



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

National Summary of State Totals

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 agencies in x state] will receive [2005 funding shortfall] less fundingⁱⁱ than they need to support their 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 state's voucher programs will drop to [2006 funding shortfall], allowing them 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]."

State	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
Alaska	4,081	-\$1,057,611	-161	-\$546,340	80	-\$6,607,474	-720
Alabama	29,621	-\$5,129,323	-1,162	-\$2,651,328	574	-\$32,065,323	-5,234
Arkansas	22,546	-\$3,372,708	-887	-\$1,746,436	440	-\$21,121,507	-3,981
Arizona	20,393	-\$5,319,090	-803	-\$2,743,449	399	-\$33,179,444	-3,600
California	300,836	-\$108,039,101	-12,027	-\$55,023,224	6,060	-\$665,454,248	-52,925
Colorado	27,955	-\$8,202,393	-1,105	-\$4,215,725	550	-\$50,985,241	-4,931
Connecticut	34,598	-\$10,932,528	-1,341	-\$5,739,379	655	-\$69,412,408	-6,129
Washington, DC	10,978	-\$4,334,725	-418	-\$2,316,604	201	-\$28,017,147	-1,952
Delaware	4,444	-\$1,183,430	-172	-\$620,410	84	-\$7,503,272	-788
Florida	89,806	-\$24,310,416	-3,522	-\$12,601,556	1,741	-\$152,403,989	-15,867
Georgia	49,430	-\$13,726,938	-1,932	-\$7,135,917	952	-\$86,302,220	-8,740
Guam	2,515	-\$1,250,719	-98	-\$652,956	48	-\$7,896,896	-445
Hawaii	12,029	-\$3,170,865	-430	-\$1,812,266	191	-\$21,917,652	-2,167

State	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
Iowa	21,511	-\$3,231,468	-849	-\$1,664,952	422	-\$20,136,032	-3,796
Idaho	6,463	-\$1,175,630	-258	-\$600,108	129	-\$7,257,739	-1,138
Illinois	89,363	-\$28,225,801	-3,415	-\$15,036,313	1,643	-\$181,850,090	-15,879
Indiana	37,321	-\$7,250,851	-1,427	-\$3,870,075	687	-\$46,804,920	-6,631
Kansas	11,221	-\$1,983,631	-434	-\$1,044,042	211	-\$12,626,708	-1,989
Kentucky	31,542	-\$5,501,155	-1,253	-\$2,813,764	628	-\$34,029,833	-5,557
Louisiana	38,694	-\$7,366,358	-1,508	-\$3,842,026	741	-\$46,465,702	-6,846
Massachusetts	71,441	-\$28,575,476	-2,833	-\$14,636,092	1,416	-\$177,009,797	-12,592
Maryland	43,748	-\$12,557,094	-1,551	-\$7,162,101	684	-\$86,618,894	-7,894
Maine	12,446	-\$2,587,342	-484	-\$1,354,572	237	-\$16,382,278	-2,204
Michigan	48,448	-\$10,623,611	-1,830	-\$5,732,941	869	-\$69,334,536	-8,630
Minnesota	30,668	-\$8,013,748	-1,198	-\$4,209,282	590	-\$50,907,317	-5,423
Missouri	40,137	-\$7,878,501	-1,583	-\$4,064,094	787	-\$49,151,401	-7,083
Mississippi	18,340	-\$3,273,954	-726	-\$1,690,412	362	-\$20,443,953	-3,234
Montana	5,624	-\$1,014,302	-227	-\$512,314	115	-\$6,195,960	-987
North Carolina	55,606	-\$11,532,570	-2,199	-\$5,926,721	1,096	-\$71,678,125	-9,807
North Dakota	7,429	-\$1,044,208	-295	-\$536,201	147	-\$6,484,843	-1,309
No. Marianas	234	-\$87,624	-10	-\$43,714	5	-\$528,685	-41
Nebraska	11,509	-\$2,179,960	-455	-\$1,120,774	227	-\$13,554,705	-2,030
New Hampshire	9,002	-\$2,579,353	-361	-\$1,310,455	183	-\$15,848,725	-1,582
New Jersey	65,064	-\$21,581,048	-2,547	-\$11,223,795	1,257	-\$135,741,266	-11,501
New Mexico	13,736	-\$2,569,777	-540	-\$1,326,585	268	-\$16,043,796	-2,425
Nevada	12,100	-\$3,536,369	-478	-\$1,820,496	238	-\$22,017,186	-2,134
New York	206,323	-\$63,117,192	-8,228	-\$32,197,048	4,136	-\$389,393,083	-36,318
Ohio	87,491	-\$18,535,416	-3,420	-\$9,632,414	1,685	-\$116,495,008	-15,470
Oklahoma	22,792	-\$4,533,470	-891	-\$2,356,773	439	-\$28,502,961	-4,030
Oregon	31,533	-\$6,854,989	-1,247	-\$3,521,190	622	-\$42,585,489	-5,561
Pennsylvania	82,644	-\$17,615,055	-3,230	-\$9,147,331	1,591	-\$110,628,379	-14,614
Rhode Island	9,537	-\$2,264,348	-356	-\$1,238,595	167	-\$14,979,649	-1,703
Puerto Rico	30,718	-\$5,918,575	-1,194	-\$3,105,882	585	-\$37,562,722	-5,438
South Carolina	24,012	-\$4,480,854	-936	-\$2,347,139	460	-\$28,386,448	-4,249
South Dakota	5,733	-\$936,980	-226	-\$481,412	113	-\$5,822,228	-1,011
Tennessee	31,075	-\$6,236,261	-1,225	-\$3,216,997	609	-\$38,906,565	-5,484
Texas	141,405	-\$34,676,130	-5,545	-\$17,901,121	2,740	-\$216,497,258	-24,986
Utah	10,318	-\$2,280,377	-398	-\$1,199,700	193	-\$14,509,242	-1,830
Virginia	44,355	-\$11,533,117	-1,735	-\$6,003,147	855	-\$72,602,432	-7,842
Virgin Islands	1,029	-\$290,404	-41	-\$149,179	20	-\$1,804,183	-181

State	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
Vermont	5,679	-\$1,309,027	-228	-\$663,063	115	-\$8,019,126	-998
Washington	45,179	-\$12,090,883	-1,792	-\$6,224,365	895	-\$75,277,847	-7,963
Wisconsin	28,073	-\$5,090,588	-1,116	-\$2,607,025	559	-\$31,529,521	-4,945
West Virginia	14,801	-\$2,155,402	-577	-\$1,125,171	283	-\$13,607,892	-2,619
Wyoming	2,148	-\$361,077	-82	-\$193,824	39	-\$2,344,117	-382
TOTALS	2,115,723	-564,679,822	-82,985	-292,658,795	41,022	-3,539,433,460	-373,813

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.