

State	Local participation in site selection limited to statutory minimum
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 5 points awarded to projects having letters of local government support in the project area (QAP 2008, p. 16).
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 points awarded if a project addresses an identified planning need or objective of the Local Government. (QAP 2008, p. 23).
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires local approval from highest elected official, usually the mayor or county judge (QAP 2008, p. 10).
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded if the local government has formally adopted initiatives to encourage the creation of affordable rental housing in new growth or high income areas and the applicant project is consistent with those locally adopted initiatives (Regulations 2008, p. 26).
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 points awarded to a project if a state or local governmental authority donates the site (QAP 2008, p. 21-2).
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded if a project receives a letter of local support from the chief executive officer of the area (QAP 2008, p. 38). • Up to 5 points awarded if a project receives a local monetary contribution based on the size of the contribution. (QAP 2008, p. 38).
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires multifamily or single family projects provide a properly executed local government verification of status of site plan/plat approval. (Universal Application 2008, p. 21). • 5 points awarded if local government contributes money (Universal Application Instructions 2008, p. 33).
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded if the local government adopts a resolution in support of the project or if the local government is run by an individual, a letter from him will be accepted instead of a resolution (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 14).
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 3 points awarded if projects applied or received a below market loan from local government or agency.
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2008, p. 13). • Public official comments, if made, represent only one factor of any consideration in evaluating a proposed development. The housing sponsor can submit letters of community support and are encouraged to do so in accordance with the plan (QAP 2008, p. 13). • 20 points awarded for community based projects which receive local government contribution not less than 5% of total development cost (QAP 2008 p.22).
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ADD TO B1] Up to 3 points awarded if project has accompanying letter of support depending on the status of the official; 3 points awarded if the chief officer of the area sends a letter of support (QAP 2008 & 2009 Draft, p. 48).

Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2007-2008, p. 6). • 5 points awarded to applicants who receive written approval for monetary local government funding (QAP 2007-2008, p. 28); cited in 2006 Best Practices report (“Report”): no change.
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires applicants to include the name of the chief executive officer (“CEO”) of the city in which the project will be located so that the Iowa Finance Authority can notify the CEO and give opportunity for comment (QAP 2008, p. 41). • Requires applicants to identify a public or private agency that has made a Local Contributing Effort with a value of at least 1% of the hard construction costs (QAP 2008, p. 16). • Provision cited in 2006 Best Practices report (“Report”) is not in the 9% Tax Credits scoring criteria.
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires developers to document local approval by submitting a resolution from the local governing body (QAP 2008, p. 3); cited in 2006 Report: no change. • Awards high points to developers who show that the city and community will accept the development (QAP 2008, p. 28).
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ADD TO B1] Requires all projects to include a letter of support from the mayor or county judge executive of the jurisdiction where the project is located (QAP 2008, p. 10).
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graded scale of points awarded if the local government limits community barriers by reducing project development costs (QAP 2007-2008, p. 65). • 25 points awarded if the local governmental unit adopts the final concerted community revitalization plan (QAP 2007-2008, p. 58); cited in Report: no change.
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and reasonable opportunity for comment (QAP 2008-2009, p. 7); cited in Report: no change. • 3 points awarded for the reduction of community barriers through some form of property tax relief (QAP 2008-2009, p. 17).
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires all applicants to provide either a final resolution or letter of support from the highest elected official of the local jurisdiction and evidence of a local contribution (Program Guide, p. 17); cited in 2006 Best Practices report: no change.
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Four points (out of possible 182) for letter of support from chief elected official, endorsing proposed project. MA 2008 QAP 32. • Project proposals that are part of a neighborhood plan receive 2 points (out of possible 182). MA 2008 QAP 32.

Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 24); cited in Report: no change. • Up to 15 points awarded to projects that receive local support in the form of tax abatements (Scoring Summary, p. 4).
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local approval limited to statutory minimum of notice and reasonable opportunity for comment (2008 QAP, p. 9). • 1 point awarded to projects that receive a donation or waiver of project specific local government development fees (Worksheet, p. 5). • 2-10 points awarded to projects that receive contributions from a local unit of government (Worksheet, p. 5).
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local participation limited to statutory minimum of community notification and opportunity for comment (QAP 2007-2008, p. 23).
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local approval limited to statutory minimum of notice and reasonable opportunity for comment (QAP 2008, p. 6); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): provision modified.
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Nevada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Five points (out of 262) if project "is supported by local elected public officials, local housing authority, and local community development organizations." NH 2008 QAP 18.
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Five points (out of 100) for support from state or local officials or community groups. NY 2001 QAP 9-10.
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. A letter of support from a "City-Governing Body"
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. There is a threshold criterion that applicants notify "Chief Executive Officer of the local Governing Body." OK 2007 QAP 18. Ten points (out of) are awarded for community support, such as fee waivers or tax abatements. OK 2008 QAP 30.
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. As part of the evaluation process, applications will be reviewed based on, among other things, community awareness of the project as demonstrated by public or neighborhood meetings or hearings, development or service contributions by the community, and a plan to address community concerns. Or. 2007 QAP 32.
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Agency will consider, among other things, whether the development has municipal support articulated in a publicly approved community plan or through public funding and the support of local neighborhood initiatives. Pa. 2008 QAP 7, 12.
Pennsylvania	

Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Consideration will be given to projects demonstrating substantial local support, from local officials, community development staff, community-based organizations, business groups, etc. • Sponsors will be required to demonstrate marketability and housing needs through such documentation as: letters of local support. R.I. 2008 QAP 17
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. A letter from the chief executive officer of the local governing body must be provided. S.D. 2008 QAP 31. Further, proposals containing financing or incentives from a local government, a private party or a foundation that assist in reducing the development costs or enhancing the project feasibility may receive up to 20 points. S.D. 2008 QAP 26.
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Following receipt of the initial applications, the chief executive officer will be notified and will have the opportunity to comment on the development. Tenn. 2008 QAP 8.
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Each neighborhood organization may submit one letter that represents the organization's input. Neighborhood organizations include homeowners, property owner, and resident associations, not general "community" organizations. A development may receive points ranging from zero (where organizations oppose the development) to 12 (where organizations are neutral) to 24 (where organizations support the development). Tex. 2008 QAP 46-7, 54. • An application that receives support from a State Representative or State Senator may receive up to fourteen points. Tex. 2008 QAP 51, 62-3.
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Twenty-five to fifty points may be awarded if a letter from the chief executive officer of the locality is submitted regarding the development. Va. 2008 QAP 11.
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes.
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Twenty-seven points will be awarded for developments that are supported by elected officials. Wis. 2008 QAP 6.
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires applicants to show that the CEO of the local jurisdiction has been notified; resolutions of support from local governing bodies are welcome but not required (QAP 2008, p. 6). • 20 points awarded for the reduction of community barriers (ex. reducing or waiving fees or real estate tax concessions) (QAP 2008, p. 21-22); cited in Report: no change. • Up to 65 points awarded to projects that receive support or contributions from local sources (QAP 2008, p. 24); cited in Report: no change.