

State	Scoring that discourages racial and economic concentration
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points awarded to a project located in a census tract where the Median Family income from the 2000 census data is 110% or more of the county's current Median Family income in which the project is located (QAP 2008, p. 29).
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 points awarded if there are no similar projects in the same local government jurisdiction, such as two low income developments for the disabled (QAP 2008, p. 16). • 1 point awarded if there are two or fewer similar projects in the same local government jurisdiction (QAP 2008, p. 16). • 0 points awarded when there are more than two similar projects in the local government jurisdiction (QAP 2008, p. 16).
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 points awarded when a local government official certifies that the project would be "in an area for which development of affordable housing will induce other persons and families to locate or remain in the area and thereby create a desirable economic mix of residents." (QAP 2008. p. 24).
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points awarded to projects located within a city, town or county that has not had a Tax Credit Allocation within its geographical limits within the past three (3) years." (QAP 2008, p. 27).
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Colorado	<p>Scoring that encourages "balanced communities" is awarded up to 9 points for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence from the local government that it adopted initiatives to encourage affordable housing in new growth or high income areas (3 points); • evidence that the project will actually be built adjacent to housing owned and occupied by high income families; proof can be established by showing sales data of houses or census tract data that shows the average income is above 100% of the area median (2 points); • reserving at least 20% of its units for tenants with incomes less than 30% AMI (3 points); • reserving at least 30% of its units for tenants with incomes less than 30% AMI (4 points) Regulations 2008, p. 27).
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point awarded to projects in an economically mixed community as defined by Census Data (QAP 2008, p. 42).
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point awarded to projects with no other low-income housing within 3 blocks (QAP 2008, p. 42).
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded if project is located in a difficult to develop area (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 8).
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ADD TO A2] Up to 15 points awarded to projects based on the site and market study including several factors: the frequency of allocation in the past three years and the impact on affordable and market rate rental housing in the area, etc (QAP 2008 & 2009 Draft, p. 35).
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded to projects that are located in a Difficult to Develop Area (QAP 2007-2008, p. 29).
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.

Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points awarded to projects that propose rehabilitation of an existing building but will not permanently displace current residents (Guidelines, p. 21).
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points awarded to projects located in a Difficult to Develop Area (QAP 2007-2008, p. 58). • 30 points awarded to projects located in a census tract in which the median income of the census tract exceeds the area median income ("AMI") (QAP 2007-2008, p. 63); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change. • 300 points deducted for a project concentrating 200 low income units within a 1 mile radius (QAP 2007-2008, p. 67).
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 points awarded to projects that rehabilitate existing multi-family rental properties containing 5 or more units and provide protection against displacement (QAP 2008-2009, p. 14); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awards points to rehabilitation or replacement housing projects only if the developer complies with the Department's displacement policy (Program Guide, p. 35-36).
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Six points (out of possible 182) for locating in community with less than 10% subsidized stock.
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 point awarded to projects that are located in a Difficult to Develop Area (Scoring Summary, p. 2).
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 points awarded to projects that preserve existing housing tax credit units and do not displace existing low and moderate income residents (Worksheet, p. 8).
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 points awarded to projects located in a Difficult to Develop Area (QAP 2007-2008, p. 36). • 5 points deducted for projects located in a primary market area that has received three or more tax credit awards during the previous two years (QAP 2007-2008, p. 38).
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the selection criteria, projects are assessed according to the socioeconomic mix of households in the neighborhood (QAP 2008, p. 8).
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the selection criteria, projects located in Difficult to Develop Areas are "noted" (QAP 2008, p. 8).
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, because there are seven categories of eligible projects, including mixed income / mixed use housing. NV 2008 QAP 13.
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, but see above.
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Two points (out of) are awarded for projects that encourage "integrated community living opportunities, including mixed-income projects and/or mix-special needs projects." NJ 2008 QAP 46.
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.
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.
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"> • Rhode Island has a goal of achieving at least 10% affordable housing in each community. R.I. 2008 QAP 5.

South Carolina
 South Dakota
 Tennessee
 Texas
 Utah
 Vermont
 Virginia
 Washington

• No.
• No.
• No.
• No.
• No.
• No.
• No.
• No.
• A graded scale of points is awarded for a property located in a county where that county's LIHTC program unit production as a percentage of the 2000 census renter-occupied housing units is included and falls between certain percentages. A maximum of 40 points is awarded for property located in a county where the percentages are included in or fall between 0.00% and 1.86%. W.Va. 2007-2008 QAP 19
• No.
• 15 fewer points are awarded as concentration of low-income/affordable housing units increase in the vicinity (QAP 2008, p. 15).
• 15 points awarded if projects do not contribute to a concentration of low-income housing (QAP 2008, p. 21).

West Virginia
 Wisconsin

 Wyoming