



July 16, 2008

Housing Voucher Data for Utah

- Of Utah's 10,543 authorized vouchers, 97 percent were used by families last year.
- This was an improvement over 2005, when the voucher program was underfunded and changes in funding policy undermined the effectiveness of the program.
- This year, housing agencies in Utah have sufficient funds, including reserves, to assist 474 additional families, thereby using up to 100 percent of their authorized vouchers. To encourage agencies to make efficient use of these resources, agencies must be reassured that voucher renewal funding policy will be both stable and take into account the additional vouchers used by these families. Congress should enact the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (H.R. 1851 and S. 2684) to provide confidence that renewal funding needs will be met in future years, thereby encouraging agencies to put as many of their vouchers to use as possible.

		2004	2005	2006	20	07	2008			
		% of Author- ized	% of Author- ized	% of Author- ized Vouchers	% of Author- ized	Number of	Author- ized Vouchers as of January	Author- ized Vouchers Funded under Renewal	Additional Authorized Vouchers That Could be Funded Using Remaining	% of Author- ized Vouchers Funded (Counting
Agency Name	Code	in Use	in Use	in Use	in Use	in Use	2008	Formula	Reserves	Reserves)
Utah Total		97%	96%	98%	97%	10,062	10,543	10,464	72	100%
Bear River	UT030	92%	99%	99%	95%	116	122	113	9	100%
Beaver	UT006	225%	100%	100%	125%	5	4	4	0	100%
Carbon Co.	UT016	93%	88%	87%	82%	225	273	238	35	100%
Cedar City	UT031	100%	96%	106%	97%	111	114	114	0	100%
Davis Co.	UT009	99%	94%	97%	98%	1,019	1,036	1,036	0	100%
Emery Co.	UT015	99%	97%	99%	99%	67	68	68	0	100%
Grand Co.	UT014	93%	92%	84%	86%	63	73	61	8	95%
Logan City	UT026	92%	91%	99%	100%	368	369	369	0	100%
Myton City	UT029	97%	94%	97%	91%	30	33	29	4	100%
Ogden	UT002	94%	97%	99%	100%	822	822	822	0	100%

		2004	2005	2006	20	07	2008			
									Additional Author-	
							A .1	Author-	ized	% of
		% of	% of	% of	% of		Author- ized	ized Vouchers	Vouchers That Could	Author- ized
		Author-	Author-	Author-	Author-	Number			be Funded	Vouchers
		ized	ized	ized	ized	of	as of	under	Using	Funded
		Vouchers	Vouchers	Vouchers	Vouchers	Vouchers	January	Renewal	Remaining	(Counting
Agency Name	Code	in Use	in Use	in Use	in Use	in Use	2008	Formula	Reserves	Reserves)
Provo City	UT007	98%	97%	99%	100%	883	883	883	0	100%
Roosevelt City	UT028	98%	89%	85%	79%	72	91	75	13	97%
Roosevelt City Salt Lake City	UT028 UT004				79% 94%	72 2,159	91 2,473	75 2,473		97% 100%
		95%	96%	99%		. –	, -		0	
Salt Lake City	UT004	95%	96% 100%	99% 100%	94%	2,159	2,473	2,473	0	100%
Salt Lake City Salt Lake Co.	UT004 UT003	95% 99%	96% 100% 99%	99% 100% 100%	94% 99%	2,159 2,107	2,473 2,135 244	2,473 2,135	0	100% 100%
Salt Lake City Salt Lake Co. St. George	UT004 UT003 UT021	95% 99% 98%	96% 100% 99%	99% 100% 100% 100%	94% 99% 98%	2,159 2,107 238	2,473 2,135 244 215	2,473 2,135 244	0 0 0 3	100% 100% 100%
Salt Lake City Salt Lake Co. St. George Tooele Co.	UT004 UT003 UT021 UT020	95% 99% 98% 95%	96% 100% 99% 92% 97%	99% 100% 100% 100%	94% 99% 98% 94%	2,159 2,107 238 203	2,473 2,135 244 215 952	2,473 2,135 244 212	0 0 0 3	100% 100% 100% 100%

Note: Authorized voucher figures for each agency are based on data from HUD's Resident Characteristics Report. The percentage of authorized vouchers in use in each year was determined by analysis of voucher leasing data reported by housing agencies to HUD's Voucher Management System (VMS). The number of vouchers funded in 2008 under the renewal formula was calculated using actual renewal funding awards and an estimate of the additional funds assumed to be available from excess reserves (the "offset" amount); these estimates do not take into account amounts received under the \$50 million in supplemental adjustment funds available under the law. The number of additional authorized vouchers that could be funded using remaining reserves is based on estimates of each agency's fund balance at the end of 2007, excluding the 2008 offset, and per-voucher costs for 2008.