	Reduces publicly held debt to about 52 % of projected GDP by 2021, relative to the current baseline.
Non-Security Discretionary Spending	**ALL** discretionary spending frozen at 2011 levels in 2012, & cut to inflation-adjusted 2008 levels in 2013. Cap all discretionary through 2020.	Freezes this spending at FY 2010 levels for FY 2012-FY 2017.	Reduces this spending below FY 2008 levels for FY 2012. Further reductions recommended beyond FY 2013.	Reduces this spending to FY 2008 levels for FY 2012.	Reduces this spending to FY 2006 levels for FY 2012. Freezes this spending for the next 6 years.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request- Converted to S. Con. Res. 18	House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34	Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20	Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21
Income Security Account- (Includes Budget Authority for Housing Programs)	N/A	Decreases the Income Security budget authority by $70 billion over the next 5 years.	Decreases the Income Security budget authority by $160 billion over the next 5 years.	Decreases the Income Security budget authority by over $200 billion over the next 5 years.	Decreases the Income Security budget authority by $208 billion over the next 5 years.
Specific Housing Proposals—Not included in budget resolution text but indicated in the budget assumptions	No proposals.	Original 2/14/11 budget requested full funding for all FY 2012 HCVs, Sec. 811 & 202 PRACS, & project based Sec. 8 contracts. Cuts funding for new construction programs. Proposed money for Transforming Rental Assistance demo & Choice Neighborhoods. Assumes wind down of GSEs.	Recommends reforming the Federal housing assistance programs to cut costs and impose time limits on occupancy. Calls for wind down of GSEs, increasing guarantee fees the GSEs charge lenders; & discouraging the shift of mortgage guarantees to FHA & other government-backed entities.	Calls for elimination of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. entirely & elimination of federal housing programs in the May 2011 document Senator Paul released to explain his budget.	None specified.
Tax Proposals That Could Affect LIHTC Program	Calls for lower corporate tax rate by eliminating all "business tax expenditures" and business tax credits (which would include the LIHTC program).	The 2/14/11 budget requests legislation to make the LIHTC a more effective preservation tool. S.Con.Res. 18 doesn't include these requests.	Lower corporate tax rates achieved by "eliminating or modifying deductions, credits, and special carve-outs that leave many companies paying no tax at all." LIHTC could be affected.	Senator Paul's May 2011 budget explanation called for elimination of the LIHTC.	Would eliminate tax expenditures & credits in favor of lower tax rates. LIHTC could be affected.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request- Converted to S. Con. Res. 18	House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34	Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20	Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21
Other Noteworthy Tax Changes (Included in budget resolution text or indicated in the budget assumptions.)	Reduces individual income tax rates. Establishes a single corporate tax rate between 23 % and 29 %.	Increases taxes for top 2% percent of the population. Does not reform the tax code.	Maintains 2001 & 2003 Bush tax cuts for all income levels. Lowers the top corporate marginal tax rate by 10 % (from 35% to 25%) by broadening tax base.	Maintains Bush tax cuts for all income levels.	Calls for a simplified tax code, extending Bush tax cuts of 2001 & 2003, reducing top corporate tax rate from 35% to 25%, and eliminating special-interest tax loopholes & deductions.
Changes to Social Security	Makes retirement benefit formula more progressive. Provides an enhanced minimum benefit for low-wage workers. Enhances benefits for the very old & long time disabled. Increases early & full retirement ages. Gives retirees more flexibility in claiming benefits. Creates a hardship exemption for those who cannot work.	The 2/14/11 budget states 6 principles for social security: *strengthen it for future generations & restore long-term solvency; *no privatization; *no slashing benefits for future seniors; *no reduction in basic benefits for current recipients; *strengthen retirement security for the most vulnerable; *maintain robust disability & survivors' benefits. (Not included in S. Con.Res. 18.)	H. Con. Res. 34 lays out a process for reform of a current law requiring the President, in conjunction with the Board of Trustees, to submit a plan to Congress for restoring balance to the Social Security fund if program is not sustainable. It establishes expedited legislative procedures to consider legislation to ensure solvency (a positive 75-year actuarial balance & a positive annual balance in the 75th year).	S. Con. Res. 20 Directs Congress & the relevant committees to develop legislation-- to ensure the Social Security System achieves solvency over the 75 year window; and that includes-- * progressive Price Indexing using a formula including wage & price indexing; * life expectancy & longevity indexing; and *a gradual increase in the retirement age.	No proposal.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request- Converted to S. Con. Res. 18	House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34	Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20	Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21
Changes to Medicare	Reforms the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate for physician payment & requires the fix to be offset by: Increasing government authority & funding to reduce Medicare fraud; reforming the Medicare cost-sharing rules; restricting the first-dollar coverage in Medicare supplemental insurance; cutting Medicare payments for bad debts; and reducing excess payments to hospitals for medical education.	President's budget assumptions call for reducing improper payments & reforming Medicare physicians' payments.	H. Con. Res. 34 has specific Medicare Reform Assumptions- *These changes will not affect those in or near retirement. *When younger workers become eligible for Medicare [in 2022], they will be able to choose from a list of guaranteed coverage options, & Medicare would provide a premium support payment to subsidize the cost of the plan. * Medicare will provide increased assistance for lower-income beneficiaries & those with greater health risks. Also, calls for a long-term fix for the Medicare's physician reimbursement formula—a.k.a. sustained growth rate [SGR]. Assumes medical insurance liability reform.	S. Con. Res. 20 directs the relevant Congressional Committees to reform the Medicare Program to achieve solvency over a 75 year period that-- (A) includes free-market based health care; (B) removes all mandates or laws requiring the purchase of health insurance; (C) promotes individual and family based plans; and (D) encourages interstate competition.	S. Con. Res. 21 calls for reform of the Medicare Sustainable Growth Rate for physician payment. It assumes some offset through medical malpractice reform.

	"The Moment of Truth" Report	President Obama's FY 2012 Budget Request- Converted to S. Con. Res. 18	House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan's (R-WI) "Path to Prosperity"- H. Con. Res. 34	Senator Rand Paul's (R-KY) Budget Proposal- S. Con Res. 20	Senator Pat Toomey's (R-PA) Budget Proposal- S. Con. Res. 21
Changes to Medicaid—Not included in budget resolution text but indicated in the budget assumptions	Directs the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to develop an improved physician payment formula. Eliminate state taxes on Medicaid spending. Places dual eligibles in Medicaid managed care. Reduces funding for Medicaid administrative costs.	Calls for reducing improper payments in the 2/14/11 budget request.	Reform Medicaid to become block grant program in which the federal government would send money to states, where governors would use the funding as they see fit.	Reform Medicaid to become a block grant program in which the federal government would send money to states, where governors would use the funding as they see fit.	Reform Medicaid to become block grant program in which the federal government would send money to states, where governors would use the funding as they see fit.
Additional Issues (Included in budget resolution text or indicated in the budget assumptions)	Consolidates duplicative federal programs and reduces government inefficiencies and improper payments. Reduces the size of the federal government and sells excess property. Eliminates earmarks.	The Obama budget focuses on additional proposals to improve education, innovation, and infrastructure. See previous NAHMAnalysis for details.	Consolidates duplicative federal programs. Reduces the size of the federal government &sells excess property. Eliminates earmarks & improper payments in government programs through anti-fraud measures. Repeals the Obama Health Care bill.	Reduces the size and cost of the federal government & sells excess property. Eliminates improper payments in government programs. Repeals Davis-Bacon. Repeals the Obama Health Care bill.	Reduces mandatory spending levels below FY 2007 appropriations by 2014. Repeals the Obama Health Care bill.

Although the Senate's "Gang of Six" continues their discussions without Senator Coburn, the best hopes for a budget deal now rests with the discussions led by Vice President Joe Biden. In fact, Senate Budget Committee Chairman Kent Conrad (D-ND), a member of the Gang of Six, has decided to delay drafting a

FY 2012 budget resolution pending the outcome of the ongoing White House discussions with Congressional leadership.

On April 13, President Obama asked Vice President Biden to lead a group of bipartisan Congressional leaders from the House and Senate to develop a legislative framework for comprehensive deficit reduction. In his announcement, the President set a number of goals that will guide the Administration's positions in the discussions.[6] First, he called for a strategy to reduce $4 trillion from the federal debt over the next decade, and encouraged negotiators to use the guidelines set for in the "The Moment of Truth" report. He has also advocated reductions in domestic spending, military spending, and health care spending, provided those cuts do not negatively affect low-income families and seniors, and reform the tax code as part of their efforts. Unlike the House Budget Committee's proposal, President Obama would also allow the tax cuts for the wealthiest two percent of American households expire.

As the leadership talks continue, a serious threat of defaulting on the national debt casts a shadow over these negotiations. The statutory limit on the total amount of money that the federal government may borrow in order to finance its *existing* legal obligations is currently set at $14.294 trillion. This debt limit does not authorize new spending. Rather, it limits the Federal Government's ability to use debt *as a means of financing* the deficits which resulted from previous tax and spending laws. On May 16, the U.S. debt reached its statutory limit. Secretary Timothy Geithner estimates the Treasury Department can extend borrowing authority until August 2, 2011 by using "extraordinary measures" to control the debt. If Congress does not pass a law to increase the debt limit by the time the Treasury's current options are exhausted, the United States Government will default on its legal obligations. A Treasury Department fact sheet[7] predicts:

> "…the government would have to stop, limit, or delay payments on a broad range of legal obligations, including Social Security and Medicare benefits, military salaries, interest on the national debt, tax refunds, and many other commitments….The ensuing financial crisis from a default would have catastrophic economic consequences, potentially including the loss of millions of American jobs. And it would lead to higher borrowing costs, reduced retirement savings, and lower home values for families across the nation."

Although there seems to be conceptual agreement among congressional leaders and the Obama Administration that the debt limit should be raised and deficits should be reduced, there is not agreement about what deficit reduction should entail, or whether these goals should be linked. On May 31, House Republican leaders reiterated their position that any increase in the debt limit must be accompanied by cutting spending at a rate greater than the amount of the increase. House Republicans believe deficit reduction must be a condition of raising the debt limit to end the cycle of debt that has resulted from the deficits. To prove that a "clean" unconditional bill increasing the debt limit without spending cuts is unacceptable, the House Republican leaders put the question to a vote. On May 31, by a vote of 97 yeas to 318 nays with 7 voting "present," the House overwhelmingly rejected H.R. 1954, a bill to implement the President's request to increase the statutory limit on the public debt. This 13-line bill would have raised the statutory debt limit by $2.4 trillion to a total of $16.7 trillion. Nevertheless, White House Press Secretary Jay Carney told reporters the very next day that although the President is committed to both deficit reduction and increasing the debt limit,

---

[6] See FACT SHEET: The President's Framework for Shared Prosperity and Shared Fiscal Responsibility, April 13, 2011 at **http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/04/13/fact-sheet-presidents-framework-shared-prosperity-and-shared-fiscal-resp**.

[7] See "Debt Limit: Myth vs. Fact" at: **http://www.treasury.gov/initiatives/Documents/Debt%20Limit%20Myth%20v%20Fact%20FINAL.pdf**.

> "What we have said all along is that it sends the wrong signal and it would be a mistake to directly link, tie, or hold hostage one to the other because of the absolute necessity of raising the debt ceiling. It is not an option if you want to maintain full faith and credit of the United States and you don't want to send this economy back into recession."[8]

Having made their points—the Senate rejected the Ryan Budget plan and the House rejected an unconditional increase in the debt limit--Congressional leaders are scheduled to meet with Vice President Biden and Administration officials again on June 9.

Positive Aspects

NAHMA was pleased to see the Obama Administration and the Senate oppose the House Budget Committee's FY 2012 budget resolution (H.Con.Res. 34), because we were concerned about the significant reductions proposed for the budget authority of the Income Security account. This account contains HUD and USDA-RHS's affordable housing programs' budget authority. Cuts to the Income Security function could indirectly reduce the funding available for affordable housing programs and rental assistance contracts in the 2012 and beyond. NAHMA strongly urges the budget negotiators to construct a more thoughtful, balanced approach to deficit reduction.

Although we are still unsure if any serious tax reform bills will completely adopt the corporate tax reform recommendations make by the bipartisan National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, NAHMA's conversations with House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee staff indicate that eliminating the LIHTC is unlikely. The LIHTC enjoys strong support in both the House and the Senate. In fact, Senate Finance Committee staff members have told NAHMA that the LIHTC is not viewed as a tax loophole, but as a legitimate tax expenditure to facilitate additional housing development. Furthermore, staff from both the House and Senate tax-writing committees believe tax reform is a long-term project that will take years to complete.

Similarly, in a meeting with NAHMA, Treasury Department officials indicated that their interest in pursuing tax reform does not include eliminating the LIHTC. They have said that—although internal discussions on tax reform are ongoing—they proposed the income averaging and basis boost proposals in the FY 2012 budget request to help improve the LIHTC program.

Issues of Concern to NAHMA

NAHMA is extremely concerned about the statements and faulty assumptions found in budget-related documents which advocate cutting or eliminating federal affordable housing programs. It is absolutely essential to correct these assumptions to prevent them from negatively affecting the appropriations process.

For example, the "Path to Prosperity"[9] document released by the House Budget Committee claims that Federal housing assistance subsidies are growing at an out of control rate "**because policymakers are**

---

[8] See Press Briefing by Press Secretary Jay Carney and Assistant to the President for Manufacturing Policy Ron Bloom, June 01, 2011at: **http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/06/01/press-briefing-press-secretary-jay-carney-and-assistant-president-manufa**.

[9] To read the "Path to Prosperity," please see **http://budget.house.gov/fy2012budget/**.

choosing to grow it, and because there are no time limits or work requirements that encourage recipients to lead lives of increased self-sufficiency." (Emphasis added.) However, this logic is extremely flawed. First, funding for housing assistance has increased because the Bush Administration did not request enough money in their budgets to fully-fund all project-based Section 8 contracts for their 12-month terms. Underfunding the programs over several years led to a $2 billion funding gap and recurring housing assistance payment delays. It was not until passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in February 2009 that Congress increased appropriations to meet the government's contractual obligations to project-based Section 8 owners. The seven percent increase in the project-based Section 8 funding account between FY 2010 and FY 2011 was to allow for rent increases to cover growing property operating, utility, and emergency costs. NAHMA continues to oppose any cuts to rental assistance programs—tenant-based Section 8, project-based Section 8, Section 202 and 811 PRACS, and rural rental assistance—that would result in the loss of assistance to any existing recipients. Second, this logic assumes that project-based Section 8 tenants are not motivated enough to leave the program. HUD's tenant data for 2008 debunks this claim. HUD's data suggests that 70 percent of project-based Section 8 tenants are elderly or disabled. They cannot work or cannot find work. Only four percent of all project-based Section 8 tenants report welfare as their primary source of income. NAHMA wonders if it is wise to pursue time limits under the present economic circumstances.

Unfortunately, faulty assumptions are not limited to the House. Senator Rand Paul's budget summary calls the LIHTC "**a perfect example of market manipulation that does nothing to further the mission of public housing**.[10]" He states, "**The program does nothing to facilitate its goal of lower rents. Developers pocket $4 billion in annual tax credits, while the rents in the buildings constructed under the program are generally no lower than they would have been in the absence of the program**." (Emphasis added.) Even more curiously, Senator Paul used the LIHTC program as a justification for eliminating the whole *Department of Housing and Urban Development*, which has no jurisdiction over the LIHTC.

In addition, we are concerned that the general focus of Congress and the Obama Administration on cutting government spending over the next decade will reduce funding available for the construction of additional affordable units and rehabilitation for existing units. Financing new construction and rehabilitation is already difficult because of the credit crunch. Reducing funding for HUD and USDA-RHS's affordable housing programs—like CDBG, HOME, Section 202, Section 811, and RHS Multifamily Housing Revitalization—could lower the number of affordable units available to low-income working, elderly, and disabled Americans, as well as reduce the number of jobs available in local communities. NAHMA will continue to push for adequate funding for programs that support affordable housing in the FY 2012 appropriations.

NAHMA's Position

Going forward, NAHMA will continue to work with the Obama Administration and Congress to protect affordable multifamily housing programs. We will strongly oppose budget proposals which would jeopardize funding for housing assistance programs. We will vigorously challenge faulty assumptions used to justify harmful cuts to these programs. As the focus shifts from discussions about overall revenue, deficits, and debt to appropriations for specific programs, we will oppose any appropriations level that does not provide *at least* full funding for all tenant-based Section 8, project-based Section 8, Section 202 and 811 PRACS, and rural rental assistance contracts for their 12-month terms. We also oppose any attempts to reduce funding or de-authorize any programs that support affordable housing efforts, including the LIHTC.

[10] See **http://www.scribd.com/doc/55912438/Senator-Rand-Paul-5-Year-Balanced-Budget**.

We continue to encourage NAHMA members to contact their U.S. Senators and Representatives to let them know you support funding for affordable housing programs that have successfully provided quality affordable housing to low-income Americans, like the LIHTC and project-based Section 8.

If you would like to contact your Senators, please visit:
http://www.senate.gov/general/contact_information/senators_cfm.cfm.

If you would like to contact your Member of the House of Representatives, please visit:
http://www.house.gov/writerep/.

You may also visit NAHMA's grassroots page for more information meeting with your representatives and for additional information on affordable housing issues at:
http://www.nahma.org/content/grassroots.html.