

November 1, 2006

HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN ALABAMA UNDER PENDING PROPOSALS

Due largely to the flaws in the formula for distributing “Section 8” housing voucher funding, the share of vouchers in use in Alabama has fallen over the past few years, from 94 percent in 2004 to a projected 87 percent in 2006. In other words, **2,115 vouchers have already been cut** in Alabama over the past two years.

For 2007, Congress will have to choose among three funding approaches that have been put forward. Each provides the same new funding for the program nationally in 2007, but uses a different method for distributing the money among the 2,400 state and local housing agencies. Here is the impact that each of the three formulas would have on Alabama.

- Under the formula in the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (or SEVRA), a bill passed by the House Financial Services Committee on June 14, 2006, ***all vouchers in use in Alabama in 2006 would be funded***. Moreover, agencies in Alabama would receive enough funding to restore many of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **92 percent of Alabama’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the SEVRA formula.
- The formula in the Senate appropriations bill would also renew funding for all vouchers in use in Alabama in 2006. However, it would not provide agencies in Alabama with enough funding to restore a substantial share of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **89 percent of Alabama’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the Senate appropriations formula.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, 30 housing agencies in Alabama would be forced to cut assistance to 414 low-income families in 2007. **91 percent of Alabama’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the House appropriations formula.

For a description of the pending proposals for distribution of renewal funding to state and local agencies and an analysis of their national impact, see "Fixing the Housing Voucher Formula: A No-Cost Way to Strengthen the Section 8 Program," <http://www.cbpp.org/11-1-06hous.htm>. The paper's Technical Appendix explains the sources and methods for the data in this table.

Agency Estimates (next page)

Agency Estimates

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Albertville	al121	376	352	376	359	338	14
Alexander City HA	al174	265	257	265	262	246	10
Anniston HA	al004	246	231	246	235	223	8
Arab HA	al091	69	58	58	59	62	0
Atmore HA	al154	100	100	100	100	100	0
Auburn HA	al050	258	220	220	224	250	0
Bessmer HA	al125	277	265	277	270	274	0
Birmingham District	al001	4,652	4,111	4,652	4,192	3,956	155
Boaz	al075	368	312	312	318	331	0
Columbiana HA	al072	79	68	79	70	70	0
Cordova HA	al055	50	46	50	47	43	3
Cullman HA	al052	183	143	183	146	145	0
Decatur HA*	al048	950	800	950	815	869	0
Dothan HA	al007	615	584	615	596	582	2
Elba HA	al107	119	107	119	109	109	0
Enterprise HA	al115	190	139	139	141	190	0
Eufaula HA* **	al118	428	343	428	350	364	0
Evergreen HA**	al181	160	160	160	160	160	0
Fairfield HA	al010	466	437	466	446	450	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Florence HA	al054	677	677	677	677	677	0
Foley HA	al165	279	242	279	247	239	3
Fort Payne HA	al011	111	102	111	104	98	4
Gordo HA* **	al138	100	100	100	100	100	0
Greater Gadsen HA	al049	112	109	112	111	100	9
Greenville	al155	181	159	159	162	175	0
Guntersville HA	al014	174	148	174	151	142	6
Hamilton	al053	72	70	70	71	72	0
Hartford HA	al103	36	35	36	36	34	1
Huntsville	al047	1,199	1,199	1,199	1,199	1,161	38
Jacksonville HA	al139	162	136	162	139	138	0
Jasper HA	al012	233	220	233	225	219	2
Jefferson Co. HA	al086	1,620	1,566	1,620	1,597	1,505	60
Leeds HA	al069	182	168	182	172	166	2
Lineville HA	al114	55	51	51	52	55	0
Midland city HA	al124	50	48	50	49	49	0
Millport	al095	17	17	17	17	15	2
Mobile County HA	al202	95	83	83	85	95	0
Mobile Housing Board*	al002	3,495	3,230	3,230	3,295	3,495	0
Monroeville HA	al173	46	38	38	39	44	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Montgomery*	al006	2,305	1,434	1,434	1,462	2,022	0
Northport HA	al152	393	393	393	393	393	0
Oneonta HA	al063	50	44	50	45	43	2
Opelika HA	al061	490	443	443	452	486	0
OPP HA	al112	100	75	75	76	94	0
Ozark	al073	434	412	434	421	398	15
Phenix City	al005	772	671	772	685	688	0
Phil Campbell	al090	53	47	53	48	45	2
Piedmont	al110	50	40	50	41	39	2
Prattville City HA	al131	40	32	32	33	37	0
Prichard HA	al169	2,596	2,117	2,117	2,159	2,442	0
Russellville	al060	90	80	90	81	76	3
Samson HA	al128	208	163	163	166	185	0
Scottsboro HA	al099	175	169	175	172	162	7
Selma HA	al008	1,072	923	1,072	942	889	34
Sheffield HA	al068	322	321	322	322	321	0
South Central AL Regional HA	al192	897	683	683	697	811	0
Talladega HA	al105	30	26	30	27	26	1
Tallassee HA	al172	68	55	68	56	50	4
Tarrant AL HA	al013	87	82	82	83	87	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Troy HA	al177	215	140	140	143	158	0
Tuscaloosa HA	al077	1,156	1,095	1,156	1,117	1,077	18
Tuskegee HA	al160	74	69	74	70	66	3
Uniontown HA	al171	50	34	50	35	34	1
Walker County	al129	146	89	89	91	105	0
York HA	al116	100	93	100	95	89	4
Total		30,720	26,861	28,425	27,337	28,164	414

*Agency received new "tenant protection" vouchers from HUD in 2005 to replace demolished public housing units or privately-owned units that no longer receive project-based federal housing assistance. Incomplete information was available to estimate the additional funding due these agencies in 2007 to renew these vouchers under each of the approaches. As a result, estimates for these agencies may be too low, and under the House approach may be too low or too high.

**Agency took over administration of additional vouchers from another agency in 2005 or early 2006. Our estimates may not fully account for the effect of the consolidation on the agency's likely funding in 2007.