

Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056

center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

November 1, 2006

Budget and Policy Priorities

Centeron

HOUSING VOUCHERS FUNDED IN ARIZONA 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 Arizona has fallen over the past few years, from 97 percent in 2004 to a projected 93 percent in 2006. In other words, **766 vouchers have already been cut** in Arizona 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 Arizona.

- 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 Arizona in 2006
 would be funded. Moreover, agencies in Arizona would receive enough funding to restore
 many of the vouchers that have been cut in recent years. Overall, 96 percent of Arizona's
 currently authorized vouchers would be funded under the SEVRA formula.
- Under the formula in the House appropriations bill, 8 housing agencies in Arizona would be forced to cut assistance to 129 low-income families in 2007. <u>96 percent</u> of Arizona'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 (next page)

Agency Estimates

Housing Agency	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authoriz SEVRA	zed Vouchers Fun Senate Appropriations Bill	House	Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
Arizona State HA	az901	59	51	59	52	51	0
Chandler Housing & Redevelopment Division	az028	480	480	480	480	480	0
Cochise Co. sec. 8 Voucher	az034	404	334	404	341	327	7
Douglas HA	az037	193	163	163	166	175	0
Eloy sec. 8 voucher	az021	159	137	137	140	151	0
Flagstaff HA	az006	333	329	333	333	333	0
Gila Co. HA	az045	53	48	53	49	46	2
Glendale sec. 8 voucher	az003	1,054	988	1,054	1,007	931	57
Maricopa Co. Housing Dept.	az009	1,478	1,450	1,478	1,478	1,478	0
Mesa Housing Services	az005	1,422	1,365	1,365	1,392	1,422	0
Mohave Co. HA	az043	234	219	234	224	230	0
Nogales sec. 8 voucher	az023	192	185	192	189	176	9
Peoria HA	az038	82	66	66	67	70	0
Phoenix Housing Dept.	az001	5,245	5,008	5,245	5,107	5,000	7
Pima Co.	az033	752	578	578	589	752	0
Pinal Co. Division of	az010	584	438	438	447	529	0

Housing Agency Housing	HUD Code	Authorized Vouchers as of Jan. 2006	Vouchers in Use in 2006 (Estimated)	Authoriz	sed Vouchers Fun Senate Appropriations Bill	House Appropriations Bill	Vouchers in Use That Would Be Cut Under House Appropriations Bill
Scottsdale	az032	707	652	707	665	647	5
South Tucson sec. 8 voucher	az025	132	78	78	79	89	0
Tempe HA	az031	1,082	1,027	1,082	1,048	1,072	0
Tucson Community Services*	az004	3,824	3,555	3,555	3,625	3,824	0
Williams HA	az041	47	36	36	37	45	0
Winslow HA	az008	128	117	128	120	122	0
Yuma Co. Housing Dept.	az013	401	397	401	401	389	8
Yuma, City	az035	1,122	1,122	1,122	1,122	1,088	34
Total		20,167	18,822	19,388	19,158	19,429	129

^{*}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.