

August 24, 2005

ESTIMATED VOUCHER CUTS IN 2006 UNDER HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

California

The table below displays estimates of cuts in housing voucher assistance that would occur under the 2006 HUD funding bills passed by the U.S. House of Representatives and by the Senate Appropriations Committee. It includes estimates for the state as a whole and for the hardest hit housing agencies in the state (those that would need to cut assistance for at least 50 families or 5 percent of their total). The key statewide findings are:

- Under the **House bill**, California housing agencies would have to cut **1,591 vouchers**.
- Under the **Senate bill**, California housing agencies would have to cut **598 vouchers**.

The cuts would occur at the same time that other agencies would receive more funding than they need to cover vouchers now being used. Indeed, because of a flawed formula the House bill would provide many agencies with more funding than they need to cover all of the vouchers they are legally permitted to issue. Because of this waste, the House bill imposes larger cuts even though it provides more funding for voucher renewals than the Senate bill. If the Senate bill were funded at the same level as the House bill, the voucher cuts would be significantly less than the estimates shown here.

For further information on the potential cuts and other issues raised by the House and Senate bills, see <http://www.cbpp.org/8-24-05hous.htm>.

	Authorized Vouchers	Number of Families Assisted According to Recent Data	Reductions in Families Assisted at Agencies Facing Cuts	
			House Bill	Senate Bill
California (All Housing Agencies)	295,469	289,580	-1,591	-598
Housing Agencies Facing Large Cuts				
Carlsbad Housing Agency	703	646	-83	-25
Contra Costa Co.	6,781	6,781	-237	-59
Hawaiian Gardens HA*	139	97	0	-7
Hawthorne	684	684	-73	0
Humboldt Co. HA	1,222	1,172	-54	-9
Inglewood HA	1,002	1,002	-64	-11
Lassen Co.	113	104	-6	-3
Lomita HA	86	60	-3	-1
Merced	2,705	2,575	-54	0

	Authorized Vouchers	Number of Families Assisted According to Recent Data	Reductions in Families Assisted at Agencies Facing Cuts	
			House Bill	Senate Bill
Oakland HA**	10,155	10,155	-216	-94
Richmond HA	1,750	1,631	-90	-31
San Juan Bautista	25	24	-3	-2
San Mateo Co.	4,023	4,023	-209	-59
Santa Barbara City HA	1,855	1,851	-53	-26
Santa Cruz Co.	3,811	3,716	-73	-30
Solano Co. HA	250	243	-28	-6
Tulare Co. HA**	2,809	2,800	-60	-26

*It appears from the available HUD data that these agencies may have received a significant number of new vouchers in 2004. Such agencies may be eligible for additional funds under the House and Senate bills, but HUD has not released sufficient data to accurately assess the number of new vouchers at each agency or the size of the adjustment it could receive. As a result, there is a higher risk for these agencies than for other agencies that the estimated cuts under either or both bills are inaccurate.

** These agencies receive funding under special agreements resulting from their participation in the Moving-to-Work (MTW) demonstration. Data on the number of vouchers in use at these agencies usually have not been used to determine their funding levels and some of the agencies are permitted by their MTW agreements to use voucher funds for purposes other than voucher subsidies, so voucher utilization data for these agencies are often unavailable or unreliable as indicators of the number of families receiving assistance under their voucher programs. In the table entries for these agencies, the number of vouchers in use according to recent data reflects the number of vouchers for which we estimate they would be eligible to receive renewal funding in 2006 if Congress fully funds the voucher program as a whole.

Note on Estimates: Estimates are calculated from projections of average voucher costs and the number of authorized vouchers that will actually be in use in 2006 based on data through January 2005. Estimates of cuts in assistance reflect reductions below the average number of authorized vouchers in use from May 2004-January 2005, the most recent 9 months for which data are available. In some cases, housing agencies could respond to funding reductions by cutting assistance through steps other than reducing the number of families assisted, but these steps would also harm low-income families. For example, agencies could reduce the amount of rent a voucher can cover, but this would make it more difficult for families to rent apartments outside the lowest-rent neighborhoods — which often have high crime, poor schools, and few jobs.

For additional information on the assumptions used in making these estimates, see the technical appendix available on the internet at <http://www.cbpp.org/8-24-05hous.htm>. State and local housing agencies may have more recent data, which could be used to make estimates that would more accurately reflect recent conditions in the area. A calculator that would allow local agencies to make estimates based on these data is also available at <http://www.cbpp.org/8-24-05hous.htm>.