

November 1, 2006

HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN TENNESSEE 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 Tennessee has fallen over the past few years, from 96 percent in 2004 to a projected 90 percent in 2006. In other words, **1,732 vouchers have already been cut** in Tennessee 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 Tennessee.

- 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 Tennessee in 2006 would be funded.*** Moreover, agencies in Tennessee would receive enough funding to restore many of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years.
- The formula in the Senate appropriations bill would also renew funding for all vouchers in use in Tennessee in 2006. However, it would not provide agencies in Tennessee with enough funding to restore as many of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years as SEVRA would.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, **11 housing agencies in Tennessee would be forced to cut assistance to 286 low-income families in 2007.**

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	
Athens HA	TN015	52	41	52	41	39	2
Briston HA	TN066	200	192	200	196	182	10
Brownsfille	TN013	169	169	169	169	166	3
Chattanooga HA	TN004	3,140	2,399	2,399	2,446	2,923	0
Cleveland HA	TN054	208	208	208	208	200	8
Crossville HA	TN042	321	321	321	321	321	0
Dayton HA	TN062	354	317	317	323	336	0
Dickson HA	TN079	644	612	644	624	612	0
Elizabethton HA	TN076	203	192	203	196	178	14
Ethra*	TN113	726	644	726	657	726	0
Etowah Sec. 8 Voucher	TN026	122	119	122	122	119	0
Jackson HA	TN007	1,298	1,172	1,298	1,195	1,158	14
Johnson City HA	TN002	468	468	468	468	447	21
Kingsport HA	TN006	1,155	1,079	1,079	1,100	1,155	0
Knox County HA	TN111	562	522	562	532	554	0
Knoxville's Community Development Co.	TN003	2,735	2,263	2,263	2,307	2,496	0
LaFollette HA	TN012	328	269	328	275	278	0
Maryville HA	TN065	304	291	291	297	304	0
Memphis HA	TN001	5,342	5,154	5,154	5,256	5,342	0
Metropolitan	TN005	5,460	4,935	4,935	5,033	5,242	0

Housing Agency Development HA	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	
Morristown HA	TN038	409	352	409	359	365	0
Murfreesboro HA	TN020	573	573	573	573	573	0
Oak Ridge Sec. 8 Voucher	TN088	260	215	215	220	233	0
Pulaski Sec. 8 Voucher	TN011	102	93	102	95	98	0
SE TN Human Resource Agency	TN117	227	194	194	198	224	0
Sweetwater HA	TN016	58	55	58	56	51	4
Tennessee HA*	TN903	5,878	5,378	5,878	5,485	5,171	207
Tullahoma HA	TN024	116	106	116	108	102	4
Total		31,414	28,332	29,284	28,860	29,595	286

*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.