

State	Scoring that promotes units for lowest-income households outside high-poverty neighborhoods
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, provision in the 2006 Report has been deleted. • Up to 20 points awarded if projects reserve units for tenants with less than 50% AMI; points awarded proportionately based on percentage of units over the minimum required number (QAP 2008, p. 12). • 15 points awarded to projects which principally (50% of units or more) serve special needs populations such as person/families whose AMI is below 30% (QAP 2008, p. 17-8).
Alaska	
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 bonus points awarded to projects that set aside units for households with less than 30% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 19). • Up to 52 points awarded if projects reserve a percentage of units (up to 50%) for tenants below 55% of the AMI. Points are awarded based on the percentages of units reserved and the AMI. Categories can be combined to achieved maximum points. See chart (Regulations 2008, p. 28). • 2 points awarded to projects that reserve at least 10% of units available for tenants with income less than 30% AMI; the units must be spread across bedroom size (QAP 2008, p. 29).
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards points if projects target households at 50%AMI based on the percentage of units set aside (QAP 2008, p. 25).
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 15 points awarded to projects that target households at 30% AMI depending on the percentage of units (QAP 2008, p. 26).
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 5 points awarded to projects that serve households below 25% of AMI depending on percentage of units reserved (QAP 2008, p. 15). • Up to 5 points awarded to projects that serve households between 25% and 50% of the AMI depending on the percentage of units reserved. (QAP 2008, p. 12-6).
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 to 15 points awarded if projects have units affordable to individuals and families below 50% of median income based on percentage of units reserved in the development (QAP 2008, p. 36-37). • 1 to 5 points awarded if projects have units affordable for those living in poverty based on percentage of units reserved. (QAP 2008, p. 36-37).
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects which serve the lowest income families will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 20).
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 10 points awarded to projects that set aside units for tenants with less than 50% AMI depending on the percentage of units reserved (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 5). • 5 points awarded to projects that set aside 5% or more for tenants at 30% AMI (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 5).
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 10 points awarded to projects setting aside a greater percentage of low-income units. A maximum of 10 points will be awarded to a project that commits all units to tenants at or below 40% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 6).
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference is granted to projects which serve the lowest income tenants for the longest periods (QAP 2008, p. 24). • 15 points awarded if projects have 1-50 units and set aside at least 5% of units for households at 30% AMI or if projects have 51 or more units and set aside at least 10% of units for households at 30% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 24). • 5 points awarded if projects have 1-50 units and set aside at least 2.5% of units for households at 35% AMI or if projects have 51 or more units and set aside at least 5% of units for households at 35% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 24). • 15 points awarded if projects have 1-50 units and set aside at least 5% of units for households at 40% AMI or if projects have 51 or more units and set aside at least 10% of units for households at 40% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 24). • 5 points awarded if projects have 1-50 units and set aside at least 2.5% of units for households at 45% AMI or if projects have 51 or more units and set aside at least 5% of units for households at 45% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 25).

Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 7 points awarded if projects serve the lowest income tenants by reserving 10% of units or more for households with incomes less than 50% (3 points), 40% (4 points), or 30% (5 points) (QAP 2008 & 2009 Draft, p. 36). • 3 points awarded to projects that target a minimum of 10% of units for households with 30% or less AMI under the special needs population scoring criteria (QAP 2008 & 2009 Draft, p. 38).
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires developers who seek an affordable assisted living set-aside to reserve no less than 40% of the units to families with incomes at or below 40% of area median gross income (“AMGI”) (QAP 2008, p. 2) • 0 to 20 points awarded for units that are reserved for tenants with incomes at or below 40% of AMGI (QAP 2008, p. 19).
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing priority given to projects in which all or a portion of the units are affordable for tenants who earn no more than 50% of the gross median income for the area in which the property is located (QAP 2008, p. 7). • Graded scale of points awarded to developers who reserve a certain percentage of units for tenants whose incomes are below a certain percentage of the median income (QAP 2008, p. 14).
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires owners to adhere to one of the following: 20% of the units are rent restricted and occupied by individuals whose incomes are 50% or less of the area median income (“AMI”); or 40% of the units are rent restricted and occupied by individuals whose incomes are 60% or less of the AMI.
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graded scale of points awarded in which 10% of a project’s units serve households with a certain percentage of AMI (QAP 2007-2008, p. 57). • 50 points awarded in which 10% of the units serve households with 20% AMI and 10% of the units serve households with 30% AMI (QAP 2007-2008, p. 57).
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires developers to keep at least 60% of the total units occupied by people with very low income (QAP 2008-2009, p. 9).
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires owners to set aside either 20% of the units for households with incomes of 50% or less of the area median gross income (“AMGI”) or 40% of the units for households with incomes of 60% or less of the AMGI (QAP 2008, p. 1). • 5 points awarded to projects that commit 10% of the units to households with incomes of 30% or less of the area median income (“AMI”) (Program Guide, p. 37). • Up to 20 points awarded to projects that restrict units for households with incomes below 60% of the AMI (Program Guide, p. 36). • Awards maximum points to projects in which all the units are rented to households with incomes of 30% or less of the AMI (Program Guide, p. 36).
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires 10% of the units in a preservation project to have income and rents set at 40% of median income (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 19). • Requires 10% of the units in a preservation project to have income and rents set at 30% of median income (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 19). • Up to 50 points awarded for low-income targeting (2008 Scoring Summary, p. 7).
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires projects to have at least 75% of the units as single room occupancy with rents affordable to households whose income do not exceed 30% area median income (“AMI”) (QAP 2008, p. 7). • Up to 10 points awarded if 50% of the units is one bedroom or less with rents affordable to households whose income do not exceed 30% of AMI (Worksheet, p. 3).
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points awarded to projects that reserve at least 20% of the units for people at or below 50% area median gross income (QAP 2007-2008, p. 27).
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for very low income households (i.e., below 50% of area median income) will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 8).
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"> • Yes. Project location scoring changed "to target areas where there is a large difference between market rents and LIHTC Program rents." NH 2008 QAP iv.
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.
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. Twenty points (out of), however, are possible for a project that "serves lowest income group possible." ND 2008 QAP 19.
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, although ten points (out of) are awarded for "additional income targeting," where up to 10% of the units are open to households with income at or below 35% of area median gross income. OH 2008 QAP 37.
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDHDA and the Department of Human Services (DHS) have entered into an agreement promoting the full integration of citizens with disabilities into individualized housing settings rather than group homes. All housing designed specifically for people with disabilities must receive prior approval from DHS. Applicants who agree to offer services to these individuals in an integrated housing setting will receive points under this section. S.D. 2008 QAP 28. • The QAP does award 40 points for projects intended for eventual tenant ownership. S.D. 2008 QAP 27. The QAP defines the "Tenant Ownership Project" as a housing option designed to bring home ownership within reach of low- and very low-income households. S.D. 2008 QAP 41.
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe. Up to 28% of the tax credits will be set-aside for developments located in Tennessee counties identified as "rural." Tenn. 2008 QAP 3.
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. An application may receive four points if the development is located in a census tract which has a median family income that is higher than the family income for the county in which the census tract is located. Tex. 2008 QAP 53. • The QAP awards points if a certain percentage of the total units in the development are set-aside for people with incomes at or below a certain percentage of AMGI. Tex. 2008 QAP 48.
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to be eligible, a development must provide infill new construction in housing markets where there is a lack of affordable housing stock. Vt. 2008 QAP 30.
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 points awarded to projects that provided homes to people with income levels between 41-50% of HUD median income (QAP 2008, p. 17). • 10 points awarded to projects that provided homes to people with income levels at or below 40% of HUD median income (QAP 2008, p. 17).