



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

ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF THE LOSS OF VOUCHER FUNDING ON THE ELDERLY, PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND WORKING FAMILIES IN 2005 AND 2010

Oklahoma

This table displays estimates of the effects of cuts in housing voucher assistance on the elderly, people with disabilities and working families under the actual 2005 voucher funding level and under the Administration's budget plan for 2010 based on the limited information available to the public. "Working families" are defined in this table as families obtaining at least some of their income from wages.

The table below can be read as follows: "In 2005, the shortfall in voucher funding needed to support its vouchers will cause [housing agency] to cut an estimated [Overall Number of Vouchers Cut] vouchers. As a result, [2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families assisted] elderly/disabled/working families will go without housing assistance. Information available on the Administration's budget plans through 2010 indicate the voucher funding shortfall will grow substantially, resulting in an estimated further cut in the number elderly/disabled/working families assisted by [2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level]."

HUD Code	Housing Agency Name	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	Overall Number of Vouchers Cut in 2005	2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted			2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level		
				Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families	Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families
OK002	Oklahoma City HA	3,971	-156	-16	-31	-48	-70	-140	-217
OK005	Lawton HA	74	-3	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-5
OK006	Broken Bow HA	217	-8	-1	-1	-3	-7	-5	-15
OK020	Coalgate HA	46	-1	0	0	0	-1	-1	-3
OK024	Ada	110	-4	0	-1	-2	-2	-3	-10
OK027	Miami	243	-10	-1	-2	-5	-5	-8	-21

HUD Code	Housing Agency Name	Current Number of Authorized Vouchers	Overall Number of Vouchers Cut in 2005	2005 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted			2010 Estimated Vouchers Cut by Types of Families Assisted Below 2005 Level		
				Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families	Elderly	People with Disabilities	Working Families
OK032	Seminole HA	189	-7	-1	-1	-3	-4	-4	-15
OK033	Bristow HA	87	-3	-1	-1	-1	-5	-3	-5
OK044	Hugo Housing Authority	178	-6	-1	-1	-2	-4	-6	-13
OK045	Cherokee Nation HA	350	-12	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
OK062	McAlester HA	73	-3	0	-1	-1	-2	-3	-5
OK067	Stilwell HA	29	-1	-1	0	0	-3	-1	-1
OK073	Tulsa HA	4,221	-172	-22	-43	-47	-96	-185	-200
OK095	Shawnee	497	-20	-2	-3	-8	-10	-15	-37
OK096	Wewoka HA	154	-6	-1	-1	-2	-6	-4	-10
OK099	Muskogee HA	751	-28	-4	-7	-12	-17	-32	-56
OK111	Ponca City HA	134	-5	-2	-1	-1	-7	-6	-6
OK118	Fort Gibson HA	44	-2	0	-1	0	-1	-2	-2
OK139	Norman HA	1,185	-48	-5	-12	-16	-21	-50	-71
OK142	Henryetta HA	95	-4	-1	-1	-1	-5	-4	-4
OK146	Stillwater HA	656	-27	-2	-6	-12	-7	-28	-52
OK148	Tecumseh HA	31	-1	0	0	0	-2	-1	-2
OK150	Del City HA	62	-2	0	0	-1	-1	-1	-6
OK901	Oklahoma HFA	9,395	-360	-47	-83	-112	-217	-384	-517
Total for Oklahoma		22,792	-891	-109	-197	-281	-491	-888	-1,271

The estimated numbers of each type of family affected are based on the current proportion of an agency's vouchers now received by families of that type, based on data in HUD's Public and Indian Housing Information (PIC) Center system as of January 21, 2005 (accessed at <http://pic.hud.gov/pic/RCRPublic/rcrmain.asp>). The estimates for 2010 assume that the demographic mix of families served in 2010 would be the same as in January 2005. The numbers of vouchers cut for each type of family do not add up to the total cut because some vouchers are received by families that do not have earnings and are not headed by a person who is elderly or disabled. For an explanation of how we derived these estimates, see the papers referenced at www.cbpp.org/hous2-18-05hous-states.htm. All figures in the table assume that agencies will respond to funding shortfalls by reducing the number of families assisted. Agencies also have some limited flexibility to reduce the level of assistance provided per family, for example by shifting rental burdens onto needy households or reducing the maximum amount of rent a voucher can cover (and therefore limiting the ability of voucher households to live outside high-poverty

neighborhoods in areas that may be safer and with better schools and more job opportunities). If agencies took these measures, the reduction in the number of families assisted could be somewhat smaller.