

Revised March 15, 2006

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

North Carolina

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 **57 housing agencies in North Carolina** would be forced to cut assistance to **478 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 **43 North Carolina 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 3 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 ¹	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level ²	Total Vouchers Funded ³	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded ⁴	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded ⁵
Albemarle Dept of Public Housing	333	21	291	-4	287	86%
Asheboro HA	783	-12	749	-10	739	94%
Asheville	1,355	26	1,271	-19	1,252	92%
Bladenboro HA	232	-3	210	-3	207	89%
Brunswick County	472	32	441	-6	435	92%
Charlotte	4,217	334	4,217	262	4,479	106%

Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers ¹	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level ²	Total Vouchers Funded ³	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded ⁴	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded ⁵
Chatham County HA	410	31	410	6	416	101%
Choanoke Area Development Assn., Inc.	483	9	450	-6	444	92%
Coastal Community Action, Inc.	444	15	444	12	456	103%
Columbus County PHA	467	17	461	-7	454	97%
Concord Housing Department	534	-3	513	-7	506	95%
Durham	2,684	137	2,589	-36	2,553	95%
East Spencer HA	239	1	236	-3	233	97%
Eastern Carolina Human Services, Inc.	662	-11	631	-9	622	94%
Economic Improvement Council, Inc.	1,595	153	1,595	72	1,667	105%
Fayetteville Metropolitan HA	1,525	15	1,454	-21	1,433	94%
Four County Community Services, Inc.	437	-4	420	-6	414	95%
Four Square Community Action, Inc.	469	53	468	-6	462	99%
Franklin Vance Warren Opp, Inc.	526	6	501	-7	494	94%
Gastonia HA	1,155	14	1,093	-16	1,077	93%
Goldsboro HA	237	4	229	-3	226	95%
Graham HA	1,005	16	979	-13	966	96%
Greene County Public Housing Agency	286	2	283	-4	279	98%
Greensboro	2,543	16	2,543	163	2,706	106%
Greenville HA	652	-41	601	-9	592	91%
Harnett County Housing	277	20	254	-4	250	90%
Hickory HA	449	-1	436	-7	429	96%
Highpoint	1,350	-58	1,237	-20	1,217	90%
Isothermal Planning & Development Commission	1,331	56	1,331	-3	1,328	100%
Jackson County Public Housing Agency	324	-4	315	-5	310	96%
Johnston County Housing Assistance Payments Program	619	3	600	-8	592	96%
Kinston Housing Authority	765	-30	612	-8	604	79%
Laurinburg	530	-13	495	-10	485	92%
Lexington HA	512	8	492	-6	486	95%
Lincolnton HA	275	-7	256	-4	252	92%
Lumberton HA	596	-1	590	-8	582	98%
Macon Program for Progress, Inc.	224	-30	172	-2	170	76%
Madison County HA	191	-6	185	-2	183	96%
Mid-East Regional HA	537	-17	491	-7	484	90%
Monroe HA	318	-6	289	-4	285	90%
Mountain Projects, Inc.	684	15	684	8	692	101%
Nash-Edgecombe Eco., Dev., Inc.	585	17	481	-7	474	81%

Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers ¹	Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
		Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level ²	Total Vouchers Funded ³	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded ⁴	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded ⁵
NC Dept of Admin, Commission of Indian Affairs	936	-2	880	-13	867	93%
New Reidsville HA	220	-16	173	-3	170	77%
Northwest Piedmont Council of Governments	842	29	813	-12	801	95%
Northwestern Regional HA	1,945	58	1,825	-26	1,799	92%
Orange County	623	7	622	-9	613	98%
Pender Count Housing Department	217	27	217	17	234	108%
Raleigh Housing	3,537	88	3,537	79	3,616	102%
Roanoke Chowan Regional HA	882	16	805	-12	793	90%
Rockingham	55	0	55	8	63	115%
Rocky Mount HA	265	-8	245	-3	242	91%
Rowan County HA	554	11	519	-7	512	92%
Salisbury HA	44	3	44	2	46	105%
Sandhills Community Action Program, Inc.	567	10	541	-8	533	94%
Sanford HA	441	36	368	-7	361	82%
Section (8) Housing	267	-15	252	-3	249	93%
Statesville HA	704	24	704	3	707	100%
Thomasville HA	100	-13	78	-1	77	77%
Troy	25	0	25	1	26	104%
Twin Rivers Opportunities, Inc.	880	-36	773	-11	762	87%
Wadesboro HA	131	14	122	-2	120	92%
Wake Count HA	193	2	189	-2	187	97%
Washington HA	370	19	330	-4	326	88%
Western Carolina Community Action, Inc.	646	11	620	-9	611	95%
Western Piedmont Council of Governments	1,017	67	1,008	-15	993	98%
Williamston HA	157	23	140	-2	138	88%
Wilmington	1,722	-63	1,592	-22	1,570	91%
Wilson HA	550	-11	505	-7	498	91%
Winston-Salem	4,100	0	4,100	287	4,387	107%
North Carolina	55,302	1055	53,081	442	53,523	97%⁶

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

² 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.

³ 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.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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.

⁶ 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.