

From Insight to Impact
– worldwide

**HUD National Low
Income Housing Tax
Credit (LIHTC)
Database: Projects
Placed in Service
through 2005**

**Contract
C-OPC-21895**

Data Tables

November 30, 2007

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
Joshua Cox
Meryl Finkel

Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138



Table of Contents

Table 1. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2005.....	1
Table 2. Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2005.....	2
Table 3. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type 1995-2005	3
Table 4. Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types 1995-2005.....	4
Table 5. Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	4
Table 6. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	5
Table 7. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	6
Table 8. LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and Additional Financing Sources Used Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	7
Table 9. Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years 1995-2005	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 1995-2005.....	10
Table 12. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region 1995-2005	10
Table 13. Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005	11
Table 14. Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type 1995-2005	12
Table 15. Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region 1995-2005.....	13
Table 16. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type 1995-2005	14

Table 17. LIHTC Projects and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005	15
Table 18. LIHTC Projects Targeted to a Specific Population by Location Type Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	15
Table 19. Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs 1995-2005	16
Table 20. Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs 1995-2005	17
Table 21. Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location in DDAs or QCTs Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	18
Table 22. LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type 1995-2005	19
Table 23. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by DDA or QCT Designation 1995-2005	19
Table 24. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type 1995-2005	20
Table 25. Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units LIHTC Projects for Targeted to Specific Populations Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005.....	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
1995-2005

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	All Projects 1995-2005
Number of Projects	1,409	1,327	1,360	1,345	1,469	1,348	1,369	1,299	1,452	1,420	1,298	15,096
Number of Units	81,154	82,976	88,744	93,977	107,786	98,786	100,577	102,514	121,045	118,864	103,707	1,100,130
Average Project Size Distribution	57.6	62.6	65.3	69.9	73.8	73.4	73.8	80.5	83.4	83.8	80.0	73.1
0-10 Units	13.4%	14.6%	7.6%	7.5%	6.2%	6.0%	4.7%	4.2%	3.1%	4.9%	3.8%	6.9%
11-20 Units	11.8%	12.1%	12.2%	10.6%	12.2%	11.5%	10.5%	10.1%	8.0%	8.5%	6.8%	10.4%
21-50 Units	41.7%	36.4%	41.1%	39.7%	37.3%	34.9%	40.4%	35.4%	35.4%	33.7%	34.9%	37.4%
51-99 Units	17.0%	17.5%	19.6%	21.0%	21.6%	23.2%	21.6%	23.6%	24.4%	24.2%	27.8%	21.9%
100+ Units	16.2%	19.5%	19.5%	21.2%	22.7%	24.3%	22.8%	26.7%	29.1%	28.7%	26.8%	23.4%
Average Qualifying Ratio Distribution	97.4%	96.7%	96.0%	95.6%	94.9%	94.4%	94.4%	92.3%	93.8%	93.8%	95.6%	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%
21-40%	0.6%	1.5%	1.3%	1.6%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.8%	0.9%	1.5%	0.8%	1.2%
41-60%	2.6%	2.1%	2.5%	2.5%	3.0%	3.8%	2.5%	4.0%	2.1%	2.8%	2.2%	2.7%
61-80%	1.8%	2.6%	5.0%	5.6%	7.5%	7.5%	9.8%	12.7%	12.8%	9.0%	7.1%	7.3%
81-90%	2.3%	1.8%	2.1%	2.3%	2.4%	3.3%	4.3%	6.3%	6.3%	7.4%	4.5%	3.9%
91-95%	1.9%	1.8%	1.5%	1.6%	2.6%	2.7%	2.8%	2.2%	1.7%	2.7%	2.3%	2.2%
96-100%	90.8%	90.3%	87.7%	86.4%	83.2%	81.6%	79.4%	73.1%	76.2%	76.7%	83.1%	82.6%
Average Bedrooms Distribution	1.91	1.95	1.91	1.98	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.88	1.87	1.94	1.91	1.92
0 Bedroom	3.4%	3.8%	4.1%	2.9%	4.2%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%	5.8%	4.5%	4.9%	3.9%
1 Bedroom	30.7%	29.2%	29.9%	28.3%	28.3%	32.3%	29.2%	32.0%	31.2%	31.8%	32.8%	30.5%
2 Bedroom	44.5%	45.1%	42.8%	43.2%	42.8%	42.0%	43.8%	42.2%	40.4%	40.7%	38.9%	42.3%
3 Bedroom	19.4%	19.8%	20.7%	22.0%	21.1%	19.8%	20.8%	20.3%	19.9%	19.4%	20.0%	20.3%
≥4 Bedroom	2.1%	2.1%	2.6%	3.5%	3.5%	2.4%	3.2%	2.7%	2.7%	3.5%	3.3%	2.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,096 projects and 1,100,130 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. The average number of units per property and the distribution of property size are both calculated based on the 15,048 properties with a known number of units, and not on the full universe of 15,096 properties. The database contains missing data for number of units (0.3%), qualifying ratio (percentage of tax credit units) (2.1%) and bedroom count (13.1%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 2.
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects
1995-2005**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	All Projects 1995-2005
Construction												
New	65.9%	62.6%	62.2%	63.7%	64.6%	59.9%	60.5%	62.0%	67.8%	63.9%	71.3%	64.0%
Rehab	32.8%	36.1%	35.1%	34.7%	33.7%	39.1%	37.8%	36.0%	30.3%	34.5%	27.0%	34.3%
Both	1.3%	1.3%	2.8%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.6%	1.9%	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	17.9%	24.8%	35.0%	37.3%	35.2%	31.1%	31.8%	27.4%	25.0%	26.3%	26.4%	28.9%
RHS Section 515	25.9%	16.7%	13.7%	12.0%	11.4%	9.7%	10.5%	7.0%	5.5%	8.7%	4.6%	11.3%
Tax-Exempt Bonds	3.5%	5.7%	8.0%	12.1%	18.0%	25.1%	23.5%	30.6%	30.9%	31.2%	29.1%	19.8%
Credit Type												
30 Percent	26.0%	20.8%	20.6%	25.8%	28.2%	32.0%	30.2%	33.7%	34.1%	33.9%	29.7%	28.7%
70 Percent	64.5%	70.7%	71.3%	65.4%	64.4%	61.7%	60.9%	57.9%	55.5%	59.1%	63.5%	63.1%
Both	9.5%	8.6%	8.1%	8.8%	7.4%	6.3%	8.9%	8.4%	10.4%	7.0%	6.8%	8.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,096 projects and 1,100,130 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. The database contains missing data for construction type (3.2%), nonprofit sponsor (12.6%), RHS Section 515 (17.0%), bond financing (8.1%), and credit type (8.9%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 3.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type
1995-2005**

Credit Type	Projects			Units		
	30%	70%	Both	30%	70%	Both
Construction Type						
New	54.3%	77.0%	8.4%	55.9%	79.0%	10.4%
Rehab	44.9%	21.7%	84.2%	43.3%	19.8%	83.7%
Both	0.8%	1.4%	7.4%	0.8%	1.2%	5.9%
RHS Section 515	26.3%	3.3%	19.2%	7.6%	1.8%	12.1%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	64.2%	2.0%	5.6%	86.7%	3.5%	11.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,096 projects and 1,100,130 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. The database contains missing data for construction type (3.2%), nonprofit sponsor (12.6%), RHS Section 515 (17.0%), bond financing (8.1%), and credit type (8.9%). 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
1995-2005

	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Projects 1995-2005
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 515	
Average Project Size (units)	54.2	144.4	32.6	73.1
Distribution by Project Size				
0-10 units	6.0%	0.8%	2.7%	6.9%
11-20 units	15.3%	2.3%	18.0%	10.4%
21-50 units	44.4%	14.5%	70.2%	37.4%
51-99 units	21.6%	22.4%	7.2%	21.9%
100+ units	12.6%	60.2%	1.9%	23.4%
Construction Type				
New	60.2%	56.0%	51.3%	63.5%
Rehab	35.8%	43.2%	48.3%	34.8%
Both	4.0%	0.9%	0.4%	1.7%
Average Qualifying Ratio	96.2%	91.4%	99.0%	95.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,096 projects and 1,100,130 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. The database contains missing data for construction type (3.2%), nonprofit sponsor (12.6%), RHS Section 515 (17.0%), bond financing (8.1%), and credit type (8.9%). 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 2003-2005

Number of Non-LIHTC Subsidy Sources	Percent of Projects
0	41.0%
1	46.9%
2	10.4%
3	1.5%
4 or more	0.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 2,592 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005 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 2003-2005

	Tax-Exempt Bonds	RHS Section 515 Loans	HOME Funds	CDBG Funds	FHA-Insured Loans	Part of HOPE VI Development
All 2003-2005 Projects	30.5%	6.2%	29.7%	6.1%	3.6%	2.9%
Average Project Size	138.0	38.4	53.2	61.3	119.8	95.3
Distribution by Project Size						
0-10 units	0.4%	1.8%	9.2%	8.7%	1.0%	1.3%
11-20 units	2.1%	13.6%	13.4%	14.5%	2.0%	5.1%
21-50 units	16.8%	69.2%	43.4%	38.2%	18.4%	24.4%
51-99 units	22.2%	10.4%	22.1%	22.5%	25.5%	30.8%
100+ units	58.4%	5.0%	11.9%	16.2%	53.1%	38.5%
Average Qualifying Ratio	94.3%	98.8%	93.5%	91.5%	89.5%	93.4%
Construction Type						
New	59.5%	46.6%	65.1%	45.7%	39.6%	96.1%
Rehab	39.7%	52.5%	32.1%	50.9%	58.3%	1.3%
Both	0.8%	0.9%	2.9%	3.5%	2.0%	2.6%
Projects by Credit Type						
30%	89.9%	40.1%	14.8%	18.6%	67.0%	27.8%
70%	7.9%	40.1%	75.2%	67.4%	24.7%	69.4%
Both	2.2%	19.8%	10.0%	14.0%	8.3%	2.8%
Units by Credit Type						
30%	93.1%	44.1%	25.6%	28.0%	73.5%	28.6%
70%	4.9%	35.8%	61.2%	60.2%	16.1%	70.5%
Both	2.1%	20.1%	13.2%	11.8%	10.4%	0.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005 with data on the use of the additional financing sources. The dataset is missing data on tax-exempt bonds (8.2%) and RHS Section 515 loans (14.4%). Data are missing or incomplete on the use of HOME funding (24.5%), CDBG funding (32.0%), FHA-Insured loans (35.4%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (34.8%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 7.
 Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations
 Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005**

	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
All 2003-2005 Projects	55.6%	27.4%	12.1%	4.5%	6.9%
Average Project Size	82.8	74.1	62.8	55.0	78.1
Distribution by Project Size					
0-10 units	2.7%	1.5%	2.5%	3.7%	0.8%
11-20 units	9.1%	5.4%	10.1%	11.1%	6.4%
21-50 units	35.6%	37.9%	45.9%	47.5%	39.8%
51-99 units	25.8%	29.1%	23.5%	25.3%	27.3%
100+ units	26.9%	26.1%	18.0%	12.4%	25.7%
Average Qualifying Ratio	95.0%	95.7%	96.7%	95.1%	96.3%
Construction Type					
New	70.5%	75.7%	71.2%	61.5%	64.9%
Rehab	27.7%	22.6%	28.1%	36.0%	30.7%
Both	1.9%	1.7%	0.7%	2.5%	4.4%
Projects by Credit Type					
30%	31.5%	33.0%	17.2%	6.0%	17.2%
70%	59.1%	59.6%	68.0%	72.7%	70.1%
Both	9.5%	7.4%	14.8%	21.3%	12.7%
Units by Credit Type					
30%	50.0%	44.7%	30.1%	8.9%	29.6%
70%	41.7%	48.0%	54.2%	66.4%	59.5%
Both	8.3%	7.3%	15.7%	24.7%	10.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 3,610 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005 with data on whether or not the project was targeted for a specific population. Of these, 3,143 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 2003-2005

Additional Financing Used	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	30.2%	30.3%	15.5%	6.5%	19.3%
RHS Section 515	6.1%	7.5%	5.0%	2.6%	2.9%
HOME Funds	28.6%	31.2%	31.4%	34.8%	31.3%
CDBG Funds	5.7%	4.7%	4.8%	9.5%	6.8%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.3%	4.1%	2.5%	3.4%	4.2%
Part of a HOPE VI Development	4.4%	0.8%	2.1%	0.7%	3.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 3,143 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005 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
1995-2005

Year Tax Credit Allocated	Year Placed in Service											
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	1995-2005
Pre-1993	0.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
1993	34.6%	0.9%	0.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.8%
1994	49.8%	43.4%	1.8%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.0%
1995	15.2%	42.8%	41.5%	2.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%
1996	0.0%	12.4%	40.8%	39.1%	4.1%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
1997	0.0%	0.3%	14.9%	39.5%	39.4%	4.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%
1998	0.1%	0.1%	0.5%	14.9%	39.3%	37.7%	1.6%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%
1999	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	3.0%	12.2%	41.5%	37.5%	2.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	12.1%
2000	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.5%	4.2%	12.2%	43.8%	36.4%	2.4%	0.6%	0.4%	11.6%
2001	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.6%	2.6%	13.4%	43.9%	44.7%	2.8%	0.7%	7.1%
2002	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.2%	12.4%	35.8%	42.7%	5.6%	2.1%
2003 or later	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	4.6%	16.8%	53.7%	93.3%	2.1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,096 projects and 1,100,130 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. The database contains missing data for allocation year (0.4%). 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 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	2005
Annual Number of Projects	1,390 ^a	1,409	1,327	1,360	1,345	1,469	1,348	1,369	1,299	1,452	1,420	1,298
Annual Number of Units	58,166 ^a	81,154	82,976	88,744	93,977	107,786	98,786	100,577	102,514	121,045	118,864	103,707
Annual Number of Low-Income Units	54,045 ^a	75,790	77,209	81,156	86,162	97,969	90,204	92,758	94,884	108,530	105,586	93,272
Average Project Size (units)	42.2	57.6	62.6	65.3	69.9	73.8	73.4	73.8	80.5	83.4	83.8	80.0
Distribution by Size												
0-10 units	22.4%	13.4%	14.6%	7.6%	7.5%	6.2%	6.0%	4.7%	4.2%	3.1%	4.9%	3.8%
11-50 units	55.2%	53.48%	48.5%	53.3%	50.4%	49.5%	46.3%	50.8%	45.5%	43.4%	42.2%	41.6%
51-99 units	12.5%	17.0%	17.5%	19.6%	21.0%	21.6%	23.2%	21.6%	23.6%	24.4%	24.2%	27.8%
100+ units	9.8%	16.2%	19.5%	19.5%	21.2%	22.7%	24.3%	22.8%	26.7%	29.1%	28.7 %	26.8%
Average Bedrooms	1.86	1.91	1.95	1.91	1.98	1.94	1.88	1.91	1.88	1.87	1.94	1.91
Distribution												
0 Bedrooms	5.4%	3.4%	3.8%	4.1%	2.9%	4.2%	3.6%	2.9%	2.8%	5.8%	4.5%	4.9%
1 Bedroom	39.1%	30.7%	29.2%	29.9%	28.3%	28.3%	32.3%	29.2%	32.0%	31.2%	31.8%	32.8%
2 Bedrooms	39.0%	44.5%	45.1%	42.8%	43.2%	42.8%	42.0%	43.8%	42.2%	40.4%	40.7%	38.9%
3 Bedrooms	15.3%	19.4%	19.8%	20.7%	22.0%	21.1%	19.8%	20.8%	20.3%	19.9%	19.4%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	1.2%	2.1%	2.1%	2.6%	3.5%	3.5%	2.4%	3.2%	2.7%	2.7%	3.5%	3.3%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.9%	97.4%	96.7%	96.0%	95.6%	94.9%	94.4%	94.4%	92.3%	93.8%	93.8%	95.6%
Distribution of Projects by Construction Type												
New	65.4%	65.9%	62.6%	62.2%	63.7%	64.6%	59.9%	60.5%	62.0%	67.8%	63.9%	71.3%
Rehab	33.9%	32.8%	36.1%	35.1%	34.7%	33.7%	39.1%	37.8%	36.0%	30.3%	34.5%	27.0%
Both	0.8%	1.3%	1.3%	2.8%	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%	1.6%	1.9%	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%
Nonprofit Sponsor	19.8%	17.9%	24.8%	35.0%	37.3%	35.2%	31.1%	31.8%	27.4%	25.0%	26.3%	26.4%
RHS Section 515	35.0%	25.9%	16.7%	13.7%	12.0%	11.4%	9.7%	10.5%	7.0%	5.5%	8.7%	4.6%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2.8%	3.5%	5.7 %	8.0%	12.1%	18.0%	25.1%	23.5%	30.6%	30.9%	31.2%	29.1%

^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 (43.9%), qualifying ratio (2.4%), construction type (20.2%), nonprofit sponsor (28.0%), RHS Section 515 (30.9%), and bond financing (21.5%). For projects placed in service between 1995 and 2005, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (13.1%), qualifying ratio (2.1%), construction type (3.2%), nonprofit sponsor (12.6%), RHS Section 515 (17.0%), and bond financing (8.1%). Qualifying ratio is a simple average of the qualifying ratio of projects. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 11.
Regional Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units
1995-2005

Region	All LIHTC Projects		Geocoded LIHTC Projects		All U.S. Rental Housing Units	U.S. Population
	Projects	Units	Projects	Units		
Northeast	18.9%	14.2%	19.3%	13.2%	21.4%	19.0%
Midwest	26.9%	22.1%	27.0%	21.9%	20.6%	22.9%
South	33.7%	40.9%	32.9%	40.8%	33.7%	35.6%
West	20.5%	22.9%	20.7%	23.2%	24.2%	22.5%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 15,008 projects and 1,093,609 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. Of these, 13,915 projects and 1,041,922 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
1995-2005

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Average Project Size (Units)	54.8	59.9	88.9	81.4	73.1
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.3%	94.5%	97.1%	95.6%	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%	6.9%	3.9%
1 Bedroom	43.3%	30.3%	25.1%	31.8%	30.5%
2 Bedrooms	33.0%	43.8%	47.6%	38.2%	42.4%
3 Bedrooms	13.5%	19.7%	23.3%	19.8%	20.2%
4+ Bedrooms	2.3%	2.9%	2.8%	3.4%	2.9%
Construction Type					
New Construction	38.8%	66.8%	71.8%	71.5%	64.0%
Rehab	58.6%	30.8%	27.0%	27.9%	34.4%
Both	2.6%	2.4%	1.3%	0.6%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	42.4%	29.2%	21.2%	33.6%	29.0%
RHS Section 515	6.0%	10.0%	18.0%	6.7%	11.0%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	16.1%	14.7%	18.2%	34.8%	19.9%
Credit Type					
30 Percent	21.7%	23.1%	31.2%	37.7%	28.6%
70 Percent	68.9%	64.8%	61.4%	59.4%	63.3%
Both	9.4%	12.0%	7.5%	2.9%	8.1%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes 15,008 projects and 1,093,609 units placed in service between 1995 and 2005. Projects and units in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.2%), construction type (3.3%), nonprofit sponsor (12.6%), RHS Section 515 (17.0%), bond financing (8.1%) and credit type (8.9%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 13.
Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Region
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
Tax-Exempt Bonds	25.8%	23.1%	30.3 %	41.8%	30.6%
RHS Section 515 Loans	5.3%	7.7%	6.5%	5.1%	6.2%
HOME Funds	46.8%	29.4%	18.1%	30.9%	29.8%
CDBG Funds	12.6%	4.9%	2.6%	4.8%	6.1%
FHA-Insured Loans	4.6%	1.4%	3.1%	6.2%	3.7%
Part of HOPE VI Development	4.0%	1.5%	3.9%	1.4%	2.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 4,148 projects placed in service in from 2003 to 2005. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (8.2%), RHS Section 515 loans (14.4%), HOME funding (24.5%), CDBG funding (32.0%), FHA-Insured loans (35.4%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (34.8%).

Table 14.
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location Type
1995-2005

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	All Projects 1995-2005
Projects	1,268	1,215	1,242	1,204	1,345	1,244	1,265	1,206	1,371	1,332	1,223	13,915
Central City	43.3%	43.2%	44.1%	43.1%	42.2%	41.2%	43.5%	47.8%	45.1%	45.4%	44.9%	44.0%
Suburb	27.5%	29.6%	29.6%	32.1%	32.9%	34.4%	29.9%	31.2%	33.3%	31.3%	32.4%	31.3%
Non-metro	29.2%	27.2%	26.3%	24.8%	25.0%	24.4%	26.6%	21.1%	21.6%	23.4%	22.7%	24.7%
Units	77,047	78,190	83,958	86,874	102,403	92,774	94,768	98,064	115,635	112,992	99,217	1,041,922
Central City	50.6%	49.4%	50.9%	48.0%	47.5%	46.1%	46.9%	51.1%	50.7%	49.9%	51.3%	49.3%
Suburb	33.8%	36.8%	34.9%	39.6%	39.8%	40.1%	39.3%	38.2%	38.1%	37.3%	36.3%	37.8%
Non-metro	15.6%	13.8%	14.2%	12.4%	12.6%	13.8%	13.8%	10.7%	11.2%	12.8%	12.5%	12.9%

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 15.
Metro/Non-Metro Status of LIHTC Units and All Occupied Rental Units by Region
1995-2005**

	Northeast	Midwest	South	West	All Regions
LIHTC Units					
Central City	61.4%	48.7%	46.4%	47.5%	49.3%
Suburb	32.3%	33.3%	40.1%	41.2%	37.8%
Non-metro	6.3%	18.0%	13.5%	11.3%	12.9%
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 16.
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Location Type
1995-2005

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	84.4	90.4	39.2	75.1
Average Qualifying Ratio	92.9%	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	6.9%	1.6%	1.3%	4.1%
1 Bedroom	30.4%	31.3%	29.6%	30.6%
2 Bedrooms	40.2%	44.5%	44.7%	42.5%
3 Bedrooms	19.2%	20.2%	22.4%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	3.4%	2.4%	1.9%	2.8%
Construction Type				
New Construction	51.2%	72.6%	71.4%	62.9%
Rehab	46.1%	26.5%	27.5%	35.3%
Both	2.7%	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	33.5%	24.8%	26.6%	29.1%
RHS Section 515	0.7%	8.6%	29.0%	10.4%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	22.5%	28.7%	8.1%	20.8%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	24.8%	34.3%	29.0%	28.9%
70 Percent	65.9%	59.6%	62.0%	62.9%
Both	9.3%	6.1%	9.0%	8.2%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis contains only geocoded projects. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.3%), construction type (3.1%), nonprofit sponsor (12.7%), RHS Section 515 (16.1%), bond financing (7.8%) and credit type (8.7%). Metropolitan areas are defined according to the MSA/PMSA definitions published June 30, 1999. Suburb is defined here as metro area, non-central city. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 17.
LIHTC Projects and the Use of Additional Subsidy Sources by Location Type
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2005

	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	31.8%	40.6%	16.7%	31.4%
RHS Section 515	0.7%	5.3%	18.0%	6.1%
HOME Funds	29.7%	27.3%	33.2%	29.8%
CDBG Funds	8.7%	4.5%	4.3%	6.3%
FHA-Insured Loans	4.8%	3.0%	3.0%	3.8%
Part of HOPE VI Development	4.8%	0.7%	1.0%	2.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 3,926 geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (7.8%), RHS Section 515 loans (13.6%), HOME funding (24.2%), CDBG funding (31.6%), FHA-Insured loans (35.0%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (34.9%). 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 2003-2005

Project Target to:	Central City	Suburb	Non-Metro Area	Total
Families	53.5%	53.6%	61.2%	55.2%
Elderly	21.1%	34.5%	28.3%	27.2%
Disabled	12.0%	11.8%	13.1%	12.2%
Homeless	6.5%	2.2%	3.4%	4.4%
Other	8.9%	4.9%	5.4%	6.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 and 2005. 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 12.9 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 19.
Distribution of LIHTC Projects and Units by Location in DDAs and QCTs
1995-2005

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	All Projects 1995-2005
Projects	1,268	1,215	1,242	1,204	1,345	1,244	1,265	1,206	1,371	1,332	1,223	13,915
DDA	14.5%	12.6%	20.4%	22.8%	22.8%	24.2%	23.9%	23.6%	21.2%	23.7%	19.5%	20.9%
QCT	20.7%	23.8%	25.9%	27.7%	27.5%	24.3%	27.3%	30.4%	34.1%	36.0%	38.0%	28.8%
DDA or QCT	30.5%	32.3%	39.6%	43.2%	42.9%	41.3%	42.9%	47.6%	46.2%	49.6%	49.6%	42.4%
Units	77,047	78,190	83,958	86,874	102,403	92,774	94,768	98,064	115,635	112,992	99,217	1,041,922
DDA	15.4%	11.8%	17.9%	21.8%	21.5%	23.3%	20.0%	20.5%	16.9%	20.8%	21.4%	19.4%
QCT	19.5%	23.9%	24.6%	24.4%	27.9%	22.8%	24.7%	27.1%	34.0%	36.3%	38.8%	28.2%
DDA or QCT	30.8%	32.0%	37.6%	41.8%	44.1%	40.4%	39.1%	43.2%	43.2%	49.8%	51.7%	41.9%

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 2005, 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
1995-2005**

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Average Project Size (Units)	69.7	73.8	75.7	75.1
Average Qualifying Ratio	91.4%	93.9%	95.6%	94.8%
Average Number of Bedrooms	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9
Distribution of Units by Size				
0 Bedrooms	7.5%	7.8%	2.0%	4.1%
1 Bedroom	33.5%	30.6%	29.7%	30.6%
2 Bedrooms	36.7%	36.8%	46.1%	42.5%
3 Bedrooms	19.2%	20.1%	20.0%	20.0%
4+ Bedrooms	3.0%	4.7%	2.6%	2.8%
Construction Type				
New Construction	51.6%	47.7%	71.0%	62.9%
Rehab	46.9%	49.1%	28.0%	35.3%
Both	1.5%	3.2%	1.0%	1.7%
Nonprofit Sponsor	32.6%	37.0%	24.4%	29.1%
RHS Section 515	5.7%	2.2%	15.0%	10.4%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	25.3%	16.6%	21.0%	20.8%
Credit Type				
30 Percent	29.2%	20.9%	31.7%	28.9%
70 Percent	65.4%	68.9%	60.6%	62.9%
Both	5.4%	10.2%	7.7%	8.2%

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 2005, QCT designation is based on the 2000 census tract location. The dataset contains missing data for bedroom count (13.3%), construction type (3.1%), nonprofit sponsor (12.7%), RHS Section 515 (16.1%), bond financing (7.8%) and credit type (8.7%). 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 2003-2005

	In DDA	In QCT	Not in DDA or QCT	Total
Tax-Exempt Bonds	37.8%	25.0%	32.6%	31.4%
RHS Section 515	5.1%	2.2%	8.5%	6.1%
HOME Funds	43.0%	30.7%	28.4%	29.8%
CDBG Funds	10.7%	9.7%	3.7%	6.3%
FHA-Insured Loans	3.8%	4.3%	3.3%	3.8%
Part of HOPE VI Development	2.1%	6.4%	0.7%	2.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes geocoded projects placed in service from 2003 to 2005. Projects in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were excluded. The dataset includes missing data for tax-exempt bonds (7.8%), RHS Section 515 loans (13.6%), HOME funding (24.2%), CDBG funding (31.6%), FHA-Insured loans (35.0%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (34.9%). 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 2005 are based on 2000 census tract locations.

Table 22.
LIHTC and All Rental Units by Tract Characteristic and Location Type
1995-2005

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	34.2%	20.8%	5.9%	3.5%	11.2%	8.1%	20.5%	8.9%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	60.1%	44.9%	29.2%	23.3%	15.4%	11.3%	42.7%	35.5%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	27.2%	16.0%	8.0%	3.5%	5.2%	2.7%	17.1%	22.6%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	65.4%	64.1%	28.1%	30.9%	15.2%	12.7%	44.9%	37.6%	43.6%

Notes: The dataset used for 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. 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
1995-2005

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	27.3%	15.8%	63.2%	61.0%	2.7%	3.7%	20.5%	12.3%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	55.8%	44.6%	80.9%	74.6%	24.4%	20.5%	42.7%	31.5%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	20.8%	11.8%	43.4%	39.1%	6.3%	3.7%	17.1%	9.2%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	60.8%	61.0%	81.7%	85.1%	26.6%	31.6%	44.9%	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 24.
Census Tract Characteristics of LIHTC Units by Project Type
1995-2005

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	27.4%	14.8%	8.9%	20.5%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	43.9%	40.9%	15.7%	42.7%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	21.2%	13.1%	3.3%	17.1%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	51.1%	46.8%	7.2%	44.9%

Notes: The dataset used in this analysis includes only geocoded projects. The dataset contains missing data for nonprofit sponsor (12.7%), RHS Section 515 (16.1%), and bond financing (7.8%). 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 2003-2005

Census Tract Characteristic	Projects Targeted to:					All 2005 Projects
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other	
Over 30 Percent of People Below Poverty Line	22.0%	15.6%	22.1%	39.2%	39.8%	22.6%
Over 50 Percent Minority Population	42.7%	36.1%	31.8%	39.0%	59.4%	45.6%
Over 20 Percent Female-Headed Families with Children	19.1%	8.1%	14.0%	23.2%	21.7%	16.7%
Over 50 Percent Renter Occupied Units	42.3%	42.1%	41.6%	69.6%	55.2%	44.1%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 343,616 units placed in service from 2003 to 2005. Data on project targeting are missing for 13.5 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	2005
Distribution by Region												
Northeast	13.6%	15.4%	11.7%	16.7%	16.1%	13.3%	15.9%	12.0%	14.0%	13.9%	13.1%	14.6%
Midwest	27.7%	31.2%	28.7%	25.1%	21.0%	22.1%	19.7%	17.7%	19.6%	19.8%	23.0%	16.4%
South	40.0%	44.3%	42.7%	36.5%	38.6%	37.8%	34.6%	45.2%	42.7%	43.6%	38.9%	43.4%
West	18.8%	9.1%	16.9%	21.6%	24.3%	26.8%	29.8%	25.1%	23.7%	22.7%	25.0%	25.6%
Distribution by Location Type												
Central City	50.0%	50.6%	49.4%	50.9%	48.0%	47.5%	46.1%	46.9%	51.1%	50.7%	49.9%	51.3%
Suburb	30.5%	33.8%	36.8%	34.9%	39.6%	39.8%	40.1%	39.3%	38.2%	38.1%	37.3%	36.3%
Non-metro	19.6%	15.6%	13.8%	14.2%	12.4%	12.6%	13.8%	13.8%	10.7%	11.2%	12.8%	12.5%
Distribution by Location in DDA or QCT												
DDA	15.9%	15.4%	11.8%	17.9%	21.8%	21.5%	23.3%	20.0%	20.5%	16.9%	20.8%	21.4%
QCT	25.7%	19.5%	23.9%	24.6%	24.4%	27.9%	22.8%	24.7%	27.1%	34.0%	36.3%	38.8%
DDA or QCT	34.4%	30.8%	32.0%	37.6%	41.8%	44.1%	40.4%	39.1%	43.2%	43.2%	49.8%	51.7%
Distribution by Census Tract Characteristics												
>30% Poor* Households	22.1%	17.4%	20.3%	17.0%	20.1%	21.3%	17.6%	17.9%	23.8%	21.8%	22.0%	24.4%
>50% Minority Population	40.1%	36.5%	36.4%	41.2%	45.7%	40.3%	40.9%	42.7%	45.6%	45.2%	47.2%	44.4%
>50% Renter	44.8%	45.1%	49.6%	48.4%	47.4%	46.7%	42.3%	42.6%	41.1%	44.3%	43.0%	45.1%

*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. 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.