

Revised March 15, 2006

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

### Texas

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 **115 housing agencies in Texas** would be forced to **cut assistance to 1,094 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 **97 Texas 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 3 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>
Abilene HA	1,013	132	1,013	81	1,094	108%
Alamo Area Council of Gov'ts	98	4	98	0	98	100%
Alamo HA	70	4	70	-1	69	99%
Alice Sec. 8 Voucher	154	0	154	0	154	100%
Alpine	123	39	118	-2	116	94%
Alto HA	45	2	45	-1	44	98%
Amarillo	1,329	115	1,281	-18	1,263	95%
Anderson County HA	393	99	393	6	399	102%

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>
Anthony Sec. 8 Voucher	453	6	453	88	541	119%
Aransas Pass HA	211	1	208	-3	205	97%
Ark-Tex Council of Gov'ts	1,585	106	1,585	16	1,601	101%
Arlington HA	3,300	0	3,300	371	3,671	111%
Asherton HA	32	-2	28	0	28	88%
Athens HA	199	1	199	1	200	101%
Austin HA	4,964	-24	4,932	-69	4,863	98%
Baird HA	85	6	84	-1	83	98%
Balch Springs HA	40	-1	39	-1	38	95%
Bastrop HA	22	-2	20	0	20	91%
Bay City Sec. 8 Voucher	247	20	247	11	258	104%
Baytown	727	113	727	-1	726	100%
Bea HA	1,876	39	1,737	-25	1,712	91%
Beckville HA	331	87	318	-8	310	94%
Beeville	346	33	322	-5	317	92%
Bexar County HA	1,811	109	1,595	-25	1,570	87%
Big Spring HA	366	27	366	8	374	102%
Boerne	101	-3	98	-2	96	95%
Brady HA	85	-6	71	-1	70	82%
Brazos Council of Gov'ts	1,901	29	1,756	-26	1,730	91%
Breckenridge Sec. 8 Vouchers	95	6	95	1	96	101%
Brenham	82	-12	61	-1	60	73%
Brownsille HA	1,851	113	1,851	15	1,866	101%
Brownwood HA	501	31	467	-9	458	91%
Burkburnett	16	0	15	-1	14	88%
Burnet Sec. 8 Voucher HA	100	-5	89	-1	88	88%
Cameron County HA	1,006	75	1,006	-4	1,002	100%
Cameron HA	141	7	141	-1	140	99%
Carrizo Springs	149	-9	124	-1	123	83%
Central Texas Council of Gov'ts	3,109	136	2,627	-37	2,590	83%
Cisco HA	68	5	59	-1	58	85%
Cleburne HA	355	15	322	-4	318	90%
Commerce	175	24	175	1	176	101%
Corpus Christi HA	1,157	92	1,130	-15	1,115	96%
Corsicana HA	188	11	149	-2	147	78%
Cotulla HA	47	4	47	-1	46	98%
Crystal City HA	215	-22	137	-2	135	63%
Cuero	69	5	69	2	71	103%
Dallas County HA	3,678	55	3,421	-49	3,372	92%

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>
Dallas HA	15,975	361	15,975	34	16,009	100%
Deep East Texas Council of Gov'ts	1,700	64	1,610	-22	1,588	93%
DeKalb Secton 8 Voucher	66	-2	60	-1	59	89%
Del Rio HA	661	25	641	-9	632	96%
Denton HA	1,358	5	1,358	-5	1,353	100%
Devine HA	50	2	43	0	43	86%
Dilley HA	34	-3	30	-1	29	85%
Donna HA	276	4	252	-4	248	90%
Duval County	117	0	94	-1	93	79%
Eagle Pass	485	27	482	-6	476	98%
Edcouch HA	54	-1	44	0	44	81%
Edgewood Sec. 8 Voucher	34	5	34	4	38	112%
Edinburg HA	870	21	843	-12	831	96%
Edna HA	132	1	128	-2	126	95%
El Paso County HA	125	-11	111	-2	109	87%
El Paso HA	5,297	434	4,914	-75	4,839	91%
Electra HA	12	1	12	0	12	100%
Elgin	85	2	81	-1	80	94%
Elsa HA	132	14	131	-1	130	98%
Falfurrias HA	182	28	174	-3	171	94%
Floresville	32	2	32	4	36	113%
Floydada	140	10	140	12	152	109%
Forth Worth	4,693	128	4,693	177	4,870	104%
Gainesville HA	415	35	415	34	449	108%
Galveston HA	1,213	2	1,162	-17	1,145	94%
Garland	1,463	-48	1,386	-20	1,366	93%
Georgetown HA	87	4	87	2	89	102%
Gonzales HA	42	9	39	-1	38	90%
Grande Prairie HA	2,281	73	2,281	57	2,338	102%
Grapevine HA	81	2	81	4	85	105%
Grayson County HA	326	-8	281	-4	277	85%
Greenville Sec. 8 Voucher HA	605	-16	558	-7	551	91%
Gregory HA	39	19	39	-1	38	97%
Hale County HA	380	22	351	-5	346	91%
Hallettsville	25	-3	18	0	18	72%
Harlingen HA	698	46	681	-9	672	96%
Harris County HA	1,840	31	1,840	16	1,856	101%
Haskell HA	37	-2	29	0	29	78%
Henderson	67	-12	49	0	49	73%

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>
Hidalgo County HA	716	-37	637	-9	628	88%
Hidalgo HA	67	-1	60	-1	59	88%
Houston HA	14,045	151	13,626	-189	13,437	96%
Jacksonville HA	207	-13	177	-2	175	85%
Jefferson HA	25	0	21	0	21	84%
Jim Hogg County HA	75	6	66	-1	65	87%
Kenedy	34	1	34	-1	33	97%
Kermit HA	62	7	62	3	65	105%
Killeen	80	5	78	-1	77	96%
Kingsville HA	472	0	465	-7	458	97%
Kyle HA	10	1	10	2	12	120%
La Feria HA	10	2	10	0	10	100%
La Grange HA	91	2	82	-1	81	89%
La Joya HA	128	-5	123	-2	121	95%
LaMarque	58	10	57	0	57	98%
Lamesa Housing Project	113	-2	104	-1	103	91%
Lancaster HA	1,073	13	970	-14	956	89%
Laredo HA	1,197	36	1,197	-9	1,188	99%
Liberty County	271	0	249	-5	244	90%
Livingston HA	86	3	86	0	86	100%
Longview Sec. 8 Voucher	674	0	674	49	723	107%
Los Fresnos HA	102	0	102	5	107	105%
Lubbock HA	852	35	770	-11	759	89%
Marble Falls HA	126	4	107	-1	106	84%
Marfa HA	19	4	19	0	19	100%
Marshall	602	73	571	-10	561	93%
Mathis HA	92	17	90	-2	88	96%
McAllen HA	1,032	44	956	-13	943	91%
McKinney HA	345	2	319	-5	314	91%
Mercedes HA	260	28	237	-4	233	90%
Merkel HA	20	-1	15	0	15	75%
Mesquite HA	1,359	94	1,291	-18	1,273	94%
Midland County HA	458	36	455	-7	448	98%
Mineral Wells HA	235	26	235	2	237	101%
Mission HA	727	-60	620	-10	610	84%
Monahans HA	44	7	40	0	40	91%
Montgomery County HA	321	47	321	-1	320	100%
Nacogdoches HA	961	28	961	-6	955	99%
Navasota HA	51	-8	35	0	35	69%

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>
New Braunfels	292	0	292	-8	284	97%
Nixon HA	13	-1	12	-1	11	85%
Oden HA	48	5	47	-1	46	96%
Odessa	1,024	48	999	-13	986	96%
Orange HA	805	16	805	13	818	102%
Palacios HA	57	-2	41	-1	40	70%
Panhandle Community Services	1,910	224	1,842	-26	1,816	95%
Paris HA	181	6	180	-2	178	98%
Pasadena	1,056	2	1,056	2	1,058	100%
Pearsall	118	8	118	0	118	100%
Pharr HA Voucher	628	-12	584	-9	575	92%
Pittsburgh HA	25	3	25	0	25	100%
Plano HA	742	5	732	-10	722	97%
Pleasanton	108	4	95	-2	93	86%
Port Arthur HA	1,968	2	1,810	-26	1,784	91%
Port Isabel HA	44	0	44	0	44	100%
Port Lavaca	83	0	76	-1	75	90%
Poteet HA	24	2	24	0	24	100%
Poth HA	14	1	13	0	13	93%
Quanah Sec. 8 Voucher	110	1	110	4	114	104%
Ralls HA	45	1	44	-1	43	96%
Robstown HA	177	4	177	2	179	101%
Rockwall HA	36	2	36	1	37	103%
Roma HA	104	5	104	2	106	102%
Rosenberg HA	340	1	340	28	368	108%
Round Rock HA	76	8	76	2	78	103%
Rusk HA	175	3	169	-3	166	95%
San Angelo	783	-16	673	-9	664	85%
San Antonio	11,421	143	11,421	267	11,688	102%
San Benito HA	309	-7	254	-4	250	81%
San Juan HA	151	-17	122	-1	121	80%
San Marcos	206	8	206	0	206	100%
Schertz HA	148	-5	138	-2	136	92%
Seguin	286	0	286	3	289	101%
Sinton HA	61	2	58	-1	57	93%
Slaton	64	-2	53	0	53	83%
Smithville HA	45	-3	42	-1	41	91%
Somervell County Sec. 8 Voucher	60	8	55	-1	54	90%
South Plains Regional HA	484	-19	392	-6	386	80%

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>
Stamford HA	47	5	47	4	51	109%
Starr County HA	180	13	180	3	183	102%
Stockton PHA	104	5	104	-1	103	99%
Tarrant County HA	2,041	45	1,787	-25	1,762	86%
Tatum HA	63	9	59	0	59	94%
Taylor	78	0	78	10	88	113%
Terrell HA	458	-1	441	-8	433	95%
Texarkana	392	60	373	-6	367	94%
Texas City HA	313	35	303	-4	299	96%
Texas Dept. of Housing	1,540	195	1,540	287	1,827	119%
Texoma Council Gov'ts	591	0	516	-7	509	86%
Travis County HA	564	-22	498	-10	488	87%
Tulia HA	54	4	37	-1	36	67%
Tyler HA	908	0	908	44	952	105%
Uvalde HA	217	5	203	-3	200	92%
Victoria HA	347	9	305	-4	301	87%
Waco HA	2,070	-88	1,856	-26	1,830	88%
Walker County HA	251	10	251	15	266	106%
Weatherford HA	517	14	498	-7	491	95%
Weslaco HA	328	1	315	-5	310	95%
Wichita Falls HA Program	989	107	989	131	1,120	113%
Willacy County HA	57	4	57	3	60	105%
Wills Point Sec. 8 Voucher	40	-3	35	0	35	88%
Yoakum	16	1	14	0	14	88%
Zapata County HA	118	2	118	3	121	103%
<b>Texas</b>	<b>140,622</b>	<b>4129</b>	<b>135,416</b>	<b>736</b>	<b>136,152</b>	<b>97%<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.