



CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

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

Revised March 8, 2005

ESTIMATED VOUCHER FUNDING SHORTFALLS IN 2005, 2006 AND 2010

Michigan

This table displays estimates of cuts in housing voucher assistance under the actual 2005 voucher funding level, the Administration's 2006 budget request, and an estimate of the Administration's budget plan for 2010 based on the limited information available to the public.ⁱ (Please see the endnotes for the methods used to develop these estimates.) The table below can be read as follows:

"In 2005, [housing agency] will receive [2005 funding shortfall] less fundingⁱⁱ than it needs to support its vouchers, causing an estimated [2005 cut in families assisted] low-income families to go without housing assistance.ⁱⁱⁱ Under the Administration's budget for 2006, the funding gap confronting the agency will drop to [2006 funding shortfall], allowing it to restore temporarily [2006 number of cut vouchers restored] of the vouchers that were cut in 2005. But estimates based on available information on the Administration's budget plans through 2010 show the shortfall widening to approximately [2010 funding shortfall], eliminating all of the vouchers restored in 2006 and cutting the number of families assisted by a further [2010 cut in families assisted below 2005 level]."

Housing Agency	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	2005 Actual Funding		2006 Administration Request		2010 Administration Budget Plan (Estimated)	
		Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted	Funding Shortfall	Number of Cut Vouchers Restored	Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted Below 2005 Level
Alma HC	64	-\$8,553	-2	-\$4,670	1	-\$56,475	-11
Ann Arbor HC	1,333	-\$365,219	-48	-\$205,014	22	-\$2,479,450	-239
Baldwin HC	180	-\$26,842	-7	-\$13,391	4	-\$161,954	-32
Baraga HC	25	-\$3,081	-1	-\$1,601	0	-\$19,364	-4
Bath Charter Township HC	25	-\$5,677	-1	-\$2,870	1	-\$34,715	-4
Battle Creek HC	415	-\$64,911	-16	-\$34,577	8	-\$418,179	-74
Benton Township HC	75	-\$13,965	-3	-\$7,228	1	-\$87,414	-13
Beton Harbor HC	128	-\$22,264	-5	-\$11,107	3	-\$134,332	-22
Boyne City HC	64	-\$7,968	-3	-\$3,975	1	-\$48,078	-11
Cadillac HC	25	-\$3,143	-1	-\$1,611	0	-\$19,483	-4
Cheboygan HC	120	-\$18,605	-5	-\$9,282	3	-\$112,255	-21
Clinton Township HC	23	-\$6,298	-1	-\$3,285	0	-\$39,724	-4
Coldwater HC	25	-\$3,132	-1	-\$1,699	0	-\$20,542	-4
Dearborn HC	96	-\$24,292	-4	-\$13,072	2	-\$158,093	-17
Dearborn Heights HC	359	-\$102,503	-14	-\$52,957	7	-\$640,467	-63
Detroit HC	5,635	-\$1,399,963	-216	-\$745,648	104	-\$9,017,910	-1,001

Housing Agency	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	2005 Actual Funding		2006 Administration Request		2010 Administration Budget Plan (Estimated)	
		Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted	Funding Shortfall	Number of Cut Vouchers Restored	Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted Below 2005 Level
Dowagia HC	115	-\$17,227	-4	-\$10,234	2	-\$123,768	-21
Eastpointe HC	131	-\$31,665	-5	-\$15,797	3	-\$191,052	-23
Ewart HC	25	-\$2,535	-1	-\$1,317	0	-\$15,932	-4
Ferndale HC	238	-\$40,738	-7	-\$26,700	3	-\$322,911	-44
Flint HC	963	-\$144,935	-33	-\$86,498	14	-\$1,046,111	-175
Grand Rapids HC	2,690	-\$646,908	-110	-\$322,732	56	-\$3,903,144	-471
Grayling HC	130	-\$14,920	-5	-\$7,443	3	-\$90,021	-23
Greenville HC	107	-\$18,097	-4	-\$9,028	2	-\$109,188	-19
Hancock HC	40	-\$4,015	-1	-\$2,246	1	-\$27,168	-7
Inkster HC	436	-\$85,823	-13	-\$60,158	4	-\$727,561	-81
Ionia HC	20	-\$2,418	-1	-\$1,316	0	-\$15,919	-4
Iron County HC	169	-\$23,660	-7	-\$11,803	4	-\$142,751	-30
Jackson HC	475	-\$91,396	-19	-\$47,462	9	-\$574,003	-84
Kent County Housing Comm	330	-\$87,532	-13	-\$44,846	7	-\$542,372	-58
Lansing HC	1,700	-\$319,572	-64	-\$172,777	30	-\$2,089,571	-303
Lapeer HC	122	-\$12,222	-2	-\$13,366	0	-\$161,648	-24
Lincoln Park HC	293	-\$79,829	-12	-\$40,008	6	-\$483,854	-51
Livonia HC	782	-\$230,843	-31	-\$117,569	16	-\$1,421,882	-138
Luce County HC	110	-\$13,403	-4	-\$6,686	2	-\$80,867	-19
Madison Heights HC	287	-\$60,151	-9	-\$40,139	3	-\$485,441	-53
Manistique HC	59	-\$6,498	-2	-\$3,542	1	-\$42,837	-11
Marquette	50	-\$6,518	-2	-\$3,296	1	-\$39,856	-9
Melvindale HC	134	-\$34,824	-5	-\$20,180	2	-\$244,059	-24
Menominee HC	61	-\$8,534	-2	-\$4,281	1	-\$51,774	-11
Michigan State HA	21,417	-\$4,529,412	-802	-\$2,464,678	377	-\$29,807,963	-3,822
Montcalm County HC	318	-\$40,227	-12	-\$22,366	5	-\$270,495	-57
Mt. Pleasant HC	50	-\$7,734	-2	-\$3,992	1	-\$48,275	-9
Munising HC	25	-\$3,021	-1	-\$1,615	0	-\$19,529	-4
Muskegon HC	164	-\$33,830	-7	-\$16,877	3	-\$204,115	-29
Muskegon Heights HC	50	-\$8,177	-2	-\$4,533	1	-\$54,821	-9
Plymouth HC	1,417	-\$416,288	-58	-\$208,759	29	-\$2,524,747	-248
Pontiac HC	768	-\$214,451	-26	-\$127,481	11	-\$1,541,758	-139
Port Huron HC	522	-\$113,430	-19	-\$63,118	9	-\$763,352	-94
Pottsville HC	25	-\$5,379	-1	-\$2,684	1	-\$32,455	-4
Reed Ciuty HC	90	-\$9,612	-3	-\$5,885	1	-\$71,177	-16
River Rouge HC	249	-\$47,908	-7	-\$33,044	2	-\$399,636	-46
Rockford HC	90	-\$17,393	-4	-\$9,011	2	-\$108,974	-16
Roseville HC	309	-\$69,296	-12	-\$35,568	6	-\$430,166	-54

Housing Agency	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	2005 Actual Funding		2006 Administration Request		2010 Administration Budget Plan (Estimated)	
		Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted	Funding Shortfall	Number of Cut Vouchers Restored	Funding Shortfall	Cut in Families Assisted Below 2005 Level
Royal Oaks HA	222	-\$47,970	-9	-\$24,865	4	-\$300,722	-39
Saginaw HC	1,197	-\$209,268	-47	-\$109,141	23	-\$1,319,955	-212
Saint Louis HC	155	-\$19,223	-6	-\$10,228	3	-\$123,695	-28
Sault Ste Marie HC	50	-\$5,925	-2	-\$3,085	1	-\$37,315	-9
Schoolcraft County HC	35	-\$3,682	-1	-\$1,968	1	-\$23,800	-6
Southfield HC	150	-\$39,248	-6	-\$19,756	3	-\$238,926	-26
St. Clair HC	30	-\$5,548	-1	-\$2,863	1	-\$34,630	-5
St. Clair Shores HC	90	-\$20,345	-4	-\$10,225	2	-\$123,666	-16
Sterling Heights	40	-\$9,363	-1	-\$5,288	1	-\$63,953	-7
Taylor HC	452	-\$111,584	-16	-\$63,961	7	-\$773,548	-82
Traverse City HC	198	-\$40,820	-8	-\$21,529	4	-\$260,367	-35
Westland HC	957	-\$229,466	-39	-\$114,477	20	-\$1,384,492	-168
Wyoming HC	1,122	-\$243,142	-42	-\$133,048	20	-\$1,609,091	-200
Ypsilanti HC	197	-\$61,190	-8	-\$31,486	4	-\$380,793	-35
Michigan	48,448	-\$10,623,611	-1,830	-\$5,732,941	869	-\$69,334,536	-8,630

ⁱ The Administration has released its planned 2010 funding level for a “housing assistance” category that includes the voucher program, public housing and several other programs taken together, but has not released a funding level for the voucher program separately. We have estimated the 2010 voucher funding level by assuming that the Administration plans to cut all housing assistance programs proportionately. It is possible that the Administration actually intends to impose larger cuts in voucher assistance than we estimate and smaller cuts in other programs, or vice versa. See Appendix, “The Basis for the Estimate that the Budget Would Support 370,000 Fewer Vouchers in 2010,” <http://www.cbpp.org/2-18-05hous-app.htm>.

ⁱⁱ We assume that the amount of funding needed to support an agency’s vouchers in 2005 is equal to the agency’s average voucher cost in May -July 2004 plus the applicable HUD inflation adjustment, multiplied by the sum of the number of the agency’s vouchers in use in May -July 2004 and the number of new vouchers requiring funding that were issued to families losing public housing or other types of federal housing assistance. In 2006 and 2010 we assumed the agencies would need funding for approximately the same number of vouchers as in 2005, but that the average cost of these vouchers would rise based on a national average CBO voucher cost inflation estimate.

ⁱⁱⁱ All figures in the table assume that agencies will respond to funding shortfalls by reducing the number of families assisted. Agencies also have some limited flexibility to reduce the level of assistance provided per family, for example by shifting rental burdens onto needy households or reducing the maximum amount of rent a voucher can cover (and therefore limiting the ability of voucher households to live outside high-poverty neighborhoods in areas that may be safer and with better schools and more job opportunities). If agencies took these measures, the reduction in the number of families assisted could be somewhat smaller.