



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**

### **Utah**

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
UT030	Bear River Regional HA	122	122	122	\$537,831	\$4,596	117	-5	-5
UT006	Beaver HA	19	19	3	\$7,983	\$3,121	3	-16	0
UT016	Carbon County HA	273	273	245	\$857,788	\$3,656	235	-38	-10
UT031	Cedar City HA	139	139	114	\$410,257	\$3,752	109	-30	-5
UT009	Davis County HA	1,036	1,036	1,018	\$5,845,029	\$5,988	976	-60	-42
UT015	Emery County HA	68	68	66	\$262,954	\$4,133	64	-4	-3
UT014*	Grand County HA*	73	73	73	\$249,118	\$3,558	70	-3	-3
UT026	Logan City HA	444	444	330	\$1,309,000	\$4,140	316	-128	-13
UT029	Myton City HA	33	33	32	\$108,551	\$3,483	31	-2	-1
UT002	Ogden HA	822	822	754	\$4,313,557	\$5,964	723	-99	-31
UT007	Provo City HA	883	883	855	\$3,808,004	\$4,645	820	-63	-35
UT028	Roosevelt City HA	91	91	87	\$245,125	\$2,926	84	-7	-4
UT004	Salt Lake City	2,139	2,139	1,958	\$11,643,250	\$6,201	1,878	-261	-80
UT003	Salt Lake County HA	2,129	2,129	2,074	\$13,581,346	\$6,827	1,989	-140	-85
UT021	St. George HA	244	244	242	\$952,973	\$4,100	232	-12	-10
UT020	Tooele County HA	215	215	210	\$977,224	\$4,852	201	-14	-9
UT011	Utah County HA	952	952	950	\$5,131,614	\$5,634	911	-41	-39
UT022	Weber County HA	123	123	117	\$694,018	\$6,184	112	-11	-5
UT025	West Valley City HA	513	513	499	\$2,634,540	\$5,504	479	-34	-20
Total for Utah		10,318	10,318	9,748	\$53,570,162		9,350	-968	-398