



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

Maine

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
ME007	Auburn	590	590	585	\$2,381,399	\$4,244	561	-29	-24
ME030*	Augusta HA*	432	432	432	\$1,469,445	\$3,545	414	-18	-18
ME009	Bangor	431	431	414	\$1,698,420	\$4,277	397	-34	-17
ME023	Bar Harbor HA	127	127	125	\$554,465	\$4,637	120	-7	-5
ME019	Bath HA	126	126	125	\$651,728	\$5,450	120	-6	-5
ME028*	Biddeford HA*	118	118	118	\$546,457	\$4,828	113	-5	-5
ME021	Brewer HA	133	133	127	\$531,416	\$4,363	122	-11	-5
ME006	Brunswick	430	430	402	\$2,141,314	\$5,558	385	-45	-16
ME025	Caribou HA	193	193	191	\$588,994	\$3,221	183	-10	-8
ME031	City of Saco HA	38	38	38	\$213,167	\$5,918	36	-2	-2
ME027	Ellsworth HS	137	137	136	\$613,308	\$4,696	131	-6	-6
ME002	Fort Fairfield HA	132	132	132	\$556,635	\$4,396	127	-5	-5
ME018	HA of the City of Old Town	209	209	209	\$904,118	\$4,517	200	-9	-9
ME005	Lewiston HA	1,238	1,238	1,082	\$4,534,722	\$4,369	1,038	-200	-44
ME901	Maine State HA	3,995	3,991	3,699	\$18,971,357	\$5,348	3,548	-444	-151
ME024	Mount Desert HA	53	53	53	\$244,947	\$4,849	51	-2	-2
ME003	Portland HA	1,724	1,724	1,682	\$12,503,738	\$7,750	1,613	-111	-69
ME004	Preque Isle HA	75	75	74	\$261,415	\$3,683	71	-4	-3
ME011	Sanford HA	593	591	591	\$2,964,653	\$5,228	567	-24	-24
ME020	South Portland	389	389	386	\$2,299,481	\$6,205	371	-18	-16
ME022	Southwest Harbor HA	31	31	31	\$127,452	\$4,286	30	-1	-1
ME032	Topsham HA	23	23	23	\$106,282	\$4,818	22	-1	-1
ME026	Tremont HA	29	29	29	\$136,916	\$4,922	28	-1	-1
ME001	Van Buren HA	101	101	99	\$259,925	\$2,732	95	-6	-4
ME008	Waterville HA	394	394	384	\$1,190,167	\$3,231	368	-26	-16
ME015	Westbrook HA	705	705	681	\$4,329,441	\$6,628	653	-52	-28
Total for Maine		12,446	12,441	11,846	\$60,781,362		11,362	-1,078	-484