

Revised March 15, 2006

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

### Alabama

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 **54 housing agencies in Alabama** would be forced to cut assistance to **404 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 **45 Alabama 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>
Albertville	376	-8	355	-6	349	93%
Alexander City HA	265	-8	246	-4	242	91%
Anniston HA	246	-3	239	-3	236	96%

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>
Arab HA	69	5	66	-1	65	94%
Atmore HA	100	3	100	4	104	104%
Auburn HA	258	-3	241	-3	238	92%
Bessmer HA	277	0	266	-4	262	95%
Birmingham District	4,652	593	4,436	-75	4,361	94%
Boaz	368	-29	329	-5	324	88%
Carrollton HA	50	0	46	-1	45	90%
Clayton HA	90	46	77	-4	73	81%
Columbiana HA	79	4	70	-1	69	87%
Cordova HA	50	4	44	0	44	88%
Cullman HA	183	10	165	-3	162	89%
Decatur HA	950	198	920	-19	901	95%
Dothan HA	615	39	600	-8	592	96%
Elba HA	119	1	111	-1	110	92%
Enterprise HA	190	25	182	-3	179	94%
Eufaula HA	428	20	360	-8	352	82%
Evergreen HA	160	8	160	0	160	100%
Fairfield HA	466	26	466	-4	462	99%
Florence HA	677	0	677	5	682	101%
Foley HA	279	5	253	-4	249	89%
Fort Payne HA	111	0	107	-2	105	95%
Gordo HA	100	25	92	-4	88	88%
Greater Gadsen HA	112	7	108	-1	107	96%
Greenville	181	16	181	5	186	103%
Guntersville HA	174	-6	151	-3	148	85%
Hamilton	72	8	72	4	76	106%
Hartford HA	36	-2	33	-1	32	89%
Huntsville	1,199	11	1,185	-16	1,169	97%
Jacksonville HA	162	2	152	-3	149	92%
Jasper HA	233	41	229	-3	226	97%
Jefferson Co. HA	1,620	35	1,546	-22	1,524	94%
Leeds HA	182	-11	161	-2	159	87%
Lineville HA	55	5	53	-1	52	95%
Midland city HA	50	3	50	-1	49	98%
Millport	17	0	17	1	18	106%
Mobile County HA	95	5	93	-1	92	97%
Mobile Housing Board	3,495	406	3,495	46	3,541	101%
Monroeville HA	46	3	46	0	46	100%

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>
Montgomery	2,305	465	1,912	-52	1,860	81%
Northport HA	393	0	393	-5	388	99%
Oneonta HA	50	-1	47	-1	46	92%
Opelika HA	490	23	477	-7	470	96%
OPP HA	100	-2	81	-2	79	79%
Ozark	434	-16	414	-6	408	94%
Phenix City	772	50	709	-10	699	91%
Phil Campbell	53	-4	48	0	48	91%
Piedmont	50	0	41	-1	40	80%
Prattville City HA	40	0	38	-1	37	93%
Prichard HA	2,596	246	2,490	-34	2,456	95%
Russellville	90	-5	85	-1	84	93%
Samson HA	208	3	178	-3	175	84%
Scottsboro HA	175	-3	161	-2	159	91%
Selma HA	1,072	0	900	-19	881	82%
Sheffield HA	322	6	322	1	323	100%
South Central AL Regional HA	897	3	789	-11	778	87%
Talladega HA	30	-2	25	0	25	83%
Tallassee HA	68	4	57	-1	56	82%
Tarrant AL HA	87	2	87	0	87	100%
Troy HA	215	-13	162	-2	160	74%
Tuscaloosa HA	1,156	43	1,131	-22	1,109	96%
Tuskegee HA	74	-2	66	-1	65	88%
Uniontown HA	50	1	41	-1	40	80%
Walker County	146	25	140	-3	137	94%
York HA	100	5	99	-2	97	97%
<b>Alabama</b>	<b>30,860</b>	<b>2312</b>	<b>29,073</b>	<b>-338</b>	<b>28,735</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.