

Revised March 15, 2006

## WINNERS AND LOSERS UNDER ADMINISTRATION'S 2007 HOUSING VOUCHER FUNDING PLAN

### Michigan

The table below compares estimates of the number of vouchers that would be funded in 2007 under the Administration's budget proposal with the number funded in 2006 and the number in use in 2005. Under the Administration's plan:

- An estimated **37 housing agencies in Michigan** would be forced to cut assistance to **622 low-income families** in 2007, compared to the number they are able to help in 2006.

When the number of vouchers the Administration is proposing to fund in 2007 is compared to the total number Congress has authorized agencies to administer (rather than the number funded in 2006), the shortfalls faced by some agencies are even deeper:

- At **36 Michigan housing agencies, 5 percent or more of the vouchers** Congress authorized the agency to issue to needy families **would be left unused in 2007 because of inadequate funding**. Statewide, the number of vouchers funded would be 7 percent below the number agencies are authorized to issue.

Because the Administration has proposed a flawed and inequitable formula for distributing voucher funds in 2007, these funding shortfalls would occur at the same time that other agencies would receive more funding than they need to cover vouchers that are funded in 2006. Indeed, if it were distributed more efficiently, the total amount of funding the Administration requested to renew housing vouchers in 2007 likely would be adequate to cover the vouchers that were funded in 2006 at every agency — averting all of the cuts below 2006 levels listed in this table. For further information on the potential cuts and other issues raised by the Administration's budget proposal, see <http://www.cbpp.org/3-13-06hous.htm>.

Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>
Alma HC	64	1	59	0	59	92%
Ann Arbor HC	1,333	-39	1,178	-16	1,162	87%
Baldwin HC	180	0	174	-2	172	96%
Baraga HC	25	2	25	1	26	104%
Bath Charter Township HC	25	-3	22	0	22	88%
Battle Creek HC	590	210	585	-14	571	97%
Benton Township HC	75	8	75	18	93	124%
Beton Harbor HC	200	84	200	7	207	104%

Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>
Boyne City HC	60	-9	49	0	49	82%
Cadillac HC	25	-5	19	0	19	76%
Cheboygan HC	120	1	120	6	126	105%
Clinton Township HC	23	-2	20	-1	19	83%
Coldwater HC	25	-2	23	0	23	92%
Dearborn HC	96	2	92	-1	91	95%
Dearborn Heights HC	359	0	340	-5	335	93%
Detroit HC	5,635	349	4,906	-74	4,832	86%
Dowagia HC	115	5	110	-2	108	94%
Eastpointe HC	171	43	165	-4	161	94%
Evart HC	25	2	24	-1	23	92%
Ferndale HC	528	312	528	34	562	106%
Flint HC	963	23	710	-10	700	73%
Grand Rapids HC	2,690	20	2,690	208	2,898	108%
Grayling HC	130	-4	117	-1	116	89%
Greenville HC	107	2	106	-2	104	97%
Hancock HC	40	-2	33	-1	32	80%
Inkster HC	517	101	517	101	618	120%
Ionia HC	20	2	20	1	21	105%
Iron County HC	169	0	169	5	174	103%
Jackson HC	475	17	475	2	477	100%
Kent County Housing Comm	330	10	319	-4	315	95%
Lansing HC	1,700	47	1,474	-22	1,452	85%
Lapeer HC	122	9	122	21	143	117%
Lincoln Park HC	293	34	293	8	301	103%
Livonia HC	803	64	803	-8	795	99%
Luce County HC	110	0	110	3	113	103%
Madison Heights HC	237	-8	207	-3	204	86%
Manistique HC	59	3	59	5	64	108%
Marquette	50	1	49	-1	48	96%
Melvindale HC	134	8	128	-2	126	94%
Menominee HC	61	2	61	6	67	110%
Michigan State HA	22,842	1,525	21,519	-349	21,170	93%
Montcalm County HC	318	5	260	-4	256	81%
Mt. Pleasant HC	50	-2	46	0	46	92%
Munising HC	25	0	23	0	23	92%
Muskegon HC	164	5	164	8	172	105%
Muskegon Heights HC	50	4	47	-1	46	92%

Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>
Plymouth HC	1,489	18	1,408	-21	1,387	93%
Pontiac HC	768	44	658	-9	649	85%
Port Huron HC	522	1	522	-8	514	98%
Pottersville HC	25	3	25	2	27	108%
Reed Ciuty HC	90	14	86	-1	85	94%
River Rouge HC	249	23	242	-3	239	96%
Rockford HC	90	-4	82	-1	81	90%
Roseville HC	309	-16	285	-4	281	91%
Royal Oaks HA	222	2	202	-3	199	90%
Saginaw HC	1,197	2	1,103	-15	1,088	91%
Saint Louis HC	155	-5	144	-3	141	91%
Sault Ste Marie HC	50	4	50	4	54	108%
Schoolcraft County HC	35	5	35	0	35	100%
Southfield HC	150	3	150	1	151	101%
St. Clair HC	30	-1	29	-1	28	93%
St. Clair Shores HC	90	2	90	0	90	100%
Sterling Heights	40	-2	37	0	37	93%
Taylor HC	452	42	451	-6	445	98%
Traverse City HC	198	20	198	0	198	100%
Westland HC	1,090	215	1,090	144	1,234	113%
Wyoming HC	1,122	77	1,105	-16	1,089	97%
Ypsilanti HC	197	-15	180	-3	177	90%
<b>Michigan</b>	<b>50,703</b>	<b>3,257</b>	<b>47,407</b>	<b>-37</b>	<b>47,370</b>	<b>93%<sup>6</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Figures for total authorized vouchers are based on HUD data as of January 2006.

<sup>2</sup> Compares number of authorized vouchers funded in 2006 (3rd data column) with number of vouchers actually used in January – September 2005, based on agency data submitted to HUD. For some agencies, a portion of the increase in vouchers that can be used in 2006 compared with vouchers leased in 2005 is due to the award of new vouchers during 2005 to replace other federal housing subsidies. These new vouchers were in use in part but not all of 2005.

<sup>3</sup> Based on CBPP estimates of funding available to each agency. Includes only vouchers funded up to each agency's authorized level, as of January 2006. Assumes each agency's average voucher cost remains level in the last three months of 2005 and increases at the applicable HUD inflation factor beginning January 1, 2006. Figures for some agencies include tenant protection vouchers awarded in 2005 and before; because information released by HUD on tenant protection vouchers is incomplete, the actual number of such vouchers is somewhat uncertain.

<sup>4</sup> Based on CBPP estimates of funding each agency would receive under the proposed formula and of likely per unit costs in 2007. Does not include renewal of tenant protection vouchers that will be awarded in 2006, as these approximately 26,000 vouchers cannot be allocated to the agency level in advance of award. Our estimates assume that these additional vouchers will be renewed, subject to the same proration as other renewal funding.

---

<sup>5</sup> Under HUD's SEMAP performance measurement system, agencies that use fewer than 95 percent of their authorized vouchers are considered deficient performers. These figures compare the funding available in 2007 under the President's request to renew vouchers that were authorized as of January 2006 (listed in the first data column). Under the Administration's proposal and our estimates, vouchers awarded subsequent to January 2006 also would receive renewal funding through calendar year 2007, subject to the same proration as other renewal funding.

<sup>6</sup> The statewide percentage of authorized vouchers funded compares the total number of vouchers renewed in 2007 to the total number authorized in 2006. If some agencies in the state are funded for more than 100 percent of their authorized vouchers, the statewide percentage understates the share of authorized vouchers left unfunded in particular communities.