

Revised March 15, 2006

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

### Missouri

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 **36 housing agencies in Missouri** would be forced to **cut assistance to 320 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 **32 Missouri 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 4 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>
ABCD Sec. 8 Voucher	227	28	216	-3	213	94%
Ava Vouchers	30	0	29	-1	28	93%
Boone County PHA	401	30	396	-6	390	97%
Brookfield Sec. 8 Voucher	55	14	51	-1	50	91%
Cabool Sec. 8 Voucher	46	-7	27	0	27	59%
Carrollton HA	86	17	79	-1	78	91%

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>
Chillicothe HA	89	2	85	-1	84	94%
Columbia HA	1,062	9	1,001	-14	987	93%
Dallas County PHA	572	5	553	-8	545	95%
East Prairie Sec. 8 Voucher	98	2	98	3	101	103%
Excelsior Springs	166	18	159	-3	156	94%
Franklin County PHA	1,030	-26	951	-13	938	91%
Fulton Missouri	110	7	84	-2	82	75%
Grundy County HA	627	-53	551	-8	543	87%
Hannibal Sec. 8 Voucher	168	-1	163	-3	160	95%
Houston HA	83	2	70	-1	69	83%
Howell County PHA	457	69	457	33	490	107%
Independence HA	1,655	694	1,655	92	1,747	106%
Jasper County PHA	342	36	342	1	343	100%
Jefferson HA	231	29	212	-3	209	90%
Joplin Sec. 8 Voucher	497	4	481	-7	474	95%
Kansas City HA	7,510	303	7,510	-19	7,491	100%
Kirksville Sec. 8 Voucher	200	8	200	14	214	107%
Lafayette County HA	418	-22	362	-5	357	85%
Lee's Summit HA	433	27	406	-6	400	92%
Liberty Missouri HA	343	18	343	10	353	103%
Lincoln County PHA	2,745	186	2,745	222	2,967	108%
Macon Voucher	45	6	45	1	46	102%
Marshall HA	103	3	103	7	110	107%
Maryville HA	88	2	88	8	96	109%
Mexico HA	194	62	186	-5	181	93%
Mtn. Grove Vouchers	227	14	200	-3	197	87%
Nevada HA	88	-2	73	-1	72	82%
New Madrid County HA	50	3	50	11	61	122%
Nodaway HA	187	22	162	-2	160	86%
Oran Sec. 8 Voucher	49	3	49	4	53	108%
Phelps County PHA	756	55	747	-11	736	97%
Pulaski County PHA	394	45	394	0	394	100%
Ray County HA	102	24	97	-1	96	94%
Richmond HA	129	25	112	-2	110	85%
Ripley County PHA	356	-1	331	-4	327	92%
Rolla Sec. 8 Voucher	160	7	158	-2	156	98%
Scotland County PHA	329	4	329	12	341	104%
Sedalia HA	70	-3	63	-1	62	89%

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>
Sikeston HA	496	-31	378	-5	373	75%
Springfield HA	740	-29	711	-10	701	95%
St. Charles Sec. 8 Voucher	265	22	265	9	274	103%
St. Clair County PHA	1,190	81	1,190	0	1,190	100%
St. Francois County PHA	1,923	255	1,801	-26	1,775	92%
St. Joseph Sec. 8 Voucher	864	77	864	24	888	103%
St. Louis County HA	6,237	25	6,237	-60	6,177	99%
St. Louis HA	6,063	-28	5,036	-78	4,958	82%
Vandalia HA	30	1	30	0	30	100%
Warrensburg HA	151	16	151	0	151	100%
West Plains Sec. 8 Voucher	205	7	190	-3	187	91%
Weston HA	82	-4	75	-1	74	90%
<b>Missouri</b>	<b>41,254</b>	<b>2060</b>	<b>39,341</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>39,472</b>	<b>96%<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.