

November 1, 2006

HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN OREGON 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 Oregon has fallen over the past few years, from 98 percent in 2004 to a projected 95 percent in 2006. In other words, **822 vouchers have already been cut** in Oregon 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 Oregon.

- 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 Oregon in 2006 would be funded*. Moreover, agencies in Oregon would receive enough funding to restore vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **98 percent of Oregon’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 Oregon in 2006. However, it would not provide agencies in Oregon with enough funding to restore a substantial share of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, **96 percent of Oregon’s currently authorized vouchers would be funded** under the Senate appropriations formula.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, 7 housing agencies in Oregon would be forced to cut assistance to 632 low-income families in 2007. **96 percent of Oregon’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	
Central Oregon Regional HA	OR034	1,003	1,003	1,003	1,003	1,003	0
Clackamas County	OR001	1,467	1,410	1,467	1,438	1,404	6
Coos Curry HA*	OR020	721	630	630	643	709	0
Douglas County	OR003	641	641	641	641	641	0
Jackson County	OR015	1,414	1,414	1,414	1,414	1,403	11
Josephine Housing Council	OR031	752	641	641	654	752	0
Klamath HA	OR017	734	734	734	734	734	0
Lane County*	OR006	2,639	2,639	2,639	2,639	2,598	41
Lincoln County*	OR005	497	468	497	478	492	0
Linn-Benton HA*	OR019	2,392	2,392	2,392	2,392	2,392	0
Malheur County HA	OR027	349	344	349	349	330	13
Marion County HA*	OR014	1,170	932	932	951	1,153	0
Mid-Columbia HA	OR025	551	522	551	533	0	522
Northeast Oregon HA	OR032	710	705	710	710	691	14
Northwest Oregon HA*	OR028	1,076	1,044	1,044	1,065	1,076	0
Portland*	OR002	7,365	7,365	7,365	7,365	7,339	26
Salem HA*	OR011	2,764	2,470	2,470	2,519	2,632	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	
Umatilla County HA	OR007	329	298	329	304	311	0
Washington County HA	OR022	2,569	2,253	2,569	2,297	2,320	0
West Valley HA	OR008	699	633	699	646	652	0
Yamhill County*	OR016	1,303	1,168	1,303	1,192	1,238	0
Total		31,145	29,707	30,379	29,965	29,871	632

*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.