

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510

What is the Impact of Cuts to the Section 8 Housing Voucher Program on New York Families?

The Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 (FY05) budget proposal would cut funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Section 8 Program called the Flexible Voucher Program (FVP) by \$1.6 billion in 2005. Under the proposal these cuts would grow to \$4.6 billion by FY2009, a 30 percent reduction in the program over the next 5 years. These vouchers provide critical assistance to help 53,000 families in upstate New York cover the cost of private rental housing. To pay for these cuts housing authorities will either have to reduce the number of families receiving vouchers or reduce the amount of assistance provided by a voucher, thereby increasing the amount of rent each family has to pay out of pocket.

The following details the county by county impact of these cuts and illustrates how many New York families could lose their homes for FY2005 and for FY2009.

Capital Region: As of July 2003, 8,335 families in the Capital Region received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$4.5 million and as a result 1,011 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$539. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Albany	3326	\$1,854,957	404	\$558
Fulton	383	\$146,297	46	\$382
Montgomery	671	\$322,537	81	\$481
Rensselaer	1106	\$570,988	134	\$516
Saratoga	818	\$458,460	99	\$560
Schenectady	1958	\$1,102,261	238	\$563
Washington	73	\$37,353	9	\$512

Capital Region	8335	\$4,492,853	1011	\$539
-----------------------	-------------	--------------------	-------------	--------------

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in the Capital Region \$12 million and as a result 2,422 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$1,436.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Albany	\$4,943,159	967	\$1,486
Fulton	\$389,858	111	\$1,018
Montgomery	\$859,509	194	\$1,281
Rensselaer	\$1,521,589	323	\$1,376
Saratoga	\$1,221,725	238	\$1,494
Schenectady	\$2,937,345	568	\$1,500
Washington	\$99,540	21	\$1,364
Capital Region	\$11,972,725	2,422	\$1,436

Central New York: As of July 2003, 7,078 families in Central New York received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$3.8 million and as a result 859 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$541. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Cortland	306	\$119,856	37	\$392
Madison	241	\$108,715	29	\$451
Oneida	1666	\$753,986	203	\$453
Onondaga	3812	\$2,282,028	463	\$599
Oswego	1053	\$564,124	127	\$536
Central New York	7078	\$3,828,709	859	\$541

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in Central New York \$10.2 million and as a result 2,058 families could lose their homes or all families could see

their annual rent increase by \$1,441.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Cortland	\$319,396	89	\$1,044
Madison	\$289,708	70	\$1,202
Oneida	\$2,009,251	485	\$1,206
Onondaga	\$6,081,237	1108	\$1,595
Oswego	\$1,503,302	306	\$1,428
Central New York	\$10,202,894	2058	\$1,441

Rochester/Finger Lakes: As of July 2003, 7,984 families in the Rochester/Finger Lakes Area received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$4.4 million and as a result 967 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$551. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Cayuga	157	\$67,106	19	\$427
Monroe	6,510	\$3,579,408	789	\$550
Ontario	400	\$233,016	48	\$583
Tompkins	540	\$338,758	65	\$627
Wayne	377	\$182,643	46	\$484
Rochester/ Finger Lakes	7,984	\$4,400,931	967	\$551

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in the Rochester/Finger Lakes area \$11.7 million and as a result 2,322 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$1,469.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Cayuga	\$178,828	46	\$1,139
Monroe	\$9,538,545	1,893	\$1,465
Ontario	\$620,950	116	\$1,552
Tompkins	\$902,735	157	\$1,672
Wayne	\$486,713	110	\$1,291
Rochester/ Finger Lakes	\$11,727,771	2,322	\$1,469

Hudson Valley: As of July 2003, 13,036 families in the Hudson Valley received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$13.8 million and as a result 1,579 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$1,058. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Columbia	106	\$52,059	13	\$491
Dutchess	983	\$769,830	120	\$783
Orange	1,122	\$848,595	136	\$756
Rockland	2,400	\$3,200,050	291	\$1,333
Sullivan	554	\$314,824	67	\$568
Ulster	559	\$374,331	67	\$670
Westchester	7,312	\$8,231,837	885	\$1,126
Hudson Valley	13,036	\$13,791,526	1579	\$1,058

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in the Hudson Valley \$36.7 million and as a result 3,791 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$2,819.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Columbia	\$138,728	31	\$1,309
Dutchess	\$2,051,472	287	\$2,087
Orange	\$2,261,370	325	\$2,015
Rockland	\$8,527,616	699	\$3,553
Sullivan	\$838,954	161	\$1,514
Ulster	\$997,534	162	\$1,784
Westchester	\$21,936,518	2126	\$3,000
Hudson Valley	\$36,752,192	3791	\$2,819

North Country: As of July 2003, 1,661 families in the North Country received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$685,442 and as a result 201 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$412. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Clinton	191	\$82,953	23	\$434
Essex	180	\$72,590	22	\$403
Franklin	371	\$155,543	45	\$419
Herkimer	326	\$114,339	39	\$351
St. Lawrence	50	\$18,220	6	\$364
Warren	633	\$277,618	77	\$439
North Country	1,661	\$685,422	201	\$412

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in the North Country \$1.8 million and as a result 484 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$1,098.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Clinton	\$221,057	56	\$1,157
Essex	\$193,439	52	\$1,075
Franklin	\$414,496	108	\$1,117
Herkimer	\$304,695	95	\$935
St Lawrence	\$48,554	15	\$971
Warren	\$739,806	184	\$1,169
North Country	\$1,826,590	484	\$1,098

Southern Tier: As of July 2003, 1,878 families in the Southern Tier received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$690,315 and as a result 228 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$368. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Broome	1,039	\$365,639	126	\$352
Chemung	94	\$34,910	11	\$371
Chenango	180	\$83,587	22	\$464
Delaware	351	\$122,677	43	\$350
Otsego	80	\$29,607	10	\$370
Steuben	134	\$53,895	16	\$402
Southern Tier	1,878	\$690,315	228	\$368

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in the Southern Tier \$1.8 million and as a result 547 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$980.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Broome	\$974,367	303	\$938
Chemung	\$93,029	27	\$990
Chenango	\$222,747	52	\$1,237
Delaware	\$326,916	103	\$931
Otsego	\$78,897	23	\$986
Steuben	\$143,622	39	\$1,072
Southern Tier	\$1,839,578	547	\$980

Western New York: As of July 2003, 12,760 families in Western New York received assistance through the voucher program. Under the Administration's FY05 budget proposal, local housing authorities would face cuts of \$6.7 million and as a result 1,546 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$525. *Note: First Chart below shows FY05 impacts; 2nd Chart shows FY09.*

County	Number of Families Receiving Housing Vouchers (July 2003)	Potential Program Cuts Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's FY05 Proposal
Cattaraugus	174	\$63,974	21	\$368
Chautauqua	268	\$108,352	32	\$404
Erie	10,911	\$5,850,635	1322	\$536
Niagara	1,407	\$669,731	171	\$476
Western New York	12,760	\$6,692,692	1546	\$525

By 2009, the Administration's cuts to the program could cost housing authorities in Western New York \$17.8 million and as a result 3,711 families could lose their homes or all families could see their annual rent increase by \$1,398.

County	Potential Program Cuts under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Families Potentially Losing Vouchers Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09	Potential Rent Increase Under the Administration's Proposal by FY09
Cattaraugus	\$170,481	51	\$980
Chautauqua	\$288,742	78	\$1,077
Erie	\$15,590,997	3,173	\$1,429
Niagara	\$1,784,723	409	\$1,268
Western New York	\$17,834,943	3,711	\$1,398

Source: Schumer estimates based on data and analysis from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Center on Budget Policy and Priorities.