



820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056 center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

February 17, 2005

LOCAL EFFECTS OF CUTS IN HOUSING VOUCHER ASSISTANCE IN 2005

Oklahoma

The table shows voucher estimates based in part on data that housing agencies reported to HUD covering the period through July 2004. Individual agencies will have more current data they can use to update the estimates. The funding figures in the column “Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD” come directly from HUD data. The estimated annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC) is derived by adjusting the agency’s voucher cost data in mid-2004 by the applicable HUD annual adjustment factor. Agencies’ actual voucher costs in 2005 may be more or less than the estimate.

The column “number of vouchers cut” is the number of vouchers the appropriations act directs HUD to fund — authorized vouchers in use in May – July 2004 plus any additional vouchers issued to replace other federal housing subsidies that need renewal funding in 2005 — that are unfunded due to the appropriations shortfall. If the estimated “number of vouchers cut” is less than the total number of expiring vouchers not funded, it is likely that the agency was not using all its vouchers in mid-2004. The number of vouchers in use in February 2005 that are not funded may be less than the estimates provided if an agency is using fewer vouchers than in mid-2004 or if the agency’s average per unit cost has declined substantially. The number of vouchers in use that are not funded may be more than the estimates provided if the agency’s per unit cost is currently greater than the estimate. For some agencies (marked with an asterisk) our estimates include adjustments made in light of HUD’s final funding figures, and may be more subject to error.

Agencies may be able to remedy a funding shortfall through use of reserve funds (if accessed quickly) or other policy changes, rather than by reducing the number of families receiving voucher assistance.

HUD Code	Housing Agency name	Authorized vouchers in January 2005	Number of expiring vouchers	Expiring vouchers eligible for funding under bill formula	Voucher renewal funding allocated by HUD (HAP)	Annual per voucher subsidy cost (PUC)	Number of expiring vouchers funded (based on PUC)	Total expiring vouchers not funded	Vouchers cut in 2005
OK024	Ada	110	110	106	\$283,579	\$2,798	101	-9	-4
OK033	Bristow HA	87	87	82	\$299,314	\$3,790	79	-8	-3
OK006	Broken Bow HA	217	217	203	\$672,051	\$3,443	195	-22	-8
OK045	Cherokee Nation HA	350	350	296	\$1,657,712	\$5,832	284	-66	-12
OK020	Coalgate HA	46	46	32	\$79,109	\$2,577	31	-15	-1
OK150	Del City HA	62	62	59	\$292,585	\$5,170	57	-5	-2
OK118	Fort Gibson HA	44	44	41	\$110,571	\$2,789	40	-4	-2
OK142	Henryetta HA	95	95	89	\$249,189	\$2,919	85	-10	-4
OK044	Hugo Housing Authority	178	178	149	\$489,769	\$3,436	143	-35	-6
OK005	Lawton HA	74	74	67	\$358,284	\$5,548	65	-9	-3
OK062	McAlester HA	73	73	69	\$207,350	\$3,133	66	-7	-3
OK027	Miami	243	243	235	\$640,763	\$2,843	225	-18	-10
OK099	Muskogee HA	751	751	698	\$2,395,478	\$3,580	669	-82	-28
OK139	Norman HA	1,185	1,185	1,182	\$5,953,806	\$5,253	1,133	-52	-48
OK002	Oklahoma City HA	3,971	3,971	3,828	\$19,373,117	\$5,276	3,672	-299	-156
OK901	Oklahoma HFA	9,395	9,383	8,815	\$42,243,664	\$4,996	8,455	-928	-360
OK111*	Ponca City HA*	134	134	134	\$394,122	\$3,066	129	-5	-5
OK032	Seminole HA	189	189	172	\$546,013	\$3,316	165	-24	-7
OK095	Shawnee	497	497	482	\$2,511,431	\$5,428	463	-34	-20
OK146	Stillwater HA	656	656	656	\$2,768,845	\$4,400	629	-27	-27
OK067	Stilwell HA	29	29	25	\$69,033	\$2,841	24	-5	-1
OK148	Tecumseh HA	31	31	29	\$130,420	\$4,729	28	-3	-1
OK073*	Tulsa HA*	4,221	4,221	4,221	\$24,267,656	\$5,994	4,049	-172	-172
OK096	Wewoka HA	154	154	151	\$505,496	\$3,482	145	-9	-6
Total for Oklahoma		22,792	22,780	21,822	\$106,499,357		20,931	-1,849	-891