

Revised March 15, 2006

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

Tennessee

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 **22 housing agencies in Tennessee** would be forced to **cut assistance to 328 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 **16 Tennessee 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 4 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
Athens HA	52	2	46	-1	45	87%
Briston HA	200	6	189	-3	186	93%
Brownsfille	169	2	169	1	170	101%
Chattanooga HA	3,140	412	3,012	-43	2,969	95%
Cleveland HA	208	7	208	-2	206	99%
Crossville HA	321	0	321	25	346	108%
Dayton HA	354	28	354	-5	349	99%

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
Dickson HA	644	7	621	-9	612	95%
Elizabethton HA	203	13	199	-3	196	97%
Ethra	726	87	701	-14	687	95%
Etowah Sec. 8 Voucher	122	8	115	-2	113	93%
Jackson HA	1,298	146	1,205	-16	1,189	92%
Johnson City HA	468	0	466	-6	460	98%
Kingsport HA	1,155	50	1,155	-10	1,145	99%
Knox County HA	562	8	524	-8	516	92%
Knoxville's Community Development Co.	2,735	33	2,534	-36	2,498	91%
LaFollette HA	328	-10	288	-4	284	87%
Maryville HA	304	46	304	18	322	106%
Memphis HA	5,342	357	5,342	286	5,628	105%
Metropolitan Development HA	5,460	205	5,356	-75	5,281	97%
Morristown HA	409	25	391	-5	386	94%
Murfreesboro HA	573	2	573	22	595	104%
Oak Ridge Sec. 8 Voucher	260	10	232	-3	229	88%
Pulaski Sec. 8 Voucher	102	-2	98	-2	96	94%
SE TN Human Resource Agency	227	32	227	3	230	101%
Sweetwater HA	58	2	55	-1	54	93%
Tennessee HA	5,878	-19	5,486	-78	5,408	92%
Tullahoma HA	116	-4	103	-2	101	87%
Tennessee	31,414	1453	30,274	27	30,301	96%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.