

107TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. CON. RES. 52

Expressing the sense of Congress that reducing crime in public housing should be a priority, and that the successful Public Housing Drug Elimination Program should be fully funded.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 21, 2001

Mr. CORZINE, (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REID, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DODD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. KERRY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of Congress that reducing crime in public housing should be a priority, and that the successful Public Housing Drug Elimination Program should be fully funded.

Whereas while various public housing developments suffer from serious crime problems, many have made significant progress in reducing crime through initiatives funded by the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program (PHDEP);

Whereas PHDEP was first established in 1988 under former President George Bush and the former Secretary of the

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Jack Kemp, and has enjoyed strong bipartisan support since its inception;

Whereas PHDEP funds a wide variety of anticrime initiatives, that include—

- (1) the employment of security personnel and investigators;
- (2) the reimbursement of local law enforcement agencies for additional security;
- (3) drug education and prevention, intervention, and treatment programs;
- (4) voluntary resident patrols; and
- (5) physical improvements designed to enhance security, including fences and cameras;

Whereas PHDEP has successfully enabled housing authorities to work cooperatively with residents, local officials, police departments, community groups, Boys and Girls Clubs, drug counseling centers, and other community-based organizations to develop locally-supported anticrime initiatives;

Whereas the Internet web site of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has stated that the program's "success is rooted in the fact that the people respond better and become more involved in something they have helped to build";

Whereas in addition to providing direct funding for anticrime initiatives, PHDEP has helped housing authorities leverage funding from other sources that might otherwise be

unavailable, such as funding from local banks, Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, and private foundations;

Whereas a portion of funding allocated to the PHDEP is also used to reduce crime in privately-owned, publicly assisted housing, and assisted housing on Indian reservations, which also can suffer from serious crime problems;

Whereas the Internet web site of the Department of Housing and Urban Development has pointed out that “in several of the Nation’s largest public housing authorities—largest in terms of unit size—the rate of crime has fallen since the mid-1990’s, even though the crime rate in the respective surrounding communities increased. And we know that crime levels in many housing authorities are dropping, in both absolute and percentage terms. These are merely the successes that we can measure. There are many more that are simply immeasurable.”;

Whereas Congress has recognized the success of the PHDEP by increasing program funding from \$8,200,000 in fiscal year 1989 to \$310,000,000 in fiscal year 2001;

Whereas evicting residents who engage in unlawful activity can help reduce crime, but much of the crime in public housing is perpetrated by nonresidents, and evictions must be supplemented by the more comprehensive anticrime approach supported by the PHDEP;

Whereas public housing authorities could use operating subsidies to fund some anticrime initiatives under applicable law, but those subsidies are based on a formula that does not account for PHDEP eligible activities and are inadequate to fund most of the anticrime initiatives supported by the program, and PHDEP has the added advantage of requiring public housing authorities to develop and im-

plement anticrime plans with the support and participation of residents and local communities, which has proved critical in ensuring the effectiveness of such plans;

Whereas while, as with any program of its size, there have been reports of isolated problems, PHDEP generally has been well run and free of the widespread abuses that have plagued other housing programs in the past, in part because of the broad participation of residents and local communities, and because the program has required housing authorities to provide comprehensive plans before receiving funds, and complete reports on their progress;

Whereas during the process leading to his confirmation, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mel Martinez, stated in a written response to a question posed by Senator Jon S. Corzine that, “HUD’s Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, PHDEP, supports a wide variety of efforts by public and Indian housing authorities to reduce or eliminate drug-related crime in public housing developments. Based on this core purpose, I certainly support the program.”;

Whereas PHDEP is critical not only to millions of public and assisted housing residents, most of whom are hard working, law abiding citizens, but also to surrounding communities, residents of which also suffer if neighboring housing developments are plagued with high rates of crime; and

Whereas continued funding of PHDEP would demonstrate that the Nation is serious about maintaining its commitment to reducing the problem of crime in public housing: Now, therefore, be it

1 *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives*
2 *concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that—

3 (1) reducing crime in public housing should be
4 a priority; and

5 (2) the successful Public Housing Drug Elim-
6 nation Program should be fully funded.

○