

Revised March 15, 2006

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

Minnesota

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 **37 housing agencies in Minnesota** would be forced to cut assistance to **271 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 **25 Minnesota 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
Aitkin County HRA	31	4	31	7	38	123%
Albert Lea HRA	155	13	155	25	180	116%
Austin HRA	177	1	177	18	195	110%
Becker County HA	74	13	74	6	80	108%
Bemidji HRA	183	0	176	-3	173	95%

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
Big Stone County HRA	34	2	34	3	37	109%
Bloomington HRA	525	-9	504	-7	497	95%
Blue Earth County EDA	72	2	72	0	72	100%
Brainerd HRA	320	0	315	-5	310	97%
Cambridge HRA	58	2	56	-1	55	95%
Cass County HRA	137	0	112	-2	110	80%
Chippewa County HRA	95	7	95	3	98	103%
Clay County HRA	360	20	346	-5	341	95%
Clearwater County HA	107	9	107	2	109	102%
Cloquet HA	105	4	105	-1	104	99%
Crookston HRA	188	14	175	-3	172	91%
Dakota County CDA	2,202	36	2,202	62	2,264	103%
Detroit Lakes HRA	167	9	157	-2	155	93%
Douglas County	245	-11	226	-3	223	91%
Duluth HRA	1,428	85	1,428	80	1,508	106%
East Grand Forks Economic HA	311	3	307	-4	303	97%
Fairbault County	93	11	91	-1	90	97%
Fergus Falls HRA	185	1	185	12	197	106%
Grant County HRA	51	3	47	-1	46	90%
Itasca County HRA	204	32	204	0	204	100%
Kandiyohi County HRA	327	2	322	-5	317	97%
Koochiching HRA	128	7	127	-1	126	98%
LeSueur County	158	67	139	-4	135	85%
Mankato EDA	425	35	425	20	445	105%
McLeod County HRA	85	12	85	9	94	111%
Meeker County HRA	69	-7	57	-1	56	81%
Metropolitan Council HRA	5,871	35	5,871	-51	5,820	99%
Minneapolis HA	4,840	20	4,500	-64	4,436	92%
Moorhead HA	95	28	89	-1	88	93%
Mora HRA	81	8	81	2	83	102%
Morrison County HA	131	-2	129	-2	127	97%
Mower County HRA	40	8	40	5	45	113%
New Ulm EDA	124	0	124	0	124	100%
NW MN Multi-County HRA	637	39	637	49	686	108%
Olmsted County HRA	522	19	522	31	553	106%
Otter Tail County HRA	140	1	140	13	153	109%
Owatonna HRA	113	11	113	-1	112	99%
Pipestone HRA	53	4	53	1	54	102%

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
Plymouth HRA	210	-48	151	-2	149	71%
Red Wing HRA	169	12	162	-2	160	95%
Renville County HRA	84	-1	77	-1	76	90%
Rice County HRA	329	7	318	-4	314	95%
Richfield HRA	231	-8	219	-4	215	93%
Scott County HRA	241	12	238	-4	234	97%
South Central MN Multi-County HRA	667	153	667	33	700	105%
South St. Paul HRA	302	8	302	2	304	101%
Southeastern Minnesota Multi-County HRA	370	20	370	5	375	101%
St. Cloud HRA	830	88	797	-11	786	95%
St. Louis Park HA	265	-10	255	-4	251	95%
St. Paul HA	3,911	39	3,856	-56	3,800	97%
Stearns County HRA	251	26	241	-3	238	95%
Stevens County HRA	128	0	128	10	138	108%
Swift County HRA	83	0	80	-1	79	95%
Todd County HA	137	1	128	-2	126	92%
Virginia HRA	505	50	498	-7	491	97%
Wadena HRA	74	-6	67	-1	66	89%
Washington County HRA	90	1	90	26	116	129%
Willmar HRA	50	0	45	-1	44	88%
Winona HRA	142	22	142	8	150	106%
Worthington HA	192	15	192	16	208	108%
Yellow Medicine County HRA	65	3	65	2	67	103%
Minnesota	30,672	922	29,923	179	30,102	98%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.