



820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056 center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

February 17, 2005

LOCAL EFFECTS OF CUTS IN HOUSING VOUCHER ASSISTANCE IN 2005

New Hampshire

The table shows voucher estimates based in part on data that housing agencies reported to HUD covering the period through July 2004. Individual agencies will have more current data they can use to update the estimates. The funding figures in the column “Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD” come directly from HUD data. The estimated annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC) is derived by adjusting the agency’s voucher cost data in mid-2004 by the applicable HUD annual adjustment factor. Agencies’ actual voucher costs in 2005 may be more or less than the estimate.

The column “number of vouchers cut” is the number of vouchers the appropriations act directs HUD to fund — authorized vouchers in use in May – July 2004 plus any additional vouchers issued to replace other federal housing subsidies that need renewal funding in 2005 — that are unfunded due to the appropriations shortfall. If the estimated “number of vouchers cut” is less than the total number of expiring vouchers not funded, it is likely that the agency was not using all its vouchers in mid-2004. The number of vouchers in use in February 2005 that are not funded may be less than the estimates provided if an agency is using fewer vouchers than in mid-2004 or if the agency’s average per unit cost has declined substantially. The number of vouchers in use that are not funded may be more than the estimates provided if the agency’s per unit cost is currently greater than the estimate. For some agencies (marked with an asterisk) our estimates include adjustments made in light of HUD’s final funding figures, and may be more subject to error.

Agencies may be able to remedy a funding shortfall through use of reserve funds (if accessed quickly) or other policy changes, rather than by reducing the number of families receiving voucher assistance.

HUD Code	Housing Agency name	Authorized vouchers in January 2005	Number of expiring vouchers	Expiring vouchers eligible for funding under bill formula	Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD (HAP)	Annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC)	Number of expiring vouchers funded (based on PUC)	Total expiring vouchers not funded	Vouchers cut in 2005
NH011	Berlin HA	285	285	285	\$839,180	\$3,070	273	-12	-12
NH012	Claremont HA	140	140	137	\$626,063	\$4,764	131	-9	-6
NH005	Concord HA	224	224	224	\$1,149,097	\$5,348	215	-9	-9
NH022	DHRA	100	100	100	\$677,460	\$7,063	96	-4	-4
NH003	Dover HA	347	347	302	\$2,426,762	\$8,387	289	-58	-12
NH014	Exeter HA	169	169	167	\$1,123,436	\$7,000	160	-9	-7
NH018*	Franklin*	89	89	89	\$551,283	\$6,458	85	-4	-4
NH010**	Keene HA**	359	359	359	\$2,237,826	\$6,499	344	-15	-15
NH007	Laconia Housing and Redevelopment Authority	407	407	406	\$2,140,617	\$5,501	389	-18	-17
NH015	Lancaster	68	68	65	\$222,943	\$3,558	63	-5	-3
NH009	Lebanon	163	163	163	\$785,811	\$5,026	156	-7	-7
NH001	Manchester Housing and Redevelopment Authority	1,813	1,813	1,793	\$12,364,927	\$7,190	1,720	-93	-73
NH002	Nashua HA	758	758	748	\$6,135,463	\$8,552	717	-41	-31
NH901	New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority	3,222	3,218	3,174	\$22,837,860	\$7,502	3,044	-174	-130
NH013	Newmarket	72	72	66	\$450,046	\$7,109	63	-9	-3
NH016	Northumberland	15	15	15	\$49,602	\$3,448	14	-1	-1
NH004	Portsmouth HA	406	406	406	\$3,182,129	\$8,171	389	-17	-17
NH008	Rochester HA	182	182	182	\$1,484,912	\$8,522	174	-8	-7
NH006	Somersworth HA	183	183	170	\$1,308,219	\$8,007	163	-20	-7
Total for New Hampshire		9,002	8,998	8,851	\$60,593,636		8,489	-509	-361

** Agency receiving funding according to special agreement under the Moving To Work (MTW) Demonstration, annual per voucher subsidy cost figures cited for such agencies include administrative costs