
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

WASHINGTON, DC

Counting for Dollars 2020

16 Large Federal Assistance Programs that Distribute Funds on Basis of Decennial Census-derived Statistics (Fiscal Year 2015)

#5: Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers

The [first report](#) of the Counting for Dollars Project examines 16 large federal financial assistance programs that use Decennial Census-derived data to geographically distribute funds. This fact sheet describes the **Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers** program, its reliance on Census-derived data, and funds distribution by state.

Objective: Aid very low income families in obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) #: [14.871](#)

Legal basis: [42 USC Chapter 8](#) (Low-income Housing)

Applicant eligibility: Public housing agencies (PHAs)

Beneficiary eligibility: Very low income families (whose income does not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the area, with adjustments by family size)

Type of assistance: Direct payments to housing owners. The PHA issues an eligible family a voucher and the family selects a unit of its choice.

Allocation of vouchers to PHAs: Based on determination of housing needs, annually adjusted for inflation

Determination of housing assistance payments: Generally, the difference between the local payment standard and 30 percent of the family's adjusted income

Primary Census-derived data sources: American Community Survey (Census) and Renewal Funding Inflation Factors (HUD) for allocation of vouchers; Median Family Income (Census) for household eligibility; Fair Market Rent (HUD) for housing assistance payments.

Relation to accuracy of local Decennial Census: Positive

A local Decennial Census miscount would increase the likelihood of less accurate estimates of a local area's housing needs, median family income, and average rents by size of unit.

**Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers
Obligations – U.S. and States, FY2015**

United States	\$19,087,549,000		
Alabama	\$188,563,000	Montana	\$31,303,000
Alaska	\$40,807,000	Nebraska	\$67,187,000
Arizona	\$174,235,000	Nevada	\$145,155,000
Arkansas	\$97,864,000	New Hampshire	\$85,714,000
California	\$3,480,189,000	New Jersey	\$752,029,000
Colorado	\$242,806,000	New Mexico	\$74,512,000
Connecticut	\$387,129,000	New York	\$2,444,859,000
Delaware	\$40,770,000	North Carolina	\$360,281,000
District of Columbia	\$204,957,000	North Dakota	\$33,237,000
Florida	\$868,850,000	Ohio	\$557,615,000
Georgia	\$507,976,000	Oklahoma	\$130,911,000
Hawaii	\$112,152,000	Oregon	\$233,291,000
Idaho	\$38,570,000	Pennsylvania	\$610,158,000
Illinois	\$919,219,000	Rhode Island	\$83,778,000
Indiana	\$206,628,000	South Carolina	\$150,707,000
Iowa	\$97,095,000	South Dakota	\$28,858,000
Kansas	\$63,929,000	Tennessee	\$221,068,000
Kentucky	\$202,260,000	Texas	\$1,045,825,000
Louisiana	\$359,303,000	Utah	\$74,676,000
Maine	\$84,293,000	Vermont	\$51,055,000
Maryland	\$547,480,000	Virginia	\$397,813,000
Massachusetts	\$943,359,000	Washington	\$476,585,000
Michigan	\$358,373,000	West Virginia	\$70,616,000
Minnesota	\$232,959,000	Wisconsin	\$152,326,000
Mississippi	\$153,589,000	Wyoming	\$13,744,000
Missouri	\$240,891,000		

Source: USASpending.gov

Prepared by Andrew Reamer, Research Professor, GWIPP, with data provided by Sean Moulton, Open Government Program Manager, Project on Government Oversight

August 18, 2017