

State	Mandatory Restrictions prohibiting increases in racial and economic concentration
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The market study must demonstrate an adequate market for the proposed units and that the proposed project would not adversely impact any existing AFHA project or create excessive concentration of multi-family units (QAP 2008, p. 7-8); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan must be submitted in the application if the project will displace people in acquiring or rehabilitating property. NOFA details the anti-displacement requirement plan (NOFA 2007, p. 9).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No mandatory restriction prohibiting increases in concentration, but the applicant must include a map indicating whether "[existing LIHTC or any other governmental subsidized housing developments" are within two miles of the proposed project (QAP 2008, p. 14).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colorado considers proximity to existing tax credit developments. If a choice needs to be made between two applications, proximity to other tax credit developments in a particular market or area of the state (QAP 2008, p. 5).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restriction deems project ineligible if displacement of existing residents occurs due to income ineligibility. Applications must include income certifications of existing tenants or a letter of willing relocation. (QAP 2008, p.34).</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires owners for rehabilitation project to minimize displacement of current low income tenants (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 25).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires developers to have a displacement/relocation plan if the project will displace or relocate tenants (QAP 2007-2008, p. 13-14).</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires developers to have a relocation plan if the project will displace tenants (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tenant displacement is strongly discouraged (QAP 2008, p. 7).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maryland Department of Housing ("the Department") will not participate in a project if the permanent displacement level exceeds a certain percentage (Program Guide, p. 21).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires all acquisition/rehabilitation projects to have a relocation plan if it involves the displacement of tenants (QAP 2007-2008, p. 6).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No.</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>• Partly. One general threshold criterion is that project does not create "undue concentration of income targeting." NH 2008 QAP 12.</li> </ul>
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. In fact, there is a "density bonus subsidy" for low and moderate-income projects that receive a "zoning change that increases permitted density." NJ 2008 QAP 4.</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>• Yes. "Projects cannot be in areas of minority and low-income concentration." NC 2008 QAP 23.</li> <li>• A maximum of 30 points (out of possible 205), however, for concentration of affordable housing. NC 2008 QAP 10.</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.</li> </ul>
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The affordable housing policy criteria seek to encourage the integration of incomes and densities in communities. Or. 2007 QAP 67.</li> <li>• Permanent displacement or relocation is strongly discouraged. If any relocation or displacement might occur, the QAP sets forth a number of conditions the developer must satisfy. Or. 2007 QAP 56.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Developments that have resulted from or will result in the permanent displacement of residents will be ineligible for Tax Credit Program participation unless the developer provides evidence satisfactory that an appropriate relocation plan has been developed. Pa. 2008 QAP 3.</li> </ul>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All sponsors receiving an allocation of credits from Rhode Island Housing must enter into an Affirmative Action Agreement. R.I. 2008 QAP 13</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Developments must minimize the displacement of low-income households. Developments involving permanent relocation are discouraged, no more than 10% of the existing tenants may be permanently displaced. Should permanent or temporary displacement occur, a detailed relocation plan must be furnished. S.C. 2008 TAX CREDIT MANUAL 11-2.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. The compliance monitoring procedures states that all low-income units in the project were used on a non-transient basis. Tenn. 2008 QAP 33.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board may only allocate Housing Tax Credits to more than one Development in the same calendar year if the Developments are, or will be, located more than one linear mile apart as determined by the Department. For purposes of this rule, any two sites not more than one linear mile apart are deemed to be 'in a single community.' Tex. 2008 QAP 18.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>