

August 24, 2005

ESTIMATED VOUCHER CUTS IN 2006 UNDER HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

New Hampshire

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 housing agencies in the state that would face cuts. The key statewide findings are:

- Under the **House bill**, New Hampshire housing agencies would have to cut **35 vouchers**.
- Under the **Senate bill**, New Hampshire housing agencies would have to cut **17 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
New Hampshire (All Housing Agencies)	9,076	8,775	-35	-17
Housing Agencies Facing Cuts				
Berlin HA	285	285	-4	0
Keene HA**	359	359	-8	-3
Lancaster	68	62	0	-1
Manchester HRA	1,813	1,771	-6	-6
Nashua HA	758	740	-3	-3
Newmarket	72	67	-2	0
Portsmouth HA	406	405	-1	0
Rochester HA	182	181	-2	-1
Somersworth HA	183	176	-10	-2

** 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>.