



Abt Associates Inc.

Cambridge, MA
Lexington, MA
Hadley, MA
Bethesda, MD

HUD National Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) Database: Projects Placed in Service through 2004

**Contract
C-OPC-21895**

Data Tables

December 20, 2006

Prepared for

Mr. Michael Hollar
U.S. Department of Housing and
Urban Development
451 Seventh Street, SW, Room 8234
Washington, DC 20410

Prepared by

Carissa Climaco
Gabriella Chiarenza
Meryl Finkel

Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Table of Contents

Table 1.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2004	1
Table 2.	Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2004	2
Table 3.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type 1995-2004	3
Table 4.	Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types 1995-2004.....	4
Table 5.	Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004	4
Table 6.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004.....	5
Table 7.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004	6
Table 8.	LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and Additional Financing Sources Used Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004.....	7
Table 9.	Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years 1995-2004	8
Table 10.	Characteristics of LIHTC Properties Over Time: 1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years.....	9
Table 11.	Regional Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units 1995-2004	10
Table 12.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region 1995-2004.....	10
Table 13.	Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004	11
Table 14.	Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type 1995-2004.....	12
Table 15.	Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region 1995-2004.....	13
Table 16.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type 1995-2004	14
Table 17.	LIHTC Project and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004.....	15
Table 18.	LIHTC Projects Targeted to a Specific Population by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004	15
Table 19.	Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs 1995-2004	16

Table 20. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs 1995-2004 ...	17
Table 21. Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004.....	18
Table 22. LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type 1995-2004	19
Table 23. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by DDA or QCT Designation 1995-2004	19
Table 24. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type 1995-2004	20
Table 25. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units LIHTC Projects for Targeted to Specific Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004.....	20
Table 26. Distribution of LIHTC Units by Location Characteristics Over Time: 1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years.....	21

**Table 1
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects
1995-2004**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Projects 1995-2004
Number of Projects	1,411	1,328	1,359	1,331	1,472	1,346	1,363	1,300	1,431	1,307	13,648
Number of Units	81,179	82,716	88,533	93,298	108,160	98,640	100,210	102,835	119,532	110,457	985,560
Average Project Size	57.5	62.3	65.1	70.1	73.5	73.3	73.5	79.1	83.5	84.5	72.2
Distribution											
0-10 Units	13.3%	14.6%	7.6%	7.6%	6.2%	6.1%	4.7%	4.2%	2.8%	4.3%	7.1%
11-20 Units	11.7%	12.1%	12.2%	10.8%	12.2%	11.5%	10.5%	10.1%	8.0%	8.2%	10.7%
21-50 Units	41.8%	36.5%	41.2%	39.1%	37.3%	34.8%	40.4%	35.2%	35.6%	34.0%	37.6%
51-99 Units	16.9%	17.6%	19.6%	21.2%	21.5%	23.3%	21.5%	23.6%	24.6%	24.2%	21.4%
100+ Units	16.2%	19.3%	19.4%	21.4%	22.8%	24.3%	22.8%	26.9%	29.0%	29.3%	23.1%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.4%	96.7%	96.0%	95.7%	94.9%	94.4%	94.4%	92.4%	94.0%	94.3%	95.1%
Distribution											
0-20%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21-40%	0.6%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.7%	0.8%	1.5%	1.3%
41-60%	2.6%	2.2%	2.5%	2.4%	2.9%	3.8%	2.5%	3.9%	2.1%	2.0%	2.7%
61-80%	1.8%	2.6%	5.0%	5.6%	7.5%	7.5%	9.8%	12.7%	12.2%	8.5%	7.3%
81-90%	2.3%	1.8%	2.1%	2.1%	2.4%	3.3%	4.2%	6.1%	6.5%	7.8%	3.8%
91-95%	1.8%	1.8%	1.5%	1.6%	2.6%	2.6%	2.9%	2.4%	1.6%	2.3%	2.2%
96-100%	90.9%	90.2%	87.8%	86.7%	83.3%	81.7%	79.5%	73.2%	76.8%	77.9%	82.9%
Average Bedrooms	1.94	1.97	1.93	2.00	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.89	1.87	1.95	1.93
Distribution											
0 Bedroom	3.3%	3.9%	4.1%	3.0%	4.2%	3.6%	2.9%	2.7%	5.6%	4.5%	3.8%
1 Bedroom	30.4%	28.9%	29.4%	28.0%	28.4%	32.3%	29.1%	32.0%	31.1%	31.7%	30.1%
2 Bedroom	44.1%	44.5%	42.5%	43.2%	42.9%	42.0%	44.0%	42.3%	40.6%	40.7%	42.7%
3 Bedroom	19.1%	19.7%	20.7%	22.0%	21.0%	19.8%	20.8%	20.2%	20.0%	20.0%	20.3%
≥4 Bedroom	3.1%	3.0%	3.3%	3.9%	3.5%	2.4%	3.2%	2.7%	2.7%	3.6%	3.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,648 projects and 985,560 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The average number of units per property and the distribution of property size are both calculated based on the 13,600 properties with a known number of units, and not on the full universe of 13,648 properties. The database contains missing data for number of units (0.4%), qualifying ratio (percentage of tax credit units) (1.2%) and bedroom count (13.6%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 2
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects
1995-2004

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Projects 1995-2004
Construction											
New	65.9%	62.6%	62.2%	63.7%	64.5%	59.9%	60.6%	62.1%	68.0%	66.0%	63.5%
Rehab	32.8%	36.1%	35.1%	34.7%	33.9%	39.1%	37.9%	35.9%	30.2%	32.1%	34.8%
Both	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.6%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	18.0%	24.9%	35.0%	37.1%	35.2%	31.1%	31.8%	27.7%	25.0%	26.4%	29.2%
RHS Section 515	25.9%	16.6%	13.7%	12.0%	11.3%	9.7%	10.6%	7.1%	5.6%	9.2%	12.1%
Tax-Exempt Bonds	3.6%	5.8%	8.0%	12.3%	18.0%	25.1%	23.6%	30.7%	31.2%	30.6%	18.9%
Credit Type											
30 Percent	26.1%	20.9%	20.6%	25.6%	28.4%	32.0%	30.3%	33.8%	34.3%	33.3%	28.5%
70 Percent	64.4%	70.6%	71.3%	65.6%	64.2%	61.7%	60.9%	58.0%	55.3%	59.4%	63.1%
Both	9.5%	8.6%	8.1%	8.8%	7.4%	6.3%	8.8%	8.3%	10.4%	7.3%	8.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,648 projects and 985,560 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The database contains missing data for construction type (2.6%), nonprofit sponsor (12.8%), RHS Section 515 (17.4%), bond financing (7.4%), and credit type (8.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 3
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type
1995-2004

Credit Type	Projects			Units		
	30%	70%	Both	30%	70%	Both
Construction Type						
New	54.0%	76.6%	8.5%	55.7%	78.5%	11.0%
Rehab	45.1%	22.1%	83.7%	43.4%	20.4%	82.8%
Both	0.9%	1.3%	7.8%	0.9%	1.1%	6.2%
RHS Section 515	28.7%	3.3%	20.3%	8.3%	1.8%	12.8%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	62.0%	1.8%	5.1%	86.1%	3.1%	11.0%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,648 projects and 985,560 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The database contains missing data for construction type (2.6%), nonprofit sponsor (12.8%), RHS Section 515 (17.4%), bond financing (7.4%), and credit type (8.2%). When data are presented in a cross tabulation of two variables, the percentage of missing data may increase. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 4
Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types
1995-2004

	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Projects 1995-2004
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 515	
Average Project Size (units)	54.5	146.0	32.2	72.2
Distribution by Project Size				7.1%
0-10 units	6.1%	0.8%	2.9%	10.7%
11-20 units	15.5%	2.4%	18.6%	37.6%
21-50 units	44.3%	14.3%	69.8%	21.4%
51-99 units	21.3%	21.7%	7.0%	23.1%
100+ units	12.8%	60.7%	1.8%	
Construction Type				
New	59.5%	55.7%	51.4%	63.5%
Rehab	36.5%	43.4%	48.3%	34.8%
Both	4.0%	0.9%	0.3%	1.7%
Average Qualifying Ratio	96.2%	90.8%	99.0%	95.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,648 projects and 985,560 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The database contains missing data for construction type (2.6%), nonprofit sponsor (12.8%), RHS Section 515 (16.0%), bond financing (7.4%), and credit type (8.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 5
Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

Number of Non-LIHTC Subsidy Sources	Percent of 2004 Projects
0	41.3%
1	47.4%
2	9.5%
3	1.7%
4 or more	1.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 1,641 projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004 with complete data on the use of tax-exempt bonds, Section 515 loans, HOME funds, CDBG funds, FHA-insured loans, and whether the project was part of a HOPE VI development. Total may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Table 6
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

	Tax-Exempt Bonds	RHS Section 515 Loans	HOME Funds	CDBG Funds	FHA-Insured Loans	Part of HOPE VI Development
All 2003-2004 Projects	30.9%	7.1%	28.1%	5.6%	4.0%	2.8%
Average Project Size	139.3	36.9	54.3	62.9	137.5	90.4
Distribution by Project Size						
0-10 units	0.4%	2.4%	8.5%	11.5%	1.5%	2.1%
11-20 units	2.6%	17.1%	14.7%	15.4%	2.9%	6.3%
21-50 units	17.4%	65.2%	42.9%	35.6%	11.6%	29.2%
51-99 units	20.6%	10.4%	21.7%	18.3%	20.3%	29.2%
100+ units	59.1%	4.9%	12.2%	19.2%	63.8%	33.3%
Average Qualifying Ratio	94.0%	98.7%	93.6%	91.2%	88.0%	92.6%
Construction Type						
New	60.2%	45.7%	67.3%	47.1%	37.3%	93.6%
Rehab	38.8%	53.7%	29.5%	49.0%	61.2%	2.1%
Both	1.0%	0.6%	3.3%	3.9%	1.5%	4.3%
Projects by Credit Type						
30%	90.3%	41.3%	16.9%	25.0%	69.1%	34.1%
70%	4.3%	35.6%	73.5%	59.6%	20.6%	61.4%
Both	6.7%	23.1%	9.6%	15.4%	10.3%	4.6%
Units by Credit Type						
30%	93.9%	43.0%	29.4%	37.5%	76.4%	32.5%
70%	4.2%	32.9%	58.9%	47.6%	11.7%	66.0%
Both	1.9%	24.1%	11.7%	14.9%	11.8%	1.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004 with complete data on the use of the additional financing sources. The dataset is missing data on tax-exempt bonds (2.9 percent) and RHS Section 515 loans (7.6 percent). Data are missing or incomplete on the use of HOME funding (26.4 percent), CDBG funding (31.6 percent), FHA-Insured loans (36.7 percent), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (36.3 percent). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 7
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
All 2003-2004 Projects	64.2%	31.3%	12.8%	4.5%	8.0%
Average Project Size	85.2	73.6	65.8	59.6	83.6
Distribution by Project Size					
0-10 units	2.3%	1.3%	2.3%	2.2%	1.2%
11-20 units	9.1%	5.4%	8.2%	14.3%	6.2%
21-50 units	35.9%	38.6%	46.7%	44.0%	36.7%
51-99 units	24.1%	29.3%	23.7%	24.2%	27.3%
100+ units	28.7%	25.5%	19.1%	15.4%	28.6%
Average Qualifying Ratio	94.7%	95.5%	96.2%	96.5%	95.8%
Construction Type					
New	70.4%	75.3%	75.1%	65.6%	62.5%
Rehab	27.7%	22.9%	24.9%	32.2%	33.8%
Both	1.9%	1.8%	0.0%	2.2%	3.8%
Projects by Credit Type					
30%	32.3%	33.0%	18.4%	8.0%	20.8%
70%	57.1%	59.0%	66.0%	67.1%	66.0%
Both	10.5%	8.1%	15.6%	25.0%	13.2%
Units by Credit Type					
30%	50.5%	43.9%	32.2%	10.8%	34.8%
70%	40.2%	47.8%	51.1%	61.8%	54.6%
Both	9.4%	8.3%	16.7%	27.5%	10.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,268 projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004 with data on whether or not the project was targeted for a specific population. Of these, 2,001 projects were targeted to a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

Table 8
LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and
Additional Financing Sources Used
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

Additional Financing Used	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	30.1%	30.4%	13.3%	3.3%	20.8%
RHS Section 515	7.0%	8.2%	6.7%	4.4%	3.2%
HOME Funds	26.6%	30.1%	31.0%	32.1%	33.3%
CDBG Funds	5.2%	4.6%	4.8%	7.0%	5.0%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.8%	4.2%	3.2%	4.7%	5.0%
Part of a HOPE VI Development	4.2%	0.6%	1.8%	0.0%	3.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,001 projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004 targeted for a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

Table 9
Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years
1995-2004

Year Tax Credit Allocated	Year Placed in Service											
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	1995-2004	
Pre-1993	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
1993	34.7%	0.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
1994	50.0%	43.3%	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%
1995	15.0%	42.9%	41.5%	2.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
1996	0.0%	12.5%	40.9%	39.4%	4.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
1997	0.0%	0.3%	14.9%	39.1%	39.4%	4.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
1998	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	15.0%	39.2%	37.6%	1.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
1999	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	2.9%	12.1%	41.5%	37.6%	2.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	12.1%
2000	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	4.2%	12.2%	43.8%	36.5%	2.4%	0.6%	0.6%	11.6%
2001	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	2.6%	13.2%	44.0%	45.0%	3.1%	3.1%	7.1%
2002	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.4%	12.1%	36.7%	45.5%	45.5%	2.1%
2003 or later	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	5.2%	16.2%	50.6%	50.6%	2.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,648 projects and 985,560 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. The database contains missing data for allocation year (0.4%).

Table 10
Characteristics of LIHTC Properties Over Time:
1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years

Year Placed in Service	1992-1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Annual Number of Projects	1,388 ^a	1,411	1,328	1,359	1,331	1,472	1,346	1,363	1,300	1,431	1,307
Annual Number of Units	58,214 ^a	81,179	82,716	88,533	93,298	108,160	98,640	100,210	102,835	119,532	110,457
Annual Number of Low-Income Units	53,974 ^a	75,881	76,871	81,018	85,685	92,232	90,072	92,475	95,244	107,370	97,400
Average Project Size (units)	42.3	57.5	62.3	65.1	70.1	73.5	73.3	73.5	79.1	83.5	84.5
Distribution by Size											
0-10 units	22.4%	13.3%	14.6%	7.6%	7.6%	6.2%	6.1%	4.7%	4.2%	2.8%	4.3%
11-50 units	55.1%	53.6%	48.5%	53.4%	49.9%	49.5%	46.2%	50.9%	45.3%	43.6%	42.2%
51-99 units	12.5%	16.9%	17.6%	19.6%	21.2%	21.5%	23.3%	21.5%	23.6%	24.6%	24.2%
100+ units	9.9%	16.2%	19.3%	19.4%	21.4%	22.8%	24.3%	22.8%	26.9%	29.0%	29.3%
Average Bedrooms	1.85	1.94	1.97	1.93	2.00	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.89	1.87	1.95
Distribution											
0 Bedrooms	5.8%	3.3%	3.9%	4.1%	3.0%	4.2%	3.6%	2.9%	2.7%	5.6%	4.5%
1 Bedroom	39.5%	30.4%	28.9%	29.4%	28.0%	28.4%	32.3%	29.1%	32.0%	31.1%	31.7%
2 Bedrooms	38.9%	44.1%	44.5%	42.5%	43.2%	42.9%	42.0%	44.0%	42.3%	40.6%	40.7%
3 Bedrooms	14.6%	19.1%	19.7%	20.7%	22.0%	21.0%	19.8%	20.8%	20.2%	20.0%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	1.3%	3.1%	3.0%	3.3%	3.9%	3.5%	2.4%	3.2%	2.7%	2.7%	3.6%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.9%	97.4%	96.7%	96.0%	95.7%	94.9%	94.4%	94.4%	92.4%	94.0%	94.3%
Distribution of Projects by Construction Type											
New	65.4%	65.9%	62.6%	62.2%	63.7%	64.5%	59.9%	60.6%	62.1%	68.0%	66.0%
Rehab	33.8%	32.8%	36.1%	35.1%	34.7%	33.9%	39.1%	37.9%	35.9%	30.2%	32.1%
Both	0.8%	1.3%	1.3%	2.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.6%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%
Nonprofit Sponsor	19.8%	18.0%	24.9%	35.0%	37.1%	35.2%	31.1%	31.8%	27.7%	25.0%	26.4%
RHS Section 515	35.0%	25.9%	16.6%	13.7%	12.0%	11.3%	9.7%	10.6%	7.1%	5.6%	9.2%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2.7%	3.6%	5.8%	8.0%	12.3%	18.0%	25.1%	23.6%	30.7%	31.2%	30.6%

^a Average for 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Notes: For projects placed in service between 1992 and 1994, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (53.3%), qualifying ratio (2.3%), construction type (20.0%), nonprofit sponsor (27.8%), RHS Section 515 (30.7%), and bond financing (21.3%). For projects placed in service between 1995 and 2004, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (13.6%), qualifying ratio (1.2%), construction type (2.3%), nonprofit sponsor (12.8%), RHS Section 515 (17.4%), and bond financing (7.4%). Qualifying ratio is a simple average of the qualifying ratio of projects. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana.

Table 11
Regional Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units
1995-2004

Region	All LIHTC Projects		Geocoded LIHTC Projects		All U.S. Rental Housing Units	U.S. Population
	Projects	Units	Projects	Units		
Northeast	18.9%	14.0%	19.2%	13.9%	21.4%	19.0%
Midwest	27.1%	22.3%	27.5%	22.1%	20.6%	22.9%
South	33.9%	41.1%	33.0%	41.0%	33.7%	35.6%
West	20.1%	22.7%	20.3%	23.0%	24.2%	22.5%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 13,571 projects and 980,235 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Of these, 12,570 projects and 932,570 units were geocoded. Projects and units in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. Total population and rental units are based on 2000 Census data. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 12
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region
1995-2004

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Average Project Size (Units)	53.5	59.5	88.2	81.4	72.5
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.5%	94.6%	97.2%	95.3%	95.0%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size					
0 Bedrooms	7.8%	3.3%	1.1%	6.7%	3.8%
1 Bedroom	44.0%	29.1%	25.2%	31.8%	30.1%
2 Bedrooms	33.2%	43.9%	47.7%	38.3%	42.7%
3 Bedrooms	13.3%	20.0%	23.1%	19.9%	20.2%
4+ Bedrooms	2.1%	3.9%	2.9%	3.3%	3.1%
Construction Type					
New Construction	37.5%	67.1%	70.8%	71.6%	63.5%
Rehab	59.9%	30.4%	27.9%	27.9%	34.8%
Both	2.6%	2.5%	1.2%	0.1%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	42.7%	29.2%	21.2%	33.1%	29.3%
RHS Section 515	6.4%	10.5%	19.2%	7.3%	11.8%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	14.7%	14.0%	18.0%	33.5%	19.0%
Credit Type					
30 Percent	21.4%	22.6%	32.1%	36.7%	28.4%
70 Percent	69.2%	65.4%	60.1%	60.7%	63.4%
Both	9.4%	12.0%	7.8%	2.6%	8.3%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 13,571 projects and 980,235 units placed in service between 1995 and 2004. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Projects and units in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.6%), construction type (2.6%), nonprofit sponsor (12.8%), RHS Section 515 (17.4%), bond financing (7.3%) and credit type (8.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 13
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Tax-Exempt Bonds	23.6%	23.2%	36.0%	41.3%	31.7%
RHS Section 515 Loans	6.4%	8.7%	6.5%	5.8%	6.9%
HOME Funds	46.4%	27.7%	16.2%	29.6%	28.0%
CDBG Funds	10.7%	5.4%	3.0%	4.9%	5.7%
FHA-Insured Loans	6.5%	1.2%	4.3%	4.6%	4.1%
Part of HOPE VI Development	3.8%	0.7%	3.2%	1.3%	2.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (5.4 percent), RHS Section 515 loans (15.9 percent), HOME funding (26.4 percent), CDBG funding (31.6 percent), FHA-Insured loans (36.7 percent), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (36.3 percent).

Table 14
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type
1995-2004

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Projects 1995-2004
Projects	1,275	1,216	1,241	1,196	1,350	1,248	1,262	1,203	1,353	1,226	12,570
Central City	43.2%	43.3%	44.0%	43.0%	42.1%	41.1%	43.6%	47.6%	45.2%	43.9%	43.7%
Suburb	27.7%	29.6%	29.7%	32.2%	33.0%	34.4%	29.9%	31.7%	33.3%	32.0%	31.3%
Non-metro	29.1%	27.1%	26.4%	24.9%	25.0%	24.5%	26.6%	20.8%	21.5%	24.1%	25.0%
Units	77,309	77,897	83,739	86,392	102,805	92,866	94,589	97,820	114,181	104,972	932,570
Central City	50.5%	49.5%	50.8%	48.1%	47.4%	46.1%	47.1%	50.8%	50.1%	49.6%	49.1%
Suburb	33.9%	36.9%	34.9%	39.5%	40.1%	40.1%	39.3%	38.6%	37.9%	37.2%	38.0%
Non-metro	15.6%	13.6%	14.3%	12.4%	12.5%	13.8%	13.6%	10.6%	11.2%	13.3%	13.0%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 15
Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region
1995-2004

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
LIHTC Units					
Central City	61.8%	47.8%	46.0%	48.0%	49.1%
Suburb	31.8%	33.7%	40.7%	41.0%	38.0%
Non-metro	6.4%	18.5%	13.3%	11.1%	13.0%
All Occupied Rental Units					
Central City	51.1%	44.8%	44.6%	47.3%	46.7%
Suburb	41.2%	33.2%	35.6%	42.0%	37.8%
Non-metro	7.6%	22.1%	19.8%	10.7%	15.5%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. All U.S. Occupied Rental Units data are based on 2000 Census tracts. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 16
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type
1995-2004

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	83.7	90.0	38.6	77.1
Average Qualifying Ratio	93.0%	95.5%	97.1%	94.8%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size				
0 Bedrooms	6.8%	1.5%	1.3%	3.9%
1 Bedroom	30.1%	30.8%	29.6%	30.3%
2 Bedrooms	40.5%	44.8%	44.5%	42.7%
3 Bedrooms	19.1%	20.3%	22.3%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	3.6%	2.6%	2.3%	3.0%
Construction Type				
New Construction	50.3%	72.2%	71.2%	62.4%
Rehab	46.9%	26.9%	27.8%	35.8%
Both	2.7%	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	34.3%	24.8%	26.8%	29.4%
RHS Section 515	0.7%	9.0%	30.5%	11.0%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	21.7%	27.3%	7.5%	19.8%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	24.5%	33.2%	29.7%	28.6%
70 Percent	66.1%	60.5%	61.2%	63.0%
Both	9.5%	6.3%	9.2%	8.4%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis contains only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.7%), construction type (2.4%), nonprofit sponsor (13.0%), RHS Section 515 (16.4%), bond financing (7.0%) and credit type (8.0%). Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 17
LIHTC Project and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	32.7%	39.8%	17.7%	31.7%
RHS Section 515	0.7%	5.6%	20.5%	6.9%
HOME Funds	27.3%	27.2%	30.3%	28.0%
CDBG Funds	7.5%	4.7%	4.2%	5.7%
FHA-Insured Loans	5.5%	3.5%	2.5%	4.1%
Part of HOPE VI Development	4.4%	0.7%	1.0%	2.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (5.0 percent), RHS Section 515 loans (14.9 percent), HOME funding (25.9 percent), CDBG funding (31.0 percent), FHA-Insured loans (36.1 percent), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (36.4 percent). Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city.

Table 18
LIHTC Projects Targeted to a Specific Population by Location Type
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

Project Target to:	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Families	54.7%	55.2%	60.7%	56.2%
Elderly	23.2%	32.5%	29.5%	27.9%
Disabled	10.9%	11.5%	12.1%	11.4%
Homeless	5.5%	2.1%	3.7%	3.9%
Other	9.1%	5.6%	6.0%	7.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. Data on whether or not a project was targeted for a specific population was missing for 16.6 percent of the projects. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population. Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city.

Table 19
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs
1995-2004

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	All Projects 1995-2004
Projects	1,275	1,216	1,196	1,198	1,350	1,248	1,262	1,203	1,353	1,353	12,570
DDA	14.6%	12.1%	20.2%	22.0%	24.4%	23.9%	23.9%	22.5%	22.2%	21.6%	20.7%
QCT	21.2%	23.2%	25.7%	26.4%	29.6%	24.1%	27.5%	30.4%	36.8%	34.2%	27.9%
DDA or QCT	31.0%	31.3%	39.2%	41.4%	46.1%	41.0%	43.2%	45.7%	49.5%	47.5	41.6%
Units	77,309	77,897	83,739	86,392	102,805	92,866	94,589	97,820	114,181	104,972	932,570
DDA	12.7%	9.7%	16.1%	20.4%	23.5%	23.2%	20.3%	21.5%	20.6%	22.9%	19.1%
QCT	16.3%	20.1%	22.2%	22.7%	30.7%	22.7%	25.3%	30.8%	41.6%	40.5%	27.3%
DDA or QCT	25.5%	26.6%	33.9%	39.0%	48.5%	40.2%	39.9%	46.5%	52.7%	56.1%	40.9%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. For LIHTC projects placed in service from 1995-2002, QCT designation is based on the 1990 census tract location. For LIHTC projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004, QCT designation is based on the 2000 census tract location. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 20
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs
1995-2004

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	68.4	73.0	75.3	74.4
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.5%	94.2%	95.6%	94.8%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size				
0 Bedrooms	7.1%	8.0%	2.0%	3.9%
1 Bedroom	33.5%	29.9%	29.5%	30.2%
2 Bedrooms	37.0%	36.9%	46.2%	42.7%
3 Bedrooms	19.4%	20.4%	20.0%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	3.0%	4.8%	2.4%	3.0%
Construction Type				
New Construction	51.0%	46.3%	70.7%	62.4%
Rehab	47.4%	50.4%	28.4%	35.8%
Both	1.6%	3.4%	0.9%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	33.2%	38.5%	24.3%	29.4%
RHS Section 515	6.0%	2.1%	15.8%	11.0%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	23.5%	15.8%	20.2%	19.8%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	28.2%	20.8%	31.5%	28.6%
70 Percent	66.3%	68.9%	60.6%	63.0%
Both	5.4%	10.4%	7.9%	8.4%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. For LIHTC projects placed in service from 1995-2002, QCT designation is based on the 1990 census tract location. For LIHTC projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004, QCT designation is based on the 2000 census tract location. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.7%), construction type (2.4%), nonprofit sponsor (13.0%), RHS Section 515 (16.4%), bond financing (7.0%) and credit type (8.0%). Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Some properties are located in both a DDA and a QCT.

Table 21
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	36.5%	25.9%	33.3%	31.7%
RHS Section 515	6.3%	2.6%	9.2%	6.9%
HOME Funds	39.7%	29.1%	26.5%	28.0%
CDBG Funds	8.9%	8.4%	3.8%	5.7%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.3%	5.4%	3.8%	4.1%
Part of HOPE VI Development	1.5%	6.2%	0.7%	2.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (5.0 percent), RHS Section 515 loans (14.9 percent), HOME funding (25.9 percent), CDBG funding (31.0 percent), FHA-Insured loans (36.1 percent), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (36.4 percent). Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Some properties are located in both a DDA and a QCT. QCTs for projects placed in service in 2003 and 2004 are based on 2000 census tract locations.

Table 22
LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type
1995-2004

Census Tract Characteristic	Central City		Suburb		Non-Metro Area		Total		
	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	LIHTC Units (Not in a QCT and no increase in basis)	All Rental Units
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	33.5%	20.8%	5.6%	3.5%	11.2%	8.1%	20.0%	10.6%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	59.1%	44.9%	28.9%	23.3%	14.6%	11.3%	42.5%	38.3%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	27.1%	16.0%	7.7%	3.5%	5.3%	2.7%	16.9%	25.8%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	65.8%	64.1%	28.2%	30.9%	14.6%	12.7%	44.9%	40.8%	43.6%

Notes: The dataset used for this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. Information on poverty, minority population, female-headed households, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data and tract definitions.

Table 23
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by DDA or QCT Designation
1995-2004

Census Tract Characteristic	In DDA		In QCT		Not in DDA or QCT		Total	
	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units	LIHTC Units	All Rental Units
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	26.7%	15.8%	63.7%	61.0%	2.7%	3.7%	20.0%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	55.0%	44.6%	81.7%	74.6%	24.8%	20.5%	42.5%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	19.6%	11.8%	43.7%	39.1%	6.5%	3.7%	16.9%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	61.0%	61.0%	82.6%	85.1%	26.9%	31.6%	44.9%	43.6%

Notes: The dataset used for this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Information on poverty, minority population, female-headed households, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data. QCTs are based on 1999 definitions and 1990 census tract definitions.

Table 24
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type
1995-2004

Census Tract Characteristic	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Units
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 515	
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	26.9%	14.2%	9.0%	20.0%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	44.0%	40.6%	15.5%	42.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	21.2%	12.6%	2.9%	16.9%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	50.8%	47.2%	6.7 %	44.9%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. The dataset contains missing data for nonprofit sponsor (13.0%), RHS Section 515 (16.4%), and bond financing (7.0%). Information on poverty, minority population, female-headed households, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data and tract definitions.

Table 25
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units
LIHTC Projects for Targeted to Specific Populations
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2004

Census Tract Characteristic	Projects Targeted to:					All 2004 Projects
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other	
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	19.6%	15.2%	22.6%	40.5%	36.7%	21.7%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	42.0%	37.7%	30.2%	35.2%	59.0%	46.3%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	17.1%	8.1%	12.3%	21.5%	18.7%	15.7%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	41.4%	40.7%	40.1%	67.7%	50.7%	43.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 229,989 units placed in service in 2003 and 2004. Data on project targeting are missing for 17.9 percent of units. Targeting is project specific and not unit specific. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population. The percent of projects targeted to families, elderly, disabled, homeless, or other are based on the number of projects with targeting data.

Table 26
Distribution of LIHTC Units by Location Characteristics Over Time:
1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years

Year Placed in Service	1992-1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Distribution by Region											
Northeast	13.6%	15.4%	11.7%	16.7%	16.2%	13.3%	15.9%	11.9%	14.0%	13.3%	11.3%
Midwest	27.3%	31.4%	28.8%	25.0%	20.0%	22.4%	19.7%	17.5%	19.1%	19.7%	21.1%
South	40.3%	44.2%	42.6%	36.6%	39.3%	37.6%	34.6%	45.5%	43.2%	44.1%	41.9%
West	18.8%	9.0%	16.9%	21.6%	24.5%	26.7%	29.8%	25.1%	23.7%	22.9%	25.7%
Distribution by Location Type											
Central City	50.2%	50.5%	49.5%	50.8%	48.1%	47.4%	46.1%	47.1%	50.8%	50.9%	49.6%
Suburb	30.5%	33.9%	36.9%	34.9%	39.5%	40.1%	40.1%	39.3%	38.6%	37.9%	37.2%
Non-metro	19.4%	15.6%	13.6%	14.3%	12.4%	12.5%	13.8%	13.6%	10.6%	11.2%	13.3%
Distribution by Location in DDA or QCT											
DDA	15.7%	15.4%	11.6%	17.9%	22.0%	21.4%	23.3%	20.0%	20.5%	16.8%	20.4%
QCT	25.7%	19.6%	24.0%	24.7%	24.5%	27.9%	22.8%	25.0%	29.4%	34.0%	36.0%
DDA or QCT	34.4%	30.8%	31.9%	37.7%	42.1%	44.0%	40.4%	39.3%	44.3%	43.0%	49.8%
Distribution by Census Tract Characteristics											
>30% Poor* Households	22.3%	17.3%	20.4%	17.1%	20.2%	21.3%	17.6%	18.0%	23.7%	21.7%	21.7%
>50% Minority Population	40.2%	36.4%	36.5%	41.3%	45.8%	40.2%	40.9%	42.8%	45.6%	45.3%	47.4%
>50% Renter	44.7%	45.2%	49.9%	48.2%	47.4%	46.6%	42.2%	42.9%	41.1%	44.2%	43.0%

*Defined as below the poverty line.

Notes: The data set used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects, except the analysis of distribution by region, which used the full data set excluding Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Projects placed in service in 2004 do not include updates for Louisiana. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. Information on poverty, minority population, female-headed households, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data and tract definitions.