

November 1, 2006

## HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN OKLAHOMA UNDER PENDING PROPOSALS

Due largely to the flaws in the formula for distributing “Section 8” housing voucher funding, the share of vouchers in use in Oklahoma has fallen over the past few years, from 96 percent in 2004 to a projected 92 percent in 2006. In other words, **928 vouchers have already been cut** in Oklahoma over the past two years.

For 2007, Congress will have to choose among three funding approaches that have been put forward. Each provides the same new funding for the program nationally in 2007, but uses a different method for distributing the money among the 2,400 state and local housing agencies. Here is the impact that each of the three formulas would have on Oklahoma.

- Under the formula in the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (or SEVRA), a bill passed by the House Financial Services Committee on June 14, 2006, ***all vouchers in use in Oklahoma in 2006 would be funded***. Moreover, agencies in Oklahoma would receive enough funding to restore vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **97 percent of Oklahoma’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the SEVRA formula.
- The formula in the Senate appropriations bill would also renew funding for all vouchers in use in Oklahoma in 2006. However, it would not provide agencies in Oklahoma with enough funding to restore a substantial share of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **94 percent of Oklahoma’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the Senate appropriations formula.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, 8 housing agencies in Oklahoma would be forced to cut assistance to 47 low-income families in 2007. **96 percent of Oklahoma’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the House appropriations formula.

For a description of the pending proposals for distribution of renewal funding to state and local agencies and an analysis of their national impact, see "Fixing the Housing Voucher Formula: A No-Cost Way to Strengthen the Section 8 Program," <http://www.cbpp.org/11-1-06hous.htm>. The paper's Technical Appendix explains the sources and methods for the data in this table.

## Agency Estimates

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Ada	OK024	110	107	110	109	103	4
Bristow HA	OK033	87	72	87	74	69	3
Broken Bow HA	OK006	217	217	217	217	217	0
Cherokee Nation HA*	OK045	350	210	210	214	350	0
Coalgate HA	OK020	46	24	46	25	26	0
Del City HA	OK150	62	45	45	46	55	0
Fort Gibson HA	OK118	44	38	44	38	35	3
Henryetta HA	OK142	95	78	78	80	85	0
Hugo Housing Authority	OK044	178	133	133	136	154	0
Lawton HA	OK005	74	68	74	69	65	3
McAlester HA	OK062	73	59	59	60	66	0
Miami	OK027	243	219	243	224	210	10
Muskogee HA	OK099	751	751	751	751	751	0
Norman HA	OK139	1,185	1,185	1,185	1,185	1,185	0
Oklahoma City HA	OK002	4,033	3,679	3,679	3,752	3,918	0
Oklahoma HFA	OK901	9,395	8,424	9,395	8,592	8,908	0
Ponca City HA	OK111	134	134	134	134	134	0
Seminole HA	OK032	189	153	189	157	154	0
Shawnee	OK095	497	471	497	480	486	0

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authorized Vouchers Funded in 2007			Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
				SEVRA	Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	
Stillwater HA	OK146	656	656	656	656	639	17
Stilwell HA	OK067	29	29	29	29	23	6
Tecumseh HA	OK148	31	29	31	29	28	1
Tulsa HA	OK073	4,281	4,247	4,281	4,281	4,281	0
Wewoka HA	OK096	154	147	154	150	150	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>22,914</b>	<b>21,177</b>	<b>22,327</b>	<b>21,488</b>	<b>22,092</b>	<b>47</b>

\*Agency received new "tenant protection" vouchers from HUD in 2005 to replace demolished public housing units or privately-owned units that no longer receive project-based federal housing assistance. Incomplete information was available to estimate the additional funding due these agencies in 2007 to renew these vouchers under each of the approaches. As a result, estimates for these agencies may be too low, and under the House approach may be too low or too high.

\*\*Agency took over administration of additional vouchers from another agency in 2005 or early 2006. Our estimates may not fully account for the effect of the consolidation on the agency's likely funding in 2007.