

**Table 1**  
**LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable**  
**1992-2015**

Variable	1992-1994		1995-2015	
	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 <sup>a</sup>	4.2%	4.9%	1.1%	0.9%
Owner Contact Data	7.5%	8.4%	7.8%	6.5%
Total Units	0.6%	-	0.4%	-
Low Income Units	1.5%	2.3%	4.2%	4.4%
Number of Bedrooms <sup>b</sup>	26.6%	32.3%	11.9%	12.2%
Allocation Year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction Type (new/rehab)	14.2%	17.1%	7.2%	8.6%
Credit Type	36.4%	38.9%	12.6%	13.0%
Nonprofit Sponsorship	20.2%	20.4%	11.8%	12.2%
Increase in Basis	27.3%	26.0%	11.6%	9.5%
Use of Tax-Exempt Bonds	16.4%	19.5%	7.0%	6.9%
Use of RHS Section 515	19.5%	18.3%	10.8%	11.9%

LIHTC = low-income housing tax credit. RHS = Rural Housing Service.

<sup>a</sup> Indicates only that some location was provided. Address may not be a complete street address.

<sup>b</sup> For some properties, bedroom count was provided for most but not all units, in which case data are 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 2**  
**LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable**  
**For 2006 New Data Elements**  
**2006-2015**

	Percent of Projects with Missing Data	Percent of Units with Missing Data
Annual LIHTC Allocation Amount	27.4%	27.0%
Elected Set-Aside (50 Percent or 60 Percent of AMGI)	15.2%	14.3%
Set-Aside of Units with Rents Below the Elected Set-Aside	19.3%	21.0%
Amount of HOME Funding <sup>a</sup>	14.7%	15.6%
Amount of CDBG Funding <sup>a</sup>	16.9%	17.0%
Amount of HOPE VI Funding <sup>a</sup>	39.4%	39.0%
FHA Loan Number <sup>b</sup>	93.2%	89.6%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract	21.9%	26.3%

<sup>a</sup> Percent missing funding amounts are based on the number of projects and number of units indicated to have received funding from that source (HOME, CDBG, or HOPE VI).

<sup>b</sup> Percent missing the FHA loan number is based on the projects and number of units indicated to have received an FHA-insured loan.

**Table 3  
Characteristics of LIHTC Projects  
1995-2015**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	All Projects 1995-2015
Number of Projects	1,669	1,517	1,459	1,416	1,650	1,460	1,558	1,462	1,671	1,686	1,731	1,703	1,742	1,523	1,222	1,227	1,691	1,553	1,209	911	634	30,693
Number of Units	93,310	94,967	95,091	100,076	127,564	111,679	118,170	122,938	144,078	145,218	142,302	140,804	141,219	115,828	95,706	93,993	131,386	113,847	81,337	62,996	41,347	2,313,856
Average Project Size	56.0	62.7	65.4	70.7	77.5	76.7	75.9	84.2	86.3	86.2	82.3	82.8	81.3	76.1	78.5	76.8	78.0	73.9	68.2	72.2	66.0	75.7
Distribution																						
0-10 Units	16.7%	15.8%	9.7%	7.1%	5.6%	5.8%	4.0%	4.0%	3.7%	4.4%	4.7%	2.1%	3.0%	1.9%	3.2%	2.0%	4.6%	4.4%	2.0%	1.6%	2.2%	5.4%
11-20 Units	11.8%	11.3%	11.7%	10.8%	11.7%	10.9%	10.1%	9.2%	7.5%	8.0%	7.5%	6.0%	5.6%	5.7%	5.8%	5.9%	4.9%	5.6%	4.2%	3.5%	4.4%	7.9%
21-50 Units	38.7%	35.3%	39.4%	39.8%	36.7%	34.0%	39.9%	34.3%	33.3%	32.6%	33.2%	35.8%	36.3%	39.1%	36.6%	41.2%	38.0%	36.7%	43.1%	39.2%	41.5%	37.0%
51-99 Units	16.5%	18.1%	19.5%	21.4%	21.3%	23.4%	22.3%	23.7%	25.1%	23.5%	26.6%	28.5%	27.8%	31.8%	30.2%	29.6%	32.5%	31.7%	32.0%	32.6%	33.9%	25.8%
100+ Units	16.3%	19.5%	19.7%	20.9%	24.7%	26.0%	23.6%	28.9%	30.5%	31.4%	28.1%	27.5%	27.2%	21.5%	24.2%	21.3%	20.0%	21.5%	18.7%	23.1%	18.0%	23.8%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.5%	96.8%	96.1%	95.3%	94.8%	94.7%	94.1%	92.6%	94.2%	93.7%	95.1%	96.4%	96.1%	96.3%	95.9%	95.8%	96.6%	96.7%	97.3%	96.1%	96.8%	95.6%
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%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
21-40%	0.8%	1.5%	1.2%	1.6%	1.2%	1.0%	1.2%	1.6%	0.8%	1.5%	0.8%	0.4%	0.8%	1.3%	1.3%	2.4%	1.9%	1.8%	0.6%	1.6%	0.7%	1.2%
41-60%	2.0%	2.1%	2.5%	2.7%	3.3%	3.2%	2.6%	3.8%	2.0%	2.9%	2.3%	1.1%	1.8%	1.2%	1.2%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%	2.0%
61-80%	1.8%	2.7%	4.4%	5.8%	7.1%	7.3%	9.9%	11.4%	11.8%	9.7%	8.5%	6.4%	5.0%	4.8%	6.3%	4.4%	2.5%	2.6%	3.1%	3.9%	2.3%	6.1%
81-90%	1.8%	1.2%	2.0%	2.4%	2.2%	3.6%	5.0%	6.9%	5.1%	6.1%	4.7%	5.0%	4.6%	3.2%	2.5%	2.8%	3.3%	3.4%	2.8%	3.8%	5.2%	3.7%
91-95%	1.8%	1.6%	1.5%	1.8%	3.0%	3.6%	3.2%	2.3%	2.2%	2.6%	2.5%	2.7%	2.9%	2.6%	2.8%	3.1%	2.1%	2.5%	2.8%	2.8%	3.0%	2.5%
96-100%	91.8%	90.9%	88.4%	85.6%	83.1%	81.3%	78.1%	74.0%	78.1%	77.2%	81.2%	84.4%	84.9%	86.9%	86.0%	86.6%	89.1%	88.9%	89.9%	86.6%	87.5%	84.5%
Average Bedrooms	1.91	1.94	1.93	1.95	1.94	1.88	1.90	1.88	1.87	1.94	1.89	1.88	1.84	1.83	1.79	1.75	1.78	1.75	1.76	1.75	1.75	1.86
Distribution																						
0 Bedroom	4.1%	4.2%	5.0%	4.1%	4.4%	3.9%	3.3%	4.0%	5.4%	4.6%	4.6%	4.5%	4.9%	6.0%	7.1%	8.6%	5.7%	6.9%	7.9%	6.5%	4.7%	5.1%
1 Bedroom	30.5%	27.8%	29.9%	28.9%	27.6%	31.1%	29.7%	30.2%	31.9%	31.4%	33.6%	35.2%	37.7%	34.7%	36.7%	36.4%	35.3%	36.1%	37.9%	37.8%	38.1%	33.0%
2 Bedroom	43.3%	45.7%	42.3%	43.3%	43.5%	43.4%	43.2%	43.1%	41.4%	41.6%	39.4%	38.6%	37.9%	37.4%	37.0%	36.6%	39.7%	37.2%	36.9%	35.9%	39.7%	40.5%
3 Bedroom	19.9%	19.4%	19.4%	20.7%	20.9%	19.2%	20.5%	20.2%	18.8%	18.7%	19.1%	19.0%	16.9%	19.0%	16.1%	15.6%	16.6%	17.6%	15.1%	16.7%	15.1%	18.5%
≥4 Bedroom	2.3%	3.0%	3.4%	3.0%	3.6%	2.4%	3.3%	2.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	2.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.2%	2.3%	3.1%	2.5%	2.9%

Notes: The dataset includes 30,693 projects and 2,313,856 units placed in service between 1995 and 2015. The average number of units per property and the distribution of property size are both calculated based on the 30,693 properties with a known number of units, and not the full universe of 30,693 properties. The database contains missing data for number of units (0.0%), qualifying ratio percentage of tax credit units (9.7%) and bedroom count (18.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 4**  
**Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects**  
**1995-2015**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	All Projects 1995-2015
Construction	68.8%	64.3%	60.8%	62.7%	62.5%	60.8%	57.7%	61.5%	64.4%	63.9%	64.9%	61.4%	60.9%	61.8%	62.9%	60.7%	59.9%	64.6%	57.8%	54.4%	55.0%	61.9%
New	28.9%	32.3%	33.6%	33.8%	33.5%	36.5%	36.5%	34.2%	33.2%	32.9%	32.1%	35.3%	35.7%	35.2%	33.3%	36.3%	36.1%	30.1%	37.9%	42.7%	41.6%	34.4%
Rehab	1.7%	2.3%	3.5%	2.3%	2.9%	1.2%	3.0%	3.1%	2.1%	3.0%	2.8%	3.2%	3.2%	2.7%	3.5%	2.5%	3.7%	5.1%	3.9%	2.0%	2.1%	2.9%
Both	0.5%	1.1%	2.0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	2.8%	1.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	1.3%	0.8%
Existing																						
Nonprofit Sponsor	13.1%	18.0%	22.8%	25.0%	25.6%	24.2%	26.8%	23.2%	23.1%	24.9%	23.7%	27.7%	29.2%	28.5%	30.4%	28.8%	28.4%	29.5%	38.3%	33.7%	24.6%	25.8%
RHS Section 515	16.4%	10.8%	9.9%	8.7%	8.0%	6.8%	7.5%	5.5%	4.0%	6.5%	3.5%	5.5%	6.5%	6.2%	6.1%	6.8%	6.8%	5.2%	6.9%	8.4%	9.0%	7.4%
Tax-Exempt Bonds	3.8%	6.2%	8.4%	14.0%	18.2%	23.5%	20.7%	26.2%	25.6%	26.6%	25.8%	24.9%	28.1%	25.2%	27.0%	26.4%	16.7%	18.0%	22.8%	25.7%	23.4%	20.5%
Credit Type																						
30 Percent	24.4%	21.8%	23.7%	27.1%	32.2%	33.0%	31.1%	34.9%	35.4%	33.7%	32.0%	31.5%	31.2%	31.1%	30.1%	26.3%	18.9%	24.6%	27.4%	30.7%	28.1%	29.1%
70 Percent	65.4%	64.6%	61.8%	56.4%	54.9%	52.6%	51.2%	48.1%	48.9%	51.1%	53.6%	51.8%	49.5%	48.5%	47.1%	49.4%	45.5%	41.1%	49.3%	51.0%	46.6%	52.2%
Both	8.7%	12.2%	11.3%	13.7%	11.1%	11.9%	13.8%	14.5%	13.7%	12.9%	11.2%	13.8%	14.2%	15.2%	16.9%	15.5%	16.9%	15.2%	17.3%	15.2%	20.0%	13.7%

LIHTC = low-income housing tax credit. RHS = Rural Housing Service.

Notes: The analysis data set includes 30,693 projects and 2,313,856 units placed in service between 1995 and 2015. The database contains missing data for construction type (7.2%), nonprofit sponsor (11.8%), RHS Section 515 (10.8%), bond financing (7.1%), and credit type (12.6%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 5**  
**Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type**  
**1995-2015**

Credit Type	Projects			Units		
	30%	70%	Both	30%	70%	Both
Construction Type						
New	48.8%	76.1%	35.0%	48.5%	76.2%	31.8%
Rehab	47.9%	21.5%	58.8%	48.9%	21.6%	63.0%
Both	2.9%	2.1%	6.0%	2.4%	1.9%	5.0%
Existing	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
RHS Section 515	12.4%	4.2%	15.0%	4.0%	2.7%	8.1%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	69.0%	2.2%	4.1%	85.1%	3.6%	1.7%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 30,693 projects and 2,313,856 units placed in service between 1995 and 2015. The database contains missing data for construction type (15.1%), RHS Section 515 (18.3%), bond financing (16.0%), and credit type (12.6%). 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**  
**1995-2015**

	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Projects 1995-2014
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 515	
Average Project Size (units)	60.2	133.9	36.5	75.7
Distribution by Project Size				
0-10 units	3.7%	1.0%	2.3%	5.4%
11-20 units	11.5%	2.7%	15.5%	7.9%
21-50 units	43.4%	17.1%	69.0%	37.0%
51-99 units	26.5%	25.1%	10.5%	25.8%
100+ units	14.9%	54.1%	2.7%	23.8%
Construction Type				
New	57.1%	49.0%	40.3%	61.9%
Rehab	37.4%	48.7%	58.0%	34.4%
Both	5.3%	2.2%	1.7%	2.9%
Existing	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Average Qualifying Ratio	96.6%	93.8%	98.7%	95.6%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 30,693 projects and 2,313,856 units placed in service between 1995 and 2015. The database contains missing data for construction type (7.2%), nonprofit sponsor (11.8%), RHS Section 515 (10.8%), bond financing 7.1%), and credit type (12.6%). 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 7**  
**Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2003-2015**

Number of Non-LIHTC Subsidy Sources	Percent of Projects
0	62.7%
1	27.5%
2	5.5%
3	0.8%
4 or more	3.5%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 9,791 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2015 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 2003-2015**

	<b>Tax-Exempt Bonds</b>	<b>RHS Section 515 Loans</b>	<b>HOME Funds</b>	<b>CDBG Funds</b>	<b>FHA-Insured Loans</b>	<b>Part of HOPE VI Development</b>
All 2003-2015 Projects	24.3%	6.0%	20.7%	3.7%	1.7%	0.7%
Average Project Size	127.3	41.1	54.1	58.7	108.0	76.0
Distribution by Project Size						
0-10 Units	0.9%	0.9%	6.9%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%
11-20 Units	2.9%	10.7%	9.7%	12.3%	3.8%	1.3%
21-50 Units	19.2%	69.7%	45.0%	42.3%	22.4%	27.8%
51-99 Units	26.2%	15.4%	28.0%	26.0%	30.8%	53.2%
100+ Units	50.7%	3.3%	10.3%	12.7%	43.0%	17.7%
Average Qualifying Ratio	95.6%	98.5%	93.4%	93.4%	93.8%	91.6%
Construction Type						
New	46.8%	30.0%	62.8%	53.4%	35.4%	85.1%
Rehab	50.5%	67.0%	33.9%	44.0%	61.1%	9.5%
Both	2.6%	3.0%	3.2%	2.6%	3.5%	5.4%
Existing	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Projects by Credit Type						
30%	91.5%	30.1%	19.9%	28.9%	61.2%	14.1%
70%	5.7%	37.6%	64.9%	59.3%	33.2%	69.0%
Both	2.7%	31.0%	14.8%	11.4%	5.6%	15.5%
Units by Credit Type						
30%	93.3%	31.6%	27.9%	39.4%	71.0%	16.3%
70%	3.9%	37.3%	56.2%	52.0%	24.8%	67.6%
Both	2.6%	29.6%	15.4%	8.3%	4.2%	15.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,503 projects placed in service between 2003 and 2015 with data on the use of the additional financing sources. The dataset is missing data on tax-exempt bonds (8.6%) and RHS Section 515 loans (13.0%). Data are missing or incomplete on the use of HOME funding (13.2%), CDBG funding (23.2%), FHA-Insured loans (23.4%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (39.2%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.



**Table 9**  
**Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2003-2015**

	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
All 2003-2015 Projects	56.8%	31.8%	18.5%	9.1%	10.7%
Average Project Size	80.5	73.3	66.1	61.4	67.2
Distribution by Project Size					
0-10 units	1.0%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	2.2%
11-20 units	6.3%	5.2%	5.2%	6.2%	5.1%
21-50 units	38.8%	40.2%	47.9%	46.8%	44.4%
51-99 units	29.5%	30.7%	29.0%	33.5%	28.1%
100+ units	24.4%	23.4%	17.2%	12.8%	19.8%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.0%	97.4%	98.3%	97.2%	96.8%
Construction Type					
New	63.1%	64.8%	69.3%	66.7%	61.0%
Rehab	33.4%	32.4%	26.5%	27.7%	34.3%
Both	3.5%	2.8%	4.2%	5.5%	4.4%
Existing	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.3%
Projects by Credit Type					
30%	29.5%	30.9%	18.5%	20.0%	21.7%
70%	54.6%	49.5%	59.6%	71.3%	57.6%
Both	14.7%	18.7%	18.4%	7.9%	17.3%
Units by Credit Type					
30%	44.7%	42.8%	30.2%	31.0%	29.8%
70%	40.4%	39.3%	48.9%	59.7%	49.2%
Both	13.6%	17.1%	17.7%	8.7%	16.7%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 18,503 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2015 with data on whether or not the project was targeted for a specific population. Of these, 16,712 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 Use**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2003-2015**

Additional Financing Used	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	25.3%	26.3%	13.4%	14.2%	17.3%
RHS Section 515	6.9%	6.7%	6.0%	3.3%	4.9%
HOME Funds	21.2%	24.1%	22.3%	27.2%	21.9%
CDBG Funds	4.7%	4.3%	2.3%	5.4%	3.0%
FHA-Insured Loans	1.9%	2.2%	1.5%	1.4%	1.3%
Part of a HOPE VI Development	1.1%	0.4%	1.3%	1.2%	0.3%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 12,324 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2015 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 2006-2015**

	<b>Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated</b>	<b>Amount of HOME Funds</b>	<b>Amount of CDBG Funds</b>	<b>Amount of HOPE VI Funds</b>
Number of Projects with Funding	9,260	2,492	801	300
Number of Qualifying Units	655,702	121,715	37,574	21,711
Minimum	\$13	\$0	\$0	\$0
10th Percentile	\$2,765	\$0	\$0	\$0
25th Percentile	\$5,337	\$8,333	\$0	\$0
50th Percentile (Median)	\$9,737	\$16,667	\$1,037	\$0
Mean	\$10,979	\$29,769	\$9,734	\$6,800
75th Percentile	\$14,816	\$36,357	\$14,661	\$0
90th Percentile	\$19,999	\$81,092	\$28,571	\$12,500
Maximum	\$99,591	\$284,135	\$243,867	\$333,333

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,415 projects placed in service from 2006 to 2015. Qualifying units are the number of reported low income units. The dataset contains missing data for the number of low-income units (6.3%). These projects were excluded in this analysis.

**Table 12**  
**Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, By Project Characteristics**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2006-2015**

	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	\$20,902	189	2.2%	\$108,848	121	5.1%	\$34,048	11	3.2%	-	0	0.0%
11-50 units	\$15,303	3,965	45.3%	\$32,617	1,271	53.5%	\$20,253	195	57.0%	\$37,639	18	27.3%
51-99 units	\$12,086	2,643	30.2%	\$27,974	736	31.0%	\$16,200	93	27.2%	\$55,159	35	53.0%
100+ units	\$7,190	1,951	22.3%	\$22,253	246	10.4%	\$15,531	43	12.6%	\$29,153	13	19.7%
Construction												
New	\$14,767	5,036	59.8%	\$31,657	1,443	63.5%	\$18,809	191	57.2%	\$46,643	57	87.7%
Rehab	\$8,815	3,075	36.5%	\$42,045	746	32.8%	\$18,961	135	40.4%	\$36,381	4	6.2%
Both	\$12,184	310	3.7%	\$24,935	79	3.5%	\$28,749	8	2.4%	\$71,514	4	6.2%
Existing	\$17,270	3	0.04%	\$40,743	4	0.2%	\$0	0	0%	\$0	0	0%
Nonprofit Sponsor												
Yes	\$12,595	2,566	32.8%	\$32,695	941	44.5%	\$18,763	224	68.1%	\$28,717	21	35.0%
No	\$12,841	5,263	67.2%	\$32,968	1,174	56.5%	\$15,943	106	31.9%	\$56,757	39	65.0%
RHS Section 514, 515, 538												
Yes	\$12,099	594	7.5%	\$19,782	138	7.0%	\$23,323	23	7.1%	0	1	1.7%
No	\$12,674	7,336	92.5%	\$30,309	1,821	93.0%	\$18,942	303	92.9%	\$48,617	59	98.3%
Tax-Exempt Bonds												
Yes	\$6,936	2,307	28.0%	\$48,411	453	21.5%	\$22,442	97	29.3%	\$87,064	6	10.5%
No	\$14,843	5,931	72.0%	\$29,461	1,658	78.5%	\$17,393	236	70.7%	\$41,451	51	89.5%
Credit Type												
30 Percent	\$7,303	2,582	31.7%	\$44,113	466	20.6%	\$22,925	94	27.8%	\$69,055	8	12.9%
70 Percent	\$16,074	4,278	52.5%	\$36,262	1,469	64.9%	\$17,407	202	59.5%	\$44,791	45	72.6%
Both	\$11,275	1,290	15.8%	\$18,723	327	14.5%	\$17,543	43	12.7%	\$13,441	9	14.5%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,415 projects placed in service in 2006-2015. The dataset contains missing data for the number of units (0.7%), low-income units (6.3%), construction type (8.3%), nonprofit sponsor (14.7%), RHS Section 515 (13.8%), bond financing (9.7%), and credit type (12.6%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 13**  
**Additional Project Characteristics**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2006-2015**

	Percent of Projects
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling	
50% AMGI	9.1%
60% AMGI	85.6%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling	
Yes	59.4%
No	38.4%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)	
Average	47.5%
0-10 percent	14.1%
10-25 percent	24.6%
25-50 percent	19.5%
50-75 percent	13.4%
75-90 percent	7.9%
90-100 percent	20.6%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract	
Yes	32.3%
No	61.9%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,415 projects placed in service between 2006 and 2015. The dataset contains missing data for the designation of elected rent/income ceiling for low-income units (19.3%), whether there are units set aside with rents lower than elected rent/income ceiling (15.3%), and whether there is a federal/state projected-based rental assistance contract (21.9%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Table 14**  
**Additional Project Characteristics, by Targeting Characteristics**  
**Projects Placed in Service 2006-2015**

	Project Targeted to				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Number of Projects	10,400	9,615	9,076	9,555	8,721
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
50% AMGI	9.6%	9.1%	7.4%	11.0%	9.5%
60% AMGI	88.8%	89.1%	91.9%	86.1%	87.0%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
Yes	67.8%	64.4%	69.7%	77.9%	62.5%
No	30.6%	33.8%	29.7%	19.5%	34.5%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (among Projects with Such Units)					
Average	48.7%	51.7%	55.0%	48.5%	53.6%
0-10 percent	12.8%	11.6%	6.4%	8.4%	20.0%
10-25 percent	26.0%	20.6%	25.4%	26.3%	16.2%
25-50 percent	17.5%	22.0%	19.6%	23.0%	9.9%
50-75 percent	13.5%	13.8%	11.7%	14.2%	14.9%
75-90 percent	9.1%	6.7%	9.4%	11.9%	6.6%
90-100 percent	21.1%	25.2%	27.5%	16.2%	32.5%
Federal or State Project-Base Rental Assistance Contract					
Yes	33.0%	36.7%	36.4%	52.1%	26.8%
No	67.5%	61.3%	63.3%	47.0%	72.2%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 13,415 projects placed in service between 2006 and 2015. Of these, 8,743 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**  
**1995-2015**

Year Tax Credit Allocated	Year Placed in Service																						
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	1993-2015	
Pre-1993	1.3%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.07%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	2.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.8%	5.3%	
1993	33.3%	2.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.08%	0.1%	0.3%	0.08%	0.2%	0.2%	4.5%	
1994	46.3%	42.0%	1.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.07%	0.1%	0.06%	0.2%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08%	0.0%	0.7%	0.08%	0.0%	0.2%	5.4%	
1995	16.2%	38.3%	37.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.06%	0.07%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.08%	0.0%	0.3%	4.3%	
1996	1.6%	13.3%	39.4%	34.8%	4.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.07%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.1%	
1997	0.0%	1.6%	15.7%	37.9%	35.7%	2.9%	0.1%	0.07%	0.06%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	
1998	0.2%	0.3%	2.4%	16.4%	36.4%	34.0%	1.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.2%	
1999	0.0%	0.1%	0.8%	3.9%	14.2%	39.5%	33.1%	2.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.06%	0.0%	0.06%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.08%	0.2%	0.0%	4.3%	
2000	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.8%	5.5%	15.0%	39.2%	32.0%	1.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%	
2001	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	1.0%	3.8%	15.7%	38.1%	38.4%	2.9%	0.8%	0.06%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	
2002	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.8%	5.7%	16.7%	30.9%	37.2%	4.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	
2003	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	5.9%	13.9%	32.7%	39.1%	6.6%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.08%	0.1%	0.0%	5.0%	
2004	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	1.4%	10.0%	12.9%	31.5%	37.9%	3.9%	0.5%	0.08%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	
2005	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.1%	1.0%	7.1%	11.1%	28.1%	33.7%	5.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	
2006	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	1.0%	4.7%	12.2%	31.1%	35.3%	7.7%	1.7%	0.5%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.5%	
2007	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	1.7%	7.5%	14.7%	30.9%	31.0%	6.7%	1.2%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	4.1%	
2008	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.06%	0.2%	2.7%	2.3%	9.4%	12.3%	35.8%	31.9%	8.7%	1.1%	0.08%	0.1%	0.0%	4.3%	
2009	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	2.2%	7.7%	11.2%	32.9%	36.1%	3.5%	0.3%	0.0%	0.2%	4.1%	
2010	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	6.6%	14.7%	32.5%	31.6%	4.6%	1.6%	0.0%	4.1%	
2011	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.3%	1.1%	5.9%	9.0%	29.4%	34.7%	5.5%	0.5%	3.5%	
2012	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08%	0.7%	6.5%	7.4%	35.9%	38.6%	5.5%	3.2%	
2013	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	14.0%	9.7%	34.7%	40.1%	2.7%	
2014	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	4.1%	10.8%	32.3%	1.1%	
2015 or later	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%	0.0%	0.0%	.06%	0.0%	0.2%	2.9%	7.4%	0.2%	
<b>Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 33,629 projects and 2,441,773 units placed in service between 1995 and 2015. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. 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 Place in Service	1992-1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Annual Number of Projects <sup>a</sup>	5,990	1,517	1,459	1,415	1,650	1,460	1,558	1,462	1,671	1,686	1,731	1,703	1,742	1,523	1,222	1,227	1,691	1,553	1,209	911	634
Annual Number of Units <sup>a</sup>	268,608	94,967	95,091	100,076	127,564	111,679	118,170	122,938	144,078	145,218	142,302	140,804	141,219	115,828	95,706	93,993	131,386	113,847	81,337	62,996	41,347
Annual Number of Low Income Units <sup>a</sup>	241,995	85,454	82,205	85,085	112,378	98,467	101,709	105,425	125,440	123,031	122,826	123,519	123,693	97,519	78,317	76,714	109,563	87,988	67,209	53,228	37,118
Average Project Size (units)	45.0	62.7	65.4	70.7	77.5	76.7	75.9	84.2	86.3	86.2	82.3	82.8	81.3	76.1	78.5	76.8	78.0	73.9	68.2	72.2	66.0
Distribution by Size																					
0-10 Units	22.6%	15.8%	9.7%	7.1%	5.6%	5.8%	4.0%	4.0%	3.7%	4.4%	4.7%	2.1%	3.0%	1.9%	3.2%	2.0%	4.6%	4.4%	2.0%	1.6%	2.2%
11-50 Units	52.1%	46.6%	51.1%	50.6%	48.4%	44.9%	50.0%	43.6%	40.8%	40.6%	40.7%	41.8%	41.9%	44.8%	42.4%	47.1%	42.9%	42.3%	47.3%	42.7%	45.9%
51-99 Units	13.9%	18.1%	19.5%	21.4%	21.3%	23.4%	22.3%	23.7%	25.1%	23.5%	26.6%	28.5%	27.8%	31.8%	30.2%	29.6%	32.5%	31.7%	32.0%	32.6%	33.9%
100+ Units	11.4%	19.5%	19.7%	20.9%	24.7%	26.0%	23.6%	28.9%	30.5%	31.4%	28.1%	27.5%	27.2%	21.5%	24.2%	21.3%	20.0%	21.5%	18.7%	23.1%	18.0%
Average Bedrooms	1.88	1.94	1.93	1.95	1.94	1.88	1.90	1.88	1.87	1.94	1.89	1.88	1.84	1.83	1.79	1.75	1.78	1.75	1.76	1.75	1.75
Distribution																					
0 Bedrooms	5.2%	4.2%	5.0%	4.1%	4.4%	3.9%	3.3%	4.0%	5.4%	4.6%	4.6%	4.5%	4.9%	6.0%	7.1%	8.6%	5.7%	6.9%	7.9%	6.5%	4.7%
1 Bedroom	35.2%	27.8%	29.9%	28.9%	27.6%	31.1%	29.7%	30.2%	31.9%	31.4%	33.6%	35.2%	37.7%	34.7%	36.7%	36.4%	35.3%	36.1%	37.9%	37.8%	38.1%
2 Bedrooms	40.8%	45.7%	42.3%	43.3%	43.5%	43.4%	43.2%	43.1%	41.4%	41.6%	39.4%	38.6%	37.9%	37.4%	37.0%	36.6%	39.7%	37.2%	36.9%	35.9%	39.7%
3 Bedroom	17.0%	19.4%	19.4%	20.7%	20.9%	19.2%	20.5%	20.2%	18.8%	18.7%	19.1%	19.0%	16.9%	19.0%	16.1%	15.6%	16.6%	17.6%	15.1%	16.7%	15.1%
4+ Bedrooms	1.8%	3.0%	3.4%	3.0%	3.6%	2.3%	3.3%	2.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	2.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.2%	2.3%	3.1%	2.5%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.6%	96.8%	96.1%	95.3%	94.8%	94.7%	94.1%	92.6%	94.2%	93.7%	95.1%	96.4%	96.1%	96.3%	95.9%	95.8%	96.6%	96.7%	97.3%	96.1%	96.8%
Distribution of Projects by Construction Type																					
New	66.1%	64.3%	60.8%	62.7%	62.5%	60.8%	57.7%	61.5%	64.4%	63.9%	64.9%	61.4%	60.9%	61.8%	62.9%	60.7%	59.9%	64.6%	57.8%	54.4%	55.0%
Rehab	31.5%	32.3%	33.6%	33.8%	33.5%	36.5%	36.5%	34.2%	33.2%	32.9%	32.1%	35.3%	35.7%	35.2%	33.3%	36.3%	36.1%	30.1%	37.9%	42.7%	41.6%
Both	1.6%	2.3%	3.5%	2.3%	2.9%	1.2%	3.0%	3.1%	2.1%	3.0%	2.8%	3.2%	3.2%	2.7%	3.5%	2.5%	3.7%	5.1%	3.9%	2.0%	2.1%
Existing	0.8%	1.1%	2.0%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	2.8%	1.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	1.3%
Nonprofit Sponsor	12.8%	18.0%	22.8%	25.0%	25.6%	24.2%	26.8%	23.2%	23.1%	24.9%	23.7%	27.7%	29.2%	28.5%	30.4%	28.8%	28.4%	29.5%	38.3%	33.7%	24.6%
RHS Section 514, 515, 538	22.1%	10.8%	9.9%	8.7%	8.0%	6.8%	7.5%	5.5%	4.0%	6.5%	3.5%	5.5%	6.5%	6.2%	6.1%	6.8%	6.8%	5.2%	6.9%	8.4%	9.0%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2.8%	6.2%	8.4%	14.0%	18.2%	23.5%	20.7%	26.2%	25.6%	26.6%	25.8%	24.9%	28.1%	25.2%	27.0%	26.4%	16.7%	18.0%	22.8%	25.7%	23.4%

<sup>a</sup> Average for 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Notes: For projects placed in service between 1992 and 1994, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (28.6%), qualifying ratio (4.6%), construction type (14.2%), nonprofit sponsor (20.2%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (19.5%), and bond financing (16.4%). For projects placed in service between 1995 and 2015, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (15.3%), qualifying ratio (9.7%), construction type (7.2%), nonprofit sponsor (11.8%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (10.8%), and bond financing (7.1%). Qualifying ratio is a simple average of the qualifying ratio of projects. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.