
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