

	<b>Scoring that promotes Section 8 voucher access in high-opportunity areas</b>
State	
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 points awarded if the project commits in writing to target households on the public housing waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 points awarded if projects commit in writing to give priority to households on waiting lists for subsidized housing; the project must establish a referral relationship with the local housing office and local Indian Housing authority (QAP 2008, p. 20).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 points awarded if a project preserves "existing project-based rental assistance, i.e. project based Section 8 or RD rental assistant that would otherwise be lost." (QAP 2008, p. 21).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires project to send a letter to the Public Housing Authority for use by persons on the waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 10).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 points awarded if projects commit in writing to give priority to households on public waiting lists (QAP 2008, p. 30); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded if projects commit in writing to give priority to households on public housing waiting lists, recipients of HUD vouchers, or state assistance services (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded if projects utilize local public housing lists and Section 8 waiting lists (QAP 2008, p 40); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires projects to actively seek persons on public housing waiting lists (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded if projects demonstrate that housing will be made available to persons on public housing waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 7).</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded if projects give preference for 30% to 60% of total units to persons on housing authority waiting lists or who have assistance vouchers (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> <li>• 10 points awarded if projects which give preference for more than 60% of the total units to persons on housing authority waiting lists or who have assistance vouchers (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> </ul>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires all projects to give preferential treatment to persons on public housing or choice voucher (formerly known as Section 8) waiting lists as maintained by the public housing authority (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 24).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that give priority to households on waiting lists for subsidized or public housing (QAP 2007-2008, p. 30); cited in Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers who seek an affordable preservation set-aside to reserve 10% of the units for the preservation of federally assisted housing units, which includes Section 8 rental assistance (QAP 2008, p. 2).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to developers who agree to accept tenants on the public housing waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 14).</li> <li>• 15 points awarded to projects that address priority housing needs, which includes the preservation of housing with a HUD Section 8 contract (QAP 2008, p. 1 and 14).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to rent low income units to households referred by the local PHA (QAP 2007-2008, p. 10).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires applicants to give preference to people who are on public housing or Section 8 waiting lists (QAP 2008-2009, p. 14).</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to projects that target certain incomes by accepting Section 8 vouchers for at least 10% of the units (Program Guide, p. 37-38).</li> <li>• Points awarded to projects that establish a priority for households on waiting lists for public housing (Program Guide, p. 40).</li> </ul>

Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to give priority to people whose names are on public housing waiting lists (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded for the preservation of federally assisted units, which includes any development with a project based Section 8 rental assistance (Worksheet, p. 11).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects that provide housing for people on public housing waiting lists or its equivalent (QAP 2007-2008, p. 30).</li> <li>• To receive 3 points under the tenant-based rental assistance, developers will be required to give first priority to Section 8 voucher holders (QAP 2007-2008, p. 32).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for people on waiting lists for subsidized housing will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 9).</li> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for people with Section 8 vouchers will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 9); cited in Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Nevada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, but eight points for preserving "expiring project-based Section 8 contracts." OK 2008 QAP 35.</li> </ul>
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to five points may be awarded for developments that elect to serve individuals on waiting lists for public housing if the developer includes in their marketing plan a description of outreach, marketing and advertising methods used to attract individuals on public housing waiting lists as well as evidence that the public housing agencies have been contacted. S.C. 2008 QAP 6.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. A development may receive up to 10 points if it gives priority to households on public housing agency waiting lists.</li> <li>• Yes. Marketing plans, lease-up plans, and operating policies and procedures which will give a priority to persons on current Public Housing waiting lists or to persons with Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers. Tenn. 2008 QAP 22. Further, as part of the site inspection, a review will be conducted of the owner's marketing efforts to attract Section 8 applicants. Tenn. 2008 QAP 34.</li> <li>• However, the QAP also notes that developments presently having or proposed to have development-based subsidies under the Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation program are not eligible for Tax Credits. Tenn. 2008 QAP 13.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to ten points may be awarded for projects that provide housing for persons with Section 8 vouchers. Utah 2008 QAP 59.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ten points may be awarded if preference is given to individuals on public housing waiting lists or Section 8 waiting lists. Va. 2008 QAP 11.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

West Virginia  
Wisconsin  
  
Wyoming

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes. Up to 25 points will be awarded to properties that enter into a written commitment with a public housing authority to utilize the waiting list. W.Va. 2008 QAP 25.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2 points awarded to projects that give preference to individuals on the public housing waiting lists (QAP 2008, p. 13); cited in Report: no change.</li></ul>