

# Health Equity: Tenant-Based Housing Voucher Programs

## Summary Evidence Table - Systematic Economic Review

This table outlines information from the studies included in the Community Guide economic review of Tenant-based Housing Voucher Programs to Promote Health Equity. It details study design and economic analysis, population and intervention characteristics, and economic outcomes considered in this review. Complete references for each study can be found in the Included Studies section of the [review summary](#).

### Abbreviations Used in This Document:

- Study design:
  - RCT: randomized controlled trial
- Measurement terms:
  - DiD: difference in difference
  - Pct pt: percentage point
  - QALY: quality adjusted life year
- Other terms:
  - AFDC: Assistance for Families with Dependent Children
  - NA: not applicable
  - NR: not reported
  - HUD: Department of Housing and Urban Development
  - IRS: Internal Revenue Service
  - MTO: moving to opportunity
  - PHA: Public Housing Authority
  - ROI, return on investment
  - SIPP: Survey of Income and Program Participation
  - SNAP: Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program
  - TANF: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

### Notes:

**Quality** of economic estimates – Studies are assessed to be of good, fair, or limited quality. This valuation is based on two domains: [Quality of Capture](#), and [Quality of Measurement](#).

**Race/ethnicity** of the study population: The Community Guide only summarizes race/ethnicity for studies conducted in the United States.

**Summary Economic Outcomes** are Cost-Benefit, Cost per [QALY](#), Cost per [DALY](#)

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Andersson et al. (2018)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Earnings in adulthood for those exposed to program as children</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD, Census Bureau, John D and Catherine T McArthur Foundation, CGIAR Research Program</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2010 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Siblings 13-18 years of age in housing voucher assisted rental households in year 2000</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Intervention: 118,000 Control: 994,000</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean Age: 15.3 years Females: 51.7% White: 20% Black: 47% Hispanic: 26% Single parent household: 77% Household income: \$10,667 Tenant monthly rent contribution: \$227</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 1997-2000 Follow-up 14 years</p>	<p><b>Program Name:</b> None</p> <p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers for rental units</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Siblings 13-18 years of age in unassisted rental households</p>	<p><b>Earnings increase at age 26 per year of housing voucher exposure:</b> Female: \$457 Male: \$253 (Treated mean: \$9,716)</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Employment earning</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Decennial Census, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics; PIC, Public and Indian Housing Information Center</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Household fixed effects with instrumental variable.</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	<p>NR</p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Bergman et al. (2019)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Post only with control</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Intervention cost</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> King County, Washington, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households with children 15 years of age or younger eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Intervention: 222 Control: 208</p>	<p><b>Program Name:</b> Creating Moves to Opportunity (CMTO) J-PAL Opportunity-Insights</p> <p><b>Intervention:</b> Enable housing voucher recipients to move to areas of greater opportunity. Provided</p>	<p><b>Effectiveness:</b> Proportion moving to opportunity areas was 15% in control and 53% in intervention group</p> <p><b>Intervention cost:</b> Cost of CMTO services per voucher issued: \$2,661 Financial assistance other than rent subsidy per voucher issued: \$1,043</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Funding Source:</b> Gates Foundation, Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative, Surgo Foundation, William T. Grant Foundation, Harvard University</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2018 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean age of household head: 34 years Mean age child: 7 years Mean household annual income: \$19,806 Female head of household: 84% Urban: 100% Black: 49% Hispanic: 8% White: 26% Asian: 7%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 2018-2019 Follow-up NA</p>	<p>housing vouchers, financial assistance (e.g., security deposit), rental agreement counseling, education on areas of opportunity, landlord engagement, locator services.</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Housing vouchers only</p>	<p>Program administration cost per voucher issued: \$1,500</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Services to enable moves to opportunity areas, non-rent financial assistance, administration cost</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Program and PHA data</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Post only versus control</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Carlson et al. (2011)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost-benefit</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> John D and Catherine T McArthur Foundation</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2002 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Wisconsin, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) recipients in the state of Wisconsin who are in private voucher assisted rental units.</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Monte Carlo simulations model</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> NR</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data period 2001-2003 (3 years) including 1-year follow-up</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers for private market rentals</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households receiving TANF assistance and living in unassisted private rental units</p>	<p><b>Intervention cost:</b> \$9,012 per household</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Deadweight loss from tax financing, housing voucher program cost</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Program and PHA data</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Intervention benefit:</b> \$10,882 per household</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Labor income as adults for children previously exposed to housing</p>	<p><b>Cost-benefit ratio:</b> 1.21:1</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Possible double counting of some benefits</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			<p>vouchers. Also reduced crime, increased consumption of housing services, adult labor earnings, property values, other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Unemployment insurance data for wages, administrative data for other assistance</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Monte Carlo simulations</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Pre to Post</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Carlson et al. (2012)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Adult employment earnings</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> John D. and Catherine T. McArthur Foundation</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2003 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Wisconsin, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Wisconsin residents who receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance (SNAP) and are in private voucher assisted rental units</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Intervention: 12,170 Matched control</p> <p><b>Characteristics (3 cohorts):</b> Age: 18-30 years 38% to 48% Age: 31-59 years 40% to 45%</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers for private market rentals</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> TANF or SNAP recipients living in unassisted private rentals</p>	<p><b>Adult employment earnings:</b> Reduced \$647 in year 1 (Baseline mean for control group \$5,392) Reductions dissipated over 5 years.</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Adult labor earnings</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Administrative data from unemployment insurance for wages</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with propensity matched control</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
	<p>Age &gt; 59 years: 9% to 14%                      White: 58% to 61%                      Black: 27% to 29%                      Hispanic: 3% to 4%                      Rural: 28% to 31%                      No high school diploma: 33% to 36%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b>                      Data period 2001-2006                      Maximum follow-up 6 years</p>			
<p><b>Author (Year):</b>                      Chetty et al. (2016)</p> <p><b>Design:</b>                      Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b>                      Employment earnings in adulthood for those exposed to program as children</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b>                      National Science Foundation, Harvard University, Laura and John Arnold Foundation</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b>                      Reported in 2012 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore, MD; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b>                      Families residing in public housing or project-based section 8 housing located within census tracts with 40% or more of residents below the federal poverty line.</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b>                      Adults in Intervention 1 and Intervention 2: 4,215</p> <p>Intervention 1:                      Children exposed at age &lt; 13 years: 1,427                      Children exposed at age 13 to 18 years: 686</p> <p>Intervention 2:                      Children exposed at age &lt; 13 years: 1,969                      Children exposed at age 13 to 18 years: 959</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b>                      Intervention 1: Housing voucher                      Intervention 2: Housing voucher plus opportunity move counseling; participants required to move to area with less than 10% poverty</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b>                      Households in public housing</p>	<p><b>Intervention 1:</b>  <b>Adult employment earnings:</b>                      Increased \$249 (Baseline mean for control group \$14,381)</p> <p><b>Employment earnings of children exposed at age &lt; 13 years</b>                      Increased \$1,109 (Baseline mean for control group \$11,270)</p> <p><b>Employment earnings of children exposed at age 13 to 18 years</b>                      Reduced \$1,133 (Baseline mean for control group \$15,881)</p> <p><b>Intervention 2:</b>  <b>Adult employment earnings:</b>                      Reduced \$354 (Baseline mean for control group \$14,381)</p> <p><b>Employment earnings of children exposed at age &lt; 13 years</b>                      Increased \$1,624 (Baseline mean for control group \$11,270)</p> <p><b>Employment earnings of children exposed at age 13 to 18 years</b></p>	<p>Authors calculated that the program cost was less than tax revenues from increased employment earnings.</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
	<p>Control Children exposed at age &lt; 13 years: 1,613 Children exposed at age 13 to 18 years: 686</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Intervention 1 (Intervention 2) Household head completed high school: 34.7% (30.1%) Household head employed: 21.6% (24.8%) Household head African American: 65.5% (66.5%) Household head Hispanic: 28.9% (29.1%)</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 1994-1998 Follow-up 10 years</p>		<p>Reduced \$966 (Baseline mean for control group \$15,881)</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Adult labor earnings, earnings of children as adults</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Administrative program data and IRS earnings data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression weighted for sampling and with dummies for treatment. Sensitivity analysis using baseline covariates.</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Chyn et al. (2018)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Employment earnings in adulthood for those exposed to program as children</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Chicago, IL, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households with children of age 7 to 18 years who are living in public housing</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Intervention: Adults: 4,331 Children: 5,250 Control: NR</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean Age: 11.7 years Females: 41.1% Urban: 100%</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers offered to households affected by demolitions of public housing projects. All moving expenses paid by program.</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households in public housing not affected by demolitions.</p>	<p><b>Employment earnings of adults:</b> Increased \$404 (Baseline mean for control group \$6,281)</p> <p><b>Children’s employment earnings in adulthood:</b> Increased for females \$806 (control group \$4,417) Increased for males \$417 (Baseline mean for control group \$2,947)</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Employment earnings</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>	<p>Calculations by authors indicate the additional cost of paying for moving expenses were less than tax revenues from increased employment earnings.</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Funding Source:</b> National Institute of Child Health</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2012 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Adult employed: 17.3% Adult annual earnings: \$5,791</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred 1995-2000 14 years of follow-up</p>		<p><b>Increased participation rate for TANF/AFDC, Medicaid, SNAP</b> by 1.3 percentage points (Baseline mean for control group 63%)</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Administrative data from state and federal housing programs, unemployment insurance for wages, and social assistance programs</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Instrumental variable regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Finkel et al. (1999)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of public provision of housing units compared to private market rental cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 1995 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for section 8 housing assistance</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Older properties: 5,943 Newer properties: 4,076</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Elderly: 33% White: 58% Black: 37% Hispanic: 11%</p> <p><b>Annual income less than \$15,000:</b> 80-90%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data for 1995</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Provision of Section 8 new construction and major rehabilitation</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Cost of private market rental</p>	<p>Among all section 8 assisted rental units, 67% of units had a cost of provision that was 20% greater than comparable cost of a private rental unit</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Capital and maintenance cost of section 8 housing units, administration cost</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD and PHA construction and administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Capital cost accounting methods</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Capital and maintenance cost</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Galster et al. (1999)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Panel data</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Property values</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 1993 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore County, MD, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> NA</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Property sales: 43,361 Housing voucher households: 11,000</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> NR</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data covering 1991-1997</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Household tenants receive housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Areas with fewer tenants receiving housing vouchers</p>	<p>Property values increased for high and appreciating value neighborhoods at baseline with mostly White households. Property values decreased for medium to low and declining value neighborhoods at baseline with ≥20% Black households.</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Property values</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Sales and property tax data, HUD data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Panel regression of log of sales price of single-family homes with neighborhood fixed effects by proximity to housing voucher tenants</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Regression coefficient</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Hendren et al. (2020)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Marginal Value of Public Funds – Modified cost-benefit from government fiscal perspective</p>	<p><b>Location</b></p> <p>Intervention 1: Baltimore, MD; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York, NY, USA</p> <p>Intervention 2: Atlanta, GA; Augusta, GA; Fresno, CA; Houston, TX; Los Angeles, CA; Spokane, WA, USA</p> <p>Intervention 3: Chicago, IL, USA</p>	<p><b>Intervention 1:</b> Housing voucher, opportunity move counseling, required move to area with less than 10% poverty – Moving to Opportunity (MTO)</p> <p><b>Intervention 2:</b> HUD Welfare to Work Program</p> <p><b>Intervention 3:</b></p>	<p><b>Intervention 1:</b> <b>Cost:</b> -\$9,215 <b>Benefit:</b> \$69,601</p> <p><b>Components of Cost:</b> Program cost, other assistance programs, tax impact</p> <p><b>Components of Benefit:</b> Labor earnings of adults, labor earnings during adulthood of children exposed to program</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p>	<p><b>Marginal Value of Public Funds (MVPF)~ Benefit/Cost</b></p> <p><b>Intervention 1:</b> Tax system cost saving</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Intervention 2:</b> MVPF=0.91-0.93</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Intervention 3:</b></p>



Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Funding Source:</b> National Science Foundation, Sloan Foundation, Chan Zuckerberg Initiative, Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in U.S. dollars. Index year not reported.</p>	<p><b>Eligibility:</b></p> <p>Intervention 1: Residents of public housing</p> <p>Intervention 2: TANF or TANF-eligible (7% in public housing)</p> <p>Intervention 3: Chicago residents on waitlist for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b></p> <p>Intervention 1: Placement during 1994-1998 15 years follow-up</p> <p>Intervention 2: Placement during 2000-2001 3.5 years follow-up</p> <p>Intervention 3: Placement during 1997-2003 14 years follow-up</p>	<p>Chicago Voucher Lottery – Housing Vouchers distributed by lottery</p> <p><b>Comparison 1:</b> Residents of public housing not receiving MTO</p> <p><b>Comparison 2:</b> Residents mostly in private unassisted rentals or living with friends or relatives</p> <p><b>Comparison 3:</b> Residents in private unassisted rentals</p>	<p><b>Intervention 2:</b> <b>Cost:</b> \$27,376 <b>Benefit:</b> \$24,912</p> <p><b>Components of Cost:</b> Program cost, other assistance programs, tax impact</p> <p><b>Components of Benefit:</b> Labor earnings of adults, child education benefits, labor earnings during adulthood of children exposed to program, consumption of housing and other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Intervention 3:</b> <b>Cost:</b> \$10,660 <b>Benefit:</b> \$6,958</p> <p><b>Components of Cost:</b> Program cost, other assistance programs, tax impact</p> <p><b>Components of Benefit:</b> Labor earnings of adults, child education benefits, labor earnings during adulthood of children exposed to program, consumption of housing and other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Program data and published evaluations</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Public accounting and economic models</p>	<p>MVPF=0.65-0.82</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> ICF-ORC Macro (2012); ORC-Macro (2001)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of provision of housing vouchers for rental units</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2000 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Representative sample of households eligible and receiving section 8 housing assistance</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 2,403</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> NR</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data for 2000</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Cost of private market rental without assistance</p>	<p><b>Measure Type:</b> Modeled</p> <p>(Cost of provision of rental units through housing vouchers) / (Fair market rent for comparable unit)</p> <p>≤1.0 for 71% of units ≥1.25 for 13% of units</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Value of housing vouchers, administrative cost, private market rental cost</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD files reviews for subsidies paid out, tenant interviews, income verifications</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting methods</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Accounting</p>	<p>NR</p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Jacob et al. (2012); Jacob et al. (2015)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Program cost, housing consumption, non-housing consumption, adult</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Chicago, IL, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households in Chicago on wait list for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 4,787 Children in households: 18,347</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean age of heads of household: 31.6 years</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Chicago Voucher Lottery – Housing Vouchers distributed randomly by lottery</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households in private rentals with no housing assistance</p>	<p><b>Cost of providing housing vouchers per household per year:</b> \$12,562</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Housing voucher subsidies</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> PHA administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p>employment earnings, healthcare cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, University of Chicago, Russell Sage Foundation, Joyce, McArthur and McCormick Foundation, Northwestern University, Smith Richardson Foundation, HUD, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2013 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Female heads of household: 96% Black: 94.4% Hispanic: 3.2% White: 2.2% Other: 0.2% Urban: 100% Mean annual household earnings: \$2,008 Monthly rent: \$778</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred during 1997-2003 Follow-up to 2011</p>		<p><b>Measure Type:</b> Post only</p> <p><b>Incremental benefit of housing consumption per household per year:</b> \$6,849, 73% increase</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Incremental housing cost</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> PHA administrative data, private market rent for similar unit</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Panel regression with instrumental variables</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Incremental benefit of non-housing consumption per household per year:</b> \$5,653, 29% increment</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Incremental non-housing consumption</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Source and Valuation:</b> PHA data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Panel regression with instrumental variables</p>	

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			<p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Adult earnings per year:</b> Reduced \$1,316(Baseline mean for control group \$13,160) Effect persists.</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Employment earnings</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> PHA data, human services agencies administrative data, unemployment insurance data, wages</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Panel regression with instrumental variables</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>No effect on healthcare cost</b></p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Lee et al. (1999)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Interrupted time series</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Property values</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Philadelphia, PA, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Neighborhoods with households using housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Property Sales: 18,062</p> <p><b>Characteristics (Neighborhood):</b> Black: 30.2%</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Comparable neighborhoods without households using housing vouchers</p>	<p><b>Change in property values for single family homes due to housing voucher households in neighborhood:</b> Small and negative effect, but significant (coefficient -0.005)</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Property value</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD program data, property tax data</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 1990 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Hispanic: 6.7% Percent unemployed: 10.5% Percent poverty: 18.4% Median income: \$26,129 Mean property sale price: \$47,626</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements during 1989 to 1991</p>		<p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Leger et al. (1990)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Interrupted time series</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of provision of housing vouchers for rental units, housing consumption</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in U.S. dollars. Index year not reported.</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 7,500</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Black: 45.3% Hispanic: 14.8% White: 37.6% Other: 2.2% Ratio of income to poverty income: 0.80 Percent of income from earnings: 21.7% Mean income: \$6,257</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements during mid to late 1980s. Follow-up not reported</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Unassisted private rentals</p>	<p><b>Cost of providing housing vouchers per household per year:</b> Other housing assistance: \$326 Rent Subsidy: \$3,720</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Housing voucher subsidy, administration</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> PHA data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting methods</p> <p><b>Gross rent with housing vouchers compared to fair market rent for comparable unit in private market:</b> Results indicate gross rent and fair market rent are similar in magnitude</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Housing voucher subsidy, administration, private market rents</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b></p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			<p>PHA data, private rental market data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression methods</p> <p><b>Consumption of housing services:</b> Increase \$179 per month (63%) from baseline of \$284</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Gross rent</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> PHA and HUD data</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Pre to post</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Liebman et al. (2004)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Adult employment earnings; use of other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD, National Institute of Mental Health, National Institute of Child Health and</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore, MD; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Public housing residents</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households in housing voucher program: 2,411 Households in housing voucher program with move to opportunities counseling and assistance: 2,910</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> <b>Housing Vouchers</b> Mean Age: 40.1 years Females: 98% Urban: 100%</p>	<p><b>Interventions:</b> Housing voucher program. Housing voucher program with move to opportunities counseling and assistance and requirement to move to areas with less than 10% poverty (MTO).</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Matched households in unassisted rental units.</p>	<p><b>Adult employment earnings per year for households in the housing voucher program:</b> Increased in year 1 by \$41 (Baseline mean for control group \$8,899) and in year 5 by \$370 (Baseline mean for control group \$7,313)</p> <p><b>Adult employment earnings per year for households in the housing voucher program with move to opportunities services:</b> Reduced in year 1 by \$287 (Baseline mean for control group \$9,062) and increased in year 5 by \$128 (Baseline mean for control group \$7,475)</p> <p><b>Components included for employment earnings:</b> Employment earnings</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p>Development, National Science Foundation, Russell Sage Foundation, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Smith Richardson Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, W.T. Grant Foundation, Princeton University, National Bureau of Economic Research</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2000 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Black: 66% Hispanic: 30% Teen parent: 26% High school diploma: 41%</p> <p><b>Housing Vouchers with Move to opportunities</b> Mean Age: 39.7 years Females: 99% Urban: 100% Black: 67% Hispanic: 29% Teen parent: 25% High school diploma: 41%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred 1994-1998 5 years of follow-up</p>		<p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with propensity matched control</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Use of other assistance programs per year for households on housing voucher program:</b> Decreased in year 1 by \$92 (Baseline mean for control group \$1,493) and increased in year 5 by \$7 (Baseline mean for control group \$1,242)</p> <p><b>Use of other assistance programs per year for households on housing voucher program with move to opportunities services:</b> Decreased in year 1 by \$44 (Baseline mean for control group \$1,653) and in year 5 by \$116 (Baseline mean for control group \$1,500)</p> <p><b>Components Included in use of other assistance programs:</b> TANF</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD administrative data TANF program data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b></p>	

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			Regression with propensity matched control	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Mayo et al. (1980); Olsen (2009)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of provision of housing vouchers for rental units; cost of providing public housing units</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 1975 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Phoenix, AZ, Pittsburgh, PA, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Intervention 1: Eligible for housing vouchers Intervention 2: Eligible for public housing</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Intervention 1 (Control) Pittsburgh 83 (92) Phoenix 68 (95)</p> <p>Intervention 2 (Control) Pittsburgh 241 (286) Phoenix 225 (234)</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> NR</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data from 1975</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Intervention 1: Housing vouchers Intervention 2: Public housing</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Cost of private market rental without assistance</p>	<p><b>Intervention 1:</b> <b>(Cost of provision of rental units through housing vouchers) / (Fair market rent for comparable unit):</b> 1.09 to 1.15</p> <p><b>Intervention 2:</b> <b>(Cost of provision of public housing unit) / (Fair market rent for comparable unit):</b> 1.64 to 1.91</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Value of housing vouchers, administrative cost, private market rental cost, cost of providing public housing unit</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD data, private rental market data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Accounting</p>	NR
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Mills et al. (2006)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Pre to post</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b></p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Atlanta, GA; Augusta, GA; Fresno, CA; Houston, TX; Los Angeles, CA; Spokane, WA, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers with welfare to work program</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Unassisted rental households</p>	<p><b>Quality of housing consumption:</b> 44% reduction in overcrowding; 8% increase in units rated as good or excellent; 7% reduction in units with at least 2 problems</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Housing quality</p>	NR



Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p>Housing consumption, non-housing consumption, adult employment earnings, use of other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2001 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Sample Size:</b> Adults and children: 8,573</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Age of head of household &lt; 35 years: 68.3%; 35-54 years 30.3%; ≥55 years 1.1% Households with children: 100% Adult females: 91.8% Black: 49.8% Hispanic: 21.4% White: 19.6% Other: 9.2% Employed: 44.5% Housing: Private rental 56.3%; public housing 7.0%; living with others 25.8%; other 10.9%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred during 2000-2001 Follow-up 3.5 years</p>		<p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Consumption of non-housing goods and services:</b> Increased 50%</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Tenant surveys</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with adjustments for baseline and participant/location covariates with cross-overs.</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Pre to post</p> <p><b>Earnings per person per year:</b> Reduced \$124 (Baseline mean for control group \$2,651) in first 6 months Effect dissipated over 3 years</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Employment earnings</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD data, unemployment insurance administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with adjustments for baseline and participant/location covariates with cross-overs.</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			<p><b>Use of other assistance programs per household per year:</b> Increased by \$95 (Control mean \$1,814) in first 6 months Effect persisted over 3 years</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> TANF benefits, SNAP benefits</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> TANF and SNAP administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Olsen et al. (1983)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of providing public housing units</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> University of Virginia, University of Wisconsin</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in U.S. dollars. Index year not reported.</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Eligible for public housing</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Families in public housing 142,000 in 1965 144,000 in 1968</p> <p><b>Characteristics (Families in public housing):</b> Mean age of household head 46-48 years Black heads of household: 39-41% Female heads of household: 24-30%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b></p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Public housing</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Cost of private market rental without assistance</p>	<p><b>(Cost of provision of public housing unit) / (Fair market rent for comparable unit):</b> 1.10 to 1.15</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Cost of provision excluding administrative cost</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD data, private rental market data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Post only</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Pfeiffer et al. (2018)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Healthcare cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> None</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2004 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Placement during 1965-1968</p> <p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 679 Matched controls</p> <p><b>Characteristics (Census demographics):</b> Mean age: 45 years Medicare or Medicaid: 72% White: 35% Latino: 21% African American: 39% Other race: 6% Female heads of household: 73% Monthly income: \$1,045</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 2001-2008 NA</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households with no housing assistance</p>	<p><b>Out-of-pocket healthcare cost per year:</b> Reduced by \$256</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Inpatient, Emergency Department</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> SIPP data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with matched controls</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Post only</p>	<p>NR</p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Pollack et al. (2019)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal with control</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Healthcare cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD, Johns</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore, MD; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Housing Vouchers with Opportunity Move (MTO): 1,590 adults 3,589 children</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing voucher, opportunity move counseling, required move to area with less than 10% poverty – Moving to Opportunity (MTO)</p> <p>Housing vouchers only</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households in public housing</p>	<p><b>Change in healthcare cost per person per year:</b></p> <p>Housing Vouchers with Opportunity Move (MTO) Reduced by \$95 for adults Reduced by \$134 for children</p> <p>Housing Vouchers Reduced by \$179 for adults Reduced by \$156 for children</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Inpatient</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p>Hopkins University, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2015 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Housing Vouchers: 1,216 adults 2,658 children</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> <b>Adults (Children)</b> Median age: 32 years (8 years) African American: 63% (66%) White: 8% (6%) Other: 29% (28%) Hispanic: 32% (30%) Female: 98% (50%) High School Diploma: 37% (NA) Employed: 26% (NA)</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 1994-1998 Follow-up 15 years</p>		<p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> State Hospital Discharge Data, Medicaid data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> 2-part regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Reeder et al. (1985)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Consumption of housing services</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD, U.S. Department of Agriculture</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b></p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 1,233</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> NR</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data for 1976</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> None</p>	<p><b>Change in household housing consumption per month</b></p> <p>Increased \$23 (16% based on baseline gross rent of \$144)</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Gross rent</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Bureau of Labor Statistics, Urban Institute, Annual Housing Survey, HUD data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b></p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
Reported in 1976 U.S. dollars			Regression methods and indifference maps  <b>Measure Type:</b> Pre to post	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Sanbonmatsu et al. (2011)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Program cost, fiscal cost savings, consumption of housing services, use of other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2009 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore, MD; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households in public housing eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Adults: 4,604 Children: 6,654</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Households with children: 100% Mean age of household heads: 34 years Mean age of children: 4.6 years Adult females: 97% African American: 61% Hispanic/Latino: 32% White: 2.5% Other race/ethnicity: 5% Household monthly income: \$1,669</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred during 1994-1998 15-year follow-up</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing voucher, opportunity move counseling, required move to area with less than 10% poverty – Moving to Opportunity (MTO)</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households in public housing</p>	<p><b>Program cost per household per year:</b> \$800</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Incremental rent subsidy, counseling</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Trial and PHA data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Adult earnings per year:</b> Reduced \$323</p> <p><b>Children earnings in adulthood per year:</b> Female increased \$336 Male decreased \$1,839</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Earnings from employment</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Trial and PHA data, Unemployment Insurance data</p>	NR

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
			<p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Housing consumption:</b> Small improvement in quality of housing and neighborhood characteristics</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Housing and neighborhood quality</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Self-reported from household surveys</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Utilization of other assistance programs</b> Small and mixed effects</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Use of other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Trial and survey data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b></p>	

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Schwartz et al. (2016)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Pre to post</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Program cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> John D. and Catherine T. McArthur Foundation, HUD</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in U.S. dollars. Index year not reported.</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Chicago, IL, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers and not living in higher opportunity tracts</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households in study: 3,065 Households who moved to opportunity area: 436</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> <b>Opportunity movers and stayers or non-opportunity movers</b> Mean Age: NR Females: NR Urban: 100% African American: 83.4% to 90.8% White: 10% to 18% Income percent from wages: 54.2% to 60.3%</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placements occurred during 2011-2014 NR</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing vouchers with opportunity move counseling and cash incentives</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> None</p>	<p>DiD</p> <p><b>Cost of program per household that was successfully placed:</b> \$2,869</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Counseling cost and \$500 cash incentive</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Study records</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Accounting</p>	<p>NR</p>
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Susin et al. (2005)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Longitudinal</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households eligible for housing vouchers</p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing voucher program</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b></p>	<p><b>Adult employment earnings per year:</b> Reduced by \$1,968 (Baseline mean for control group \$19,128)</p>	<p>NR</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Adult employment earnings; use of other assistance programs</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> None</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2000 U.S. dollars</p>	<p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households in vouchers group: 249</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean age: 34.2 years Single parent female household: 69.9% Urban: 100% African American: 30.5% Hispanic: 14.1% Education: 11.7 years</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data from 1996-1999</p>	<p>Households in unassisted rental units</p>	<p><b>Components Included for employment earnings:</b> Employment earnings</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with propensity matched control</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p> <p><b>Use of other assistance programs per year:</b> Increased by \$888 (Baseline mean for control group \$1,212)</p> <p><b>Components Included in use of other assistance programs:</b> Other assistance program use</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD administrative data, SIPP, TANF, SNAP</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Regression with propensity matched control</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Wallace et al.</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> National, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b></p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Provision of housing vouchers</p>	<p><b>Ratio of cost of providing rental unit through housing vouchers to cost of unit in private market:</b></p>	<p>NR</p>



Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p>(1981); Olsen (2009)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Cross-sectional</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost of public provision of housing units compared to private market rental cost</p> <p><b>Funding Source:</b> None</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 1975 U.S. dollars.</p>	<p>Households eligible for section 8 housing assistance</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Households: 299</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b> Mean Age: 13.9 y Females: 46.6% Urban: 100% Percent with symptoms at baseline: 30.8% Days with symptoms per 2 weeks for those with symptoms: 3.05</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Data from 1975 for housing vouchers Data from 1979 for section 8 new construction or rehabilitation</p>	<p>Provision of Section 8 new construction and major rehabilitation</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Cost of private market rental</p>	<p>0.91</p> <p><b>Ratio of cost of providing section 8 new construction or major rehabilitation to cost of unit in private market:</b> 1.44 - 1.78</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Change in housing consumption:</b> 31% increase (Baseline monthly rent \$208)</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Good</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> Gross rent and administrative cost</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> HUD administrative data</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Accounting methods</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> Pre to post</p>	
<p><b>Author (Year):</b> Zafari et al. (2020)</p> <p><b>Design:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Economic Outcomes:</b> Cost per QALY gained</p>	<p><b>Location:</b> Baltimore, MD; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; New York City, NY, USA</p> <p><b>Eligibility:</b> Households in public housing eligible for housing vouchers</p> <p><b>Sample Size:</b> Modeled</p> <p><b>Characteristics:</b></p>	<p><b>Intervention:</b> Housing voucher, opportunity move counseling, required move to area with less than 10% poverty (MTO)</p> <p><b>Comparison:</b> Households in public housing</p>	<p><b>Lifetime QALY gained per person</b> 0.23</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b> QALY</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Lifetime Net Cost:</b> -\$7,488</p> <p><b>Components Included:</b></p>	<p><b>Lifetime Net cost:</b> -\$7,488</p> <p>Net cost per QALY gained &lt; \$50,000 in 99% of simulations</p>

Study Information	Study and Population Characteristics Time Horizon	Program Intervention	Outcomes Data Source Methods	Cost-benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Net Cost, or ROI Outcome
<p><b>Funding Source:</b> Columbia University</p> <p><b>Monetary Values:</b> Reported in 2016 U.S. dollars</p>	<p>Simulation</p> <p><b>Time Horizon:</b> Placement during 1994-1998 Lifetime</p>		<p>Intervention cost, healthcare cost, worksite productivity</p> <p><b>Quality:</b> Fair</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Intervention data, modeled outcomes</p> <p><b>Statistical Methods:</b> Markov model for cost per QALY gained over lifetime. Reduced body weight observed in MTO experiment extrapolated to health states of obesity and diabetes.</p> <p><b>Measure Type:</b> DiD</p>	