

Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056

center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

August 24, 2005

ESTIMATED VOUCHER CUTS IN 2006 UNDER HOUSE AND SENATE BILLS

Texas

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, Texas housing agencies would have to cut 2,165 vouchers.
- Under the **Senate bill**, Texas housing agencies would have to cut **743 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.

		Number of Families Assisted	Reductions in Families Assisted at Agencies Facing Cuts			
	Authorized Vouchers	According to Recent Data	House Bill	Senate Bill		
Texas (All Housing Agencies)	140,834	134,765	-2,165	-743		
All Housing Agencies Facing Large Cuts						
Alamo Area Council of Gov'ts	98	98	-6	-2		
Alamo HA	70	70	-4	-1		
Athens HA	199	199	-13	-5		
Balch Springs HA	40	39	-3	-1		
Beckville HA	264	243	-17	-11		
Bexar County HA	1,811	1,720	-254	-66		
Brady HA	85	85	-26	-6		
Brazos Council of Gov'ts	1,901	1,893	-154	-14		
Cisco HA	68	67	-12	0		

	Authorized	Number of Families Assisted According to Recent Data	Reductions in Families Assisted at Agencies Facing Cuts	
	Vouchers		House Bill	Senate Bill
Crystal City HA	215	182	-38	-7
Dallas County HA*	3,678	3,373	-137	-38
Dallas HA	15,975	15,975	-142	-60
Del Rio HA	661	651	-51	-25
Devine HA	50	48	-5	-2
Edinburg HA	870	863	-51	0
El Paso HA	5,122	4,517	-157	-73
Garland	1,463	1,462	-56	-22
Grande Prairie HA	2,281	2,233	-85	-12
Henderson	67	60	-5	-2
Hidalgo County HA	716	688	-52	-10
Hidalgo HA	67	65	-9	-2
Houston HA	14,045	13,951	-121	0
Jacksonville HA	207	203	-13	-1
Jefferson HA	25	21	-1	0
Kenedy	34	34	-3	0
La Feria HA	10	10	-1	0
Lancaster HA	1,073	997	-62	-27
Mathis HA	92	85	-4	0
McKinney HA	345	337	-35	-6
Merkel HA	20	16	-2	0
Midland County HA*	458	419	-23	-9
Navasota HA	51	47	-3	-2
Oden HA	48	46	-5	-2
Palacios HA	57	48	-3	0
Poteet HA	24	24	-2	0
Rockwall HA	36	34	-3	0
San Angelo	783	743	-55	-25
San Benito HA	309	252	-24	-2
San Juan HA	151	147	-25	-9
Sinton HA	61	59	-4	-1
Slaton*	64	58	-7	-3
Smithville HA	45	42	-4	-2
Somervell County Sec. 8 Voucher	60	58	-8	-3
Tarrant County HA*	2,105	1,964	-56	-58
Tulia HA	54	41	-3	-1

	Authorized Vouchers		Reductions in Families Assisted at Agencies Facing Cuts	
			House Bill	Senate Bill
Victoria HA	347	323	-20	-8
Wills Point Sec. 8 Voucher	40	39	-5	-2

*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.

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