



CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

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

March 17, 2004

LOCAL EFFECTS OF PROPOSED CUTS IN FEDERAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE DETAILED Kansas

To find estimates for a housing agency in a particular city or county, press the "Ctrl" and "F" keys and enter the name of the city or county. Housing agencies are listed by the agency names contained in the HUD dataset used to develop this analysis. Because the HUD dataset uses a variety of name formats (e.g., the agency in Omaha could be listed as the Omaha Housing Authority or the Housing Authority of Omaha), it is not always possible to locate a city or county by scanning alphabetically.

The table shows estimates of reductions that would occur if the proposed funding cuts were distributed proportionally across housing agencies based on the size of each agency's voucher program. The estimates are based in part on data that housing agencies reported to HUD covering the period through July 2003. Individual agencies may have more current data they can use to update the estimates. For a small number of agencies the HUD data may contain errors; individual agencies will be able to verify whether the July 2003 number of authorized Section 8 vouchers is accurate.

Housing Agency	Number of Authorized Vouchers as of July 2003	Impact of Administration Proposal in 2005			Impact of Administration Proposal in 2009		
		Reduction in Voucher Subsidy Funding	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted if Cut Were Carried Out by Eliminating Vouchers	Increase in Annual Rent if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens	Reduction in Voucher Subsidy Funding	Reduction in Number of Families Assisted if Cut Were Carried Out by Eliminating Vouchers	Increase in Annual Rent if Cut Were Carried Out by Raising Rent Burdens
Atchison HA	32	\$13,696	4	\$419	\$36,497	9	\$1,090
Brown County PHA	150	\$52,197	18	\$341	\$139,097	44	\$886
Chanute HA	25	\$11,339	3	\$444	\$30,216	7	\$1,155
Dodge City	134	\$61,869	16	\$452	\$164,872	39	\$1,176
Eckan	499	\$237,784	60	\$466	\$633,656	145	\$1,214
Ellis County HA	159	\$53,611	19	\$330	\$142,865	46	\$859
Ford County HA	367	\$157,771	44	\$421	\$420,435	107	\$1,095
Great Bend HA	80	\$30,095	10	\$368	\$80,200	23	\$958
Hays HA	66	\$21,406	8	\$317	\$57,043	19	\$826
Hutchinson HA	222	\$67,065	27	\$296	\$178,718	65	\$769
Johnson County HA	1,367	\$1,042,240	166	\$746	\$2,777,401	398	\$1,942
Junction City	71	\$29,442	9	\$406	\$78,457	21	\$1,056
Kansas City HA	854	\$620,545	104	\$711	\$1,653,651	248	\$1,851
Lawrence/Douglas County HA***	591	\$371,624	72	\$616	\$990,317	172	\$1,601
Leavenworth	339	\$195,052	41	\$563	\$519,781	99	\$1,465
Manhattan HA	197	\$101,350	24	\$504	\$270,081	57	\$1,310
Newton	42	\$16,202	5	\$378	\$43,175	12	\$982
Olathe HA Program	322	\$218,880	39	\$665	\$583,280	94	\$1,731
Pittsburg	399	\$157,339	48	\$386	\$419,283	116	\$1,004
Riley County HA	140	\$53,455	17	\$374	\$142,450	41	\$972
Salina HA	311	\$177,833	38	\$560	\$473,897	90	\$1,456
Sedgwick County HA	342	\$196,932	41	\$564	\$524,791	99	\$1,466
SEK-CAP Inc.	407	\$153,487	49	\$369	\$409,019	118	\$960

So. Central Area Agency	318	\$103,517	39	\$319	\$275,855	93	\$829
Topeka HA	1,073	\$575,481	130	\$525	\$1,533,564	312	\$1,366
Wichita HA	2,366	\$1,502,027	287	\$621	\$4,002,659	688	\$1,617
Kansas	10,873	\$6,222,238	1,318	\$560	\$16,581,257	3,163	\$1,457

*Agencies marked with asterices participate in the Moving-to-Work demonstration and receive voucher funding according to different rules from those that govern other agencies. For further information on the effects of the Administration's proposals on Moving-to-Work agencies, see the discussion under "Sources and Methods."