



820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002  
Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056 center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

*February 17, 2005*

## **LOCAL EFFECTS OF CUTS IN HOUSING VOUCHER ASSISTANCE IN 2005**

### **Colorado**

The table shows voucher estimates based in part on data that housing agencies reported to HUD covering the period through July 2004. Individual agencies will have more current data they can use to update the estimates. The funding figures in the column “Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD” come directly from HUD data. The estimated annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC) is derived by adjusting the agency’s voucher cost data in mid-2004 by the applicable HUD annual adjustment factor. Agencies’ actual voucher costs in 2005 may be more or less than the estimate.

The column “number of vouchers cut” is the number of vouchers the appropriations act directs HUD to fund — authorized vouchers in use in May – July 2004 plus any additional vouchers issued to replace other federal housing subsidies that need renewal funding in 2005 — that are unfunded due to the appropriations shortfall. If the estimated “number of vouchers cut” is less than the total number of expiring vouchers not funded, it is likely that the agency was not using all its vouchers in mid-2004. The number of vouchers in use in February 2005 that are not funded may be less than the estimates provided if an agency is using fewer vouchers than in mid-2004 or if the agency’s average per unit cost has declined substantially. The number of vouchers in use that are not funded may be more than the estimates provided if the agency’s per unit cost is currently greater than the estimate. For some agencies (marked with an asterisk) our estimates include adjustments made in light of HUD’s final funding figures, and may be more subject to error.

Agencies may be able to remedy a funding shortfall through use of reserve funds (if accessed quickly) or other policy changes, rather than by reducing the number of families receiving voucher assistance.

HUD Code	Housing Agency name	Authorized vouchers in January 2005	Number of expiring vouchers	Expiring vouchers eligible for funding under bill formula	Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD (HAP)	Annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC)	Number of expiring vouchers funded (based on PUC)	Total expiring vouchers not funded	Vouchers cut in 2005
co058	Adams Co. HA	1,330	1,330	1,330	\$10,391,748	\$8,146	1,276	-54	-54
co081	Archuleta Co. HA	59	59	57	\$396,210	\$7,205	55	-4	-2
co050	Arvada HA	508	508	479	\$3,618,538	\$7,877	459	-49	-20
co052	Aurora HA	1,087	1,087	1,087	\$10,069,500	\$9,658	1,043	-44	-44
co016	Boulder	606	606	544	\$3,952,018	\$7,569	522	-84	-22
co061	Boulder Co. HA	641	641	641	\$5,138,216	\$8,357	615	-26	-26
co019	Brighton HA	212	212	211	\$1,412,974	\$6,971	203	-9	-9
co043	Center HA	25	25	19	\$68,490	\$3,693	19	-6	-1
co901	CO Dept. of Human Services	3,054	3,054	2,880	\$15,442,216	\$5,590	2,763	-291	-118
co911	CO Division of Housing	2,494	2,493	2,350	\$16,193,671	\$7,184	2,254	-239	-96
co028	Colorado Springs	2,065	2,047	2,022	\$14,229,481	\$7,336	1,940	-107	-83
co040	Delta HA	226	226	226	\$812,970	\$3,750	217	-9	-9
co001	Denver	5,231	5,226	5,205	\$47,248,938	\$9,465	4,992	-234	-213
co105	El Paso Co. HA	103	103	97	\$587,121	\$6,313	93	-10	-4
co048	Engelwood HA	393	393	378	\$3,305,416	\$9,109	363	-30	-15
co041	Fort Collins HA	744	744	734	\$4,750,700	\$6,745	704	-40	-30
co071	Fountain HA	238	238	225	\$1,454,849	\$6,731	216	-22	-9
co095	Garfield Co. HA	434	403	398	\$1,884,617	\$4,938	382	-21	-16
co051*	Grand Junction HA*	880	880	880	\$4,008,370	\$4,749	844	-36	-36
co035	Greeley	446	446	431	\$2,507,444	\$6,062	414	-32	-18
co072	Jefferson Co.	1,467	1,467	1,402	\$10,823,482	\$8,051	1,344	-123	-57
co031	La Junta HA	102	102	97	\$349,771	\$3,759	93	-9	-4
co049	Lakewood HA	1,251	1,210	1,210	\$10,185,548	\$8,773	1,161	-49	-49
co065	Lamar	107	107	105	\$449,356	\$4,457	101	-6	-4
co103	Larimer Co. HA	100	100	35	\$227,115	\$6,765	34	-66	-1
co024*	Las Animas HA*	124	124	124	\$506,160	\$4,256	119	-5	-5
co036	Littleton HA	288	288	274	\$1,785,849	\$6,803	262	-26	-11
co070	Longmont HA	509	509	499	\$3,719,339	\$7,771	479	-30	-20
co059	Louisville HA	27	27	27	\$193,917	\$7,488	26	-1	-1
co034	Loveland	468	468	437	\$2,737,890	\$6,527	419	-49	-18

co100	Manitou Springs	57	57	56	\$310,608	\$5,817	53	-4	-2
co079	Montezuma Co. HA	262	262	252	\$1,072,692	\$4,438	242	-20	-10
co087*	Montrose Co. HA*	178	178	178	\$787,136	\$4,610	171	-7	-7
co101	Otero Co. HA	46	46	45	\$147,955	\$3,403	43	-3	-2
co002	Pueblo	1,456	1,456	1,403	\$7,386,143	\$5,487	1,346	-110	-57
co045*	Rocky Ford HA*	50	50	50	\$216,287	\$4,510	48	-2	-2
co057	Sheridan HA	177	177	171	\$1,355,470	\$8,288	164	-13	-7
co005	Trinidad HA	83	83	74	\$344,240	\$4,828	71	-12	-3
co090	Weld Co.	427	427	425	\$2,616,449	\$6,420	408	-19	-17
<b>Total for Colorado</b>		<b>27,955</b>	<b>27,859</b>	<b>27,060</b>	<b>\$192,688,894</b>		<b>25,956</b>	<b>-1,903</b>	<b>-1,105</b>