

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 1. Regional, Rural, and Urban Funding Amounts

The table below shows the allocation of funds to the 13 State Service Regions and the corresponding rural and urban/urban distribution within each region.

Region	Place for Geographical Reference	Regional Funding Amount	Regional Funding %	Rural Funding Amount	Rural Funding %	Urban Funding Amount	Urban Funding %
1	Lubbock	\$1,542,392	3.5%	\$767,576	49.8%	\$774,816	50.2%
2	Abilene	\$909,998	2.0%	\$543,774	59.8%	\$366,225	40.2%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$10,262,835	23.0%	\$1,105,688	10.8%	\$9,157,148	89.2%
4	Tyler	\$1,584,958	3.5%	\$987,509	62.3%	\$597,449	37.7%
5	Beaumont	\$1,128,417	2.5%	\$717,167	63.6%	\$411,250	36.4%
6	Houston	\$10,899,235	24.4%	\$1,055,997	9.7%	\$9,843,238	90.3%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$2,965,164	6.6%	\$585,957	19.8%	\$2,379,207	80.2%
8	Waco	\$2,121,851	4.7%	\$616,272	29.0%	\$1,505,579	71.0%
9	San Antonio	\$3,186,848	7.1%	\$609,666	19.1%	\$2,577,182	80.9%
10	Corpus Christi	\$1,653,060	3.7%	\$693,536	42.0%	\$959,523	58.0%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$5,682,822	12.7%	\$1,693,580	29.8%	\$3,989,242	70.2%
12	San Angelo	\$766,130	1.7%	\$553,661	72.3%	\$212,469	27.7%
13	El Paso	\$1,997,481	4.5%	\$587,546	29.4%	\$1,409,935	70.6%
	Total	\$44,701,191	100.0%	\$10,517,927	23.5%	\$34,183,263	76.5%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 2. Regional Measures of Affordable Housing Need

Total RAF Funding: **\$ 44,701,191**

Region	Poverty			Rental Cost Burden			Overcrowding			Substandard Housing			Combined Need Measures	
	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount		
	50%		\$ 22,350,595	36%		\$ 16,092,429	12%		\$ 5,364,143	2%		\$ 894,024		
	# of Persons	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Need Based %
1	110,826	4%	\$ 800,421	26,048	4%	\$ 614,903	6,041	2%	\$ 114,942	1,059	3%	\$ 29,411	\$ 1,559,676	3.5%
2	65,545	2%	\$ 473,391	13,598	2%	\$ 321,000	2,325	1%	\$ 44,232	614	2%	\$ 17,056	\$ 855,679	1.9%
3	582,497	19%	\$ 4,206,983	195,560	29%	\$ 4,616,445	80,468	29%	\$ 1,531,005	7,222	22%	\$ 200,569	\$ 10,555,003	23.6%
4	140,934	5%	\$ 1,017,872	24,323	4%	\$ 574,171	5,449	2%	\$ 103,676	1,409	4%	\$ 39,121	\$ 1,734,840	3.9%
5	107,446	3%	\$ 776,013	18,207	3%	\$ 429,793	4,153	1%	\$ 79,010	990	3%	\$ 27,481	\$ 1,312,298	2.9%
6	659,660	21%	\$ 4,764,287	159,373	23%	\$ 3,762,210	87,843	31%	\$ 1,671,326	7,178	22%	\$ 199,336	\$ 10,397,159	23.3%
7	154,450	5%	\$ 1,115,487	69,458	10%	\$ 1,639,654	17,145	6%	\$ 326,203	2,426	8%	\$ 67,372	\$ 3,148,716	7.0%
8	137,607	4%	\$ 993,843	37,998	6%	\$ 896,999	7,917	3%	\$ 150,632	1,205	4%	\$ 33,463	\$ 2,074,937	4.6%
9	262,760	8%	\$ 1,897,743	57,304	8%	\$ 1,352,730	20,548	7%	\$ 390,955	2,331	7%	\$ 64,733	\$ 3,706,161	8.3%
10	120,428	4%	\$ 869,770	19,857	3%	\$ 468,747	6,883	2%	\$ 130,959	1,008	3%	\$ 27,992	\$ 1,497,468	3.3%
11	510,550	16%	\$ 3,687,363	26,735	4%	\$ 631,109	28,122	10%	\$ 535,059	4,712	15%	\$ 130,870	\$ 4,984,401	11.2%
12	72,905	2%	\$ 526,545	12,008	2%	\$ 283,477	3,227	1%	\$ 61,394	704	2%	\$ 19,558	\$ 890,974	2.0%
13	169,042	5%	\$ 1,220,877	21,231	3%	\$ 501,190	11,813	4%	\$ 224,751	1,335	4%	\$ 37,061	\$ 1,983,879	4.4%
Ttl.	3,094,651	100%	\$ 22,350,595	681,699	100%	\$ 16,092,429	281,934	100%	\$ 5,364,143	32,192	100%	\$ 894,024	\$ 44,701,191	100%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 3. Regional Distribution of Available Housing Resources

Region	HOME	HOPWA	PHA Capital	S8	USDA MF	USDA RA	HTC	MF BOND	HTC Bond	HTF	Total Resources	Region's Resource %
1	\$ -	\$ 203,771	\$ 2,505,750	\$ 20,355,546	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,585,001	\$ 3,583,464	\$ 9,300,000	\$ 9,468,848	\$ -	\$ 51,002,380	4%
2	\$ 34,077	\$ 41,429	\$ 5,639,721	\$ 6,398,754	\$ -	\$ 2,950,715	\$ 8,945,144	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,009,840	2%
3	\$ 5,119,489	\$ 4,205,197	\$ 13,063,757	\$ 219,837,690	\$ -	\$ 5,932,275	\$ 80,726,528	\$ 12,400,000	\$ 9,536,448	\$ -	\$ 350,821,384	24%
4	\$ 5,018,090	\$ 367,973	\$ 4,527,081	\$ 21,487,284	\$ 4,360,538	\$ 4,161,842	\$ 21,033,264	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,956,072	4%
5	\$ 555,212	\$ 229,466	\$ 4,792,521	\$ 35,665,248	\$ 250,000	\$ 2,542,516	\$ 22,344,408	\$ 9,734,000	\$ 6,444,520	\$ -	\$ 82,557,891	6%
6	\$ 990,824	\$ 4,691,589	\$ 16,601,830	\$ 122,551,444	\$ -	\$ 4,212,513	\$ 98,000,912	\$ 25,358,000	\$ 29,986,648	\$ -	\$ 302,393,760	21%
7	\$ 10,134,852	\$ 899,508	\$ 5,381,623	\$ 62,008,329	\$ 4,461,735	\$ 1,505,177	\$ 19,477,328	\$ -	\$ 3,904,336	\$ -	\$ 107,772,888	7%
8	\$ 3,787,181	\$ 166,808	\$ 5,968,323	\$ 30,577,725	\$ 1,226,905	\$ 4,177,823	\$ 18,038,104	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,942,869	4%
9	\$ 3,806,399	\$ 830,032	\$ 12,857,867	\$ 88,584,715	\$ -	\$ 1,308,146	\$ 28,527,736	\$ 20,770,000	\$ 4,813,896	\$ -	\$ 161,498,791	11%
10	\$ 797,236	\$ 307,453	\$ 6,766,778	\$ 18,750,719	\$ -	\$ 2,193,485	\$ 9,118,504	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,934,175	3%
11	\$ 3,131,798	\$ 462,427	\$ 11,207,125	\$ 54,686,572	\$ -	\$ 3,939,582	\$ 32,985,296	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 106,412,800	7%
12	\$ 225,582	\$ 159,040	\$ 1,691,670	\$ 13,267,139	\$ 1,043,171	\$ 1,075,347	\$ 15,724,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 33,186,789	2%
13	\$ -	\$ 353,988	\$ 10,318,147	\$ 28,453,843	\$ -	\$ 488,395	\$ 23,631,016	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,245,389	4%
Total	\$ 33,600,740	\$ 12,918,681	\$ 101,322,193	\$ 722,625,008	\$ 14,342,349	\$ 37,072,817	\$ 382,136,544	\$ 77,562,000	\$ 64,154,696	\$ -	\$ 1,445,735,028	100%
% of Total Resources	2.3%	0.9%	7.0%	50.0%	1.0%	2.6%	26.4%	5.4%	4.4%	0.0%	100%	

% of Resources not Regionally Allocated:

14.0%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 4. Regional Available Housing Resources Funding Adjustment

Region	Difference between Resources and Need			Over Allocated Regional Resource Differences					Under Allocated Regional Resource Differences					
	Region's Resource %	Region's Need Based %	Resource Difference	Over Allocated Resource Differences	Over Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Under Allocated Resource Differences	Under Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	3.5%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	(17,284)	1,559,676	(218,544)	(17,284)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	1.7%	1.9%	-0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	-	855,679	-	-	-0.3%	-3.4%	\$ 50,420	\$ 119,899	\$ 54,319
3	24.3%	23.6%	0.7%	0.7%	8.8%	(292,167)	10,555,003	(1,478,982)	(292,167)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	4.2%	3.9%	0.3%	0.3%	4.5%	(149,882)	1,734,840	(243,088)	(149,882)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	5.7%	2.9%	2.8%	2.8%	37.5%	(1,240,339)	1,312,298	(183,881)	(183,881)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	20.9%	23.3%	-2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	-	10,397,159	-	-	-2.3%	-31.7%	\$ 466,039	\$ 1,456,865	\$ 502,076
7	7.5%	7.0%	0.4%	0.4%	5.6%	(183,552)	3,148,716	(441,203)	(183,552)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	4.4%	4.6%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	2,074,937	-	-	-0.2%	-3.0%	\$ 43,547	\$ 290,743	\$ 46,914
9	11.2%	8.3%	2.9%	2.9%	38.9%	(1,287,277)	3,706,161	(519,313)	(519,313)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	2.6%	3.3%	-0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,497,468	-	-	-0.7%	-9.8%	\$ 144,424	\$ 209,827	\$ 155,592
11	7.4%	11.2%	-3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	-	4,984,401	-	-	-3.8%	-51.3%	\$ 753,868	\$ 698,421	\$ 698,421
12	2.3%	2.0%	0.3%	0.3%	4.1%	(135,140)	890,974	(124,845)	(124,845)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	4.4%	4.4%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,983,879	-	-	-0.1%	-0.9%	\$ 12,625	\$ 277,984	\$ 13,601
Ttl.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	7.4%	100.0%	(3,305,642)	44,701,191	(3,209,855)	(1,470,924)	-7.4%	-100.0%	\$ 1,470,924	\$ 6,263,595	\$ 1,470,924

State Resource Difference: 7.4%
 Total RAF Funding: 44,701,191
 State Over Allocated Resource Amount: (3,305,642)
 Regional Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 14.0%

State Under Allocated Resource Amount



2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 5. Regional Funding Amounts

Region	Place for Geographic Reference	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Funding Amount	Region's Funding Percentage
1	Lubbock	\$ 1,559,676	\$ (17,284)	\$ 1,542,392	3.5%
2	Abilene	\$ 855,679	\$ 54,319	\$ 909,998	2.0%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$ 10,555,003	\$ (292,167)	\$ 10,262,835	23.0%
4	Tyler	\$ 1,734,840	\$ (149,882)	\$ 1,584,958	3.5%
5	Beaumont	\$ 1,312,298	\$ (183,881)	\$ 1,128,417	2.5%
6	Houston	\$ 10,397,159	\$ 502,076	\$ 10,899,235	24.4%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$ 3,148,716	\$ (183,552)	\$ 2,965,164	6.6%
8	Waco	\$ 2,074,937	\$ 46,914	\$ 2,121,851	4.7%
9	San Antonio	\$ 3,706,161	\$ (519,313)	\$ 3,186,848	7.1%
10	Corpus Christi	\$ 1,497,468	\$ 155,592	\$ 1,653,060	3.7%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$ 4,984,401	\$ 698,421	\$ 5,682,822	12.7%
12	San Angelo	\$ 890,974	\$ (124,845)	\$ 766,130	1.7%
13	El Paso	\$ 1,983,879	\$ 13,601	\$ 1,997,481	4.5%
Ttl.		\$ 44,701,191	\$ 0	\$ 44,701,191	100%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 6. Measuring Affordable Housing Need in Rural and Urban/Exurban Places

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight: 50%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Persons	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Persons	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,542,392	\$ 771,196	41,023	42%	\$ 324,524	56,463	58%	\$ 446,672
2	\$ 909,998	\$ 454,999	29,880	54%	\$ 244,008	25,837	46%	\$ 210,991
3	\$ 10,262,835	\$ 5,131,418	51,223	9%	\$ 483,575	492,321	91%	\$ 4,647,842
4	\$ 1,584,958	\$ 792,479	51,160	60%	\$ 478,767	33,522	40%	\$ 313,711
5	\$ 1,128,417	\$ 564,208	39,093	54%	\$ 302,799	33,749	46%	\$ 261,409
6	\$ 10,899,235	\$ 5,449,617	45,178	8%	\$ 429,315	528,299	92%	\$ 5,020,302
7	\$ 2,965,164	\$ 1,482,582	16,164	12%	\$ 183,857	114,178	88%	\$ 1,298,725
8	\$ 2,121,851	\$ 1,060,926	26,658	23%	\$ 243,736	89,379	77%	\$ 817,189
9	\$ 3,186,848	\$ 1,593,424	27,777	12%	\$ 192,558	202,078	88%	\$ 1,400,866
10	\$ 1,653,060	\$ 826,530	47,886	46%	\$ 382,889	55,484	54%	\$ 443,640
11	\$ 5,682,822	\$ 2,841,411	150,537	35%	\$ 988,190	282,312	65%	\$ 1,853,221
12	\$ 766,130	\$ 383,065	21,515	35%	\$ 134,160	39,915	65%	\$ 248,904
13	\$ 1,997,481	\$ 998,740	16,737	10%	\$ 103,775	144,341	90%	\$ 894,965
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	\$ 22,350,595	564,829	21%	\$ 4,492,155	2,097,879	79%	\$ 17,858,440

Cost Burden Measure

Measure Weight: 36%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,542,392	\$ 555,261	6,058	24%	\$ 134,257	18,996	76%	\$ 421,004
2	\$ 909,998	\$ 327,599	4,930	38%	\$ 124,885	8,003	62%	\$ 202,715
3	\$ 10,262,835	\$ 3,694,621	13,184	7%	\$ 257,783	175,767	93%	\$ 3,436,838
4	\$ 1,584,958	\$ 570,585	10,585	52%	\$ 297,780	9,697	48%	\$ 272,805
5	\$ 1,128,417	\$ 406,230	8,467	54%	\$ 217,354	7,357	46%	\$ 188,876
6	\$ 10,899,235	\$ 3,923,725	10,013	7%	\$ 267,357	136,943	93%	\$ 3,656,367
7	\$ 2,965,164	\$ 1,067,459	4,151	6%	\$ 67,841	61,156	94%	\$ 999,618
8	\$ 2,121,851	\$ 763,866	4,731	13%	\$ 99,701	31,518	87%	\$ 664,165
9	\$ 3,186,848	\$ 1,147,265	5,478	10%	\$ 116,112	48,646	90%	\$ 1,031,153
10	\$ 1,653,060	\$ 595,101	5,537	29%	\$ 173,160	13,493	71%	\$ 421,942
11	\$ 5,682,822	\$ 2,045,816	6,244	25%	\$ 507,354	18,935	75%	\$ 1,538,462
12	\$ 766,130	\$ 275,807	2,357	21%	\$ 56,818	9,086	79%	\$ 218,989
13	\$ 1,997,481	\$ 719,093	959	5%	\$ 33,431	19,676	95%	\$ 685,662
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	\$ 16,092,429	82,695	13%	\$ 2,353,832	559,273	87%	\$ 13,738,597

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Over Crowding Measure

Measure Weight: 12%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,542,392	\$ 185,087	2,171	40%	\$ 73,838	3,270	60%	\$ 111,249
2	\$ 909,998	\$ 109,200	859	41%	\$ 45,105	1,221	59%	\$ 64,095
3	\$ 10,262,835	\$ 1,231,540	3,484	4%	\$ 54,732	74,910	96%	\$ 1,176,808
4	\$ 1,584,958	\$ 190,195	2,172	53%	\$ 101,134	1,913	47%	\$ 89,061
5	\$ 1,128,417	\$ 135,410	1,686	49%	\$ 66,039	1,771	51%	\$ 69,371
6	\$ 10,899,235	\$ 1,307,908	3,562	4%	\$ 56,192	79,341	96%	\$ 1,251,716
7	\$ 2,965,164	\$ 355,820	1,307	8%	\$ 29,409	14,510	92%	\$ 326,411
8	\$ 2,121,851	\$ 254,622	1,364	19%	\$ 48,622	5,779	81%	\$ 206,000
9	\$ 3,186,848	\$ 382,422	1,433	7%	\$ 28,368	17,885	93%	\$ 354,054
10	\$ 1,653,060	\$ 198,367	2,265	36%	\$ 71,256	4,041	64%	\$ 127,112
11	\$ 5,682,822	\$ 681,939	5,958	23%	\$ 159,781	19,471	77%	\$ 522,158
12	\$ 766,130	\$ 91,936	833	29%	\$ 27,100	1,992	71%	\$ 64,835
13	\$ 1,997,481	\$ 239,698	471	4%	\$ 9,901	10,939	96%	\$ 229,797
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	\$ 5,364,143	27,566	10%	\$ 771,475	237,044	90%	\$ 4,592,668

Substandard Measure

Measure Weight: 2%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,542,392	\$ 30,848	260	27%	\$ 8,302	707	73%	\$ 22,545
2	\$ 909,998	\$ 18,200	238	44%	\$ 7,961	306	56%	\$ 10,239
3	\$ 10,262,835	\$ 205,257	722	11%	\$ 21,945	6,033	89%	\$ 183,312
4	\$ 1,584,958	\$ 31,699	457	50%	\$ 15,862	456	50%	\$ 15,837
5	\$ 1,128,417	\$ 22,568	324	48%	\$ 10,801	353	52%	\$ 11,768
6	\$ 10,899,235	\$ 217,985	423	7%	\$ 14,186	6,080	93%	\$ 203,798
7	\$ 2,965,164	\$ 59,303	263	12%	\$ 7,290	1,879	88%	\$ 52,014
8	\$ 2,121,851	\$ 42,437	188	20%	\$ 8,553	744	80%	\$ 33,884
9	\$ 3,186,848	\$ 63,737	263	14%	\$ 8,784	1,644	86%	\$ 54,953
10	\$ 1,653,060	\$ 33,061	327	40%	\$ 13,325	484	60%	\$ 19,736
11	\$ 5,682,822	\$ 113,656	1,563	40%	\$ 45,419	2,348	60%	\$ 68,237
12	\$ 766,130	\$ 15,323	127	20%	\$ 3,020	519	80%	\$ 12,302
13	\$ 1,997,481	\$ 39,950	101	8%	\$ 3,332	1,110	92%	\$ 36,617
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	\$ 894,024	5,257	19%	\$ 168,781	22,663	81%	\$ 725,243

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Overall Measure of Affordable Housing Need

Region	Region's Funding Amount				Rural Need Based Funding Amount	Rural Need Based %		Urban Need Based Funding Amount	Urban Need Based %
1	\$ 1,542,392				\$ 540,921	35.1%		\$ 1,001,471	64.9%
2	\$ 909,998				\$ 421,958	46.4%		\$ 488,040	53.6%
3	\$ 10,262,835				\$ 818,035	8.0%		\$ 9,444,800	92.0%
4	\$ 1,584,958				\$ 893,543	56.4%		\$ 691,414	43.6%
5	\$ 1,128,417				\$ 596,992	52.9%		\$ 531,425	47.1%
6	\$ 10,899,235				\$ 767,051	7.0%		\$ 10,132,184	93.0%
7	\$ 2,965,164				\$ 288,397	9.7%		\$ 2,676,767	90.3%
8	\$ 2,121,851				\$ 400,613	18.9%		\$ 1,721,238	81.1%
9	\$ 3,186,848				\$ 345,823	10.9%		\$ 2,841,025	89.1%
10	\$ 1,653,060				\$ 640,630	38.8%		\$ 1,012,430	61.2%
11	\$ 5,682,822				\$ 1,700,743	29.9%		\$ 3,982,079	70.1%
12	\$ 766,130				\$ 221,098	28.9%		\$ 545,031	71.1%
13	\$ 1,997,481				\$ 150,439	7.5%		\$ 1,847,042	92.5%
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191				\$ 7,786,244	17.4%		\$ 36,914,947	82.6%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 7. Measuring Available Housing Resources in Rural and Urban Places

Region	Reg All Res Rur	Reg All Res Urb	Reg All Res	Rural Resource %	Urban Resource %
1	\$ 8,937,629	\$ 42,022,945	\$ 50,960,574	17.5%	82.5%
2	\$ 10,389,138	\$ 13,524,635	\$ 23,913,773	43.4%	56.6%
3	\$ 31,442,017	\$ 318,580,807	\$ 350,022,824	9.0%	91.0%
4	\$ 34,010,877	\$ 26,120,025	\$ 60,130,902	56.6%	43.4%
5	\$ 35,363,899	\$ 46,521,161	\$ 81,885,060	43.2%	56.8%
6	\$ 29,814,895	\$ 272,425,473	\$ 302,240,368	9.9%	90.1%
7	\$ 19,250,604	\$ 88,509,832	\$ 107,760,436	17.9%	82.1%
8	\$ 9,540,543	\$ 54,343,043	\$ 63,883,586	14.9%	85.1%
9	\$ 16,256,335	\$ 145,242,456	\$ 161,498,791	10.1%	89.9%
10	\$ 15,351,911	\$ 22,582,264	\$ 37,934,175	40.5%	59.5%
11	\$ 37,559,389	\$ 68,567,053	\$ 106,126,442	35.4%	64.6%
12	\$ 9,943,051	\$ 23,150,042	\$ 33,093,093	30.0%	70.0%
13	\$ 1,595,103	\$ 61,568,447	\$ 63,163,550	2.5%	97.5%
Ttl.	\$ 259,455,390	\$ 1,183,158,184	\$ 1,442,613,574	18.0%	82.0%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 8. Rural and Urban Resource Adjustment

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas							Urban Areas						
		Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	\$ 1,542,392	17.5%	35.1%	-17.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	82.5%	64.9%	17.5%	\$ (270,411)	\$ 1,001,471	\$ (140,328)	\$ (140,328)
2	\$ 909,998	43.4%	46.4%	-2.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	56.6%	53.6%	2.9%	\$ (26,617)	\$ 488,040	\$ (68,385)	\$ (26,617)
3	\$ 10,262,835	9.0%	8.0%	1.0%	\$ (103,860)	\$ 818,035	\$ (114,624)	\$ (103,860)	91.0%	92.0%	-1.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	\$ 1,584,958	56.6%	56.4%	0.2%	\$ (2,931)	\$ 893,543	\$ (125,205)	\$ (2,931)	43.4%	43.6%	-0.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	\$ 1,128,417	43.2%	52.9%	-9.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	56.8%	47.1%	9.7%	\$ (109,660)	\$ 531,425	\$ (74,464)	\$ (74,464)
6	\$ 10,899,235	9.9%	7.0%	2.8%	\$ (308,119)	\$ 767,051	\$ (107,480)	\$ (107,480)	90.1%	93.0%	-2.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	\$ 2,965,164	17.9%	9.7%	8.1%	\$ (241,308)	\$ 288,397	\$ (40,411)	\$ (40,411)	82.1%	90.3%	-8.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	\$ 2,121,851	14.9%	18.9%	-3.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	85.1%	81.1%	3.9%	\$ (83,730)	\$ 1,721,238	\$ (241,182)	\$ (83,730)
9	\$ 3,186,848	10.1%	10.9%	-0.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	89.9%	89.1%	0.8%	\$ (25,038)	\$ 2,841,025	\$ (398,089)	\$ (25,038)
10	\$ 1,653,060	40.5%	38.8%	1.7%	\$ (28,361)	\$ 640,630	\$ (89,766)	\$ (28,361)	59.5%	61.2%	-1.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	\$ 5,682,822	35.4%	29.9%	5.5%	\$ (310,474)	\$ 1,700,743	\$ (238,311)	\$ (238,311)	64.6%	70.1%	-5.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	\$ 766,130	30.0%	28.9%	1.2%	\$ (9,091)	\$ 221,098	\$ (30,981)	\$ (9,091)	70.0%	71.1%	-1.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	\$ 1,997,481	2.5%	7.5%	-5.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	97.5%	92.5%	5.0%	\$ (99,996)	\$ 1,847,042	\$ (258,810)	\$ (99,996)
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	18.0%	17.4%	0.6%	(1,004,142)	5,329,498	(746,777)	(530,444)	82.0%	82.6%	-0.6%	(615,452)	\$ 8,430,241	\$ (1,181,257)	(450,172)

Resource Funding Adjustment Limit:

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 9. Rural and Urban Area Funding Amount

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas					Urban Areas				
		Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban
1	\$ 1,542,392	35.1%	540,921	\$ 140,328	\$ 681,249	44.2%	64.9%	\$ 1,001,471	\$ (140,328)	\$ 861,143	55.8%
2	\$ 909,998	46.4%	421,958	\$ 26,617	\$ 448,575	49.3%	53.6%	\$ 488,040	\$ (26,617)	\$ 461,423	50.7%
3	\$ 10,262,835	8.0%	818,035	\$ (103,860)	\$ 714,175	7.0%	92.0%	\$ 9,444,800	\$ 103,860	\$ 9,548,660	93.0%
4	\$ 1,584,958	56.4%	893,543	\$ (2,931)	\$ 890,613	56.2%	43.6%	\$ 691,414	\$ 2,931	\$ 694,345	43.8%
5	\$ 1,128,417	52.9%	596,992	\$ 74,464	\$ 671,456	59.5%	47.1%	\$ 531,425	\$ (74,464)	\$ 456,961	40.5%
6	\$ 10,899,235	7.0%	767,051	\$ (107,480)	\$ 659,570	6.1%	93.0%	\$ 10,132,184	\$ 107,480	\$ 10,239,664	93.9%
7	\$ 2,965,164	9.7%	288,397	\$ (40,411)	\$ 247,986	8.4%	90.3%	\$ 2,676,767	\$ 40,411	\$ 2,717,178	91.6%
8	\$ 2,121,851	18.9%	400,613	\$ 83,730	\$ 484,342	22.8%	81.1%	\$ 1,721,238	\$ (83,730)	\$ 1,637,509	77.2%
9	\$ 3,186,848	10.9%	345,823	\$ 25,038	\$ 370,861	11.6%	89.1%	\$ 2,841,025	\$ (25,038)	\$ 2,815,987	88.4%
10	\$ 1,653,060	38.8%	640,630	\$ (28,361)	\$ 612,269	37.0%	61.2%	\$ 1,012,430	\$ 28,361	\$ 1,040,791	63.0%
11	\$ 5,682,822	29.9%	1,700,743	\$ (238,311)	\$ 1,462,433	25.7%	70.1%	\$ 3,982,079	\$ 238,311	\$ 4,220,390	74.3%
12	\$ 766,130	28.9%	221,098	\$ (9,091)	\$ 212,008	27.7%	71.1%	\$ 545,031	\$ 9,091	\$ 554,122	72.3%
13	\$ 1,997,481	7.5%	150,439	\$ 99,996	\$ 250,435	12.5%	92.5%	\$ 1,847,042	\$ (99,996)	\$ 1,747,046	87.5%
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	17.4%	7,786,244	\$ (80,272)	\$ 7,705,972	17.2%	82.6%	\$ 36,914,947	\$ 80,272	\$ 36,995,218	82.8%

Rural Pct of State Allocation 15%

2009 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 10. Rural and Urban Area Funding Amount Adjusted for Rural Minimum

Region	Regional Allocation		Adjusted for Minimum Regional Rural Amount				Adjusted for Minimum Statewide Rural Amount				
			Rural Areas		Urban Areas		Funds Reapplied to Rural	Rural Areas		Urban Areas	
	Region's Funding Amount	Regional Funding %	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban		Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban
1	\$ 1,542,392	4.7%	\$ 681,249	44.2%	\$ 861,143	55.8%	\$ 86,328	\$ 767,576	49.8%	\$ 774,816	50.2%
2	\$ 909,998	2.4%	\$ 500,000	54.9%	\$ 409,998	45.1%	\$ 43,774	\$ 543,774	59.8%	\$ 366,225	40.2%
3	\$ 10,262,835	21.4%	\$ 714,175	7.0%	\$ 9,548,660	93.0%	\$ 391,512	\$ 1,105,688	10.8%	\$ 9,157,148	89.2%
4	\$ 1,584,958	5.3%	\$ 890,613	56.2%	\$ 694,345	43.8%	\$ 96,896	\$ 987,509	62.3%	\$ 597,449	37.7%
5	\$ 1,128,417	2.5%	\$ 671,456	59.5%	\$ 456,961	40.5%	\$ 45,711	\$ 717,167	63.6%	\$ 411,250	36.4%
6	\$ 10,899,235	21.7%	\$ 659,570	6.1%	\$ 10,239,664	93.9%	\$ 396,427	\$ 1,055,997	9.7%	\$ 9,843,238	90.3%
7	\$ 2,965,164	4.7%	\$ 500,000	16.9%	\$ 2,465,164	83.1%	\$ 85,957	\$ 585,957	19.8%	\$ 2,379,207	80.2%
8	\$ 2,121,851	6.4%	\$ 500,000	23.6%	\$ 1,621,851	76.4%	\$ 116,272	\$ 616,272	29.0%	\$ 1,505,579	71.0%
9	\$ 3,186,848	6.0%	\$ 500,000	15.7%	\$ 2,686,848	84.3%	\$ 109,666	\$ 609,666	19.1%	\$ 2,577,182	80.9%
10	\$ 1,653,060	4.5%	\$ 612,269	37.0%	\$ 1,040,791	63.0%	\$ 81,267	\$ 693,536	42.0%	\$ 959,523	58.0%
11	\$ 5,682,822	12.7%	\$ 1,462,433	25.7%	\$ 4,220,390	74.3%	\$ 231,148	\$ 1,693,580	29.8%	\$ 3,989,242	70.2%
12	\$ 766,130	2.9%	\$ 500,000	65.3%	\$ 266,130	34.7%	\$ 53,661	\$ 553,661	72.3%	\$ 212,469	27.7%
13	\$ 1,997,481	4.8%	\$ 500,000	25.0%	\$ 1,497,481	75.0%	\$ 87,546	\$ 587,546	29.4%	\$ 1,409,935	70.6%
Ttl.	\$ 44,701,191	100.0%	\$ 8,691,765	19.4%	\$ 36,009,426	80.6%	\$ 1,826,162	\$ 10,517,927	23.5%	\$ 34,183,263	76.5%

Rural Pct of State Allocation 16.5% Rural Pct of State Allocation (Readjust) 20.0%
 Difference Below Mandated 20% 3.5%
 Funds Reapplied to Rural \$ 1,826,162