

Revised March 13, 2006

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

Indiana

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 **45 housing agencies in Indiana** would be forced to cut assistance to **417 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 **37 Indiana 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 9 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
Anderson HA	1,153	7	1,089	-16	1,073	93%
Bedford HA	161	12	137	-2	135	84%
Bloomfield Housing	50	3	48	0	48	96%
Bloomington HA	1,284	42	1,188	-16	1,172	91%
Brazil HA	115	-17	80	-1	79	69%
Cannelton HA	179	20	163	-3	160	89%
Charleston HA	70	0	66	-1	65	93%

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
Columbus	579	-22	538	-8	530	92%
Crawfordsville	397	0	397	0	397	100%
Decatur	178	10	178	-3	175	98%
Delaware Co. HA	256	8	256	-1	255	100%
East Chicago	636	-30	543	-8	535	84%
Elkhart HA	633	-3	622	-9	613	97%
Elwood HA	301	8	289	-4	285	95%
Evansville HA	1,906	5	1,906	72	1,978	104%
Fayette Co. HA	376	73	376	14	390	104%
Fort Wayne HA	2,870	164	2,748	-38	2,710	94%
Franklin Co. PHA	100	3	85	-1	84	84%
Fulton Co. HA	175	9	165	-3	162	93%
Gary HA	1,408	172	1,371	-25	1,346	96%
Goshen HA	320	0	320	29	349	109%
Greencastle HA	184	3	173	-2	171	93%
Greensburg HA	115	0	105	-1	104	90%
Hammond HA	639	2	630	-9	621	97%
Indiana Family & Soc. Svc. Adm.	4,491	173	3,740	-53	3,687	82%
Indianapolis HA	7,791	151	6,660	-93	6,567	84%
Jasonville HA	50	9	45	-1	44	88%
Jeffersonville	382	-4	366	-5	361	95%
Kendallville HA	15	-2	13	0	13	87%
Knox Co. HA	334	8	334	-1	333	100%
Kokomo	674	-12	575	-8	567	84%
Lafayette HA	1,099	19	1,099	3	1,102	100%
Linton HA	219	-5	189	-3	186	85%
Logansport HA	283	11	267	-4	263	93%
Marion	421	-10	411	-6	405	96%
Marshall Co.	171	0	158	-2	156	91%
Michigan City HA	261	16	261	-4	257	98%
Mishawaka HA	307	-2	293	-4	289	94%
Mt. Vernon	203	27	168	-2	166	82%
Muncie HA	842	53	842	-11	831	99%
New Albany	408	2	408	38	446	109%
New Castle	274	5	263	-4	259	95%
Noblesville HA	185	-3	175	-2	173	94%
Peru HA	212	1	200	-2	198	93%
Portland HA	50	-3	46	0	46	92%

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
Richmond	273	-7	261	-3	258	95%
Rockville HA	133	4	133	1	134	101%
Sellersburg HA	55	1	52	-1	51	93%
Seymour	158	11	154	-2	152	96%
South Bend	2,124	23	1,998	-29	1,969	93%
St. Joseph HA	224	-2	210	-3	207	92%
Sullivan	50	2	47	-1	46	92%
Tell City HA	67	-6	51	0	51	76%
Terre Haute	916	27	864	-14	850	93%
Union City HA	161	41	158	-3	155	96%
Vincennes HA	372	28	352	-5	347	93%
Warsaw HA	175	7	175	7	182	104%
Indiana	37,465	1032	34,441	-253	34,188	91%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.