

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 15, 2006

## WINNERS AND LOSERS UNDER ADMINISTRATION'S 2007 HOUSING VOUCHER FUNDING PLAN

## **Massachusetts**

The table below compares estimates of the number of vouchers that would be funded in 2007 under the Administration's budget proposal with the number funded in 2006 and the number in use in 2005. Under the Administration's plan:

• An estimated **62 housing agencies in Massachusetts** would be forced **to cut assistance to 520 low-income** families in 2007, compared to the number they are able to help in 2006.

When the number of vouchers the Administration is proposing to fund in 2007 is compared to the total number Congress has authorized agencies to administer (rather than the number funded in 2006), the shortfalls faced by some agencies are even deeper:

• At **34 Massachusetts housing agencies**, **5 percent or more of the vouchers** Congress authorized the agency to issue to needy families **would be left unused in 2007 because of inadequate funding**..

Because the Administration has proposed a flawed and inequitable formula for distributing voucher funds in 2007, these funding shortfalls would occur at the same time that other agencies would receive more funding than they need to cover vouchers that are funded in 2006. Indeed, if it were distributed more efficiently, the total amount of funding the Administration requested to renew housing vouchers in 2007 likely would be adequate to cover the vouchers that were funded in 2006 at every agency — averting all of the cuts below 2006 levels listed in this table. For further information on the potential cuts and other issues raised by the Administration's budget proposal, see <a href="http://www.cbpp.org/3-13-06hous.htm">http://www.cbpp.org/3-13-06hous.htm</a>.

		Actual 2006 A	ppropriation	2007 Administration Budget Request			
Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>	
Abington	86	4	86	3	89	103%	
Acton HA	155	2	152	-2	150	97%	
Adams HA	95	-5	83	-1	82	86%	
Amesbury HA	62	2	62	1	63	102%	
Amherst	413	0	413	0	413	100%	
Andover	127	3	127	7	134	106%	
Arlington	422	16	420	-6	414	98%	
Athol HA	58	2	58	1	59	102%	
Attleboro	91	-1	85	-1	84	92%	
Auburn HA	25	0	24	-1	23	92%	

		Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request			
Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>	
Avon	102	9	98	-1	97	95%	
Barnstable	271	0	271	16	287	106%	
Bellingham	30	0	29	0	29	97%	
Belmont	47	3	47	2	49	104%	
Beverly HA	320	3	320	-3	317	99%	
Billerica HA	65	0	60	-1	59	91%	
Boston HA	11,372	112	10,972	-156	10,816	95%	
Bourne	76	3	76	-1	75	99%	
Braintree	395	18	395	10	405	103%	
Bridgewater	69	2	62	-1	61	88%	
Brockton	931	148	931	-5	926	99%	
Brookline	619	8	619	0	619	100%	
Burlington	93	4	93	5	98	105%	
Cambridge HA	2,150	-59	2,025	-28	1,997	93%	
Chelmsford HA	358	7	347	-5	342	96%	
Chelsea	459	12	459	9	468	102%	
Chicopee HA	393	4	378	-5	373	95%	
Concord HA	85	2	85	0	85	100%	
Danvers HA	145	1	144	-2	142	98%	
Dartmouth	197	0	180	-4	176	89%	
Dedham HA	460	19	460	5	465	101%	
Dennis	98	1	97	-2	95	97%	
Dept. of Housing & Comm. Dev.	18,618	220	18,618	-21	18,597	100%	
Dracut	68	2	68	0	68	100%	
Duxbury	13	0	12	0	12	92%	
Easton HA	101	0	85	-1	84	83%	
Everett HA	365	7	365	0	365	100%	
Fall River HA	2,431	101	2,242	-31	2,211	91%	
Falmouth	319	9	319	5	324	102%	
Fitchburg	177	17	172	-2	170	96%	
Framingham	787	12	787	10	797	101%	
Franklin County Reg Housing & Redevelopment	579	5	579	42	621	107%	
Gardner HA	102	2	102	0	102	100%	
Gloucester	573	12	573	-4	569	99%	
Greenfield	450	9	450	22	472	105%	
Halifax	14	1	14	0	14	100%	
Hanover	27	-3	21	-1	20	74%	
Hanson HA	25	3	23	0	23	92%	
Haverhill	349	14	347	-5	342	98%	
Hingham	25	0	25	2	27	108%	

		Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>
Holbrook	82	4	82	-1	81	99%
Holden	59	1	59	3	62	105%
Holliston HA	49	1	49	2	51	104%
Holyoke	1,180	35	1,166	-17	1,149	97%
Hudson HA	46	0	46	5	51	111%
Ipswich HA	55	0	48	-1	47	85%
Lawrence HA	930	100	915	-21	894	96%
Leominster HA	273	0	273	10	283	104%
Lexington HA	68	0	68	2	70	103%
Lowell	1,171	-12	1,120	-16	1,104	94%
Lynn HA	1,242	43	1,242	1	1,243	100%
Malden HA	670	43	670	9	679	101%
Mansfield	64	1	64	4	68	106%
Marlborough	135	8	135	1	136	101%
Medford	987	70	909	-13	896	91%
Melrose	240	14	240	-1	239	100%
Merrimac HA	22	0	21	-1	20	91%
Methuen	558	-2	551	-8	543	97%
Middleborough	154	7	154	10	164	106%
Milford	556	12	540	-8	532	96%
Millis HA	21	0	20	0	20	95%
Milton	144	5	144	1	145	101%
Natick HA	102	2	102	3	105	103%
Needham	120	1	118	-2	116	97%
New Bedford	1,595	48	1,595	46	1,641	103%
Newburyport	102	12	99	-1	98	96%
Newton	441	4	441	-4	437	99%
North Adams	313	22	302	-5	297	95%
North Andover	133	8	133	6	139	105%
North Attleboro	104	6	102	-2	100	96%
North Reading	22	0	19	0	19	86%
Northampton	510	-2	439	-8	431	85%
Norwood HA	341	10	337	-4	333	98%
Oxford HA	87	2	87	5	92	106%
Peabody Housing	262	6	262	1	263	100%
Pembroke HA	83	4	83	0	83	100%
Pittsfield	580	90	580	-7	573	99%
Plymouth	363	24	352	-6	346	95%
Quincy	845	-15	827	-12	815	96%
Reading HA	125	7	125	-1	124	99%
Revere	470	23	460	-7	453	96%

		Actual 2006 Appropriation		2007 Administration Budget Request		
Housing Agency	Total Authorized Vouchers <sup>1</sup>	Potential Increase (or Loss) in Vouchers from 2005 Level <sup>2</sup>	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>3</sup>	Change in Vouchers Funded from 2006 Level	Total Vouchers Funded <sup>4</sup>	Percent of Total Authorized Vouchers Funded <sup>5</sup>
Rockland	154	4	154	0	154	100%
Rockport HA	153	6	151	-3	148	97%
Salem HA	865	6	802	-11	791	91%
Salisbury HA	58	-9	46	0	46	79%
Sandwich	28	-1	24	0	24	86%
Saugus	150	14	141	-2	139	93%
Shrewsbury	173	0	173	5	178	103%
Somerville	1,034	12	1,034	6	1,040	101%
Southbridge	125	-1	124	-2	122	98%
Springfield	2,485	-119	2,342	-33	2,309	93%
Stockbridge HA	41	1	41	4	45	110%
Stoughton	48	5	43	-1	42	88%
Stow	23	2	23	0	23	100%
Taunton	734	1	697	-10	687	94%
Tewksbury	110	3	110	1	111	101%
Wakefield HA	331	3	331	-5	326	98%
Walpole HA	95	2	95	5	100	105%
Waltham	450	8	450	21	471	105%
Ware	99	26	84	-1	83	84%
Warren	66	7	66	1	67	102%
Watertown	156	4	156	1	157	101%
Wayland	78	12	78	0	78	100%
Webster	42	1	34	0	34	81%
Wellesley	11	0	11	0	11	100%
West Springfield	251	1	244	-3	241	96%
Westfield	240	0	237	-4	233	97%
Weymouth HA	159	12	158	-2	156	98%
Williamstown	97	2	97	-1	96	99%
Wilmington HA	11	-1	10	0	10	91%
Winchendon	35	2	35	2	37	106%
Winchester	143	6	143	3	146	102%
Woburn	288	8	288	-2	286	99%
Worcester HA	1,798	0	1,798	38	1,836	102%
Yarmouth HA	249	8	243	-4	239	96%
Massachusetts	71,376	1,338	69,902	-184	69,718	98%6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Figures for total authorized vouchers are based on HUD data as of January 2006.

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Compares number of authorized vouchers funded in 2006 (3rd column) with number of vouchers actually used in January – September 2005, based on agency data submitted to HUD. For some agencies, a portion of the increase in

vouchers that can be used in 2006 compared with vouchers leased in 2005 is due to the award of new vouchers during 2005 to replace other federal housing subsidies. These new vouchers were in use in part but not all of 2005.

- <sup>3</sup> Based on CBPP estimates of funding available to each agency. Includes only vouchers funded up to each agency's authorized level, as of January 2006. Assumes each agency's average voucher cost remains level in the last three months of 2005 and increases at the applicable HUD inflation factor beginning January 1, 2006. Figures for some agencies include tenant protection vouchers awarded in 2005 and before; because information released by HUD on tenant protection vouchers is incomplete, the actual number of such vouchers is somewhat uncertain.
- <sup>4</sup> Based on CBPP estimates of funding each agency would receive under the proposed formula and of likely per unit costs in 2007. Does not include renewal of tenant protection vouchers that will be awarded in 2006, as these approximately 26,000 vouchers cannot be allocated to the agency level in advance of award. Our estimates assume that these additional vouchers will be renewed, subject to the same proration as other renewal funding.
- <sup>5</sup> Under HUD's SEMAP performance measurement system, agencies that use fewer than 95 percent of their authorized vouchers are considered deficient performers. These figures compare the funding available in 2007 under the President's request to renew vouchers that were authorized as of January 2006 (listed in the first data column). Under the Administration's proposal and our estimates, vouchers awarded subsequent to January 2006 also would receive renewal funding through calendar year 2007, subject to the same proration as other renewal funding.
- <sup>6</sup> The statewide percentage of authorized vouchers funded compares the total number of vouchers renewed in 2007 to the total number authorized in 2006. If some agencies in the state are funded for more than 100 percent of their authorized vouchers, the statewide percentage understates the share of authorized vouchers left unfunded in particular communities.