

Revised March 15, 2006

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

California

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 **68 housing agencies in California** would be forced to cut assistance to **1,631 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 **36 California 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.**

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
Alameda City	1,675	120	1,675	62	1,737	104%
Alameda Co.	5,456	-242	5,186	-73	5,113	94%
Anaheim HA	6,108	554	6,108	-62	6,046	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
Baldwin Park	882	28	691	-10	681	77%
Benicia HA	372	7	372	2	374	101%
Berkeley HA	1,841	48	1,793	-25	1,768	96%
Burbank	1,014	13	1,007	-14	993	98%
Butte Co.	1,864	184	1,849	-26	1,823	98%
Calexico	244	21	244	-3	241	99%
California Dept. of Housing and Community Development	47	1	43	0	43	91%
California Dept. of Housing and Community Development	738	43	738	-4	734	99%
Carlsbad Housing Agency	703	-22	619	-9	610	87%
Community Development Commission	1,044	-36	990	-14	976	93%
Compton HA	803	23	803	121	924	115%
Consolidated Area HA of Sutter Co.	803	113	803	129	932	116%
Contra Costa Co.	6,781	-23	6,400	-102	6,298	93%
Crescent City HA	590	-13	545	-9	536	91%
Culver City	384	18	300	-5	295	77%
El Dorado Co. Dept. of Community Services	374	-13	344	-5	339	91%
Encinitas	136	6	136	2	138	101%
Fairfield HA	851	35	851	12	863	101%
Fresno Co.	5,587	130	5,587	89	5,676	102%
Fresno, City	6,244	0	6,244	285	6,529	105%
Garden Grove	2,337	53	2,337	-15	2,322	99%
Glendale	1,592	28	1,586	-23	1,563	98%
Hawaiian Gardens HA	132	16	117	-2	115	87%
Hawthorne	684	-68	612	-9	603	88%
Hollister	319	23	319	13	332	104%
Humboldt Co. HA	1,222	-102	1,050	-14	1,036	85%
Imperial Valley HA	1,577	76	1,577	84	1,661	105%
Inglewood HA	1,002	-101	879	-12	867	87%
Kern Co.	3,282	201	3,236	-49	3,187	97%
Kings Co. HA	688	38	688	2	690	100%
Lake Co. Housing Commission	224	7	224	7	231	103%
Lakewood HA	215	0	195	-3	192	89%
Lassen Co.	113	-7	92	-2	90	80%
Lawndale HA	212	-21	188	-3	185	87%
Livermore	719	8	719	-3	716	100%
Lomita HA	86	-6	58	0	58	67%

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
Long Beach HA	6,244	103	6,244	227	6,471	104%
Los Angeles Co. HA	20,485	694	20,485	1,257	21,742	106%
Los Angeles, City	44,449	566	44,449	609	45,058	101%
Madera	725	30	714	-10	704	97%
Marin HA	2,109	27	2,055	-29	2,026	96%
Mariposa Co.	165	7	138	-2	136	82%
Mendocino Co. CDC	925	38	804	-12	792	86%
Merced	2,705	101	2,705	-23	2,682	99%
Monterey Co.	3,818	67	3,736	-53	3,683	96%
Napa HA	1,188	41	1,188	-4	1,184	100%
Needles	20	0	19	-1	18	90%
Nevada Co. HA	294	-18	247	-4	243	83%
Norwalk HA	705	17	705	-6	699	99%
Oakland HA	10,774	79	10,362	-144	10,218	95%
Oceanside CDC	1,313	93	1,308	-19	1,289	98%
Orange Co.	9,619	24	9,578	-139	9,439	98%
Oxnard HA	1,649	26	1,649	16	1,665	101%
Paramount HA	203	0	203	-2	201	99%
Pasadena CDC	1,315	51	1,315	-9	1,306	99%
Pico Rivera Housing Assistance Agency	517	42	504	-8	496	96%
Pittsburg	948	19	948	5	953	101%
Placer Co. HA	276	19	255	-4	251	91%
Plumas Co. CDC	335	15	329	-4	325	97%
Pomona	894	5	869	-12	857	96%
Port Hueneme	279	13	263	-4	259	93%
Redding	1,504	96	1,429	-20	1,409	94%
Redondo Beach HA	593	23	563	-8	555	94%
Richmond HA	1,750	104	1,677	-23	1,654	95%
Riverside Co.	8,361	435	8,353	-129	8,224	98%
Roseville HA	562	15	522	-7	515	92%
Sacramento County	11,217	335	11,217	809	12,026	107%
San Bernardino Co.	8,244	107	8,244	86	8,330	101%
San Buenaventura	1,189	50	1,189	13	1,202	101%
San Diego Co.	10,404	253	10,404	897	11,301	109%
San Diego Housing Commission	12,184	318	12,184	452	12,636	104%
San Francisco HA	7,409	114	7,309	-104	7,205	97%
San Joaquin Co.	4,871	407	4,871	304	5,175	106%
San Jose	6,429	33	6,429	24	6,453	100%

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
San Juan Bautista	25	13	25	1	26	104%
San Luis Obispo	1,825	24	1,787	-25	1,762	97%
San Mateo Co.	4,023	-147	3,861	-54	3,807	95%
Santa Ana	2,558	66	2,558	-2	2,556	100%
Santa Barbara City HA	1,955	42	1,921	-32	1,889	97%
Santa Barbara Co.	3,396	55	3,383	-47	3,336	98%
Santa Clara Co.	9,465	30	9,465	71	9,536	101%
Santa Cruz Co.	3,636	-78	3,557	-49	3,508	96%
Santa Fe Springs HA	224	-15	182	-2	180	80%
Santa Monica sec. 8 voucher	1,092	14	1,092	-7	1,085	99%
Santa Paula	577	2	575	-8	567	98%
Santa Rosa HA	1,391	0	1,391	103	1,494	107%
Shasta Co. HA	644	108	644	18	662	103%
Solano Co. HA	250	0	228	-3	225	90%
Sonoma Co. CDC	2,722	42	2,705	-38	2,667	98%
South Gate HA	654	26	582	-8	574	88%
Stanislaus Co.	3,995	63	3,995	215	4,210	105%
Suisun City HA	318	0	318	25	343	108%
Tehama Co.	144	1	139	-2	137	95%
Torrance	690	37	667	-9	658	95%
Tulare Co. HA	2,825	9	2,825	183	3,008	106%
Upland HA	624	20	624	3	627	100%
Vacaville HA	1,143	33	1,063	-15	1,048	92%
Vallejo	2,266	74	2,266	108	2,374	105%
Ventura Co.	2,532	88	2,463	-36	2,427	96%
West Hollywood HA	97	1	97	2	99	102%
Yolo Co. HA	1,466	88	1,329	-18	1,311	89%
Yuba Co. HA	449	106	449	6	455	101%
California	296,602	6,191	292,859	4,611	297,470	100%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.