

## March 3, 2011

## Estimated Public Housing Capital Fund Cuts in California Under House GOP Bill

The 2011 funding proposal (H.R. 1) that the House of Representatives passed on February 19 would reduce public housing capital funding by nearly \$1.1 billion, or 43 percent, compared to the 2010 level. This cut would prevent local housing agencies from carrying out needed repairs to public housing developments, such as replacing boilers or fixing roofs. As a result, it would:

- Cause living conditions to deteriorate for over one million vulnerable families that live in public housing;
- Eliminate or prevent creation of jobs in the hard-hit residential construction sector;
- Increase future federal costs by deferring improvements that would reduce energy consumption or avoid more expensive damage down the road (for example, by patching a leaky roof);
- Risk creating blight that would lower property values in surrounding neighborhoods; and
- Permit some developments to deteriorate to the point where they must be demolished, squandering decades of federal and local investment and eliminating badly needed affordable housing.

In California, 27 percent of households in public housing are elderly and 18 percent are disabled.\* The House plan would cut \$42.9 million from housing agencies across California, as shown below.

Housing Agency	Number of Public Housing Units	Estimated Capital Fund Cut Under H.R. 1
Alameda City	0**	\$97,000
Alameda Co.	230	\$163,000
Baldwin Park	12	\$7,000
Benicia HA	75	\$53,000
Berkeley HA	61	\$58,000
Butte Co.	345	\$308,000
Calexico	268	\$243,000

Housing Agency	Number of Public Housing Units	Estimated Capital Fund Cut Under H.R. 1
City of South San Francisco		
HA	80	\$63,000
City of Wasco HA	25	\$17,000
Consolidated Area Sutter	20	\$17,000
Co.	203	\$136,000
Contra Costa Co.	1,158	\$1,029,000
Dublin HA	150	\$128,000
Eureka HA	196	\$158,000
Fresno Co.	963	\$1,036,000
Fresno, City	730	\$859,000
Imperial Valley HA	511	\$531,000
Kern Co.	895	\$755,000
Kings Co. HA	268	\$318,000
Livermore	125	\$98,000
Lomita HA	78	\$45,000
Los Angeles Co. HA	2,962	\$2,651,000
Los Angeles, City	6,837	\$9,114,000
Madera	244	\$183,000
Marin HA	491	\$519,000
Mendocino Co. CDC	138	\$99,000
Merced	454	\$418,000
Monterey Co.	594	\$578,000
Needles	52	\$36,000
Oakland HA	1,577	\$3,934,000
Oxnard HA	779	\$884,000
Paso Robles	148	\$97,000
Pleasanton	50	\$25,000
Plumas Co. CDC	96	\$76,000
Port Hueneme	90	\$53,000
Richmond HA	678	\$500,000
Riverbank	90	\$56,000
Riverside Co.	474	\$344,000
Sacramento City	1,840	\$1,644,000
Sacramento Co	1,040	\$859,000
San Bernardino Co.	1,363	\$1,929,000
San Buenaventura	716	\$579,000
San Diego Co.	121	\$78,000
San Diego Hsg. Comm.	36	\$898,000
San Francisco HA	6,163	\$6,303,000
San Joaquin Co.	1,068	\$1,098,000
San Luis Obispo	168	\$125,000
San Mateo Co.	179	\$133,000
Santa Barbara City HA	491	\$396,000
Santa Barbara Co.	524	\$493,000
Santa Clara Co.	20	\$395,000
Santa Cruz Co.	234	\$195,000

Housing Agency	Number of Public Housing Units	Estimated Capital Fund Cut Under H.R. 1
Stanislaus Co.	647	\$627,000
Tulare Co HA	710	\$699,000
Upland HA	97	\$71,000
Ventura Co.	351	\$219,000
Yolo Co. HA	431	\$453,000

\* HUD defines a household as "elderly" if the head or spouse of the head is 62 or older, and as "disabled" if the head or spouse of the head has a disability. The percentage of disabled households shown here includes only non-elderly disabled households. Data exclude most households assisted by the 33 agencies participating in the Moving-to-Work demonstration.

\*\* Agencies shown as administering zero public housing units have demolished or otherwise taken out of use all of their public housing developments and receive capital funds to develop replacement housing.

Note: Estimated cuts are relative to the 2010 funding level, and assume that agencies will be eligible for the same percentage share of capital funds in 2011 as they were in 2010. Unit counts show the total number of public housing units administered by the agency according to the most recent publicly available HUD data. A small portion of the units in these data (likely less than 5 percent nationally) are in the process of being demolished, sold, or otherwise taken out of use as public housing.