

*April 2004*

## **THOUSANDS OF CALIFORNIA'S LOW-INCOME FAMILIES WOULD LOSE HOUSING ASSISTANCE UNDER THE BUSH BUDGET PLAN**

### **KEY FINDINGS**

President Bush's proposed budget cuts to housing could force thousands of low-income California families into overcrowded or substandard housing, or, even worse, onto the streets.

- Under the President's proposal, over 35,000 low-income families in California could lose their federal housing assistance in 2005, rising to nearly 86,000 by 2009.
- Alternatively, California housing agencies could raise recipients' annual share of rental costs by more than \$1,000 by 2005, and by nearly \$2,700 by 2009.

President Bush's proposed cuts threaten the core intent of the federal housing assistance program, which is to help needy families and individuals find safe, decent housing.

- The President's budget for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005 proposes dramatic cuts of more than \$1 billion to Section 8, the nation's principal low-income housing assistance program, with further reductions in subsequent years.
- The Section 8 program enables over two million low-income working families, elderly individuals, and people with disabilities to afford modest rental units in the private housing market.

The Administration's proposal includes no mechanism to adjust annual funding to reflect changing rental costs.

- The Administration proposes to restructure the Section 8 program into a block grant to local housing agencies, arguing that a block grant would provide local housing agencies the flexibility to absorb large cuts through increasing efficiencies.
- The block grant, however, would not account for changing costs, such as the rapidly increasing rents in certain housing markets, such as California's.

Section 8 program costs are not out of control.

- Congressional Budget Office projections show that if sufficient funding is provided in 2005 to keep pace with increases in rental costs, program spending will increase by only 0.1 percent after adjusting for inflation.

## INTRODUCTION

President Bush's new budget for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005 proposes dramatic cuts in federal housing assistance to states and localities. The proposed budget would cut funding for Section 8 housing vouchers in FFY 2005 by more than \$1 billion below the FFY 2004 level, with further reductions in subsequent years. It would also replace the current housing voucher program with a block grant to local housing agencies. This proposal could cause 250,000 low-income families nationwide, 35,000 of them in California, to lose their federal housing assistance in FFY 2005; over the next five years, 600,000 families, nearly 86,000 of them in California, could lose their assistance.

## WHY IS THE HOUSING VOUCHER PROGRAM BEING CUT?

The Bush Administration argues that changes are needed to control program costs for Section 8. Section 8 program costs have risen somewhat rapidly in recent years due to certain cost pressures; many of these pressures, however, now appear to be easing. For example, the economic downturn, which appears to be improving, has depressed the incomes of low-income families, thereby increasing the average rent subsidies that program recipients receive. Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections show that if sufficient funding is provided in FFY 2005 to keep pace with increases in rental costs, and the current program structure is maintained, program spending will increase by only 1.8 percent in FFY 2005 – just 0.1 percent after adjusting for inflation.

## HOW WOULD THE BUSH BUDGET PROPOSAL AFFECT STATE AND LOCAL HOUSING AGENCIES?

Under current law, each housing agency receives annual federal funding based on the estimated cost of its vouchers in use, plus its administrative costs. However, if the Section 8 program were converted to a

### What Is the Housing Voucher Program?<sup>1</sup>

The Housing Choice Voucher Program, commonly referred to as "Section 8" after the section of the US Housing Act that authorized it, was established in 1974 during the Nixon Administration. Section 8 is the principal federal low-income housing assistance program, and is administered by state, local, and regional housing agencies. The program enables more than two million low-income households, most of them low-income working families, elderly individuals, or people with disabilities, to afford modest rental units in the private housing market.

The Section 8 program requires agencies to ensure that 75 percent of households admitted to the program each year have incomes at or below 30 percent of the area median income:

- Nationally, 30 percent of the median family income is \$17,250;
- In California, 30 percent of the median family income is \$18,750; and
- The 2003 federal poverty threshold for a family of four is \$18,660.<sup>2</sup>

Nationally, only about one out of four households that are eligible for vouchers receive them; many areas have long waiting lists for vouchers, and numerous housing agencies have closed their waiting lists because the backlog has grown unmanageable.<sup>3</sup>

The Section 8 program requires a family to contribute 30 percent of its income toward rent and utilities. The voucher, up to a specified limit that is set by the housing agency, pays the remaining share of costs. Housing agencies are required, in most cases, to set the limit within 10 percent of the area's Fair Market Rent (FMR).<sup>4</sup> For example, the FMR for a two-bedroom apartment in Los Angeles is \$1,021; therefore, the highest a Los Angeles housing agency could set the maximum limit would be \$1,123. Vouchers can also be used to help families with mortgage payments, and up to 20 percent of an agency's vouchers can be used for construction or rehabilitation of low-income housing.

block grant, Congress would appropriate a funding level for the program each year. The result would disadvantage states such as California, since individual state allotments would not be adjusted to reflect disproportionate increases in housing costs. According to the Administration, converting the program to a block grant would provide housing agencies with the flexibility to absorb large funding reductions through increased efficiency. Critics argue, however, that the proposed cuts will force state and local housing agencies to choose among several options that would all negatively affect low-income families:<sup>5</sup>

- ***Reducing the number of families assisted.*** In order to accommodate the proposed cuts solely by reducing assistance to families, roughly 250,000 low-income families across the US would have to be removed from the rolls in FFY 2005, rising to roughly 600,000 families by FFY 2009. This would force many families to shift scarce resources from other essentials, such as food and child care, to pay the rent. Even worse, many families would likely end up in overcrowded or substandard housing, homeless shelters, or on the street.
- ***Cutting costs by shifting the rental burden to low-income families.*** Alternatively, housing agencies could require families who receive vouchers to pay a higher percentage of their income in rent, or reduce the maximum amount of rent the voucher can cover. Nationally, raising the required contribution would increase the rent burden of families in the program by an average of \$850 per year in FFY 2005, rising to \$2,000 per year by FFY 2009. Reducing the amount of rent the voucher will cover would make fewer housing units accessible to families with vouchers, with the likely result of concentrating families with vouchers in poor areas – exactly what the program was originally designed to avoid.
- ***Cutting costs by shifting housing assistance to higher-income families.*** A third option for state and local housing agencies under the proposed plan would be to shift assistance to higher-income families, who require a smaller subsidy than lower-income families. The proposal to convert the program to a block grant would repeal the existing requirement to ensure that 75 percent of households admitted to the program have incomes at or below 30 percent of area median income. Agencies could therefore not only sharply reduce the number of poor families they serve, but could actually stop admitting low-income families to the program altogether in favor of higher-income families. Although the core intent of the program is to help needy families find decent housing, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has proposed this option as a potential “efficiency” to help cut program costs.

## HOW WOULD THE BUSH PROPOSAL AFFECT CALIFORNIA?

California housing agencies currently administer a total of 294,708 vouchers throughout the state. Under the Bush proposal, this number could be reduced by more than 35,000 in FFY 2005, and by more than 85,000 by FFY 2009. Alternatively, California housing agencies could raise recipients’ share of rental costs by more than \$1,000 in FFY 2005, and by nearly \$2,700 by FFY 2009.<sup>6</sup>

***Cutting families from the rolls.*** If California received a proportional share of the cuts and California housing agencies chose to implement the cuts solely by dropping families from program, 35,721 fewer California families would receive vouchers in FFY 2005. State, local, and regional housing agencies would each have to cut the number of families receiving vouchers by about 12 percent. Given the current distribution of vouchers, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) estimates that housing agencies across the state would have to remove hundreds of families from the program (Table 1). Under the Bush proposal, housing agencies would have to implement further cuts by FFY 2009, equivalent to a 29 percent reduction in families receiving assistance from each housing authority (85,737 families).

**Table 1: Impact of the Bush Budget Plan: Taking Away Housing Vouchers from Families**

Housing Authority or Agency	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009
Anaheim Housing Authority	747	1,794
Housing Authority of County of Butte	224	537
Housing Authority of City of Fresno	752	1,806
Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles	5,336	12,806
Housing Authority of County of Riverside	979	2,351
Housing Authority of City of Sacramento	671	1,610
City of San Diego Housing Commission	1,459	3,501
San Francisco Housing Authority	876	2,103
Housing Authority of City of San Jose	779	1,870
Housing Authority of County of Stanislaus	483	1,159

Source: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

**Increasing recipients' share of costs.** Alternatively, if housing agencies chose to raise the amounts that households must pay, the average recipient in California would be paying approximately \$1,054 more per year beginning in FFY 2005, and approximately \$2,693 more per year by FFY 2009. Annual rent increases would vary by community (Table 2).

**Table 2: Impact of the Bush Budget Plan: Increasing Recipients' Share of Housing Costs**

	Increase in Annual Rent in 2005	Increase in Annual Rent by 2009
Anaheim Housing Authority	\$1,027	\$1,671
Housing Authority of County of Butte	\$542	\$1,409
Housing Authority of City of Fresno	\$591	\$1,538
Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles	\$933	\$2,427
Housing Authority of County of Riverside	\$746	\$1,942
Housing Authority of City of Sacramento	\$902	\$2,346
City of San Diego Housing Commission	\$1,029	\$2,676
San Francisco Housing Authority	\$2,066	\$5,375
Housing Authority of City of San Jose	\$1,843	\$4,794
Housing Authority of County of Stanislaus	\$654	\$1,701

Source: Center on Budget and Policy Priorities

## NEXT STEPS

The FFY 2005 budget, which would go into effect October 1, 2004 if approved on time, is currently being considered by Congress. In a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee hearing on April 1, Senators Christopher Bond (R-MO) and Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), the Chair and Ranking Member, respectively, expressed numerous concerns over the proposed HUD budget. Regarding the voucher program proposal in particular, Senator Bond criticized HUD for including significant policy changes in an appropriations bill rather than allowing them to be fully considered in policy hearings, and both Senators expressed concerns that the proposal did not include sufficient funding and requirements to assist the nation's neediest families.<sup>7</sup>

## NOTES

This *Brief* is based on a recent report by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP).<sup>8</sup> For more details on the impact of the housing voucher proposal, please see the following:

- For a list of the impact of the Bush budget cuts by state – including the reduction in voucher subsidy funding by agency – as well as the methodology used by the CBPP to determine these impacts – visit the CBPP website at <http://www.cbpp.org/pubs/housing.htm>.
- For a list of the impact of the Bush budget cuts on California by county, see Appendix A of this report. To see the full list of housing agencies organized by county, see Appendix B of this report.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *Introduction to the Housing Voucher Program* (May 15, 2003) and Barbara Sard and Will Fischer, *Administration Seeks Deep Cuts in Housing Vouchers and Conversion of Program to a Block Grant* (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Revised March 24, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> 2004 median family incomes from US Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Estimated Median Family Incomes for FY 2004* (Notice PDR-2004-01, Issued January 28, 2004), downloaded from <http://www.huduser.org/intercep.asp?loc=/Datasets/IL/IL04/HUD-Medians.pdf> on April 9, 2004. 2003 Federal poverty threshold from US Census Bureau, *Poverty 2003*, downloaded from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty/threshld.html> on April 16, 2004.

<sup>3</sup> For more information on California waiting lists, see California Budget Project, *Locked Out!: California's Affordable Housing Crisis* (May 2000), pp. 43-44.

<sup>4</sup> The US Department of Housing and Urban Development sets FMRs for metropolitan areas each year based on the 40<sup>th</sup> or 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of area market rents; the FMR is considered to be the amount needed to rent a modest housing unit. For current California FMRs, see California Budget Project, *Locked Out 2004: California's Affordable Housing Crisis* (January 2004).

<sup>5</sup> Barbara Sard and Will Fischer, *Administration Seeks Deep Cuts in Housing Vouchers and Conversion of Program to a Block Grant* (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Revised March 24, 2004).

<sup>6</sup> Current voucher estimate is through July 2003, the most recent data available. Estimates assume that cuts would be spread proportionately across all housing agencies; the Administration's proposal does not specify how the cuts would be allocated. Barbara Sard and Will Fischer, *Sources and Methods Used to Estimate Impact of Housing Voucher Proposals in Administration's Fiscal Year 2005 Budget* (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Revised March 24, 2004).

<sup>7</sup> National Low Income Housing Coalition, *Memo to Members* (Volume 9, Issue No. 13: April 2, 2004).

<sup>8</sup> Barbara Sard and Will Fischer, *Administration Seeks Deep Cuts in Housing Vouchers and Conversion of Program to a Block Grant* (Center on Budget and Policy Priorities: Revised March 24, 2004).

---

*Erin Riches prepared this Budget Brief. The California Budget Project (CBP) was founded in 1994 to provide Californians with a source of timely, objective, and accessible expertise on state fiscal and economic policy issues. The CBP engages in independent fiscal and policy analysis and public education with the goal of improving public policies affecting the economic and social well-being of low- and middle-income Californians. Support for the California Budget Project comes from grants, publications, and individual donations. Please visit the CBP's web site at [www.cbpp.org](http://www.cbpp.org).*

---

**Appendix A  
President Bush's Proposed Cuts in Federal Housing Assistance  
Would Affect Thousands of California Families**

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003</b>	<b>Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal</b>	<b>OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens**</b>	<b>Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal</b>	<b>OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens**</b>
Alameda	20,395	2,471	\$1,550	5,933	\$4,031
Butte	1,846	224	\$542	537	\$1,409
Contra Costa	9,385	1,138	\$1,393	2,730	\$3,625
Del Norte	590	72	\$500	172	\$1,301
El Dorado	374	45	\$734	109	\$1,910
Fresno	11,764	1,425	\$596	3,422	\$1,551
Humboldt	1,222	148	\$547	356	\$1,422
Imperial	1,835	223	\$494	534	\$1,286
Kern	3,228	391	\$485	939	\$1,261
Kings	688	83	\$527	200	\$1,372
Lake	224	27	\$544	65	\$1,414
Lassen	113	14	\$442	33	\$1,149
Los Angeles	84,451	10,235	\$940	24,568	\$2,446
Madera	725	88	\$576	211	\$1,499
Marin	2,109	256	\$1,533	614	\$3,987
Mariposa	165	20	\$472	48	\$1,228
Mendocino	895	108	\$648	260	\$1,686
Merced	2,705	328	\$664	787	\$1,727
Monterey	3,770	457	\$863	1,097	\$2,246
Napa	1,204	146	\$872	350	\$2,269
Nevada	294	36	\$522	86	\$1,358
Orange	20,577	2,494	\$1,064	5,986	\$2,768
Placer	838	101	\$667	243	\$1,735
Plumas	335	41	\$528	97	\$1,374
Riverside	8,081	979	\$746	2,351	\$1,942
Sacramento	10,903	1,322	\$933	3,172	\$2,425
San Benito	344	42	\$1,025	100	\$2,667
San Bernardino	8,948	1,085	\$717	2,604	\$1,864
San Diego	25,626	3,106	\$1,001	7,456	\$2,604
San Francisco	7,229	876	\$2,066	2,103	\$5,375
San Joaquin	4,817	584	\$721	1,401	\$1,874
San Luis Obispo	1,825	221	\$898	531	\$2,337
San Mateo	4,023	488	\$1,843	1,170	\$4,794
Santa Barbara	5,351	649	\$1,074	1,557	\$2,792
Santa Clara	15,956	1,934	\$1,843	4,641	\$4,795
Santa Cruz	3,811	462	\$1,338	1,109	\$3,481
Shasta	2,132	258	\$461	620	\$1,198
Solano	5,200	631	\$1,189	1,513	\$3,092
Sonoma	4,089	496	\$996	1,190	\$2,593
Stanislaus	3,984	483	\$654	1,159	\$1,701
Sutter	803	97	\$549	234	\$1,427
Tehama	144	17	\$372	42	\$968
Tulare	2,813	341	\$694	818	\$1,806
Ventura	6,213	753	\$998	1,808	\$2,597
Yolo	1,466	178	\$574	426	\$1,492
Yuba	449	54	\$441	131	\$1,147
Balance of State*	769	94	\$524	224	\$1,362
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>294,708</b>	<b>35,721</b>	<b>\$1,054</b>	<b>85,737</b>	<b>\$2,693</b>

\*The state administers the housing voucher program in some small counties.

\*\*Estimated annual rent increases for counties are weighted averages of annual rent increases within each county.

Source: CBP analysis of Center on Budget and Policy Priorities data

**Appendix B: California Impact of the Bush Budget Proposal by Housing Agency**

<b>Housing Authority (HA) or Agency</b>	<b>Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003</b>	<b>Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal</b>	<b>Share of total vouchers</b>	<b>OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*</b>	<b>Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal</b>	<b>OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*</b>	<b>Share of total vouchers</b>
<b>Alameda County</b>	<b>20,395</b>	<b>2,471</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,550</b>	<b>5,933</b>	<b>\$4,031</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of Alameda County	5,456	661	12.1%	\$1,563	1,587	\$4,066	29.1%
HA City of Alameda	1,625	197	12.1%	\$1,392	473	\$3,621	29.1%
Berkeley HA	1,841	223	12.1%	\$1,545	536	\$4,019	29.1%
HA of City of Livermore	719	87	12.1%	\$1,332	209	\$3,465	29.1%
Oakland HA	10,754	1,303	12.1%	\$1,582	3,128	\$4,116	29.1%
<b>Butte County</b>	<b>1,846</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$542</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>\$1,409</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Butte	1,846	224	12.1%	\$542	537	\$1,409	29.1%
<b>Contra Costa County</b>	<b>9,385</b>	<b>1,138</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,393</b>	<b>2,730</b>	<b>\$3,625</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Contra Costa	6,687	811	12.1%	\$1,403	1,945	\$3,650	29.1%
City of Pittsburg HA	948	115	12.1%	\$1,430	276	\$3,719	29.1%
Richmond HA	1,750	212	12.1%	\$1,336	509	\$3,476	29.1%
<b>Del Norte County</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$500</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>\$1,301</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
Crescent City HA	590	72	12.2%	\$500	172	\$1,301	29.2%
<b>El Dorado County</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>\$734</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>\$1,910</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
El Dorado County Dept. of Community Svcs.	374	45	12.0%	\$734	109	\$1,910	29.1%
<b>Fresno County</b>	<b>11,764</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$596</b>	<b>3,422</b>	<b>\$1,551</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Fresno	5,556	673	12.1%	\$602	1,616	\$1,566	29.1%
HA of City of Fresno	6,208	752	12.1%	\$591	1,806	\$1,538	29.1%
<b>Humboldt County</b>	<b>1,222</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$547</b>	<b>356</b>	<b>\$1,422</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Humboldt County HA	567	69	12.2%	\$552	165	\$1,436	29.1%
City of Eureka HA	655	79	12.1%	\$542	191	\$1,409	29.2%
<b>Imperial County</b>	<b>1,835</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$494</b>	<b>534</b>	<b>\$1,286</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA City of Calexico	244	30	12.3%	\$548	71	\$1,426	29.1%
Imperial Valley HA (Brawley, Imperial, etc.)	1,591	193	12.1%	\$486	463	\$1,265	29.1%
<b>Kern County</b>	<b>3,228</b>	<b>391</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$485</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>\$1,261</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Kern	3,228	391	12.1%	\$485	939	\$1,261	29.1%
<b>Kings County</b>	<b>688</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$527</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>\$1,372</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Kings County HA	688	83	12.1%	\$527	200	\$1,372	29.1%
<b>Lake County</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$544</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>\$1,414</b>	<b>29.0%</b>
Lake County Housing Commission	224	27	12.1%	\$544	65	\$1,414	29.0%
<b>Lassen County</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12.4%</b>	<b>\$442</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>\$1,149</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
HA of County of Lassen	113	14	12.4%	\$442	33	\$1,149	29.2%

Housing Authority (HA) or Agency	Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal	Share of total vouchers	OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal	OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Share of total vouchers
<b>Los Angeles County</b>	<b>84,451</b>	<b>10,235</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$940</b>	<b>24,568</b>	<b>\$2,446</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Los Angeles County HA	20,275	2,457	12.1%	\$977	5,898	\$2,542	29.1%
HA City of Baldwin Park	882	107	12.1%	\$877	257	\$2,282	29.1%
Burbank HA	1,014	123	12.1%	\$802	295	\$2,087	29.1%
City of Compton HA	803	97	12.1%	\$854	234	\$2,222	29.1%
Culver City HA	384	47	12.2%	\$870	112	\$2,263	29.2%
HA City of Glendale	1,584	192	12.1%	\$818	461	\$2,128	29.1%
City of Hawaiian Gardens HA	132	16	12.1%	\$766	38	\$1,993	28.8%
HA City of Hawthorne	684	83	12.1%	\$868	199	\$2,257	29.1%
Inglewood HA	1,002	121	12.1%	\$898	291	\$2,336	29.0%
Lakewood HA	215	26	12.1%	\$875	63	\$2,276	29.3%
Lawndale HA	212	26	12.3%	\$934	62	\$2,431	29.2%
Lomita HA	86	10	11.6%	\$845	25	\$2,198	29.1%
Long Beach HA	6,172	748	12.1%	\$1,015	1,795	\$2,642	29.1%
HA of City of Los Angeles	44,022	5,336	12.1%	\$933	12,806	\$2,427	29.1%
Norwalk HA	705	85	12.1%	\$835	205	\$2,172	29.1%
Paramount HA	203	25	12.3%	\$872	59	\$2,269	29.1%
Pasadena CDC	1,315	159	12.1%	\$872	383	\$2,269	29.1%
Pico Rivera Housing Assistance Agency	517	63	12.2%	\$880	150	\$2,290	29.0%
City of Pomona HA	894	108	12.1%	\$769	260	\$2,000	29.1%
Redondo Beach HA	593	72	12.1%	\$907	173	\$2,359	29.2%
Santa Fe Springs HA	224	27	12.1%	\$836	65	\$2,175	29.0%
Santa Monica HA	1,092	132	12.1%	\$1,291	318	\$3,358	29.1%
South Gate HA	654	79	12.1%	\$690	190	\$1,796	29.1%
HA of City of Torrance	690	84	12.2%	\$794	201	\$2,067	29.1%
West Hollywood HA	97	12	12.4%	\$973	28	\$2,530	28.9%
<b>Madera County</b>	<b>725</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$576</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>\$1,499</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
City of Madera HA	725	88	12.1%	\$576	211	\$1,499	29.1%
<b>Marin County</b>	<b>2,109</b>	<b>256</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,533</b>	<b>614</b>	<b>\$3,987</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Marin County HA	2,109	256	12.1%	\$1,533	614	\$3,987	29.1%
<b>Mariposa County</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$472</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>\$1,228</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Mariposa	165	20	12.1%	\$472	48	\$1,228	29.1%
<b>Mendocino County</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$648</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>\$1,686</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Mendocino County CDC	895	108	12.1%	\$648	260	\$1,686	29.1%
<b>Merced County</b>	<b>2,705</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$664</b>	<b>787</b>	<b>\$1,727</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Merced	2,705	328	12.1%	\$664	787	\$1,727	29.1%



Housing Authority (HA) or Agency	Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal	Share of total vouchers	OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal	OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Share of total vouchers
<b>Monterey County</b>	<b>3,770</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$863</b>	<b>1,097</b>	<b>\$2,246</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Monterey	3,770	457	12.1%	\$863	1,097	\$2,246	29.1%
<b>Napa County</b>	<b>1,204</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$872</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>\$2,269</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
City of Napa HA	1,204	146	12.1%	\$872	350	\$2,269	29.1%
<b>Nevada County</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$522</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>\$1,358</b>	<b>29.3%</b>
Nevada County HA	294	36	12.2%	\$522	86	\$1,358	29.3%
<b>Orange County</b>	<b>20,577</b>	<b>2,494</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,064</b>	<b>5,986</b>	<b>\$2,768</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Orange	9,619	1,166	12.1%	\$1,076	2,798	\$2,799	29.1%
Anaheim HA	6,166	747	12.1%	\$1,027	1,794	\$2,671	29.1%
Garden Grove	2,234	271	12.1%	\$1,113	650	\$2,895	29.1%
HA of City of Santa Ana	2,558	310	12.1%	\$1,066	744	\$2,774	29.1%
<b>Placer County</b>	<b>838</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$667</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>\$1,735</b>	<b>29.0%</b>
Placer County HA	276	33	12.0%	\$699	80	\$1,818	29.0%
Roseville HA	562	68	12.1%	\$651	163	\$1,694	29.0%
<b>Plumas County</b>	<b>335</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$528</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>\$1,374</b>	<b>29.0%</b>
Plumas County CDC	335	41	12.2%	\$528	97	\$1,374	29.0%
<b>Riverside County</b>	<b>8,081</b>	<b>979</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$746</b>	<b>2,351</b>	<b>\$1,942</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA County of Riverside	8,081	979	12.1%	\$746	2,351	\$1,942	29.1%
<b>Sacramento County</b>	<b>10,903</b>	<b>1,322</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$933</b>	<b>3,172</b>	<b>\$2,425</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Sacramento	5,370	651	12.1%	\$964	1,562	\$2,507	29.1%
HA of City of Sacramento	5,533	671	12.1%	\$902	1,610	\$2,346	29.1%
<b>San Benito County</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$1,025</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$2,667</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
City of Hollister HA	319	39	12.2%	\$1,027	93	\$2,672	29.2%
City of San Juan Bautista HA	25	3	12.0%	\$999	7	\$2,600	28.0%
<b>San Bernardino County</b>	<b>8,948</b>	<b>1,085</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$717</b>	<b>2,604</b>	<b>\$1,864</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of San Bernardino	8,304	1,007	12.1%	\$717	2,416	\$1,865	29.1%
HA of City of Needles	20	2	10.0%	\$510	6	\$1,326	30.0%
Upland HA	624	76	12.2%	\$720	182	\$1,873	29.2%
<b>San Diego County</b>	<b>25,626</b>	<b>3,106</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,001</b>	<b>7,456</b>	<b>\$2,604</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of San Diego	10,396	1,260	12.1%	\$976	3,024	\$2,539	29.1%
Carlsbad HA	703	85	12.1%	\$1,067	205	\$2,776	29.2%
City of Encinitas HA	136	16	11.8%	\$812	40	\$2,111	29.4%
National City CDC	1,044	127	12.2%	\$769	304	\$2,000	29.1%
Oceanside CDC	1,313	159	12.1%	\$1,115	382	\$2,902	29.1%
City of San Diego Housing Commission	12,034	1,459	12.1%	\$1,029	3,501	\$2,676	29.1%

Housing Authority (HA) or Agency	Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal	Share of total vouchers	OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal	OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Share of total vouchers
<b>San Francisco County</b>	<b>7,229</b>	<b>876</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$2,066</b>	<b>2,103</b>	<b>\$5,375</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
San Francisco HA	7,229	876	12.1%	\$2,066	2,103	\$5,375	29.1%
<b>San Joaquin County</b>	<b>4,817</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$721</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>\$1,874</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of San Joaquin	4,817	584	12.1%	\$721	1,401	\$1,874	29.1%
<b>San Luis Obispo County</b>	<b>1,825</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$898</b>	<b>531</b>	<b>\$2,337</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of City of San Luis Obispo	1,825	221	12.1%	\$898	531	\$2,337	29.1%
<b>San Mateo County</b>	<b>4,023</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,843</b>	<b>1,170</b>	<b>\$4,794</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of San Mateo	4,023	488	12.1%	\$1,843	1,170	\$4,794	29.1%
<b>Santa Barbara County</b>	<b>5,351</b>	<b>649</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,074</b>	<b>1,557</b>	<b>\$2,792</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Santa Barbara	3,396	412	12.1%	\$1,029	988	\$2,676	29.1%
Santa Barbara City HA	1,955	237	12.1%	\$1,151	569	\$2,993	29.1%
<b>Santa Clara County</b>	<b>15,956</b>	<b>1,934</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,843</b>	<b>4,641</b>	<b>\$4,795</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Santa Clara	9,527	1,155	12.1%	\$1,843	2,771	\$4,795	29.1%
HA of City of San Jose	6,429	779	12.1%	\$1,843	1,870	\$4,794	29.1%
<b>Santa Cruz County</b>	<b>3,811</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,338</b>	<b>1,109</b>	<b>\$3,481</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of the County of Santa Cruz	3,811	462	12.1%	\$1,338	1,109	\$3,481	29.1%
<b>Shasta County</b>	<b>2,132</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$461</b>	<b>620</b>	<b>\$1,198</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
County of Shasta HA	644	78	12.1%	\$488	187	\$1,268	29.0%
HA of City of Redding	1,488	180	12.1%	\$449	433	\$1,168	29.1%
<b>Solano County</b>	<b>5,200</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$1,189</b>	<b>1,513</b>	<b>\$3,092</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Solano County HA	250	30	12.0%	\$1,026	73	\$2,668	29.2%
Benicia HA	372	45	12.1%	\$1,223	108	\$3,180	29.0%
Fairfield HA	851	103	12.1%	\$1,128	248	\$2,934	29.1%
Suisun City HA	318	39	12.3%	\$1,008	93	\$2,623	29.2%
Vacaville HA	1,143	139	12.2%	\$1,029	332	\$2,677	29.0%
HA of City of Vallejo	2,266	275	12.1%	\$1,330	659	\$3,460	29.1%
<b>Sonoma County</b>	<b>4,089</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$996</b>	<b>1,190</b>	<b>\$2,593</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Sonoma County CDC	2,722	330	12.1%	\$957	792	\$2,491	29.1%
City of Santa Rosa HA	1,367	166	12.1%	\$1,075	398	\$2,797	29.1%
<b>Stanislaus County</b>	<b>3,984</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$654</b>	<b>1,159</b>	<b>\$1,701</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
HA of County of Stanislaus	3,984	483	12.1%	\$654	1,159	\$1,701	29.1%
<b>Sutter County</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$549</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>\$1,427</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Consolidated Area HA of Sutter County	803	97	12.1%	\$549	234	\$1,427	29.1%
<b>Tehama County</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>11.8%</b>	<b>\$372</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>\$968</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
Tehama County HA	144	17	11.8%	\$372	42	\$968	29.2%

Housing Authority (HA) or Agency	Number of Vouchers Authorized as of July 2003	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted in 2005 Under the Bush Proposal	Share of total vouchers	OR Increase in Annual Rent in 2005 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted by 2009 Under the Bush Proposal	OR Increase in Annual Rent by 2009 if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens*	Share of total vouchers
<b>Tulare County</b>	<b>2,813</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$694</b>	<b>818</b>	<b>\$1,806</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Tulare County HA	2,813	341	12.1%	\$694	818	\$1,806	29.1%
<b>Ventura County</b>	<b>6,213</b>	<b>753</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$998</b>	<b>1,808</b>	<b>\$2,597</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Area HA of Ventura County	2,532	307	12.1%	\$1,034	737	\$2,691	29.1%
Oxnard HA	1,636	198	12.1%	\$930	476	\$2,419	29.1%
Port Hueneme HA	279	34	12.2%	\$990	81	\$2,574	29.0%
HA San Buenaventura	1,189	144	12.1%	\$1,047	346	\$2,723	29.1%
HA of City of Santa Paula	577	70	12.1%	\$938	168	\$2,441	29.1%
<b>Yolo County</b>	<b>1,466</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>\$574</b>	<b>426</b>	<b>\$1,492</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
Yolo County HA	1,466	178	12.1%	\$574	426	\$1,492	29.1%
<b>Yuba County</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	<b>\$441</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>\$1,147</b>	<b>29.2%</b>
Yuba County HA	449	54	12.0%	\$441	131	\$1,147	29.2%
<b>Balance of State**</b>	<b>769</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>12.2%</b>	<b>\$524</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>\$1,362</b>	<b>29.1%</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>294,708</b>	<b>35,721</b>		<b>\$1,054</b>	<b>85,737</b>	<b>\$2,693</b>	

Note: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Glenn, Inyo, Modoc, Mono, Sierra, Siskiyou, Trinity, and Tuolumne Counties are not included on this list because these counties do not have housing authorities that administer Section 8 vouchers.

\*Estimated annual rent increases for counties are weighted averages.

\*\*The state administers the housing voucher program in some small counties.

Source: CBP analysis of Center on Budget and Policy Priorities data