

DRAFT 2010 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	\$1,369,771	3.4%	\$656,511	47.9%	\$713,260	52.1%
2	Abilene	\$828,266	2.0%	\$529,694	64.0%	\$298,572	36.0%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$9,528,909	23.4%	\$985,331	10.3%	\$8,543,577	89.7%
4	Tyler	\$1,388,839	3.4%	\$833,569	60.0%	\$555,270	40.0%
5	Beaumont	\$1,013,836	2.5%	\$643,475	63.5%	\$370,361	36.5%
6	Houston	\$9,762,626	24.0%	\$938,146	9.6%	\$8,824,479	90.4%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$2,803,572	6.9%	\$600,509	21.4%	\$2,203,063	78.6%
8	Waco	\$1,943,373	4.8%	\$569,671	29.3%	\$1,373,703	70.7%
9	San Antonio	\$2,931,963	7.2%	\$605,112	20.6%	\$2,326,851	79.4%
10	Corpus Christi	\$1,448,539	3.6%	\$595,275	41.1%	\$853,263	58.9%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$5,188,920	12.8%	\$1,517,383	29.2%	\$3,671,536	70.8%
12	San Angelo	\$677,732	1.7%	\$524,297	77.4%	\$153,435	22.6%
13	El Paso	\$1,751,101	4.3%	\$562,778	32.1%	\$1,188,323	67.9%
	Total	\$40,637,446	100.0%	\$9,561,752	23.5%	\$31,075,694	76.5%

DRAFT 2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

Table 2. Regional Measures of Affordable Housing Need

Total RAF Funding: **\$ 40,637,446**

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%		\$ 20,318,723	36%		\$ 14,629,481	12%		\$ 4,876,494	2%		\$ 812,749		
	# 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	111,390	4%	\$ 720,954	26,163	4%	\$ 550,919	6,072	2%	\$ 103,323	1,066	3%	\$ 26,490	\$ 1,401,686	3.4%
2	66,595	2%	\$ 431,022	13,948	2%	\$ 293,715	2,377	1%	\$ 40,443	627	2%	\$ 15,586	\$ 780,765	1.9%
3	597,641	19%	\$ 3,868,125	201,222	29%	\$ 4,237,154	82,627	29%	\$ 1,405,923	7,393	23%	\$ 183,784	\$ 9,694,986	23.9%
4	140,760	4%	\$ 911,041	24,325	4%	\$ 512,211	5,458	2%	\$ 92,873	1,407	4%	\$ 34,986	\$ 1,551,111	3.8%
5	107,638	3%	\$ 696,669	18,356	3%	\$ 386,525	4,185	1%	\$ 71,207	991	3%	\$ 24,645	\$ 1,179,045	2.9%
6	664,792	21%	\$ 4,302,744	160,715	23%	\$ 3,384,189	88,434	31%	\$ 1,504,732	7,237	22%	\$ 179,898	\$ 9,371,563	23.1%
7	159,707	5%	\$ 1,033,674	72,073	10%	\$ 1,517,655	17,786	6%	\$ 302,636	2,514	8%	\$ 62,489	\$ 2,916,453	7.2%
8	140,291	4%	\$ 908,005	39,027	6%	\$ 821,788	8,107	3%	\$ 137,945	1,223	4%	\$ 30,411	\$ 1,898,149	4.7%
9	270,157	9%	\$ 1,748,543	58,981	8%	\$ 1,241,974	21,127	7%	\$ 359,482	2,403	7%	\$ 59,742	\$ 3,409,741	8.4%
10	119,603	4%	\$ 774,106	19,704	3%	\$ 414,900	6,829	2%	\$ 116,191	1,004	3%	\$ 24,961	\$ 1,330,158	3.3%
11	520,737	17%	\$ 3,370,378	27,231	4%	\$ 573,402	28,674	10%	\$ 487,901	4,808	15%	\$ 119,518	\$ 4,551,199	11.2%
12	72,054	2%	\$ 466,354	11,892	2%	\$ 250,406	3,182	1%	\$ 54,142	695	2%	\$ 17,270	\$ 788,172	1.9%
13	167,963	5%	\$ 1,087,109	21,116	3%	\$ 444,642	11,736	4%	\$ 199,696	1,326	4%	\$ 32,969	\$ 1,764,417	4.3%
Ttl.	3,139,327	100%	\$ 20,318,723	694,753	100%	\$ 14,629,481	286,594	100%	\$ 4,876,494	32,695	100%	\$ 812,749	\$ 40,637,446	100%

DRAFT 2010 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%

DRAFT 2010 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%	3.4%	0.1%	0.1%	1.1%	(31,915)	1,401,686	(196,406)	(31,915)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	1.7%	1.9%	-0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	-	780,765	-	-	-0.3%	-3.6%	\$ 45,233	\$ 109,402	\$ 47,501
3	24.3%	23.9%	0.4%	0.4%	5.7%	(166,078)	9,694,986	(1,358,475)	(166,078)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	4.2%	3.8%	0.4%	0.4%	5.6%	(162,272)	1,551,111	(217,344)	(162,272)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	5.7%	2.9%	2.8%	2.8%	39.3%	(1,141,534)	1,179,045	(165,209)	(165,209)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	20.9%	23.1%	-2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-	9,371,563	-	-	-2.1%	-30.0%	\$ 372,397	\$ 1,313,157	\$ 391,063
7	7.5%	7.2%	0.3%	0.3%	3.9%	(112,881)	2,916,453	(408,658)	(112,881)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	4.4%	4.7%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,898,149	-	-	-0.2%	-3.5%	\$ 43,066	\$ 265,971	\$ 45,224
9	11.2%	8.4%	2.8%	2.8%	38.9%	(1,129,748)	3,409,741	(477,778)	(477,778)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	2.6%	3.3%	-0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,330,158	-	-	-0.6%	-9.1%	\$ 112,730	\$ 186,384	\$ 118,381
11	7.4%	11.2%	-3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	-	4,551,199	-	-	-3.8%	-53.8%	\$ 666,463	\$ 637,721	\$ 637,721
12	2.3%	1.9%	0.4%	0.4%	5.0%	(144,659)	788,172	(110,440)	(110,440)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	4.4%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	(13,316)	1,764,417	(247,233)	(13,316)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Ttl.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	7.1%	100.0%	(2,902,403)	40,637,446	(3,181,543)	(1,239,889)	-7.1%	-100.0%	\$ 1,239,889	\$ 5,694,177	\$ 1,239,889

State Resource Difference: 7.1%
 Total RAF Funding: 40,637,446
 State Over Allocated Resource Amount: (2,902,403)
 Regional Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 14.0%

State Under Allocated Resource Amount



DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,401,686	\$ (31,915)	\$ 1,369,771	3.4%
2	Abilene	\$ 780,765	\$ 47,501	\$ 828,266	2.0%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$ 9,694,986	\$ (166,078)	\$ 9,528,909	23.4%
4	Tyler	\$ 1,551,111	\$ (162,272)	\$ 1,388,839	3.4%
5	Beaumont	\$ 1,179,045	\$ (165,209)	\$ 1,013,836	2.5%
6	Houston	\$ 9,371,563	\$ 391,063	\$ 9,762,626	24.0%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$ 2,916,453	\$ (112,881)	\$ 2,803,572	6.9%
8	Waco	\$ 1,898,149	\$ 45,224	\$ 1,943,373	4.8%
9	San Antonio	\$ 3,409,741	\$ (477,778)	\$ 2,931,963	7.2%
10	Corpus Christi	\$ 1,330,158	\$ 118,381	\$ 1,448,539	3.6%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$ 4,551,199	\$ 637,721	\$ 5,188,920	12.8%
12	San Angelo	\$ 788,172	\$ (110,440)	\$ 677,732	1.7%
13	El Paso	\$ 1,764,417	\$ (13,316)	\$ 1,751,101	4.3%
Ttl.		\$ 40,637,446	\$ 0	\$ 40,637,446	100%

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771	\$ 684,886	41,503	42%	\$ 289,402	56,715	58%	\$ 395,484
2	\$ 828,266	\$ 414,133	30,027	53%	\$ 217,928	27,034	47%	\$ 196,205
3	\$ 9,528,909	\$ 4,764,454	52,069	9%	\$ 442,630	508,395	91%	\$ 4,321,824
4	\$ 1,388,839	\$ 694,419	51,734	61%	\$ 420,570	33,686	39%	\$ 273,849
5	\$ 1,013,836	\$ 506,918	39,783	54%	\$ 273,699	33,899	46%	\$ 233,219
6	\$ 9,762,626	\$ 4,881,313	45,883	8%	\$ 383,251	538,512	92%	\$ 4,498,062
7	\$ 2,803,572	\$ 1,401,786	16,309	12%	\$ 170,246	117,979	88%	\$ 1,231,540
8	\$ 1,943,373	\$ 971,687	26,789	22%	\$ 216,414	93,493	78%	\$ 755,273
9	\$ 2,931,963	\$ 1,465,982	28,919	12%	\$ 179,466	207,309	88%	\$ 1,286,516
10	\$ 1,448,539	\$ 724,269	47,984	47%	\$ 337,641	54,946	53%	\$ 386,628
11	\$ 5,188,920	\$ 2,594,460	153,405	35%	\$ 899,809	288,914	65%	\$ 1,694,651
12	\$ 677,732	\$ 338,866	21,395	35%	\$ 119,253	39,400	65%	\$ 219,613
13	\$ 1,751,101	\$ 875,550	17,189	11%	\$ 93,870	143,138	89%	\$ 781,680
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 20,318,723	572,989	21%	\$ 4,044,180	2,143,421	79%	\$ 16,274,543

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	\$ 1,369,771	\$ 493,118	6,168	24%	\$ 120,548	19,064	76%	\$ 372,570
2	\$ 828,266	\$ 298,176	4,975	37%	\$ 111,059	8,382	63%	\$ 187,117
3	\$ 9,528,909	\$ 3,430,407	13,433	7%	\$ 235,770	182,009	93%	\$ 3,194,638
4	\$ 1,388,839	\$ 499,982	10,701	52%	\$ 261,299	9,775	48%	\$ 238,683
5	\$ 1,013,836	\$ 364,981	8,710	54%	\$ 197,381	7,396	46%	\$ 167,600
6	\$ 9,762,626	\$ 3,514,545	10,103	7%	\$ 237,548	139,375	93%	\$ 3,276,997
7	\$ 2,803,572	\$ 1,009,286	4,206	6%	\$ 63,033	63,141	94%	\$ 946,253
8	\$ 1,943,373	\$ 699,614	4,751	13%	\$ 87,777	33,116	87%	\$ 611,838
9	\$ 2,931,963	\$ 1,055,507	5,739	10%	\$ 108,773	49,947	90%	\$ 946,734
10	\$ 1,448,539	\$ 521,474	5,535	29%	\$ 152,501	13,392	71%	\$ 368,973
11	\$ 5,188,920	\$ 1,868,011	6,354	25%	\$ 461,415	19,371	75%	\$ 1,406,596
12	\$ 677,732	\$ 243,983	2,344	21%	\$ 50,417	9,001	79%	\$ 193,566
13	\$ 1,751,101	\$ 630,396	986	5%	\$ 30,361	19,493	95%	\$ 600,035
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 14,629,481	84,007	13%	\$ 2,117,881	573,463	87%	\$ 12,511,600

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771	\$ 164,373	2,195	40%	\$ 65,822	3,286	60%	\$ 98,550
2	\$ 828,266	\$ 99,392	868	40%	\$ 40,205	1,278	60%	\$ 59,187
3	\$ 9,528,909	\$ 1,143,469	3,539	4%	\$ 50,124	77,189	96%	\$ 1,093,345
4	\$ 1,388,839	\$ 166,661	2,198	53%	\$ 88,755	1,929	47%	\$ 77,905
5	\$ 1,013,836	\$ 121,660	1,730	49%	\$ 59,975	1,779	51%	\$ 61,685
6	\$ 9,762,626	\$ 1,171,515	3,640	4%	\$ 50,402	80,976	96%	\$ 1,121,113
7	\$ 2,803,572	\$ 336,429	1,317	8%	\$ 27,171	14,988	92%	\$ 309,257
8	\$ 1,943,373	\$ 233,205	1,375	18%	\$ 43,076	6,070	82%	\$ 190,128
9	\$ 2,931,963	\$ 351,836	1,504	8%	\$ 26,699	18,311	92%	\$ 325,137
10	\$ 1,448,539	\$ 173,825	2,269	36%	\$ 62,934	3,998	64%	\$ 110,891
11	\$ 5,188,920	\$ 622,670	6,092	23%	\$ 145,681	19,946	77%	\$ 476,989
12	\$ 677,732	\$ 81,328	826	30%	\$ 24,068	1,964	70%	\$ 57,260
13	\$ 1,751,101	\$ 210,132	484	4%	\$ 8,979	10,837	96%	\$ 201,154
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 4,876,494	28,036	10%	\$ 693,892	242,553	90%	\$ 4,182,602

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	\$ 1,369,771	\$ 27,395	263	27%	\$ 7,400	711	73%	\$ 19,995
2	\$ 828,266	\$ 16,565	238	43%	\$ 7,061	321	57%	\$ 9,505
3	\$ 9,528,909	\$ 190,578	733	11%	\$ 20,089	6,220	89%	\$ 170,490
4	\$ 1,388,839	\$ 27,777	465	50%	\$ 13,941	462	50%	\$ 13,835
5	\$ 1,013,836	\$ 20,277	333	48%	\$ 9,799	356	52%	\$ 10,477
6	\$ 9,762,626	\$ 195,253	436	7%	\$ 12,794	6,214	93%	\$ 182,458
7	\$ 2,803,572	\$ 56,071	262	12%	\$ 6,660	1,942	88%	\$ 49,412
8	\$ 1,943,373	\$ 38,867	191	20%	\$ 7,710	771	80%	\$ 31,157
9	\$ 2,931,963	\$ 58,639	276	14%	\$ 8,249	1,683	86%	\$ 50,390
10	\$ 1,448,539	\$ 28,971	326	40%	\$ 11,708	481	60%	\$ 17,263
11	\$ 5,188,920	\$ 103,778	1,595	40%	\$ 41,404	2,403	60%	\$ 62,374
12	\$ 677,732	\$ 13,555	125	20%	\$ 2,661	513	80%	\$ 10,894
13	\$ 1,751,101	\$ 35,022	103	9%	\$ 3,009	1,098	91%	\$ 32,013
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 812,749	5,346	19%	\$ 152,485	23,174	81%	\$ 660,264

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771				\$ 483,173	35.3%		\$ 886,598	64.7%
2	\$ 828,266				\$ 376,252	45.4%		\$ 452,014	54.6%
3	\$ 9,528,909				\$ 748,613	7.9%		\$ 8,780,296	92.1%
4	\$ 1,388,839				\$ 784,566	56.5%		\$ 604,273	43.5%
5	\$ 1,013,836				\$ 540,854	53.3%		\$ 472,982	46.7%
6	\$ 9,762,626				\$ 683,995	7.0%		\$ 9,078,631	93.0%
7	\$ 2,803,572				\$ 267,111	9.5%		\$ 2,536,462	90.5%
8	\$ 1,943,373				\$ 354,977	18.3%		\$ 1,588,396	81.7%
9	\$ 2,931,963				\$ 323,187	11.0%		\$ 2,608,776	89.0%
10	\$ 1,448,539				\$ 564,783	39.0%		\$ 883,756	61.0%
11	\$ 5,188,920				\$ 1,548,310	29.8%		\$ 3,640,610	70.2%
12	\$ 677,732				\$ 196,399	29.0%		\$ 481,333	71.0%
13	\$ 1,751,101				\$ 136,218	7.8%		\$ 1,614,882	92.2%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446				\$ 7,008,438	17.2%		\$ 33,629,008	82.8%

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 34,002,547	\$ 26,128,355	\$ 60,130,902	56.5%	43.5%
5	\$ 35,363,899	\$ 46,521,161	\$ 81,885,060	43.2%	56.8%
6	\$ 29,800,649	\$ 272,439,719	\$ 302,240,368	9.9%	90.1%
7	\$ 19,250,599	\$ 88,509,837	\$ 107,760,436	17.9%	82.1%
8	\$ 9,540,543	\$ 54,343,043	\$ 63,883,586	14.9%	85.1%
9	\$ 16,256,274	\$ 145,242,517	\$ 161,498,791	10.1%	89.9%
10	\$ 15,351,911	\$ 22,582,264	\$ 37,934,175	40.5%	59.5%
11	\$ 37,558,797	\$ 68,567,645	\$ 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.	\$ 259,432,157	\$ 1,183,181,417	\$ 1,442,613,574	18.0%	82.0%

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771	17.5%	35.3%	-17.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	82.5%	64.7%	17.7%	\$ (242,938)	\$ 886,598	\$ (124,231)	\$ (124,231)
2	\$ 828,266	43.4%	45.4%	-2.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	56.6%	54.6%	2.0%	\$ (16,419)	\$ 452,014	\$ (63,337)	\$ (16,419)
3	\$ 9,528,909	9.0%	7.9%	1.1%	\$ (107,355)	\$ 748,613	\$ (104,897)	\$ (104,897)	91.0%	92.1%	-1.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	\$ 1,388,839	56.5%	56.5%	0.1%	\$ (788)	\$ 784,566	\$ (109,935)	\$ (788)	43.5%	43.5%	-0.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	\$ 1,013,836	43.2%	53.3%	-10.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	56.8%	46.7%	10.2%	\$ (103,006)	\$ 472,982	\$ (66,275)	\$ (66,275)
6	\$ 9,762,626	9.9%	7.0%	2.9%	\$ (278,592)	\$ 683,995	\$ (95,842)	\$ (95,842)	90.1%	93.0%	-2.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	\$ 2,803,572	17.9%	9.5%	8.3%	\$ (233,727)	\$ 267,111	\$ (37,428)	\$ (37,428)	82.1%	90.5%	-8.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	\$ 1,943,373	14.9%	18.3%	-3.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	85.1%	81.7%	3.3%	\$ (64,749)	\$ 1,588,396	\$ (222,568)	\$ (64,749)
9	\$ 2,931,963	10.1%	11.0%	-1.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	89.9%	89.0%	1.0%	\$ (28,059)	\$ 2,608,776	\$ (365,545)	\$ (28,059)
10	\$ 1,448,539	40.5%	39.0%	1.5%	\$ (21,439)	\$ 564,783	\$ (79,138)	\$ (21,439)	59.5%	61.0%	-1.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	\$ 5,188,920	35.4%	29.8%	5.6%	\$ (288,081)	\$ 1,548,310	\$ (216,951)	\$ (216,951)	64.6%	70.2%	-5.6%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	\$ 677,732	30.0%	29.0%	1.1%	\$ (7,230)	\$ 196,399	\$ (27,520)	\$ (7,230)	70.0%	71.0%	-1.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	\$ 1,751,101	2.5%	7.8%	-5.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	97.5%	92.2%	5.3%	\$ (91,997)	\$ 1,614,882	\$ (226,280)	\$ (91,997)
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	18.0%	17.2%	0.7%	\$ (937,211)	\$ 4,793,776	\$ (671,711)	\$ (484,575)	82.0%	82.8%	-0.7%	\$ (547,168)	\$ 7,623,649	\$ (1,068,237)	\$ (391,730)

Resource Funding Adjustment Limit:

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771	35.3%	483,173	\$ 124,231	\$ 607,404	44.3%	64.7%	\$ 886,598	\$ (124,231)	\$ 762,367	55.7%
2	\$ 828,266	45.4%	376,252	\$ 16,419	\$ 392,671	47.4%	54.6%	\$ 452,014	\$ (16,419)	\$ 435,595	52.6%
3	\$ 9,528,909	7.9%	748,613	\$ (104,897)	\$ 643,716	6.8%	92.1%	\$ 8,780,296	\$ 104,897	\$ 8,885,193	93.2%
4	\$ 1,388,839	56.5%	784,566	\$ (788)	\$ 783,778	56.4%	43.5%	\$ 604,273	\$ 788	\$ 605,061	43.6%
5	\$ 1,013,836	53.3%	540,854	\$ 66,275	\$ 607,129	59.9%	46.7%	\$ 472,982	\$ (66,275)	\$ 406,707	40.1%
6	\$ 9,762,626	7.0%	683,995	\$ (95,842)	\$ 588,152	6.0%	93.0%	\$ 9,078,631	\$ 95,842	\$ 9,174,473	94.0%
7	\$ 2,803,572	9.5%	267,111	\$ (37,428)	\$ 229,683	8.2%	90.5%	\$ 2,536,462	\$ 37,428	\$ 2,573,890	91.8%
8	\$ 1,943,373	18.3%	354,977	\$ 64,749	\$ 419,726	21.6%	81.7%	\$ 1,588,396	\$ (64,749)	\$ 1,523,647	78.4%
9	\$ 2,931,963	11.0%	323,187	\$ 28,059	\$ 351,246	12.0%	89.0%	\$ 2,608,776	\$ (28,059)	\$ 2,580,717	88.0%
10	\$ 1,448,539	39.0%	564,783	\$ (21,439)	\$ 543,345	37.5%	61.0%	\$ 883,756	\$ 21,439	\$ 905,194	62.5%
11	\$ 5,188,920	29.8%	1,548,310	\$ (216,951)	\$ 1,331,358	25.7%	70.2%	\$ 3,640,610	\$ 216,951	\$ 3,857,561	74.3%
12	\$ 677,732	29.0%	196,399	\$ (7,230)	\$ 189,169	27.9%	71.0%	\$ 481,333	\$ 7,230	\$ 488,563	72.1%
13	\$ 1,751,101	7.8%	136,218	\$ 91,997	\$ 228,215	13.0%	92.2%	\$ 1,614,882	\$ (91,997)	\$ 1,522,885	87.0%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	17.2%	7,008,438	\$ (92,845)	\$ 6,915,593	17.0%	82.8%	\$ 33,629,008	\$ 92,845	\$ 33,721,853	83.0%

Rural Pct of State Allocation 14%

DRAFT 2010 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	\$ 1,369,771	3.4%	\$ 607,404	44.3%	\$ 762,367	55.7%	\$ 49,107	\$ 656,511	47.9%	\$ 713,260	52.1%
2	\$ 828,266	2.0%	\$ 500,000	60.4%	\$ 328,266	39.6%	\$ 29,694	\$ 529,694	64.0%	\$ 298,572	36.0%
3	\$ 9,528,909	23.4%	\$ 643,716	6.8%	\$ 8,885,193	93.2%	\$ 341,615	\$ 985,331	10.3%	\$ 8,543,577	89.7%
4	\$ 1,388,839	3.4%	\$ 783,778	56.4%	\$ 605,061	43.6%	\$ 49,790	\$ 833,569	60.0%	\$ 555,270	40.0%
5	\$ 1,013,836	2.5%	\$ 607,129	59.9%	\$ 406,707	40.1%	\$ 36,346	\$ 643,475	63.5%	\$ 370,361	36.5%
6	\$ 9,762,626	24.0%	\$ 588,152	6.0%	\$ 9,174,473	94.0%	\$ 349,994	\$ 938,146	9.6%	\$ 8,824,479	90.4%
7	\$ 2,803,572	6.9%	\$ 500,000	17.8%	\$ 2,303,572	82.2%	\$ 100,509	\$ 600,509	21.4%	\$ 2,203,063	78.6%
8	\$ 1,943,373	4.8%	\$ 500,000	25.7%	\$ 1,443,373	74.3%	\$ 69,671	\$ 569,671	29.3%	\$ 1,373,703	70.7%
9	\$ 2,931,963	7.2%	\$ 500,000	17.1%	\$ 2,431,963	82.9%	\$ 105,112	\$ 605,112	20.6%	\$ 2,326,851	79.4%
10	\$ 1,448,539	3.6%	\$ 543,345	37.5%	\$ 905,194	62.5%	\$ 51,931	\$ 595,275	41.1%	\$ 853,263	58.9%
11	\$ 5,188,920	12.8%	\$ 1,331,358	25.7%	\$ 3,857,561	74.3%	\$ 186,025	\$ 1,517,383	29.2%	\$ 3,671,536	70.8%
12	\$ 677,732	1.7%	\$ 500,000	73.8%	\$ 177,732	26.2%	\$ 24,297	\$ 524,297	77.4%	\$ 153,435	22.6%
13	\$ 1,751,101	4.3%	\$ 500,000	28.6%	\$ 1,251,101	71.4%	\$ 62,778	\$ 562,778	32.1%	\$ 1,188,323	67.9%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	100.0%	\$ 8,104,883	19.9%	\$ 32,532,563	80.1%	\$ 1,456,869	\$ 9,561,752	23.5%	\$ 31,075,694	76.5%

Rural Pct of State Allocation 17.0% Rural Pct of State Allocation (Readjust) 20.0%
 Difference Below Mandated 20% 3.0%
 Funds Reapplied to Rural \$ 1,456,869