

November 1, 2006

HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN MICHIGAN UNDER PENDING PROPOSALS

For 2007, Congress will have to choose among three funding approaches that have been put forward. Each provides the same new funding for the program nationally in 2007, but uses a different method for distributing the money among the 2,400 state and local housing agencies. Here is the impact that each of the three formulas would have on Michigan.

- Under the formula in the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (or SEVRA), a bill passed by the House Financial Services Committee on June 14, 2006, ***all vouchers in use in Michigan in 2006 would be funded***. Moreover, agencies in Michigan would receive enough funding to restore vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **97 percent of Michigan's currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the SEVRA formula.
- The formula in the Senate appropriations bill would also renew funding for all vouchers in use in Michigan in 2006. However, it would not provide agencies in Michigan with enough funding to restore a substantial share of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **90 percent of Michigan's currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the Senate appropriations formula.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, 33 housing agencies in Michigan would be forced to cut assistance to 915 low-income families in 2007. **Only 88 percent of Michigan's currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the House appropriations formula.

For a description of the pending proposals for distribution of renewal funding to state and local agencies and an analysis of their national impact, see "Fixing the Housing Voucher Formula: A No-Cost Way to Strengthen the Section 8 Program," <http://www.cbpp.org/11-1-06hous.htm>. The paper's Technical Appendix explains the sources and methods for the data in this table.

Agency Estimates (next page)

Agency Estimates

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Alma HC	MI121	64	56	64	57	58	0
Ann Arbor HC	MI064	1,333	1,182	1,333	1,205	1,231	0
Baldwin HC	MI050	180	176	180	179	169	7
Baraga HC	MI019	25	21	21	21	24	0
Bath Charter Township HC	MI194	25	23	25	23	22	1
Battle Creek HC	MI035	590	439	590	448	408	31
Benton Township HC	MI032	75	64	64	65	75	0
Beton Harbor HC*	MI010	200	140	140	143	172	0
Boyne City HC	MI084	60	48	60	49	46	1
Cadillac HC	MI060	25	18	25	18	17	1
Cheboygan HC	MI030	120	120	120	120	117	3
Clinton Township HC	MI040	23	21	23	21	21	0
Coldwater HC	MI056	25	19	25	20	19	0
Dearborn HC	MI003	96	93	96	95	90	3
Dearborn Heights HC	MI160	359	313	313	320	334	0
Detroit HC	MI001	5,635	4,463	5,635	4,552	4,462	1
Dowagia HC	MI120	115	96	96	98	107	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Eastpointe HC*	MI044	171	124	124	127	171	0
Ewart HC	MI112	25	22	25	22	21	1
Ferndale HC*	MI096	528	240	240	245	510	0
Flint HC	MI009	963	623	623	636	680	0
Grand Rapids HC	MI073	2,690	2,683	2,683	2,690	2,690	0
Grayling HC	MI047	130	119	130	122	115	5
Greenville HC	MI023	107	93	93	95	99	0
Hancock HC	MI063	40	33	40	33	32	1
Inkster HC	MI027	517	262	262	267	328	0
Ionia HC	MI117	20	20	20	20	19	1
Iron County HC	MI119	169	164	169	167	158	6
Jackson HC	MI038	475	475	475	475	455	20
Kent County Housing Comm	MI198	330	305	330	311	281	24
Lansing HC	MI058	1,700	1,525	1,700	1,555	1,445	80
Lapeer HC	MI100	122	121	121	122	122	0
Lincoln Park HC	MI051	293	261	261	266	291	0
Livonia HC	MI055	803	803	803	803	799	4
Luce County HC	MI132	110	108	110	110	103	6
Madison Heights HC	MI188	237	202	237	206	207	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Manistique HC	MI049	59	59	59	59	59	0
Marquette	MI070	50	48	50	49	48	0
Melvindale HC	MI048	134	114	114	117	131	0
Menominee HC	MI087	61	61	61	61	61	0
Michigan State HA*	MI901	23,590	21,309	23,590	21,731	20,705	604
Montcalm County HC	MI186	318	231	318	235	239	0
Mt. Pleasant HC	MI074	50	46	50	47	46	0
Munising HC	MI094	25	25	25	25	24	1
Muskegon HC	MI066	164	160	160	163	164	0
Muskegon Heights HC	MI031	50	27	27	28	50	0
Plymouth HC	MI045	1,489	1,416	1,489	1,444	1,363	53
Pontiac HC	MI005	768	604	604	616	657	0
Port Huron HC	MI039	522	522	522	522	506	16
Potterville HC	MI167	25	21	21	21	25	0
Reed Ciuty HC	MI020	90	75	90	76	68	6
River Rouge HC	MI008	249	242	249	247	233	9
Rockford HC	MI093	90	77	90	78	74	3
Roseville HC	MI037	309	283	309	289	273	11
Royal Oaks HA	MI165	222	198	222	202	197	1

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Saginaw HC	MI006	1,197	1,001	1,197	1,021	1,047	0
Saint Louis HC	MI061	155	139	155	142	146	0
Sault Ste Marie HC	MI036	50	43	43	44	50	0
Schoolcraft County HC	MI178	35	35	35	35	34	1
Southfield HC	MI097	150	150	150	150	146	4
St. Clair HC	MI052	30	30	30	30	30	0
St. Clair Shores HC	MI059	90	88	90	90	84	4
Sterling Heights	MI157	40	36	40	37	35	1
Taylor HC	MI089	452	418	452	426	437	0
Traverse City HC	MI080	198	176	176	179	198	0
Westland HC*	MI139	1,090	995	1,090	1,015	1,090	0
Wyoming HC	MI115	1,122	1,063	1,122	1,084	1,073	0
Ypsilanti HC	MI026	197	186	197	189	179	7
Total		51,451	45,354	50,083	46,160	45,372	915

*Agency received new "tenant protection" vouchers from HUD in 2005 to replace demolished public housing units or privately-owned units that no longer receive project-based federal housing assistance. Incomplete information was available to estimate the additional funding due these agencies in 2007 to renew these vouchers under each of the approaches. As a result, estimates for these agencies may be too low, and under the House approach may be too low or too high.

**Agency took over administration of additional vouchers from another agency in 2005 or early 2006. Our estimates may not fully account for the effect of the consolidation on the agency's likely funding in 2007.