

Table of Contents

Table 1.	Tax Credit Allocating Agencies.....	1
Table 2.	LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable 1992-2007	2
Table 3.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2007	3
Table 4.	Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2007	4
Table 5.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type 1995-2007	5
Table 6.	Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types 1995-2007.....	6
Table 7.	Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007	6
Table 8.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007.....	7
Table 9.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007.....	8
Table 10.	LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and Additional Financing Sources Used Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007.....	9
Table 11.	Distribution of Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007	10
Table 12.	Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, by Project Characteristics Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007.....	11
Table 13.	Additional Project Characteristics Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007 .	12
Table 14.	Additional Project Characteristics, by Project Characteristics Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007	13
Table 15.	Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years 1995-2007	14
Table 16.	Characteristics of LIHTC Properties Over Time: 1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years.....	15
Table 17.	Regional Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units 1995-2007	16
Table 18.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region 1995-2007	17
Table 19.	Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007	18

Table 20.	Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type 1995-2007	19
Table 21.	Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region 1995-2007.....	20
Table 22.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type 1995-2007	21
Table 23.	LIHTC Projects and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007	22
Table 24.	LIHTC Projects Targeted to a Specific Population by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007.....	22
Table 25.	Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs 1995-2007	23
Table 26.	Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs 1995-2007	24
Table 27.	Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007	25
Table 28.	Distribution of LIHTC Units and Projects by Development Cost Category 1995-2007	26
Table 29.	LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type 1995-2007	27
Table 30.	Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by DDA or QCT Designation 1995-2007	28
Table 31.	Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type 1995-2007 ...	29
Table 32.	Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007.....	29
Table 33.	Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, by Location Characteristics Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007.....	30
Table 34.	Additional Project Characteristics, by Region Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007	31
Table 35.	Additional Project Characteristics, by Location Characteristics Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007	32
Table 36.	Distribution of LIHTC Units by Location Characteristics Over Time: 1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years.....	33

**Table 1.
Tax Credit Allocating Agencies**

Alabama Housing Finance Authority	Montana Board of Housing
Alaska Housing Finance Corporation	Nebraska Investment Finance Authority
Arizona Department of Housing	Nevada Department of Business & Industry
Arkansas Development Finance Authority	New Hampshire Housing Finance Authority
California Tax Credit Allocation Committee	New Jersey Housing & Mortgage Finance Agency
City of Chicago Department of Housing	New Mexico Mortgage Finance Authority
Colorado Housing & Finance Authority	New York State Division of Housing & Community Renewal ^c
Connecticut Housing Finance Authority	New York State Housing Finance Agency
Delaware State Housing Authority	City of New York Department of Housing Preservation & Development
District of Columbia Department of Housing & Community Development ^a	Development Authority of the North Country (New York)
Florida Housing Finance Corporation	North Carolina Housing Finance Agency
Georgia Department of Community Affairs	North Dakota Housing Finance Agency
Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority	Ohio Housing Finance Agency
Housing & Community Development Corporation of Hawaii	Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency
Idaho Housing & Finance Association	Oregon Housing & Community Services
Illinois Housing Development Authority	Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency
Indiana Housing Finance Authority	Puerto Rico Housing Finance Corporation
Iowa Finance Authority	Rhode Island Housing & Mortgage Finance Corporation
Kansas Department of Commerce & Housing	South Carolina Housing Finance & Development Authority
Kentucky Housing Corporation	South Dakota Housing Development Authority
Louisiana Housing Finance Agency	Tennessee Housing Development Agency
Maine State Housing Authority	Texas Department of Housing & Community Affairs
Maryland Department of Housing & Community Development	Utah Housing Finance Agency
Massachusetts Department of Housing & Community Development	Vermont Housing Finance Agency
Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency	Virgin Islands Housing Finance Authority
MassDevelopment ^b	Virginia Housing Development Authority
Michigan State Housing Development Authority	Washington State Housing Finance Commission
Minnesota Housing Finance Agency	West Virginia Housing Development Fund
Mississippi Home Corporation	Wisconsin Housing & Economic Development Authority
Missouri Housing Development Commission	Wyoming Community Development Authority

^a The District of Columbia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) is the official LIHTC allocating agency for the District of Columbia. In earlier years, the DHCD and the District of Columbia Housing Finance Agency (DCHFA) each submitted data for the HUD National LIHTC Database updates. Since 2005, all data for the District of Columbia have been submitted through the DHCD only.

^b MassDevelopment, one of three tax credit allocating agencies in Massachusetts, first placed a project in service with low income housing tax credits in 2006. This is the first database update that includes projects allocated tax credits by this agency.

^c In New York, the New York Division of Housing and Community Renewal is the official state LIHTC allocating agency. All other New York allocating agencies – including the New York State Housing Finance Agency, the City of New York Department of Housing Preservation & Development, and the Development Authority of the North Country (New York) – are suballocating agencies. Because the suballocating agencies maintain their own placed in service data, contact is made directly with the suballocating agencies

Table 2.
LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable
1992-2007

Variable	1992-1994		1995-2007	
	Percent of Projects with Missing Data	Percent of Units with Missing Data	Percent of Projects with Missing Data	Percent of Units with Missing Data
Project Address ^a	0.6%	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%
Owner Contact Data	9.2%	9.4%	3.7%	2.9%
Total Units	0.7%	---	0.3%	---
Low Income Units	1.5%	2.6%	1.1%	1.2%
Number of Bedrooms ^b	42.1%	48.9%	11.4%	11.3%
Allocation Year	5.1%	5.3%	0.8%	1.0%
Construction Type (new/rehab)	18.0%	18.7%	5.2%	5.7%
Credit Type	40.0%	40.0%	7.3%	6.7%
Nonprofit Sponsorship	27.7%	24.8%	9.8%	9.5%
Increase in Basis	37.0%	34.0%	13.8%	11.1%
Use of Tax-Exempt Bonds	20.5%	21.6%	6.0%	6.5%
Use of RHS Section 515	30.8%	27.1%	13.8%	13.6%

Notes: The database update includes revisions and updates for data in all placed in service years, including a net gain of records and data representing 979 projects and 74,833 units placed in service from 1987 to 2006. For the 1992 to 1994 placed in service years, revisions and updates included a net gain of records and data representing 24 projects and 3,590 units. For the 1995 to 2006 placed in service years, revisions and updates included a net gain of 703 projects and 59,830 units. The database update adds 1,408 projects and 111,863 units placed in service in 2007.

^a Indicates only that some location was provided. Address may not be a complete street address.

^b For some properties, bedroom count was provided for most but not all units, in which case data is not considered missing. The percent of units with missing bedroom count data is based on properties where no data were provided on bedroom count.

**Table 3.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects
1995-2007**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	All Projects 1995-2007
Number of Projects	1,507	1,422	1,372	1,353	1,547	1,374	1,403	1,353	1,505	1,515	1,622	1,484	1,408	18,865
Number of Units	88,559	90,155	88,920	95,001	117,367	103,777	104,363	106,827	127,341	125,958	128,539	115,988	111,863	1,404,658
Average Project Size Distribution	58.8	63.4	64.8	70.3	76.1	75.9	74.7	80.4	84.7	83.3	79.3	78.4	79.8	74.7
0-10 Units	12.6%	13.7%	7.5%	7.5%	6.0%	5.8%	4.6%	4.4%	3.8%	4.9%	5.4%	2.5%	3.7%	6.3%
11-20 Units	11.7%	11.7%	12.2%	10.7%	11.8%	11.0%	10.4%	10.2%	8.0%	8.6%	7.2%	6.7%	5.8%	9.7%
21-50 Units	40.8%	36.4%	41.6%	39.1%	36.5%	34.3%	39.8%	34.6%	33.9%	34.2%	34.1%	37.4%	37.1%	36.9%
51-99 Units	17.8%	18.4%	19.4%	21.1%	22.2%	23.6%	21.7%	23.5%	24.4%	23.6%	26.5%	27.2%	27.9%	22.9%
100+ Units	17.1%	19.8%	19.2%	21.6%	23.5%	25.3%	23.3%	27.3%	29.9%	28.7%	26.9%	26.3%	25.5%	24.2%
Average Qualifying Ratio Distribution	97.2%	96.5%	95.9%	95.5%	94.9%	94.3%	94.2%	92.4%	93.7%	93.4%	94.9%	96.4%	96.4%	95.1%
0-20%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21-40%	0.7%	1.8%	1.2%	1.6%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.8%	0.9%	1.5%	0.9%	0.2%	0.0%	1.1%
41-60%	2.4%	2.1%	2.6%	2.5%	2.9%	3.9%	2.7%	3.7%	1.9%	3.0%	2.4%	1.2%	1.9%	2.5%
61-80%	2.0%	2.6%	5.1%	5.5%	7.3%	7.4%	10.1%	12.8%	13.5%	9.6%	9.3%	7.5%	6.3%	7.6%
81-90%	2.1%	1.6%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	3.4%	4.3%	6.2%	6.4%	8.1%	4.0%	4.4%	4.3%	4.0%
91-95%	2.0%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6%	2.8%	3.2%	3.0%	2.3%	1.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.7%	2.7%	2.3%
96-100%	90.8%	90.0%	87.0%	86.4%	83.4%	80.9%	78.7%	73.1%	75.4%	75.3%	81.0%	83.9%	84.8%	82.4%
Average Bedrooms Distribution	1.91	1.95	1.91	1.98	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.87	1.87	1.95	1.90	1.89	1.86	1.91
0 Bedroom	4.2%	4.0%	4.8%	2.9%	4.5%	3.7%	3.2%	3.7%	5.7%	4.4%	4.7%	4.2%	4.0%	4.2%
1 Bedroom	30.2%	29.0%	29.6%	28.5%	28.2%	31.5%	28.7%	32.2%	31.0%	31.4%	34.3%	35.2%	37.1%	31.6%
2 Bedroom	43.6%	44.5%	42.2%	43.3%	42.7%	42.3%	44.2%	42.0%	40.2%	41.1%	38.7%	39.1%	38.5%	41.5%
3 Bedroom	19.8%	20.1%	20.7%	21.9%	21.1%	20.2%	21.0%	19.5%	20.2%	19.4%	19.0%	18.9%	18.1%	19.9%
≥4 Bedroom	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%	3.4%	3.5%	2.4%	2.9%	2.7%	2.9%	3.7%	3.3%	2.6%	2.5%	2.9%

Notes: The database update includes revisions and updates for data in all placed in service years, including a net gain of records and data representing 703 projects and 59,830 units placed in service from 1995 to 2006. The analysis dataset includes 18,865 projects and 1,404,658 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. The average number of units per property and the distribution of property size are both calculated based on the 18,805 properties with a known number of units, and not on the full universe of 18,865 properties. The database contains missing data for number of units (0.3%), qualifying ratio (percentage of tax credit units) (2.1%) and bedroom count (11.4%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 4.
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects
1995-2007**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	All Projects 1995-2007
Construction														
New	67.5%	64.1%	61.6%	63.3%	63.6%	60.9%	59.9%	61.1%	67.0%	62.8%	63.9%	62.2%	61.6%	63.1%
Rehab	31.6%	34.9%	36.0%	35.5%	34.9%	38.2%	38.6%	37.2%	31.1%	35.7%	34.3%	35.3%	37.3%	35.4%
Both	0.8%	1.0%	2.5%	1.2%	1.5%	0.9%	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	1.5%	1.8%	2.6%	1.1%	1.5%
Nonprofit Sponsor	16.7%	22.9%	31.7%	33.1%	30.1%	29.1%	31.4%	25.9%	25.1%	27.2%	26.8%	31.0%	26.7%	27.5 %
RHS Section 515	23.4%	14.7%	12.6%	10.4%	9.8%	8.8%	10.5%	7.2%	5.5%	8.4%	4.9%	6.8%	6.8%	9.9%
Tax-Exempt Bonds	3.8%	6.4%	9.1%	15.5%	21.6%	26.4%	24.4%	30.7%	30.3%	31.6%	30.6%	26.9%	31.7%	22.3%
Credit Type														
30 Percent	26.5%	22.4%	24.4%	29.9%	33.8%	34.6%	32.9%	36.8%	34.1%	36.0%	33.5%	31.6%	33.4%	31.5%
70 Percent	64.7%	69.8%	67.2%	61.9%	59.8%	59.3%	58.4%	55.1%	55.9%	56.9%	59.1%	57.4%	58.4%	60.3%
Both	8.7%	7.8%	8.3%	8.2%	6.4%	6.1%	8.7%	8.1%	10.0%	7.2%	7.3%	11.0%	8.2%	8.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,865 projects and 1,404,658 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. The database contains missing data for construction type (5.2%), nonprofit sponsor (9.8%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), bond financing (6.0%), and credit type (7.3%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 5.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type
1995-2007

Credit Type	Projects			Units		
	30%	70%	Both	30%	70%	Both
Construction Type						
New	52.6%	77.4%	8.7%	52.7%	78.9%	9.7%
Rehab	46.6%	21.3%	84.8%	46.5%	19.9%	85.0%
Both	0.9%	1.3%	6.5%	0.8%	1.2%	5.3%
RHS Section 515	19.2%	3.3%	20.8%	5.9%	1.9%	12.5%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	66.6%	1.9%	5.7%	87.4%	3.3%	12.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,865 projects and 1,404,658 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. The database contains missing data for construction type (5.2%), nonprofit sponsor (9.8%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), bond financing (6.0%), and credit type (7.3%). 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 6.
Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types
1995-2007**

	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Projects 1995-2007
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 515	
Average Project Size (units)	54.6	140.4	34.2	74.7
Distribution by Project Size				
0-10 units	5.7%	0.6%	2.5%	6.3%
11-20 units	14.3%	2.3%	18.3%	9.7%
21-50 units	45.0%	15.3%	68.2%	36.9%
51-99 units	22.2%	22.9%	8.5%	22.9%
100+ units	12.8%	58.9%	2.5%	24.2%
Construction Type				
New	60.5%	51.6%	48.4%	63.1%
Rehab	35.9%	47.4%	51.3%	35.4%
Both	3.6%	1.0%	0.4%	1.5%
Average Qualifying Ratio	96.0%	92.4%	99.0%	95.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,865 projects and 1,404,658 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. The database contains missing data for construction type (5.2%), nonprofit sponsor (9.8%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), bond financing (6.0%), and credit type (7.3%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 7.
Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007**

Number of Non-LIHTC Subsidy Sources	Percent of Projects
0	39.0%
1	48.2%
2	11.1%
3	1.4%
4 or more	0.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 4,505 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007 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 8.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

	Tax-Exempt Bonds	RHS Section 515 Loans	HOME Funds	CDBG Funds	FHA-Insured Loans	Part of HOPE VI Development
All 2003-2007 Projects	30.3%	6.4%	29.5%	6.2%	4.0%	2.9%
Average Project Size	134.4	39.1	50.0	57.3	106.1	95.9
Distribution by Project Size						
0-10 units	0.4%	1.5%	10.5%	9.4%	0.5%	0.7%
11-20 units	2.2%	16.0%	13.1%	13.8%	3.2%	3.6%
21-50 units	17.8%	64.9%	44.4%	42.0%	25.4%	23.7%
51-99 units	22.9%	13.8%	21.6%	20.4%	30.7%	32.4%
100+ units	56.7%	3.9%	10.4%	14.4%	40.2%	39.6%
Average Qualifying Ratio	95.0%	98.9%	93.2%	91.5%	92.3%	92.7%
Construction Type						
New	51.8%	38.1%	61.7%	44.5%	42.8%	92.7%
Rehab	47.0%	61.1%	35.6%	52.4%	55.1%	3.7%
Both	1.2%	0.7%	2.6%	3.2%	2.1%	3.7%
Projects by Credit Type						
30%	92.4%	34.2%	16.8%	24.6%	56.9%	18.2%
70%	5.6%	37.6%	73.4%	61.8%	34.6%	79.6%
Both	2.1%	28.3%	9.7%	13.6%	8.5%	2.3%
Units by Credit Type						
30%	93.9%	38.0%	26.3%	33.5%	67.8%	23.1%
70%	3.7%	36.0%	61.6%	55.5%	23.5%	76.2%
Both	2.3%	26.1%	12.2%	11.1%	8.8%	0.7%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007 with data on the use of the additional financing sources. The dataset is missing data on tax-exempt bonds (7.5%) and RHS Section 515 loans (14.4%). Data are missing or incomplete on the use of HOME funding (24.0%), CDBG funding (32.0%), FHA-Insured loans (36.8%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (35.9%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 9.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007**

	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
All 2003-2007 Projects	52.7%	26.8%	11.9%	4.5%	7.1%
Average Project Size	81.2	76.5	62.5	54.0	70.3
Distribution by Project Size					
0-10 units	2.0%	1.3%	2.1%	2.3%	2.7%
11-20 units	8.0%	5.6%	9.6%	10.8%	5.0%
21-50 units	37.3%	37.2%	47.1%	47.7%	44.3%
51-99 units	26.8%	28.3%	24.6%	28.4%	26.0%
100+ units	25.9%	27.6%	16.6%	10.8%	22.0%
Average Qualifying Ratio	95.8%	96.2%	97.7%	96.5%	96.2%
Construction Type					
New	67.6%	70.7%	71.3%	65.3%	68.7%
Rehab	30.5%	27.9%	27.7%	30.0%	26.7%
Both	2.0%	1.4%	1.0%	4.7%	4.5%
Projects by Credit Type					
30%	31.9%	35.9%	18.9%	11.5%	21.0%
70%	58.2%	56.1%	69.9%	73.7%	70.0%
Both	9.9%	8.1%	11.2%	14.9%	9.0%
Units by Credit Type					
30%	50.1%	46.8%	34.5%	16.1%	30.6%
70%	41.5%	45.8%	54.6%	68.2%	61.0%
Both	8.4%	7.4%	10.9%	15.7%	8.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 6,759 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007 with data on whether or not the project was targeted for a specific population. Of these, 5,707 projects were targeted to a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

Table 10.
LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and
Additional Financing Sources Used
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

Additional Financing Used	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	29.1%	31.8%	15.9%	9.6%	20.1%
RHS Section 515	6.6%	6.8%	6.1%	3.7%	2.6%
HOME Funds	28.3%	30.3%	31.9%	29.3%	30.8%
CDBG Funds	6.0%	5.0%	5.6%	9.5%	5.9%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.6%	4.1%	2.2%	2.9%	4.8%
Part of a HOPE VI Development	4.2%	1.4%	3.0%	1.4%	2.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 5,707 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007 targeted for a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

**Table 11.
Distribution of Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007**

	Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated	Amount of HOME Funds	Amount of CDBG Funds	Amount of HOPE VI Funds
Number of Projects with Funding	2,656	585	117	44
Number of Qualifying Units	199,572	26,343	5,997	3,754
Minimum	\$62	\$883	\$324	\$4,494
10th Percentile	\$2,569	\$6,027	\$2,371	\$14,612
25th Percentile	\$4,424	\$10,870	\$4,000	\$22,089
50th Percentile (Median)	\$7,725	\$18,623	\$12,883	\$30,738
Mean	\$8,422	\$28,002	\$17,213	\$43,029
75th Percentile	\$11,384	\$34,450	\$26,724	\$54,718
90th Percentile	\$14,943	\$67,010	\$35,119	\$84,629
Maximum	\$39,471	\$159,688	\$98,889	\$178,055

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,892 projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007. Qualifying units are the number of reported low income units. The dataset contains missing data for the number of low-income units (1.6%). These projects were excluded in this analysis.

Table 12.
Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, by Project Characteristics
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007

	Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOME Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of CDBG Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOPE VI Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects
Project Size												
0-10 units	\$12,571	87	3.3%	\$75,586	56	9.6%	\$41,565	4	3.4%	--	0	0.0%
11-50 units	\$9,664	1,157	43.6%	\$25,883	343	58.6%	\$17,066	77	65.8%	\$54,264	8	18.2%
51-99 units	\$8,833	724	27.3%	\$18,999	133	22.7%	\$15,041	22	18.8%	\$44,304	21	47.7%
100+ units	\$5,375	688	25.9%	\$14,030	53	9.1%	\$14,474	14	12.0%	\$35,251	15	34.1%
Construction												
New	\$9,986	1,611	61.0%	\$25,197	370	63.5%	\$18,211	61	53.0%	\$45,108	39	90.7%
Rehab	\$5,754	982	37.2%	\$34,002	198	34.0%	\$16,648	51	44.3%	\$19,842	2	4.7%
Both	\$10,396	49	1.9%	\$20,096	15	2.6%	\$5,068	3	2.6%	\$20,345	2	4.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor												
Yes	\$9,725	741	28.9%	\$25,551	247	42.4%	\$18,750	66	56.4%	\$37,787	9	20.5%
No	\$8,029	1,821	71.1%	\$29,947	335	57.6%	\$15,223	51	43.6%	\$44,377	35	79.5%
RHS Section 515												
Yes	\$5,354	168	6.8%	\$18,487	36	6.3%	\$17,637	11	9.4%	\$22,351	1	2.3%
No	\$8,681	2,300	93.2%	\$29,132	535	93.7%	\$17,169	106	90.6%	\$43,510	43	97.7%
Tax-Exempt Bonds												
Yes	\$5,331	770	30.7%	\$24,019	62	10.6%	\$17,474	24	20.5%	\$63,124	6	13.6%
No	\$9,936	1,739	69.3%	\$28,474	523	89.4%	\$17,146	93	79.5%	\$39,856	38	86.4%
Credit Type												
30 Percent	\$5,412	875	33.1%	\$20,892	89	15.3%	\$18,719	31	26.7%	\$63,124	6	13.6%
70 Percent	\$10,519	1,506	57.0%	\$31,007	432	74.1%	\$15,923	64	55.2%	\$40,450	37	84.1%
Both	\$6,378	264	9.9%	\$17,781	62	10.6%	\$19,666	21	18.1%	\$17,857	1	2.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,892 projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007. The dataset contains missing data for the number of units (0.4%), low-income units (1.6%), construction type (3.3%), nonprofit sponsor (6.0%), RHS Section 515 (11.2%), bond financing (5.1%), and credit type (3.8%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 13.
Additional Project Characteristics
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007**

Elected Rent/Income Ceiling	
50% AMGI	7.6%
60% AMGI	92.4%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling	
Yes	68.0%
No	32.0%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)	
Average	55.8%
0-10 percent	5.7%
10-25 percent	19.0%
25-50 percent	20.2%
50-75 percent	20.4%
75-90 percent	8.4%
90-100 percent	26.4%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract	
Yes	27.8%
No	72.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,892 projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007. The dataset contains missing data for the designation of elected rent/income ceiling for low-income units (9.3%), whether there are units set aside with rents lower than elected rent/income ceiling (26.6%), and whether there is a federal/state projected-based rental assistance contract (27.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 14.
Additional Project Characteristics, by Project Characteristics
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007**

	Project Targeted to				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Number of Projects	1,425	742	346	134	200
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
50% AMGI	7.0%	7.0%	7.6%	17.2%	14.4%
60% AMGI	93.0%	93.0%	92.4%	82.8%	85.6%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
Yes	68.8%	68.7%	76.7%	78.2%	80.4%
No	31.2%	31.3%	23.3%	21.8%	19.6%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)					
Average	56.0%	55.0%	75.0%	72.0%	57.0%
0-10 percent	6.5%	6.3%	1.1%	3.2%	5.7%
10-25 percent	19.3%	20.9%	2.9%	6.3%	20.0%
25-50 percent	18.2%	18.2%	14.9%	12.6%	20.0%
50-75 percent	20.7%	20.6%	17.2%	12.6%	17.1%
75-90 percent	9.3%	8.7%	17.8%	23.2%	3.8%
90-100 percent	26.0%	25.4%	46.0%	42.1%	33.3%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract					
Yes	26.4%	30.3%	26.0%	35.6%	43.7%
No	73.6%	69.7%	74.0%	64.4%	56.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,892 projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007. Of these, 2,800 projects were targeted to a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

**Table 15.
Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years
1995-2007**

Year Tax Credit Allocated	Year Placed in Service													
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	1995-2007
Pre-1993	1.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
1993	35.9%	2.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
1994	47.0%	42.8%	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	7.2%
1995	15.0%	39.2%	40.7%	2.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%
1996	0.9%	13.6%	40.3%	39.7%	3.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%
1997	0.0%	2.0%	15.5%	39.7%	39.4%	3.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.6%
1998	0.1%	0.2%	1.2%	15.4%	38.2%	36.9%	1.5%	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.2%
1999	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	1.7%	13.1%	41.5%	37.1%	2.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	7.2%
2000	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	4.4%	13.4%	43.0%	37.2%	2.4%	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	7.5%
2001	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.8%	2.9%	14.0%	42.1%	45.5%	2.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	8.3%
2002	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.5%	3.5%	13.5%	33.9%	45.4%	4.4%	0.9%	0.1%	8.1%
2003	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	3.3%	11.7%	36.9%	46.4%	6.9%	0.6%	8.7%
2004	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	5.4%	10.7%	34.1%	43.7%	3.7%	7.9%
2005	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	2.5%	8.7%	33.5%	41.9%	6.6%
2006	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	1.3%	8.3%	32.6%	3.2%
2007 or later	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%	0.7%	4.0%	5.9%	21.1%	2.4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,865 projects and 1,404,658 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. The database contains missing data for allocation year (0.8%). Projects with allocation year later than placed in service year are primarily bond projects that allocating agencies have reported received tax credits after being placed in service.

Table 16.
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	2005	2006	2007
Annual Number of Projects	1,430 ^a	1,506	1,421	1,372	1,352	1,543	1,368	1,398	1,328	1,504	1,512	1,620	1,480	1,401
Annual Number of Units	61,038 ^a	88,559	90,155	88,920	95,001	117,367	103,777	104,363	106,827	127,341	125,958	128,539	115,988	111,863
Annual Number of Low-Income Units	56,269 ^a	82,889	83,661	81,238	87,192	107,353	94,802	96,109	98,801	114,633	111,351	116,222	110,196	105,262
Average Project Size (units)	43.0	58.8	63.4	64.8	70.3	76.1	75.9	74.7	80.4	84.7	83.3	79.3	78.4	79.8
Distribution by Size														
0-10 units	22.0%	12.6%	13.7%	7.5%	7.5%	6.0%	5.8%	4.6%	4.4%	3.8%	4.9%	5.4%	2.5%	3.7%
11-50 units	55.1%	52.5%	48.1%	53.9%	49.9%	48.3%	45.2%	50.3%	44.9%	41.9%	42.8%	41.3%	44.1%	42.9%
51-99 units	12.9%	17.8%	18.4%	19.4%	21.1%	22.2%	23.6%	21.7%	23.5%	24.4%	23.6%	26.5%	27.2%	27.9%
100+ units	10.0%	17.1%	19.8%	19.2%	21.6%	23.5%	25.3%	23.3%	27.3%	29.9%	28.7%	26.9%	26.3%	25.5%
Average Bedrooms	1.86	1.91	1.95	1.91	1.98	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.87	1.87	1.95	1.90	1.89	1.86
Distribution														
0 Bedrooms	5.1%	4.2%	4.0%	4.8%	2.9%	4.5%	3.7%	3.2%	3.7%	5.7%	4.4%	4.7%	4.2%	4.0%
1 Bedroom	39.8%	30.2%	29.0%	29.6%	28.5%	28.2%	31.5%	28.7%	32.2%	31.0%	31.4%	34.3%	35.2%	37.1%
2 Bedrooms	38.9%	43.6%	44.5%	42.2%	43.3%	42.7%	42.3%	44.2%	42.0%	40.2%	41.1%	38.7%	39.1%	38.5%
3 Bedrooms	15.0%	19.8%	20.1%	20.7%	21.9%	21.1%	20.2%	21.0%	19.5%	20.2%	19.4%	19.0%	18.9%	18.1%
4+ Bedrooms	1.2%	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%	3.4%	3.5%	2.4%	2.9%	2.7%	2.9%	3.7%	3.3%	2.6%	2.5%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.7%	97.2%	96.5%	95.9%	95.5%	94.9%	94.3%	94.2%	92.4%	93.7%	93.4%	94.9%	96.4%	96.4%
Distribution of Projects by Construction Type														
New	64.9%	67.5%	64.1%	61.6%	63.3%	63.6%	60.9%	59.9%	61.1%	67.0%	62.8%	63.9%	62.2%	61.6%
Rehab	34.4%	31.6%	34.9%	36.0%	35.5%	34.9%	38.2%	38.6%	37.2%	31.1%	35.7%	34.3%	35.3%	37.3%
Both	0.6%	0.8%	1.0%	2.5%	1.2%	1.5%	0.9%	1.5%	1.7%	1.9%	1.5%	1.8%	2.6%	1.1%
Nonprofit Sponsor	16.9%	16.7%	22.9%	31.7%	33.1%	30.1%	29.1%	31.4%	25.9%	25.1%	27.2%	26.8%	31.0%	26.7%
RHS Section 515	33.6%	23.4%	14.7%	12.6%	10.4%	9.8%	8.8%	10.5%	7.2%	5.5%	8.4%	4.9%	6.8%	6.8%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2.8%	3.8%	6.4%	9.1%	15.5%	21.6%	26.4%	24.4%	30.7%	30.3%	31.6%	30.6%	26.9%	31.7%

^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 (42.1%), qualifying ratio (2.4%), construction type (18.0%), nonprofit sponsor (27.7%), RHS Section 515 (30.8%), and bond financing (20.5%). For projects placed in service between 1995 and 2007, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (11.4%), qualifying ratio (2.1%), construction type (5.2%), nonprofit sponsor (9.8%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), and bond financing (6.0%). Qualifying ratio is a simple average of the qualifying ratio of projects. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 17.
Regional Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units
1995-2007

Region	All LIHTC Projects		Geocoded LIHTC Projects		All U.S. Rental Housing Units	U.S. Population
	Projects	Units	Projects	Units		
Northeast	18.7%	13.9%	19.1%	14.0%	21.4%	19.0%
Midwest	26.7%	22.5%	26.7%	22.2%	20.6%	22.9%
South	32.4%	38.8%	32.0%	39.0%	33.7%	35.6%
West	22.1%	24.8%	22.3%	24.9%	24.2%	22.5%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 18,762 projects and 1,396,874 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. Of these, 17,743 projects and 1,348,080 units were geocoded. Projects and units in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam were excluded. Total population and rental units are based on 2000 Census data. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 18.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region
1995-2007**

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Average Project Size (Units)	55.4	63.0	89.6	83.3	74.7
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.0%	94.8%	97.1%	95.8%	95.1%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size					
0 Bedrooms	7.7%	3.1%	1.2%	7.6%	4.2%
1 Bedroom	44.6%	31.7%	25.8%	32.4%	31.5%
2 Bedrooms	32.2%	42.8%	47.3%	37.2%	41.6%
3 Bedrooms	13.2%	19.2%	23.0%	19.6%	19.9%
4+ Bedrooms	2.2%	3.2%	2.7%	3.3%	2.9%
Construction Type					
New Construction	40.4%	64.0%	71.3%	69.6%	63.0%
Rehab	57.2%	33.9%	27.4%	29.8%	35.4%
Both	2.4%	2.1%	1.2%	0.6%	1.6%
Nonprofit Sponsor	41.4%	30.0%	22.4%	22.6%	27.6%
RHS Section 515	5.5%	9.7%	16.3%	5.1%	9.7%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	19.1%	16.3%	18.3%	38.3%	22.4%
Credit Type					
30 Percent	33.5%	24.2%	29.8%	40.2%	31.5%
70 Percent	57.5%	63.1%	62.6%	56.8%	60.4%
Both	9.0%	12.7%	7.7%	3.0%	8.1%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 18,762 projects and 1,396,874 units placed in service between 1995 and 2007. Projects and units in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam were excluded. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (11.5%), construction type (5.2%), nonprofit sponsor (9.8%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), bond financing (6.0%) and credit type (7.3%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 19.
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Tax-Exempt Bonds	29.1%	23.5%	25.4%	44.8%	30.4%
RHS Section 515 Loans	4.8%	7.8%	7.6%	5.0%	6.4%
HOME Funds	46.3%	29.4%	19.7%	27.2%	29.6%
CDBG Funds	13.0%	4.9%	2.8%	4.6%	6.3%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.5%	1.9%	4.0%	8.1%	4.0%
Part of HOPE VI Development	2.8%	2.3%	3.6%	2.6%	2.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 7,496 projects placed in service in from 2003 to 2007. Projects in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (7.5%), RHS Section 515 loans (14.5%), HOME funding (24.0%), CDBG funding (31.9%), FHA-Insured loans (36.8%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (35.9%).

Table 20.
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type
1995-2007

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	All Projects 1995-2007
Projects	1,377	1,317	1,263	1,225	1,433	1,276	1,330	1,308	1,447	1,458	1,550	1,408	1,351	17,743
Central City	43.4%	44.5%	44.2%	43.4%	42.7%	42.3%	43.2%	48.1%	46.6%	46.2%	47.8%	45.9%	48.9%	45.2%
Suburb	29.1%	30.0%	29.9%	32.0%	33.3%	33.5%	30.0%	30.0%	32.0%	30.2%	31.1%	29.8%	26.8%	30.6%
Non-metro	27.6%	25.5%	25.9%	24.6%	24.0%	24.2%	26.9%	21.9%	21.4%	23.6%	21.1%	24.3%	24.4%	24.2%
Units	84,672	85,603	84,291	88,552	111,897	98,041	100,542	104,070	123,224	122,730	124,222	111,576	108,660	1,348,080
Central City	50.1%	51.1%	50.4%	48.1%	49.3%	48.4%	46.8%	51.9%	52.2%	50.7%	52.0%	51.8%	55.3%	50.7%
Suburb	35.5%	35.9%	35.3%	39.6%	38.9%	38.5%	39.4%	36.5%	36.6%	36.3%	36.1%	34.7%	30.8%	36.4%
Non-metro	14.4%	13.0%	14.3%	12.3%	11.8%	13.1%	13.8%	11.6%	11.3%	13.0%	11.9%	13.5%	13.9%	12.8%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. 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 21.
Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region
1995-2007

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
LIHTC Units					
Central City	62.1%	50.9%	47.7%	48.9%	50.7%
Suburb	31.5%	31.7%	38.3%	40.7%	36.4%
Non-metro	6.4%	17.4%	14.1%	10.5%	12.8%
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. 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 22.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type
1995-2007**

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	85.6	90.6	40.4	76.2
Average Qualifying Ratio	93.1%	95.6%	97.2%	94.9%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size				
0 Bedrooms	6.9%	1.8%	1.3%	4.2%
1 Bedroom	31.8%	32.2%	30.1%	31.7%
2 Bedrooms	39.3%	43.8%	44.4%	41.7%
3 Bedrooms	18.8%	19.8%	22.3%	19.6%
4+ Bedrooms	3.2%	2.4%	1.9%	2.7%
Construction Type				
New Construction	51.6%	71.7%	69.9%	62.2%
Rehab	46.1%	27.5%	29.2%	36.3%
Both	2.3%	0.8%	0.9%	1.5%
Nonprofit Sponsor	31.4%	21.7%	27.0%	27.4%
RHS Section 515	0.7%	7.5%	27.0%	9.2%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	25.2%	31.2%	9.3%	23.2%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	28.9%	39.0%	28.1%	31.9%
70 Percent	62.7%	54.8%	61.8%	60.0%
Both	8.4%	6.2%	10.1%	8.1%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis contains only geocoded projects. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (11.5%), construction type (5.0%), nonprofit sponsor (9.9%), RHS Section 515 (13.0%), bond financing (5.6%) and credit type (7.1%). 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 23.
LIHTC Projects and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	32.4%	40.3%	15.8%	31.2%
RHS Section 515	0.5%	5.7%	18.7%	6.3%
HOME Funds	29.0%	26.9%	34.4%	29.7%
CDBG Funds	8.1%	4.8%	5.2%	6.4%
FHA-Insured Loans	4.4%	3.4%	4.0%	4.0%
Part of HOPE VI Development	5.1%	0.7%	0.7%	2.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 7,214 geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (6.9%), RHS Section 515 loans (13.7%), HOME funding (23.4%), CDBG funding (31.5%), FHA-Insured loans (36.4%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (35.7%). 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 24.
LIHTC Projects Targeted to a Specific Population by Location Type
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

Project Target to:	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Families	51.0%	51.6%	57.5%	52.7%
Elderly	20.8%	34.4%	29.2%	27.0%
Disabled	11.4%	11.2%	13.4%	11.8%
Homeless	6.5%	2.7%	3.0%	4.5%
Other	9.6%	4.8%	5.1%	7.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 and 2007. 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 10.2 percent of 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 25.
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs
1995-2007

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	All Projects 1995-2007
Projects	1,377	1,317	1,263	1,225	1,433	1,276	1,330	1,308	1,447	1,458	1,550	1,408	1,351	17,743
DDA	17.7%	16.3%	20.9%	22.7%	22.6%	25.4%	24.5%	25.2%	23.4%	24.1%	22.8%	25.1%	27.0%	22.9%
QCT	21.6%	24.1%	25.8%	28.4%	28.5%	24.8%	27.0%	30.5%	35.5%	36.0%	39.7%	39.1%	40.6%	31.1%
DDA or QCT	33.1%	35.2%	39.8%	43.7%	43.1%	42.6%	42.9%	48.2%	48.6%	47.0%	51.9%	55.0%	55.2%	45.5%
Units	84,672	85,603	84,291	88,552	111,897	98,041	100,542	104,070	123,224	122,730	124,222	111,576	108,660	1,348,080
DDA	18.1%	14.9%	18.1%	21.4%	21.2%	24.6%	21.0%	22.4%	17.8%	21.8%	22.7%	27.3%	24.3%	21.4%
QCT	20.7%	23.7%	24.7%	24.7%	28.3%	23.1%	24.3%	26.4%	36.0%	35.4%	39.5%	37.0%	41.7%	30.6%
DDA or QCT	33.1%	34.0%	37.8%	41.8%	43.6%	41.6%	39.0%	43.6%	45.9%	49.5%	53.1%	57.4%	56.0%	45.1%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. 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 from 2003 to 2007, QCT designation is based on the 2000 census tract location. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 26.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs
1995-2007

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	70.9	75.1	76.7	76.2
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.7%	94.0%	95.8%	94.9%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size				
0 Bedrooms	8.0%	7.6%	2.1%	4.2%
1 Bedroom	33.7%	31.5%	30.9%	31.7%
2 Bedrooms	36.2%	36.6%	45.4%	41.7%
3 Bedrooms	19.1%	19.9%	19.6%	19.6%
4+ Bedrooms	2.9%	4.3%	2.0%	2.7%
Construction Type				
New Construction	53.2%	50.0%	69.4%	62.2%
Rehab	45.4%	47.3%	29.8%	36.3%
Both	1.5%	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%
Nonprofit Sponsor	27.4%	33.7%	23.9%	27.4%
RHS Section 515	5.1%	2.2%	13.7%	9.2%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	29.1%	19.2%	22.9%	23.2%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	32.3%	24.9%	34.6%	31.9%
70 Percent	63.4%	65.9%	57.2%	60.0%
Both	4.3%	9.2%	8.3%	8.1%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. 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 from 2003 to 2007, QCT designation is based on the 2000 census tract location. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (11.5%), construction type (5.0%), nonprofit sponsor (9.9%), RHS Section 515 (13.0%), bond financing (5.6%) and credit type (7.1%). 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 27.
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	39.6%	25.8%	31.2%	31.1%
RHS Section 515	5.0%	2.3%	9.1%	6.3%
HOME Funds	38.6%	28.8%	29.7%	29.7%
CDBG Funds	9.0%	8.5%	4.4%	6.4%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.2%	4.3%	3.7%	4.0%
Part of HOPE VI Development	2.0%	6.2%	0.8%	2.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 to 2007. Projects in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (7.2%), RHS Section 515 loans (14.7%), HOME funding (24.2%), CDBG funding (33.9%), FHA-Insured loans (38.2%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (37.4%). 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 from 2003 to 2007 are based on 2000 census tract locations.

Table 28.
Distribution of LIHTC Units and Projects by Development Cost Category
1995-2007

Development Cost Category Based on Renter Units	Ratio of FMR to Maximum LIHTC Rent	All U.S. Rental Units	LIHTC Projects	LIHTC Units	LIHTC Projects in QCTs	LIHTC Units in QCTs
Low	.521 to .775	23.4%	31.8%	25.2%	25.1%	21.5%
Moderate	>.775 to .886	23.5%	25.5%	25.7%	25.5%	28.7%
High (non-DDA)	>.886 to 1.331	23.3%	19.8%	27.8%	21.9%	27.3%
In DDAs		29.8%	22.9%	21.4%	27.5%	22.5%
Total		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Development Cost Category Based on Units Issued Multifamily Building Permits	Ratio of FMR to Maximum LIHTC Rent	Multifamily Building Permit Units 1994-2006	LIHTC Projects	LIHTC Units	LIHTC Projects in QCTs	LIHTC Units in QCTs
Low	.521 to .794	30.1%	39.1%	32.0%	31.0%	27.9%
Moderate	>.794 to .902	25.4%	20.4%	22.3%	21.6%	25.8%
High (non-DDA)	>.902 to 1.331	25.6%	17.6%	24.3%	19.8%	23.8%
In DDAs		18.9%	22.9%	21.4%	27.5%	22.5%
Total		100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Maximum LIHTC rent equals one-twelfth of 30 percent of 60 percent of area median income (or one-twelfth of 30 percent of 120 percent of the very low income limit). All U.S. Rental Units are from the 2000 Census. Annual building permit data for metropolitan areas and non-metropolitan counties are from the U.S. Census Bureau. LIHTC units placed in service from 1995 to 2007 are compared to multifamily building permits from 1994 to 2006 because it generally takes one year from issuance of building permits for a multi-unit residential building to be completed. The percentages for All U.S. Rental Units and Building Permit Units are not exactly equal for each of the three non-DDA development cost categories because MSAs (or non-metro counties) lying on the cutoffs for one-third and two-thirds of units could not be split up.

**Table 29.
LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type
1995-2007**

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	35.5%	20.8%	6.2%	3.5%	11.4%	8.1%	21.7%	7.4%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	61.5%	44.9%	31.1%	23.3%	16.0%	11.3%	44.6%	33.5%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	28.7%	16.0%	7.9%	3.5%	5.3%	2.7%	18.1%	20.3%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	66.6%	64.1%	29.1%	30.9%	15.6%	12.7%	46.4%	34.6%	43.6%

Notes: The dataset used for this analysis includes only geocoded projects. Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSEA 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 30.
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by DDA or QCT Designation
1995-2007**

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	27.9%	15.8%	63.4%	61.0%	2.5%	3.7%	21.7%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	58.4%	44.6%	80.2%	74.6%	25.2%	20.5%	44.6%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	20.6%	11.8%	44.1%	39.1%	6.4%	3.7%	18.1%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	59.9%	61.0%	82.0%	85.1%	26.9%	31.6%	46.4%	43.6%

Notes: The dataset used for this analysis includes only geocoded projects. 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 31.
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type
1995-2007

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	29.8%	15.8%	8.5%	21.7%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	46.5%	44.4%	19.8%	44.6%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	24.2%	13.8%	3.7%	18.1%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	52.3%	49.6%	10.8%	46.4%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. The dataset contains missing data for nonprofit sponsor (9.4%), RHS Section 515 (13.0%), and bond financing (6.1%). Information on poverty, minority population, female-headed households, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data and tract definitions.

Table 32.
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units
LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2007

Census Tract Characteristic	Projects Targeted to:					All 2003-2007 Projects
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other	
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	24.3%	17.8%	25.9%	42.8%	43.6%	23.5%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	45.8%	38.9%	34.4%	45.2%	62.9%	44.7%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	21.8%	10.9%	18.6%	30.3%	26.4%	18.6%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	45.0%	45.0%	44.7%	68.7%	58.7%	46.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 590,412 units placed in service from 2003 to 2007. Data on project targeting are missing for 10.1 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 33.
Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, by Location Characteristics
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007

	Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOME Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of CDBG Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOPE VI Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects
Region												
Northeast	\$10,945	503	19.0%	\$40,741	204	35.0%	\$21,517	69	59.0%	\$61,790	13	29.5%
Midwest	\$8,091	639	24.2%	\$25,684	161	27.6%	\$11,500	26	22.2%	\$43,212	13	29.5%
South	\$6,461	822	31.1%	\$18,999	161	27.6%	\$13,923	14	12.0%	\$26,636	11	25.0%
West	\$9,184	679	25.7%	\$14,811	57	9.8%	\$4,416	8	6.8%	\$33,608	7	15.9%
Location												
Central City	\$9,122	1,184	46.5%	\$34,784	246	43.0%	\$16,656	54	46.6%	\$40,857	39	90.7%
Suburb	\$7,700	733	28.8%	\$22,116	136	23.8%	\$15,333	29	25.0%	\$31,773	3	7.0%
Non-metro	\$7,651	628	24.7%	\$23,575	190	33.2%	\$19,887	33	28.5%	\$178,055	1	2.3%
Located in DDA												
Yes	\$9,618	700	27.5%	\$45,487	135	23.6%	\$16,644	22	19.0%	\$71,769	8	18.6%
No	\$7,868	1,845	72.5%	\$22,662	437	76.4%	\$17,385	94	81.0%	\$36,932	35	81.4%
Located in QCT												
Yes	\$9,708	1,003	39.4%	\$34,671	198	34.6%	\$17,905	49	42.2%	\$45,687	35	81.4%
No	\$7,466	1,542	60.6%	\$24,543	374	65.4%	\$16,761	67	57.8%	\$33,465	8	18.6%
Census Tract Characteristics												
> 30% Poor Households												
Yes	\$9,900	683	26.8%	\$35,825	131	22.9%	\$18,319	32	27.6%	\$46,271	34	79.1%
No	\$7,781	1,862	73.2%	\$25,739	441	77.1%	\$16,835	84	72.4%	\$32,621	9	20.9%
> 50% Minority Population												
Yes	\$9,319	1,103	43.3%	\$38,282	207	36.2%	\$17,006	39	33.6%	\$39,887	38	88.4%
No	\$7,608	1,442	56.7%	\$22,246	365	63.8%	\$17,365	77	66.4%	\$70,212	5	11.6%
> 50% Renters												
Yes	\$9,282	1,138	44.7%	\$35,263	246	43.0%	\$17,200	58	50.0%	\$45,139	38	88.4%
No	\$7,596	1,407	55.3%	\$22,605	326	57.0%	\$17,288	58	50.0%	\$30,302	5	11.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes only the geocoded projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007 (n=2,759), except the analysis of distribution by region, which used the full data set excluding Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam (n=2,875). The dataset contains missing data for the number of low-income units (1.4%). 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, and renter-occupied housing units is based on 2000 Census data and tract definitions. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 34.
Additional Project Characteristics, by Region
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007

	Region			
	Northeast	Midwest	South	West
Number of Projects	513	679	903	664
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling				
50% AMGI	6.1%	7.2%	8.5%	8.3%
60% AMGI	93.9%	92.8%	91.5%	91.7%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling				
Yes	60.8%	63.8%	72.6%	76.7%
No	39.2%	36.2%	27.4%	23.3%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)				
Average	48.4%	56.6%	46.1%	74.1%
0-10 percent	5.8%	2.6%	11.4%	1.8%
10-25 percent	24.0%	16.8%	27.1%	6.6%
25-50 percent	25.8%	23.8%	18.6%	12.1%
50-75 percent	21.5%	28.2%	15.1%	16.5%
75-90 percent	3.3%	9.1%	5.1%	16.8%
90-100 percent	19.6%	19.4%	22.6%	46.2%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract				
Yes	33.8%	29.7%	24.0%	23.1%
No	66.2%	70.3%	76.0%	76.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,759 projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007, excluding Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. The dataset contains missing data for the designation of elected rent/income ceiling for low-income units (9.3%), whether there are units set aside with rents lower than elected rent/income ceiling (26.6%), and whether there is a federal or state project-based rental assistance contract (27.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 35.
Additional Project Characteristics, by Location Characteristics
Projects Placed in Service in 2006-2007

	Location		
	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro
Number of Projects	1,306	782	671
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling			
50% AMGI	8.4%	9.2%	4.5%
60% AMGI	91.6%	90.8%	95.5%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling			
Yes	67.6%	61.7%	74.6%
No	32.4%	38.3%	25.4%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)			
Average	54.9%	55.5%	56.6%
0-10 percent	4.9%	5.8%	6.8%
10-25 percent	20.6%	20.6%	16.3%
25-50 percent	22.2%	17.3%	18.9%
50-75 percent	17.9%	22.0%	23.7%
75-90 percent	9.2%	9.0%	5.9%
90-100 percent	25.3%	25.3%	28.4%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract			
Yes	30.5%	21.0%	29.9%
No	69.5%	79.0%	70.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service in 2006 and 2007. The dataset contains missing data for the designation of elected rent/income ceiling for low-income units (9.3%), whether there are units set aside with rents lower than elected rent/income ceiling (26.6%), and whether there is a federal/state projected-based rental assistance contract (27.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 36.
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	2005	2006	2007
Distribution by Region														
Northeast	15.6%	14.4%	10.6%	17.4%	15.9%	13.0%	14.5%	12.4%	13.3%	13.9%	12.3%	14.6%	12.8%	16.7%
Midwest	26.6%	28.1%	28.1%	23.7%	23.5%	23.3%	20.6%	18.7%	19.4%	21.0%	23.9%	22.6%	21.2%	20.7%
South	38.7%	41.0%	39.3%	37.0%	37.6%	35.2%	32.9%	43.4%	41.2%	42.0%	37.9%	39.1%	38.8%	39.1%
West	19.2%	16.6%	22.0%	21.9%	23.1%	28.6%	32.1%	25.6%	26.1%	23.2%	26.0%	23.7%	27.2%	23.6%
Distribution by Location Type														
Central City	51.5%	50.1%	51.1%	50.4%	48.1%	49.3%	48.4%	46.8%	51.9%	52.2%	50.7%	52.0%	51.8%	55.3%
Suburb	29.8%	35.5%	35.9%	35.3%	39.6%	38.9%	38.5%	39.4%	36.5%	36.6%	36.3%	36.1%	34.7%	30.8%
Non-metro	18.8%	14.4%	13.0%	14.3%	12.3%	11.8%	13.1%	13.8%	11.6%	11.3%	13.0%	11.9%	13.5%	13.9%
Distribution by Location in DDA or QCT														
DDA	19.0%	18.1%	14.9%	18.1%	21.4%	21.2%	24.6%	21.0%	22.4%	17.8%	21.8%	22.7%	27.3%	24.3%
QCT	26.2%	20.7%	23.7%	24.7%	24.7%	28.3%	23.1%	24.3%	26.4%	36.0%	35.4%	39.5%	37.0%	41.7%
DDA or QCT	36.5%	33.1%	34.0%	37.8%	41.8%	43.6%	41.6%	39.0%	43.6%	45.9%	49.5%	53.1%	57.4%	56.0%
Distribution by Census Tract Characteristics														
>30% Poor* Households	23.0%	19.1%	20.1%	17.9%	19.8%	21.4%	17.2%	18.0%	22.8%	23.9%	21.4%	25.5%	26.6%	25.3%
>50% Minority Population	41.6%	39.9%	39.1%	41.3%	46.4%	42.8%	43.5%	43.2%	44.8%	47.1%	47.1%	44.8%	49.8%	46.1%
>50% Renter	46.5%	46.6%	50.8%	48.5%	47.5%	47.1%	44.6%	43.2%	41.7%	45.8%	42.8%	47.2%	48.5%	50.2%

*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, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. 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.

Abt Associates Inc.

Solving problems, guiding decisions - worldwide

Abt Associates applies rigorous research and consulting techniques and technical assistance expertise to a wide range of issues in social and economic policy, international health and economic development, business research and consulting, and clinical trials and registries. Clients include U.S. federal, state, and local governments; foreign governments; international organizations; foundations; nonprofit associations and institutions; and business and industry. Founded in 1965, Abt Associates has worked in more than 100 countries and currently has projects in more than 40 countries and over 25 foreign project offices.

Corporate Offices

Cambridge, Massachusetts

55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138-1168
617.492.7100

www.abtassociates.com

Bethesda, Maryland

Bethesda One
4800 Montgomery Lane
Suite 600
Bethesda, MD 20814-3460
301.913.0500

Bethesda Two
4550 Montgomery Avenue
Suite 800 North
Bethesda, MD 20814-3343
301.634.1700

Chicago, Illinois

640 North LaSalle Street
Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60610-3781
312.867.4000

Hadley, Massachusetts

Mass Venture Center
100 Venture Way
Suite 100
Hadley, MA 01035-9462
413.586.8635

Lexington, Massachusetts

181 Spring Street
Lexington, MA 02421-8030
781.372.6500

Durham, North Carolina

4620 Creekstone Drive
Maplewood Building
Suite 190
Durham, NC 27703-8062
919.294.7700



Abt Associates Inc.