Federal Budget:
Cuts for HUD and Rural Housing

On November 17, Congress passed H. R. 2112, the minibus appropriations bill that includes three spending bills: Transportation, Housing and Urban Development (T-HUD), S. 1596; Agriculture, Rural Housing, and Food and Drug Administration, H. R. 2112; and Commerce, Justice, and Science, H. R. 2596. The bill underfunds HUD and Rural Housing programs, cutting many programs deeply. H. R. 2112 cuts HUD funding by $3.7 billion or 9 percent below FY11 funding levels, providing only a net total of $37.4 billion for HUD programs. President Obama signed H. R. 2112 into law on November 18.

Homeless Assistance Grants are level-funded at the FY11 level of $1.9 billion, 20 percent below the President’s FY12 request. Funding at this level will not allow HUD to fully enact HEARTH, for which HUD has just issued new rules. By not funding Homeless Assistance Grants at the level the President requested, at

HUD Releases Partial HEARTH Act Regulations

HUD released the interim rule for the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program, the final rule on the definition of the term “homeless,” and the second allocation for FY11 ESG funds on November 15. Both of the rules reflect changes included in the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing (HEARTH) Act of 2009. Other Continuum of Care program and Rural Housing Stability program regulations related to the HEARTH Act will be released at a later date.

HUD notes in the introduction to the interim ESG rule that the forthcoming proposed CoC rule will include requirements for a centralized and coordinated assessment system to evaluate initial eligibility for individuals and families who seek homeless services or homeless prevention services.

(Continued on page 2)
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Definition of Homelessness

Persistent housing instability is one of the alternative elements in HUD’s new definition of homelessness. In the proposed rule, HUD has defined “persistent instability” as two or more moves over a 60 day period. HUD has also clarified that it would consider “the move out of the initial permanent housing placement as the first move.”

In the final rule HUD says that third-party documentation is the preferred method of confirmation of homeless status: “HUD revised paragraph (b) of the recordkeeping requirements for ‘homeless status’ to clarify that the order of priority among documentation is third-party documentation first, intake worker observation second, and certification by the individual or head of household seeking assistance third.” With respect to the documentation of an individual’s stay in an institution, HUD says that the final rule “expands what is an acceptable evidence of an individual’s stay in an institution to include an oral statement.”

Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG)

The HEARTH Act replaced the Emergency Shelter Grant program with the Emergency Solutions Grant program. The new ESG program includes an emphasis on homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing and the rule incorporates many provisions from the temporary Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-housing program (HPRP). Under the prevention and rapid re-housing provisions of the regulations, HUD clarifies that ESG funds may be used for many expenses related to housing stabilization including security deposits, last month’s rent, moving costs, housing search and placement, and housing stability case management. The interim ESG regulation includes corresponding amendments to HUD’s consolidated planning requirements.

HUD summarizes the major changes in the ESG program as “the addition of an annual funding cap on street outreach and emergency shelter activities; clarification of the eligible costs for street outreach and emergency shelter activities; the expansion of the homelessness prevention component of the program and the addition of a new rapid re-housing component, which both include rental assistance and housing relocation and stabilization services; expansion of the range of eligible administrative costs; and the addition of a new category of eligible activities for Homeless Management Information Systems (HMIS).”

The interim rule also includes a new requirement for ESG fund recipients to consult and coordinate with their local Continua of Care (CoC) in the allocation of funds, the creation of performance standards, and the evaluation of ESG project outcomes.

State and Local Consolidated Plans

The interim rule also revises portions of Consolidated Plan (ConPlan) regulations to reflect the HEARTH Act by standardizing the homelessness elements affecting all jurisdictions required to submit a ConPlan and those applying for ESG. The changes are intended to foster closer coordination between not only ESG and CoC programs, but other mainstream housing and service programs as well.

When preparing the ConPlan five-year Strategic Plan and each subsequent Annual Action Plan allocating ESG funds, jurisdictions are now required to consult with:

& Continua of Care in the jurisdiction’s geographic area.

(Continued on page 6)
**Making the Connection**

**Citizenship and Identity Documentation for IDHS Benefits**

By Kathryn Nelson

The authors of this column welcome your comments and questions. See contact information at the end of the article.

Often our customers are unable to get many of the benefits they need because they do not have the money to pay for a birth certificate or ID card. This problem is now, however, one of the past.

As of November 30, 3011, IDHS/FCRC (Family Community Resource Center) office staff is now able to complete a Social Security Administration (SSA) cross match. These cross match will verify citizenship and identity for applicants and recipients of medical benefits who have a social security number (SSN). The person does not have to have the actual Social Security card, just the number.

SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program) policy requires that identity be verified for the person applying. The caseworker is also able to use this SSA cross match as proof of identity for SNAP.

As a result of this new policy, caseworkers at IDHS/FCRC offices are instructed to no longer request proof of citizenship or identity for persons who can provide a Social Security Number (SSN).

If the SSA cross match is not able to verify citizenship for a person reporting to be a US citizen, the person will then have to provide proof of citizenship and identity. This information has to be provided within three months. Caseworkers are to approve and issue benefits during the 3 month wait period, as long as the person meets all other eligibility criteria to receive the benefit. At the end of 3 months, if proof of citizenship and identity is not provided for an adult, the adult is to have benefits stopped. Benefits are able to continue even if proof is not provided for:

- A child under age 19, or
- An adult who had an active case AND has been continuously living in a long term care facility, CILA, or SLF since 11/30/11 or earlier
- A person who reports that they were unable to obtain the proof within the 3-month period, and a good faith effort was made to get the needed benefits.

(Continued on page 7)
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least 492,000 households experiencing homelessness will not receive housing assistance. On November 14, before the Conference report was issued, 47 members of the House of Representatives sent a letter to the T-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee Chair Tom Latham (R-IA) and Ranking Member John Olver (D-MA) urging them to increase funding for Homeless Assistance Grants in the conference report.

Vouchers

The bill provides $18.91 billion for the Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TBRA) account. The bill underfunds TBRA contract renewals, providing $17.24 billion in FY12. The conference committee increased funding for this line item by $199 million over the House bill and $99 million over the Senate bill. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) estimates that the bill short-funds voucher contract renewals by $93 million. The contract renewal funding falls short of HUD’s reported estimate for contract renewals by more than $130 million. This shortfall could result in the loss of between 12,000 and 24,000 vouchers, according to a November 18 report by CBPP. Public housing agencies (PHAs) can use net restricted assets to cover voucher shortfalls. However, the bill rescinds $650 million in voucher program net restricted assets.

While H. R. 2112 would not renew all current vouchers, consistent with the President’s request it does provide $75 million for new Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (VASH) vouchers, or about 11,000 vouchers. This restores VASH funding to the FY10 level. In FY11, only $49 million was provided for new VASH vouchers.

Section 811 vouchers are funded at $112 million, 2 percent below the President’s request. In FY11, $114 million was provided for rental assistance in the Section 811 program, in part through the Section 811 account and in part through the TBRA account. In FY12, the full amount of rental assistance for the Section 811 program will be provided through TBRA vouchers.

Project-Based Section 8

The Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) program is funded at $9.34 billion, an amount lower than both the House Subcommittee and Senate-passed bills. The bill also rescinds $200 million from the Housing Certificate Fund used to supplement the PBRA contracts. HUD says that funding provided in the bill will allow it to renew all project-based contracts for 12 months.

HOME

The most severe cut was to the HOME Investments Partnership program, the subject of investigation by the Washington Post and hearings in the House Financial Services Committee. HOME was cut to $1 billion from $1.6 billion in FY11, a 38 percent cut. Based on HUD’s latest public data on affordable housing units constructed from FY10, this cut will result in 31,000 fewer affordable homes, which could include over 9,000 affordable rental units and nearly 8,000 fewer rental subsidies. The bill includes new oversight and monitoring requirements for the HOME program. One requires that homeownership units that are not sold within six months of a project’s completion be turned into rental units. Another provision sets a four-year limit on the length of time between commitment of funds and project completion. If a project is not completed within four years, the funds are to be repaid, although HUD would have flexibility to approve a one-year extension.

Section 202

The bill cuts the Section 202 Housing for the Elderly program by 51 percent below the President’s funding level, funding Section 202 at $374 million. While this is only 6 percent below the FY11 funding level, the program was cut last year and the FY12 funding level is 55 percent below the FY10 level. The bill does not provide enough funding for new construction, which could mean 2,500 to 3,000 new units for elderly households will not be developed.

HOPWA

The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program is cut to $332 million, slightly below both the FY11 funding level of $334 million and the President’s request of $335 million.

Community Development Fund

The bill cuts the Community Development Fund to $3.3 billion, 6 percent below FY11 and 13 percent below the President’s request. The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) formula grants are cut to $2.95 billion, 12 percent below FY11 funding and 20
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Please note that the “Amounts Remaining” in this chart are higher than actual and the “Percent of Funds Drawn” lower than actual due to lags in reporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Authorized Amount</th>
<th>Amount of Funds Drawn</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
<th>Percent of Funds Drawn</th>
<th>Projected Total Draws at 3 years</th>
<th>Gap or Projected Gap in Meeting 3-Year 100% Expenditure</th>
<th>Approximate monthly draw to meet 3-year 100% requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook County Consortium</td>
<td>$4,121,046</td>
<td>$2,561,011</td>
<td>$1,560,035</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$2,998,519</td>
<td>$1,132,527</td>
<td>$156,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>$540,732</td>
<td>$360,502</td>
<td>$190,230</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$506,145</td>
<td>$34,687</td>
<td>$19,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwyn</td>
<td>$559,545</td>
<td>$373,320</td>
<td>$186,217</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$407,649</td>
<td>$151,096</td>
<td>$20,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>$861,073</td>
<td>$587,865</td>
<td>$273,218</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$756,983</td>
<td>$105,390</td>
<td>$26,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Clair County Consortium</td>
<td>$566,413</td>
<td>$412,600</td>
<td>$173,813</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>$495,213</td>
<td>$91,200</td>
<td>$19,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$34,358,259</td>
<td>$25,418,760</td>
<td>$9,939,499</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>$34,356,259</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$974,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>$581,965</td>
<td>$433,873</td>
<td>$148,392</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$581,065</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$16,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison County</td>
<td>$566,887</td>
<td>$428,828</td>
<td>$140,159</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$495,963</td>
<td>$71,024</td>
<td>$15,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Park</td>
<td>$796,581</td>
<td>$642,921</td>
<td>$153,660</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>$796,581</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$17,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston</td>
<td>$801,480</td>
<td>$649,423</td>
<td>$152,057</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>$716,563</td>
<td>$84,897</td>
<td>$16,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora</td>
<td>$506,883</td>
<td>$427,150</td>
<td>$79,733</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$506,883</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>$516,198</td>
<td>$438,491</td>
<td>$79,700</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$516,198</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>$517,334</td>
<td>$443,814</td>
<td>$73,790</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$517,334</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East St. Louis</td>
<td>$750,339</td>
<td>$652,645</td>
<td>$97,694</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>$750,339</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County Consortium</td>
<td>$1,057,106</td>
<td>$921,374</td>
<td>$135,732</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>$990,349</td>
<td>$57,575</td>
<td>$15,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois (Balance of State)</td>
<td>$20,286,604</td>
<td>$17,813,579</td>
<td>$2,472,926</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>$20,286,604</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$277,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage County Consortium</td>
<td>$1,443,723</td>
<td>$1,291,121</td>
<td>$152,602</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>$1,443,723</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$17,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will County</td>
<td>$602,271</td>
<td>$565,503</td>
<td>$36,768</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$602,271</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>$750,404</td>
<td>$766,287</td>
<td>$24,107</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>$790,404</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>$623,309</td>
<td>$620,379</td>
<td>$2,930</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$623,309</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,655,285</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,811,145</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,054,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>79%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,136,007</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,729,278</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,640,033</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median</strong></td>
<td><strong>$888,824</strong></td>
<td><strong>$804,117</strong></td>
<td><strong>$150,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$889,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>$88,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,793</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HPRP program requires, by statute, that grantees expend 100 percent of their award funds within three years of the date that HUD signed the grant agreement. This document contains a listing of all HPRP grantees, their current expenditure rates as measured by draw-downs of funds from HUD’s Integrated Disbursement and Information System (IDIS), and projections as to whether each grantee will meet the requirement, based on the most recent 12 weeks of draws. This is one of three grantee expenditure listings HUD is making available to assist grantees in tracking their progress toward the requirement. Grantees whose current expenditure rates will cause their projection to fall short of the 100 percent mark should take the necessary steps to increase their expenditure rates. Please note that these projections are based on draws from IDIS, which may differ from expenditures documented in the grantee’s own financial tracking system. This data also does not account for grantees’ existing commitments to spend HPRP funds. For more technical assistance documents to assist in considering options on expending funds, see the Homelessness Resource Exchange at www.hudhere.info. Or, contact HUD via the Virtual Help Desk (located online at http://www.hudhere.info/helpdesk).
HUD Regulations
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Public and private agencies that address homeless veterans and youth.
Publicly funded institutions of care that may discharge people into homelessness.

The Citizen Participation segment of the ConPlan rule now requires jurisdictions to encourage participation by Continua of Care in the process of developing and implementing the ConPlan.

The ConPlan rule broadens attention beyond chronically homeless people to include families with children, veterans and their families, and unaccompanied youth.

The “Housing Needs Assessment” component of the ConPlan adds a new category of person whose housing assistance needs must be assessed by jurisdictions: formerly homeless families and individuals who are receiving rapid re-housing assistance that will soon end.

The “Housing Market Assessment” must include an inventory of mainstream services, not just homeless services, to stress the importance of using and collaborating with mainstream assistance providers to prevent and end homelessness.

The Strategic Plan and Annual Action Plan portions of the ConPlan now require a jurisdiction to describe its strategies for reducing and ending homelessness by helping homeless people transition to permanent housing by shortening the period of time people are homeless, helping them gain access to affordable housing, and preventing people who were recently homeless from becoming homeless again. Jurisdictions must also describe strategies for helping people avoid homelessness, especially those likely to become homeless after being discharged from publicly funded institutions and systems of care.

Resources

The interim ESG rule is available at www.hudhre.info/index.cfm?do=viewResource&ResourceId=4517

The final homeless definition rule is available at www.hudhre.info/index.cfm?do=viewResource&ResourceId=4519

The ESG fund allocation information is available at www.hudhre.info/index.cfm?do=viewResource&ResourceId=4518

The National Low Income Housing Coalition’s comments on the proposed homeless definition rule are available at www.nlihc.org/doc/NLIHC-Comments-HEARTH-Home-Def.pdf

For further information, contact the National Low Income Housing Coalition at the address in Headlines Directory.

Budget Cuts
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percent below the President’s request. It does include provisions from House bill that prohibits CDF funding for the Economic Development Initiative and the Rural Innovation Fund. The bill allows 20 percent of CDBG funding to be used for administrative, planning and management purposes, consistent with prior years and with the Senate bill.

Other HUD Programs

Funding for the Housing Counseling program is partially restored to $45 million, 49 percent below the President’s request. All funding for counseling was cut in FY11.

Rural Housing Services

H. R. 2112 reduces Rural Housing funding for rental programs below the FY11 funding level. Section 521 Rural Rental Assistance is funded at $904 million, slightly below the President’s FY12 requested funding level, but a cut of 5 percent below FY11. The Section 515 Rural Rental Housing program is funded at $64.5 million, 32 percent below the President’s FY12 request and a 7 percent cut below FY11 funding.

H. R. 2112 does include several positive HUD policy provisions including a Rental Assistance Demonstration, expanded use of tenant protection vouchers and preservation provisions.


View HUD budget charts: https://www2398.ssldomain.com/nlihc/template/page.cfm?id=28

For further information, contact the National Low Income Housing Coalition at the address in Headlines Directory.
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Funding Resources

Source: Foundation Center Online http://fconline.foundationcenter.com

HNI Charitable Foundation
(formerly HON INDUSTRIES Charitable Foundation)
P.O. Box 1109
Muscatine, IA 52761-0071
Telephone: (563) 252-7503
Contact: Dianna Stelzner, Secy.-Treas.
Fax: (563) 264-7217
E-mail: stelznerd@hnicorp.com

Type of Grantmaker: Company-sponsored foundation

Limitations: Giving limited to areas of company operations, with emphasis on IA, IL, KY, MN, NC and WA. No support for national, statewide, or religious organizations. No grants to individuals.

Financial Data (Year ended 12/31/10):
Total giving: $674,854
Giving activities include: $674,854 for grants

Number of Staff: 1 full-time professional.

Purpose and Activities: The foundation supports organizations involved with arts and culture, education, health, disaster preparedness, and human services.

Fields of Interest: Disasters, preparedness/services; Education; Health care Health care, clinics/centers Higher education Historic preservation/historical societies Hospitals (general) Human services.

Types of Support: Building/renovation; Capital campaigns; General/operating support.


Homeless Services
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The DuPage Federation on Human Services Reform, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization focused on advocacy and planning in DuPage County, Illinois and designer and trainer of Making the Connection: A Guide to Accessing Public Benefits. The DuPage Federation is affiliated with Northern Illinois University, Center for Governmental Studies. Questions can be directed to knelson@dupagefederation.org

Citizenship and Identity
(Continued from page 3)

information. A good faith effort is determined based on all the facts and conditions of each case. Examples of good faith effort include, but are not limited to persons who:

* Provide evidence showing that they ordered a copy of their birth certificate from the vital records agency of the state or county where they were born and it still has not been received,

* States s/he is a naturalized citizen who lost the original documents in a fire and provides evidence that the required document was requested from the US Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS).

In addition to the above changes any baby that is born in the U.S. on or after July 1, 2006, to mothers who were covered by HFS Medical benefits for the newborn’s birth do not have to provide any additional evidence of U.S. citizenship and identity.

Persons who claim to be U.S. Citizens but do not have a SSN will still have to provide proof of citizenship and identity.


The $8.4 million will likely amount to 70 percent or more reduction from the average of $27.9 million in HPRP dollars expended in the state in both FY2010, and FY2011. That average was obtained by subtracting the $15.1 million for Illinois that HUD reports remaining in the program as of October 17, 2011 from the total original $70.1 million allocation and dividing by two.

When you total the 2012 funding levels for the state-funded Homeless Prevention Program, and the estimated 2012 figure for ESG, and the remaining HPRP dollars for 2012 the resulting number is down 34 percent from 2011 and 36 percent from 2009. If state and federal funding stays the same for 2013, total state and federal prevention dollars for Illinois will be down 74 percent compared to both 2009 and 2011.

The percentage of Illinois agencies saying those federal funds are depleted. Of the total of $70.1 million in HPRP dollars that came to Illinois, more than 83 percent had been spent by October 17, 2011. (See table on page 5.) The HPRP funds will end altogether in 2012 (possibly by mid-year), replaced by the smaller Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG).

ESG has been funded at $250 million nationally, a 25 percent increase over FY 2011. This will translate into approximately $8.4 million for all Illinois ESG grantees, based on Illinois’ share of last year’s federal ESG appropriation and the 2012 national appropriation. This is an increase from the $6.8 million level for FY2011.

The $8.4 million will likely amount to 70 percent or more reduction from the average of $27.9 million in HPRP dollars expended in the state in both FY2010, and FY2011. That average was obtained by subtracting the $15.1 million for Illinois that HUD reports remaining in the program as of October 17, 2011 from the total original $70.1 million allocation and dividing by two.

When you total the 2012 funding levels for the state-funded Homeless Prevention Program, and the estimated 2012 figure for ESG, and the remaining HPRP dollars for 2012 the resulting number is down 34 percent from 2011 and 36 percent from 2009. If state and federal funding stays the same for 2013, total state and federal prevention dollars for Illinois will be down 74 percent compared to both 2009 and 2011.
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Illinois Association of Community Action Agencies
3435 Liberty Drive

Directory

Center for Community Change
1515 U Street NW
Washington, DC 20009
Telephone: (202) 339-9300
http://www.communitychange.org

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities
820 First Street, NE, Suite 510
Washington, DC 20002
Ph: (202) 408-1080
Fax: (202) 408-1056
http://www.cbpp.org

Coalition of Citizens With Disabilities in Illinois
300 E. Monroe, Suite 100
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone: (217) 522-7016
Fax: (217) 522-7016
http://www.ccidonline.org

Corporation for Supportive Housing
205 W. Randolph, 23rd Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: (312) 332-6690
Fax: (312) 332-7400
Email: il@csh.org
www.csh.org

Food Research and Action Center
1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 540
Washington, D.C. 20009
Telephone: (202) 986-2200
Fax: (202) 986-2525
foodresearch@frc.org

Housing Action Illinois
11 E. Adams, Suite 1601
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 939-6074
Fax: (312) 939-6822
http://housingactionil.org

Housing Assistance Council
1025 Vermont Ave, NW, Suite 606
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 842-8606
Fax: (202) 347-3441
http://www.ruralhome.org

Illinois Association of Community Action Agencies
3435 Liberty Drive
Springfield, IL 62704
Telephone: (217) 789-0125
Fax: (217) 789-0139
http://www.illinois.gov/casad

Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence
801 S. 11th
Springfield, IL 62703
Telephone: (217) 789-2830
Fax: (217) 789-1939
http://www.ilcadv.org

Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity
620 E. Adams, CIPS-3
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone (217) 785-6142
Fax: (217) 782-1206
http://www.commerce.state.il.us/

Illinois Department of Human Services
Homeless Services and Supportive Housing
400 W. Lawrence, 2C
Springfield, IL 62762
Telephone: (217) 782-1137
Fax: (217) 524-5800
http://www.dhs.state.il.us

Illinois Food Bank Association
P.O. Box 4293
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone: (217) 522-2022
Email: cifbank@aol.com

Illinois Housing Development Authority
401 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60611
Telephone: (312) 836-5200
Fax: (312) 836-5286
TDD: (312) 836-5222
http://www.ihda.org

Illinois Coalition to End Homelessness
1518 K Street, NW, Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 638-1526
Fax: (202) 638-4664
E-mail: nahn@iach.org
http://www.endhomelessness.org/

National Alliance to End Homelessness
515 K Street, NW, Suite 410
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 770-8600
Fax: (202) 770-2735
E-mail: info@naeh.org
http://www.naeh.org

National Coalition for Homeless Veterans
333 ½ Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, D.C. 20003-1148
Telephone: (202) 546-1969
Fax: (202) 546-2063
E-mail: ncvh@ncvh.org
http://www.ncvh.org/home.html

National Coalition for the Homeless
2201 “P” St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20037-1033
Telephone: (202) 462-4822 x234
Fax: (202) 462-4823
Email: info@nationalhomeless.org

National Community Reinvestment Coalition
P.O. Box 2893
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone: (217) 522-2022
E-mail: cfr Bank@aol.com

National Housing Bank
727 15th St., NW, Room 1100
Washington, D.C. 20055
Fax: (202) 848-2555
http://www.nhbc.org

National Low-Income Housing Coalition
727 15th St. NW, 6th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 662-1530
Fax: (202) 662-1533
E-mail: info@nlihc.org
http://www.nlihc.org

National Rural Housing Coalition
1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Suite 606
Washington, D.C. 20037-1033
Telephone: (202) 462-4822 x234
Fax: (202) 462-4823
Email: info@nationalhomeless.org

National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty
727 15th St., NW, Room 1000
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 628-2737
Fax: (202) 628-9800
http://nationallawcenter.org

Supportive Housing Providers Association
212 E. Ohio Street, 5th Floor
Chicago, IL 60611
Telephone: 773-935-4663, ext.123
supportivehousing@aol.com

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development
77 W. Jackson 24th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60604-1507
Telephone: (312) 353-1969
Fax: (312) 353-5417