

**State**

**Note**

Alabama

**Note:** The Alaska QAP incorporates by reference the Notice of Funding Availability ("NOFA") document which sets out additional requirements for tax credit awards and is cited below. NOFA, *available at* [http://www.novoco.com/low\\_income\\_housing/resource\\_files/qap/alaska\\_app\\_inst\\_08.pdf](http://www.novoco.com/low_income_housing/resource_files/qap/alaska_app_inst_08.pdf)

Alaska

Arizona

Arkansas

**Note:** California sets out its scoring criteria in a Code of Regulations ("Regulations"). Regulations, *available at* [http://www.novoco.com/low\\_income\\_housing/resource\\_files/qap/california\\_regulation\\_changes\\_08.pdf](http://www.novoco.com/low_income_housing/resource_files/qap/california_regulation_changes_08.pdf)

California

**Note:** This is the information, requirements, and scoring criteria for the 9% credit. There are separate threshold requirements and scoring criteria for the 4% tax credit.

Colorado

Connecticut

Delaware

**Note:** Florida does not refer to a point scoring system in its QAP, thus the language of the template when referring to the QAP will be "gives preference" or "targeted." The Universal Application and its instructions, incorporated by reference in the QAP, does use a point scoring system and will be cited below.

Universal Application *available at* [http://www.floridahousing.org/FH-ImageWebDocs/UniversalApps/2008/InstructionsAndApps/2008\\_Universal\\_Application.pdf](http://www.floridahousing.org/FH-ImageWebDocs/UniversalApps/2008/InstructionsAndApps/2008_Universal_Application.pdf)  
Universal Application Instructions, *available at* [http://www.floridahousing.org/FH-ImageWebDocs/UniversalApps/2008/InstructionsAndApps/2008\\_Universal\\_Application\\_Instructions.pdf](http://www.floridahousing.org/FH-ImageWebDocs/UniversalApps/2008/InstructionsAndApps/2008_Universal_Application_Instructions.pdf)

Florida

Georgia

Hawaii

Idaho

**Note:** Illinois is not included in the 2006 Best Practices report. Below in brackets are recommendations for additions to the 2008 report. (The bracket citations are based on the headings in the 2006 Table of Contents.)

Illinois

Indiana

Iowa

Kansas

**Note:** The scoring system is set forth in the 2008 RHP Competitive Scoring Guidelines ("Guidelines"). Guidelines, *available at* [http://www.novoco.com/low\\_income\\_housing/resource\\_files/qap/kentucky\\_score\\_guidelines\\_08.pdf](http://www.novoco.com/low_income_housing/resource_files/qap/kentucky_score_guidelines_08.pdf)  
**Note:** Kentucky is not included in the 2006 Best Practices report. Below in brackets are recommendations for additions to the 2008 report. (The bracket citations are based on the headings in the 2006 Table of Contents.)

Kentucky  
Louisiana  
Maine

**Note:** The scoring system and some of the criteria are set forth in the Multifamily Rental Financing Program Guide ("Program Guide"). Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, Program Guide (May 13, 2008), *available at* <http://www.dhcd.state.md.us/Website/programs/rhf/document/2008%20MF%20Guide%20051308%20FINAL.pdf>

Maryland  
Massachusetts

**Note:** The scoring system is set forth in the 2008 Scoring Summary ("Scoring Summary"). Scoring Summary, *available at* <http://www.michigan.gov/mshda/0,1607,7-141-5456-31750--,00.html> (follow "2008 Scoring Summary" hyperlink).

Michigan

**Note:** The scoring system is set forth in the Self-Scoring Worksheet 2008 Housing Tax Credit Program ("Worksheet"). Minnesota Housing Finance Agency, Worksheet (Apr. 2007), *available at* [www.wdha.com/2008\\_HTC\\_Self\\_Scoring\\_Wksht.pdf](http://www.wdha.com/2008_HTC_Self_Scoring_Wksht.pdf)

Minnesota  
Mississippi  
Missouri  
Montana  
Nebraska  
Nevada  
New Hampshire  
New Jersey  
New Mexico  
New York  
North Carolina  
North Dakota  
Ohio  
Oklahoma  
Oregon  
Pennsylvania  
Rhode Island  
South Carolina  
South Dakota  
Tennessee  
Texas

Utah  
Vermont  
Virginia  
Washington  
West Virginia  
Wisconsin  
Wyoming

**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>

ration



State	<b>Scoring that discourages racial and economic concentration</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded if there are two or fewer similar projects in the same local government jurisdiction (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> <li>• 0 points awarded when there are more than two similar projects in the local government jurisdiction (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<p><u>Scoring that encourages "balanced communities" is awarded up to 9 points for:</u></p>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• evidence from the local government that it adopted initiatives to encourage affordable housing in new growth or high income areas (3 points);</li> <li>• 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);</li> <li>• reserving at least 20% of its units for tenants with incomes less than 30% AMI (3 points);</li> <li>• reserving at least 30% of its units for tenants with incomes less than 30% AMI (4 points) Regulations 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects in an economically mixed community as defined by Census Data (QAP 2008, p. 42).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects with no other low-income housing within 3 blocks (QAP 2008, p. 42).</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points awarded if project is located in a difficult to develop area (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 8).</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>• [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 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 35).</li> </ul>



Indiana	• 3 points awarded to projects that are located in a Difficult to Develop Area (QAP 2007-2008, p. 29).
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• No.
Kentucky	• 10 points awarded to projects that propose rehabilitation of an existing building but will not permanently displace current residents (Guidelines, p. 21).
Louisiana	• 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	• 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	• 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	• Yes. Six points (out of possible 182) for locating in community with less than 10% subsidized stock.
Michigan	• 1 point awarded to projects that are located in a Difficult to Develop Area (Scoring Summary, p. 2).
Minnesota	• 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	• 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	• Under the selection criteria, projects are assessed according to the socioeconomic mix of households in the neighborhood (QAP 2008, p. 8).
Montana	• Under the selection criteria, projects located in Difficult to Develop Areas are "noted" (QAP 2008, p. 8).
Nebraska	• No.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• Yes, because there are seven categories of eligible projects, including mixed income / mixed use housing. NV 2008 QAP 13.
New Jersey	• No, but see above.
New Mexico	• 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	• No.
North Carolina	• Yes, at least for economic concentration. Ten points (out of possible 100) for "economic integration of tenants." NY 2001 QAP 9 (available as most updated version).
	• No.

North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	• Rhode Island has a goal of achieving at least 10% affordable housing in each community. R.I. 2008 QAP 5.
South Carolina	• No.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• No.
Washington	• 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
West Virginia	
Wisconsin	• No.
	• 15 fewer points are awarded as concentration of low-income/affordable housing units increase in the vicinity (QAP 2008, p. 15).
Wyoming	• 15 points awarded if projects do not contribute to a concentration of low-income housing (QAP 2008, p. 21).

State	Mandatory requirements encouraging sustainable development in high-opportunity areas
Alabama	• No.
Alaska	• No.
Arizona	• No.
Arkansas	• No.
California	• No.
Colorado	• No.
Connecticut	• Requires evidence of availability and access of utilities to the site before an application can be successful (QAP 2008, p. 8).
Delaware	• 2 points awarded if projects are suitable and have no geo-technical, environmental, or utility infrastructure expenditures (QAP 2008, p. 42).
Florida	• Requires evidence of infrastructure availability for utilities and roads (Universal Application 2008, p. 21).
Georgia	• No.
Hawaii	• No.
Idaho	• No.
Illinois	• No.
Indiana	• Requires that no development be located in a 100-year flood plain or on a site that has unresolvable wetlands problems, or contains hazardous substances that cannot be mitigated (QAP 2007-2008, p. 12).
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• No.
Kentucky	• No.
Louisiana	• No.
Maine	• No.
Maryland	• No.
Massachusetts	• No.
Michigan	• No, provision cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report") has been deleted.
Minnesota	• No.
Mississippi	• Requires all projects to be located on acceptable sites; the Mississippi Home Corporation can deny any application because of a site location or require a buffer for sites that are deemed unacceptable (ex. adjacent to railroad tracks or graveyards) (QAP 2007-2008, p. 8).
Missouri	• Requires that no part of any residential structure be located within 30 feet of a high-pressure gas and/or liquid petroleum transportation pipeline easement (QAP 2008, p. 9).
Montana	• Requires that no part of any residential structure be located within 100 feet of any high voltage transmission lines (QAP 2008, p. 9).
Nebraska	• No. There is the "Crane Program," however, that requires proposals to "demonstrate the development of businesses and creation of jobs and the impact on the development of affordable housing the area." NE 2008 QAP 12.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• No. Differing points are awarded for different towns, but no explanation is provided (and every city or town seems to receive some number of points). See NH 2008 QAP Appendix M.
New Jersey	• No.
New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.

North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsors must create resident services plans that assist residents to access appropriate services which promote self-sufficiency, maintain independent living, and support residents in making positive life choices. In considering available resident services, sponsors should consider public and private social service agencies, schools, and community directories. Or. 2007 QAP 17, 67, Exhibit E. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the evaluation process, applications will be reviewed based on, among other things, whether the project is near commercial and social services and employment opportunities. Or. 2007 QAP 32.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Agency will consider, among other things, whether the development has access to public transportation, public parks and open space, and community serving enterprises, access to health care services and other similar services. Pa. 2008 QAP 7. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the goal of the Agency to encourage affordable housing in areas with job opportunities; in areas near strong and stable communities; and in areas which demonstrate the capacity for community revitalization opportunities. Pa. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority will be given to developments that are sustainable in nature . . . A Sustainable Development is a secure place where people can live, work, shop and have a sense of identity; is part of an overall municipal plan with community stakeholder collaboration; economically sustainable; aesthetically pleasing; and includes a diversity of people, incomes and housing types. R.I. 2008 QAP 22-3.</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All developments must obtain a minimum of ten points and may not receive more than fifteen points for being located within two miles by accessible public paved road, to no fewer than four of the following services: grocery store, public schools, senior activity center, public transportation, public park, police/fire stations, convenience store, gas station, hospital, doctor's office, pharmacy, restaurant, public library. S.C. 2008 QAP 2-3.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No.
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Site located within a one mile radius of at least three services (grocery store, bank, hospital, etc.) will receive up to four points. A site located within one-quarter mile of public transportation accessible to all residents will receive four points. Tex. 2008 QAP 55.</li> <li>• No. One to three points are awarded if certain amenities are included in the development such as: swimming pool, laundry room, fitness center, business center, library, etc. Tex. 2008 QAP 32-33.</li> </ul>
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to ten points may be awarded for developments located within 1/2 mile of a train or subway or 1/4 mile of a bus. Va. 2008 QAP 14.</li> </ul>
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. A property will receive points (the number of points to be awarded depends on the "site suitability rating") for the inclusion of certain items such as, educational facilities, economic opportunities, accessibility for transportation, etc. W. Va. 2008 QAP 32.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. However, twenty points will be awarded to developments offering amenities that promote long-term development viability. Wis. 2008 QAP 7.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	• No.

State	<b>Scoring that discourages development in distressed neighborhoods</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unlimited loss of points for selecting a site with negative neighborhood services. 5 points deducted for each junkyard, railroad, liquor store, utility station, etc. that is adjacent to the project site (nearby, but not necessarily touching); 2 points deducted for each of the same incompatible uses if within 1/2 mile of the project site (QAP 2008, p. 29-30).</li> <li>• 2 points deducted when the condition of the streets and sidewalks are unsatisfactory; the width of the streets is taken into consideration (QAP 2008, p. 30).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 points awarded if the "chief executive officer" of a local jurisdiction certifies that a project is located in "an area that is blighted, deteriorated, deteriorating..." (QAP 2008, p. 23).</li> <li>• AZ seems to have greater concern for overwhelming rural areas. For places with populations of less than 50,000, "an Allocation will not be made to more than one family, one senior, and one Special Needs Project in any year." (QAP 2008, p.18). Also, where one set-aside has provided development in one rural region, "no additional development shall be provided by this set-aside." (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded for site location. Site suitability concerning topography and proximity to nuisances (railroad tracks, manufacturing plants, etc.) is considered in awarded the amount of points (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado considers, but does not award points, for site suitability. The site is evaluated for suitability as to slope, environmental hazards, railroad tracks, freeways, etc (QAP 2008, p. 5, 9).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoring for desirable and undesirable characteristics: up to 10 points awarded to projects with desirable characteristics. Points are lost for undesirable site location and characteristics within one-half mile such as junkyards, odors, noise, deteriorated houses and buildings, etc. 1 point is deducted per characteristic (QAP 2008 Draft , Appendix II p. 3-4).</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>• No.</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low scoring for sites in adverse utility locations, such as a highline going through the site or a site that is close to a sub station or sewer treatment plant (QAP 2008, p. 27); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.</li> <li>• Low scoring for irregular and awkward sites, sites in the flood plain, sites with poor drainage, and sites with slopes or rocky areas (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [ADD TO A4] Awards points to developers who prove that their projects are not located in a flood zone or waterway (Guidelines, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points each deducted if any of the following incompatible uses are adjacent to the site: junk yards, wastewater treatments, airports, processing plants, and etc. (QAP 2007-2008, p. 59).</li> <li>• 2 points each deducted if any of the following incompatible uses are within ½ mile of the site: junk yards, wastewater treatments, airports, processing plants, and etc. (QAP 2007-2008, p. 59).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Eight points for locating in areas where poverty rate is below 15%. MA 2008 QAP 37.</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>• No.</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects are evaluated based on the suitability of the site regarding slope, noise, flood plain, or wetland issues (QAP 2008, p. 8).</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. Three points (out of 140) for projects located in a Qualified Census Tract. NV 2008 QAP 40.</li> </ul>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Ten points (out of 262 ) for projects in "designated blighted areas." NH 2008 QAP 15.</li> </ul>
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Fifteen points (out of ) for projects located in qualified census tracts. NJ 2008 QAP 36.</li> </ul>
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Five points (out of 283) for projects in Difficult Development Areas or Qualified Census Tracts. NM 2008 QAP 18. Also, an additional five points for projects in a Metropolitan Redevelopment District. NM 2008 QAP 18.</li> </ul>
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Five points (out of 100) for fostering "geographic dispersion" of low income housing. NY 2001 QAP 9. But ten points (out of 100) for locating project in qualified census tract. NY 2001 QAP 11.</li> </ul>
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, although "extent that the location is isolated" is a consideration. NC 2008 QAP 10.</li> </ul>
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, although rural development is a priority: Fifteen points (out of ) are awarded to properties in rural areas. ND 2008 QAP 22.</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>• No.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 30 points will be awarded to developments where a Community Revitalization Plan is in place which has the capability of changing fundamentally the character of that neighborhood or enhancing lives and amenities available to residents of the community. Pa. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects located in difficult-to-develop areas ("DDA") may be eligible for additional tax credits (increasing eligible basis by up to 30%). A DDA is any area that has high construction, land, and utility costs relative to the AMGI. R.I. 2008 QAP 11 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Projects located in qualified census tracts ("QCTs") may be eligible for additional tax credits (increasing eligible basis by up to 30%). QCTs are defined as any census tract in which at least 50% of the households have incomes of less than 60% of the AMGI or which have a poverty rate at or above 25%. R.I. 2008 QAP 11</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two points will be awarded if the site is relatively flat with entrances at or above access road grade with negligible water runoff from adjacent properties. S.C. 2008 QAP 3.</li> <li>• Three points will be <i>deducted</i> for sites within 500 feet of an easement containing an electric substation; where a portion of any building is located within the fall distance of any electrical pole, tower, or satellite dish; where the site is within 500 feet of any junkyard or other eyesore; for sites near an active railroad that causes excessive noise; sites where the slope/terrain is not acceptable for development; sites where existing wetlands or man-made attributes could have a negative impact; sites within 500 feet of a pipeline; sites within 1/2 mile of a waste facility; sites within 1 mile of an operating hog/chicken/turkey farm or processing plant; sites within 1/2 mile of any prison; sites within 1/4 mile of adult video/entertainment clubs; sites within 1/4 mile of bars/night clubs; sites within 1/2 mile of operating industrial plant that may have a negative impact. S.C. 2008 QAP 3-4.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects may be rejected if detrimental site characteristics exist on or adjacent to the site. Such characteristics may include: location within one-half mile of pipeline, storage area for hazardous or noxious materials, sewage treatment plant, or sanitary landfill; location within 500 feet of airport runway clear zone, railroad tracks, commercial property or military operations; physical barriers; unsuitable slope or terrain; location within 1,000 feet of an historic property; or location in flood hazard area. S.D. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>

Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Up to 28% of the tax credits will be set-aside for developments located completely and wholly within a Qualified Census Tract. No more than 50% of the tax credits will be allocated to developments located completely and wholly within a Qualified Census Tract. Tenn. 2008 QAP 2.</li> <li>• Up to 5 points may be awarded for developments located completely and entirely in a Qualified Census Tract, the development of which contributes to an approved concerted community revitalization plan. Tenn. 2008 QAP 17.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Developments that have one of many "negative features" will have one point deducted from their score. Negative features include, among other things, being adjacent to a junkyard, industrial plants, and solid waste plants. Tex. 2008 QAP 56.</li> <li>• If the development is built within the 100 year floodplain, the ground level must at least one foot above the flood plain and parking and drive areas are no lower than six inches below the floodplain. Tex. 2008 QAP 17.</li> <li>• No. Applications may receive up to seven points if, at the time the Application is submitted or at any time in the two-year period preceding that date, the proposed Development site is located in a Disaster Area. Tex. 2008 QAP 52.</li> <li>• No. An application may receive up to four points if the development is to be built in an Economically Distressed Area; a Colonia; or a Difficult Development Area. Tex. 2008 QAP 53.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Projects may receive up to ten points if it is located in a "Difficult to Develop" or "Rural Targeted" area. Utah 2008 QAP 51.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Five points may be awarded for developments located in Qualified Census Tracts. Va. 2008 QAP 11.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Five points will be awarded for developments in a difficult development area, qualified census tract where 50% or more of households have an income that is less than 60% of the area median gross income, or for an area that is targeted for low-income housing serving households at 80% of the area median gross income or below. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 67.</li> </ul>



West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Twenty points may be awarded to properties in a Difficult Development Area. W.V. 2008 QAP 17.</li> <li>• No. Points will be awarded on an increasing basis for property with a lower median income (i.e. 5 points for property where the median income between \$59,000-64,000 and 40 points for a property where the median income is between \$25,000-30,000). W.V. 2008 QAP 17-19.</li> <li>• No. However, the state reserves the right to reject any property that is located next to any naturally occurring or man-made hazards posing health or safety risks to tenants. W. VA. 2008 QAP 32.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Fifteen points will be awarded for developments that are located within a Qualified Census Tract. Wis. 2008 QAP 6.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 200 points deducted for projects located near inappropriate locations, such as: flood areas, noise areas, and hazardous site areas (QAP 2008, p. 21); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"); provision modified.</li> </ul>

State	<b>Scoring that encourages development in high opportunity areas</b>
Alabama Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 24 points awarded to a project that selects a site near neighborhood services. 4 points awarded for each grocery store, hospital/doctor office, or pharmacy located within 1 mile of the site; 3 points awarded for each convenience store, bank/credit union, elementary school, senior activity center, public transportation, or child daycare is within 2 miles of the site (QAP 2008, p. 29).</li> <li>• 4 points awarded if site's Environmental Site Assessment form certifies that there are no recognized environmental conditions, no environmental regulatory concerns, and no further action is recommended (QAP 2008, p. 29).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects in Phoenix or Tucson areas that demonstrate at least three of the following: location within three-mile radius of employers; location one mile or less from mass transit route; location within three miles of city center; and project will be served by existing roads, utilities, and communications infrastructure (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded for site location and proximity to services (grocery stores, medical facilities, public transportation, etc); site suitability is also considered (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 7 points awarded to projects for transit access and amenities, depending on the proximity of the site and frequency of the service (Regulations 2008, p. 23-4).</li> <li>• 2 to 3 points awarded to projects based on proximity to a public park, (Regulations 2008, p. 24).</li> <li>• 2 to 3 points awarded to projects based on proximity to a public library (Regulations 2008, p. 24).</li> <li>• 2 to 3 points awarded to projects based on proximity to a medical clinic or hospital (Regulations 2008, p. 25).</li> <li>• 1 or 2 points awarded to projects based on proximity to a pharmacy (Regulations 2008, p. 25).</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado considers, but does not award points, for site suitability. The site is evaluated for proximity to schools, shopping, public transportation etc QAP 2008, p. 5, 9).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 or 5 points awarded to projects with responsible growth sites that have grocery stores, transportation, public parks, etc. within a variety of distances (QAP 2008, p. 21); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"); modified -- language and criteria made more specific.</li> </ul>

Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded for a variety of site and neighborhood characteristics including employment opportunities, daycare facilities, walking distance to retail centers, bus line, major roads, town centers, schools, etc. (QAP 2008, p. 42).</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tie-breaker points awarded for proximity to services such as schools, grocery stores, medical facilities, transportation, etc (Universal Application Instructions 2008, p. 13-6).</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scoring for desirable and undesirable characteristics: up to 10 points awarded to projects with desirable characteristics such within 1 mile of site location in urban centers and 2 miles for rural areas; activities include retail stores, grocery stores, schools, medical facilities, employment centers, etc (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 3-4).</li> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects with community transportation options such as bus routes and rapid rail transit (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 5).</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 6 points awarded for site location and market demand; proximity to employment opportunities, recreational facilities, shopping facilities are all part of the consideration (QAP 2008, p. 11).</li> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded to projects for overall feasibility including the services and amenities provided to tenants that will enhance the overall livability of the project (QAP 2008, p. 12).</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded if projects have nearby site amenities such as transportation, parks, grocery store, school etc (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 50-1).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that are accessible to at least three desirable facilities, including: retail and service establishments, schools, transportation, parks, recreational facilities, medical facilities, libraries, major public/private employers (QAP 2007-2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 to 10 points awarded for sites located near services, including: transportation, public schools, pharmacies, day care centers, libraries, senior centers, community centers, and etc. (QAP 2008, p. 19-20).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 15 points awarded for projects linked to services, including: credit counseling, homebuyer education, medical counseling, senior citizen center, day care center, and etc. (QAP 2008, p. 13).</li> <li>• High scoring for sites that are in close proximity to retail stores, schools, medical services, hospitals, day care centers, recreational facilities, and churches (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to show that transportation is close to the site, or a statement of how tenants will access commercial, educational, recreational, and other services if transportation is not nearby (QAP 2007-2008, p. 9).</li> <li>• 4 points awarded for each service located within 1 mile of the site, including: public transportation, grocery store, hospital, elementary school, day care, and pharmacy (QAP 2007-2008, p. 58-59).</li> <li>• 3 points awarded for each service located within 2 miles of the site, including: public library, convenience store, bank and post office (QAP 2007-2008, p. 58-59).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded for recreational activities that are provided on-site or public access is within ½ mile of the site (QAP 2008-2009, p. 14).</li> <li>• 4 points awarded to projects that are within 2,500 feet of at least one destination important to the course of daily activities, such as a convenience store or a public school (QAP 2008-2009, p. 22).</li> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects that are within 2,500 feet of year-round employment opportunities (QAP 2008-2009, p. 22).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that are within 2,500-5,000 feet of year-round employment opportunities (QAP 2008-2009, p. 22-23).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that are within 1,500 feet of a regularly scheduled means of public transportation (QAP 2008-2009, p. 23).</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 18 points awarded for linking service programs to the project, including: health care, day care, transportation, recreation centers, and etc. (Program Guide, p. 39).</li> <li>• 6 points awarded if the building and project site, including the nearby surroundings, provide opportunities for recreation, education, convenient access to mass transit or rail systems, and community activities (Program Guide, p. 44).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Six points (out of possible 182) for proximity to transit.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded to projects that are located in one of the top 10 job or population growth counties (Worksheet, p. 6).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects that are located in one of the top 20 job or population growth counties (Worksheet, p. 6).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects are “noted” if located in a community with new employment opportunities (QAP 2008, p. 8).</li> <li>• Under the selection criteria, sites are evaluated based on proximity to services, including: public transportation, shopping centers, schools, medical services, and parks (QAP 2008, p. 8).</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>• Yes. One point (out of 140) for site within 1/4 mile of "local transit route" and one point for each service (grocery, pharmacy, bank etc.) within 1/4 mile, for a maximum of three points all together. NV 2008 QAP 45.</li> </ul>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. One point (out of ) for proximity to a school, day care center, food store, "community center or faith-based organization," public transportation, or park. NJ 2008 QAP 41. Also, two points deducted for proximity to land fill, garbage dump, trash incinerator, nuclear power plant, oil/chemical refinery, or "unremediated Superfund or toxic waste site." <i>Id.</i></li> </ul>
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. There are up to fifteen points available for projects located in counties designated "Priority Geographic Areas." NM 2008 QAP 19.</li> </ul>
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Park of evaluation includes "proximity of schools, medical and recreational facilities, employment opportunities, appropriate social services, mass transit..." NY 2001 QAP 10.</li> </ul>
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Maximum of 60 points (out of 100) for "availability, quality and proximity of services, amenities and features," such as grocery store, malls, health care, pharmacies, schools, etc. NC 2008 QAP 10.</li> <li>• It is not explicit, but projects located near sites like wastewater treatment plants lose points. 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>• No.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 30 points will be awarded to developments located in areas that demonstrate low poverty rates, limited affordable housing options, limited affordable housing production in the past 20 years, close proximity to employment, strong housing markets, and high owner-occupied markets. Pa. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>

Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed site must support the market population in terms of desirability of location; environmental quality; adequacy of utilities and transportation; proximity to civic, and social and commercial services. R.I. 2008 QAP 18</li> <li>• Priority will be given to sites in new or existing city and town growth centers and surrounding neighborhoods. R.I. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Projects located within 6 city blocks of, or near public transportation that provides access to, community services (grocery/retail stores, hospital/clinics, schools/senior center, special service offices) will be eligible for up to 20 points (5 points for each item).</li> <li>• Projects with Qualified Census Tracts, which contribute to a Concerted Community Revitalization Plan, will receive 50 points. S.D. 2008 QAP 25.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications will receive between two and seven points for providing services such as child care, transportation, adult education, leath services, etc. Tex. 2008 QAP 52. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development can receive up to four points if it will serve families with children (two bedrooms or more) and is located in an elementary school attendance zone where the school has an academic rating of "Exemplary" or "Recognized". Tex. 2008 QAP 54.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Projects may receive nine points for providing above average non-fee amenities such as day care, education centers, and life skills education classes. Utah 2008 QAP 52.</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>• Developments demonstrating linkages with public transportation will receive twenty points. Wis. 2008 QAP 6.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded to projects located within a proximity of 1½ miles (½ mile for elderly) of appropriate services needed by the residents (QAP 2008, p. 20).</li> </ul>

State	<b>Local participation in site selection limited to statutory minimum</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects having letters of local government support in the project area (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 points awarded if a project addresses an identified planning need or objective of the Local Government. (QAP 2008, p. 23).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires local approval from highest elected official, usually the mayor or county judge (QAP 2008, p. 10).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to a project if a state or local governmental authority donates the site (QAP 2008, p. 21-2).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points awarded if a project receives a letter of local support from the chief executive officer of the area (QAP 2008, p. 38).</li> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded if a project receives a local monetary contribution based on the size of the contribution. (QAP 2008, p. 38).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 5 points awarded if local government contributes money (Universal Application Instructions 2008, p. 33).</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 3 points awarded if projects applied or received a below market loan from local government or agency.</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2008, p. 13).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 20 points awarded for community based projects which receive local government contribution not less than 5% of total development cost (QAP 2008 p.22).</li> </ul>
Idaho	

Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [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 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 48).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2007-2008, p. 6).</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Provision cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report") is not in the 9% Tax Credits scoring criteria.</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Awards high points to developers who show that the city and community will accept the development (QAP 2008, p. 28).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [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).</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graded scale of points awarded if the local government limits community barriers by reducing project development costs (QAP 2007-2008, p. 65).</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and reasonable opportunity for comment (QAP 2008-2009, p. 7); cited in Report: no change.</li> <li>• 3 points awarded for the reduction of community barriers through some form of property tax relief (QAP 2008-2009, p. 17).</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>



Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Four points (out of possible 182) for letter of support from chief elected official, endorsing proposed project. MA 2008 QAP 32.</li> <li>• Project proposals that are part of a neighborhood plan receive 2 points (out of possible 182). MA 2008 QAP 32.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local participation limited to statutory minimum of notice and comment (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 24); cited in Report: no change.</li> <li>• Up to 15 points awarded to projects that receive local support in the form of tax abatements (Scoring Summary, p. 4).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local approval limited to statutory minimum of notice and reasonable opportunity for comment (2008 QAP, p. 9).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that receive a donation or waiver of project specific local government development fees (Worksheet, p. 5).</li> <li>• 2-10 points awarded to projects that receive contributions from a local unit of government (Worksheet, p. 5).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local participation limited to statutory minimum of community notification and opportunity for comment (QAP 2007-2008, p. 23).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</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. 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.</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. Five points (out of 100) for support from state or local officials or community groups. NY 2001 QAP 9-10.</li> </ul>
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. A letter of support from a "City-Governing Body"</li> </ul>
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>

Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Consideration will be given to projects demonstrating substantial local support, from local officials, community development staff, community-based organizations, business groups, etc.</li> <li>• Sponsors will be required to demonstrate marketability and housing needs through such documentation as: letters of local support. R.I. 2008 QAP 17</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• An application that receives support from a State Representative or State Senator may receive up to fourteen points. Tex. 2008 QAP 51, 62-3.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty-seven points will be awarded for developments that are supported by elected officials. Wis. 2008 QAP 6.</li> </ul>

Wyoming

- 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.

State	Mandatory requirements ensuring affirmative marketing
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Requires projects to submit an affirmative marketing plan (NOFA 2007, p. 12).</li> <li>• Requires compliance records to include the project's ongoing affirmative marketing efforts, and that the efforts are directed towards the proper tenant population; the affirmative marketing plan must be submitted to the Internal Audit department (QAP 2008, p. 27-8).</li> </ul>
Alaska	
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</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>• No.</li> <li>• Requires sponsors to undertake strong affirmative measures and to agree to comply with all affirmative fair marketing (QAP 2008, p.6).cited in 2006 Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Connecticut	
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</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>• [ADD TO C1] Requires applicant to submit a satisfactory affirmative fair housing marketing plan (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 60).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</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>• No.</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. MA 2008 25.</li> <li>• Requires developers to submit an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 16).</li> </ul>
Michigan	
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, provision cited in Report has been deleted.</li> </ul>
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. A market study is required, however. MT 2008 QAP 16.</li> </ul>
Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, although "threshold review" does require a market plan. NE 2008 QAP 7.</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. A detailed market study, however, is required. NJ 2008 QAP 22-26.</li> </ul>

New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.
North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No, although a detailed market plan is required. ND 2008 QAP 12-13.
Ohio	• All applications must include an affirmative marketing plan. OH 2008 QAP 32.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsors will be required to report marketing and outreach strategies. R.I. 2008 QAP 17</li> <li>• As part of the required management plan, an affirmative fair housing marketing plan will be required to identify those eligible groups least likely to apply for residency at the proposed development and devise a strategy for attracting them. R.I. 2008 QAP 19</li> </ul>
South Carolina	• Applicants must list their development on the South Carolina Housing Search website. S.C. 2008 TAX CREDIT MANUAL 20.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• No.
Washington	• All Applicants must provide an Affirmative Marketing Plan that reaches out to all communities, including excluded groups, such as communities of color and special needs populations. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 32, 34.
West Virginia	• No.
Wisconsin	• No.
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires applicants to submit an Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Plan (QAP 2008, p. 5).</li> <li>• Requires an Affirmative Marketing Plan in which applicants describe how they will market their project to minorities or hard-to-reach very low-income households (Current Year Summary, p. 74); cited in Report: no change.</li> </ul>

State	Scoring that incentivizes affirmative marketing
Alabama	• No.
Alaska	• No.
Arizona	• No.
Arkansas	• No.
California	• No.
Colorado	• No.
Connecticut	• No.
Delaware	• No.
Florida	• No.
Georgia	• No.
Hawaii	• No.
Idaho	• No.
Illinois	• No.
Indiana	• No.
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• No.
Kentucky	• No.
Louisiana	• No.
Maine	• No.
Maryland	• No.
Massachusetts	• Not score, but "threshold requirement." MA 2008 QAP 25.
Michigan	• No.
Minnesota	• 3-10 points awarded to projects that serve and are marketed to reach underserved populations, which are defined as single head of household with minor children and households of color (Worksheet, p. 8).
Mississippi	• No.
Missouri	• No.
Montana	• No.
Nebraska	• No.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• No. A marketing study must be submitted with any project application, however. NH 2008 QAP Appendix D.
New Jersey	• No.
New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.
North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	• No.
South Carolina	• No.

South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. A proposal which provides a written commitment to notify local public housing agencies of vacancies and give priority to households on waiting lists of those agencies will received 10 points. S.D. 2008 QAP 28, 32.</li> <li>• "Equal Opportunity" must be employed in regard to marketing. S.D. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	• No.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• No.
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	• No.
Wisconsin	• No.
Wyoming	• Requires applicants to describe how they will market their special needs housing projects to eligible participants (Current Year Summary, p. 72); cited in Report: no change.

State	Scoring that incentivizes language access and marketing to non-English speaking applicants
Alabama	• No.
Alaska	• No.
Arizona	• No.
Arkansas	• No.
California	• No.
Colorado	• No.
Connecticut	• No.
Delaware	• No.
Florida	• No.
Georgia	• No.
Hawaii	• No, provision from the 2006 Best Practices Report was deleted.
Idaho	• No.
Illinois	• No.
Indiana	• No.
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• Requires developers to complete a minimum of one fair housing activity per year, which includes "publish[ing] bilingual fair housing information for non-English residents in the community" (QAP 2008, p. 53-54); cited in Report: no change.
Kentucky	• No.
Louisiana	• No.
Maine	• No.
Maryland	• No.
Massachusetts	• Not score, but part of "threshold requirement." See Appendix I, MA 2008 QAP 92.
Michigan	• No.
Minnesota	• No.
Mississippi	• No.
Missouri	• No.
Montana	• No.
Nebraska	• No.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• No.
New Jersey	• No.
New Mexico	• Yes. Two points to projects committed to market to households "listed on public or Indian Housing agency waiting lists." NM 2008 QAP 18.
New York	• No.
North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	• No.



South Carolina	• No.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• No.
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	• No.
Wisconsin	• No.
Wyoming	• No.

State	<b>Scoring that promotes Section 8 voucher access in high-opportunity areas</b>
Alabama	• 2 points awarded if the project commits in writing to target households on the public housing waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 27).
Alaska	• 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).
Arizona	• 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).
Arkansas	• Requires project to send a letter to the Public Housing Authority for use by persons on the waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 10).
California	• No.
Colorado	• 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.
Connecticut	• 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).
Delaware	• 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.
Florida	• Requires projects to actively seek persons on public housing waiting lists (QAP 2008, p. 19).
Georgia	• No.
Hawaii	• 1 point awarded if projects demonstrate that housing will be made available to persons on public housing waiting list (QAP 2008, p. 7).
Idaho	• 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). • 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).
Illinois	• 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 & 2009 Draft, p. 24).

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	• No.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• No.
New Jersey	• No.
New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.
North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No, but eight points for preserving "expiring project-based Section 8 contracts." OK 2008 QAP 35.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	• No.
South Carolina	• 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.
South Dakota	• Yes. A development may receive up to 10 points if it gives priority to households on public housing agency waiting lists.
Tennessee	• 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. • 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.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• Up to ten points may be awarded for projects that provide housing for persons with Section 8 vouchers. Utah 2008 QAP 59.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• 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.
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	• 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.

Wisconsin

• No.
• 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.

Wyoming

State	Requirements for monitoring Section 8 voucher access
Alabama	• No.
Alaska	No.
Arizona	• No.
Arkansas	• No.
California	• Requires an owner under penalty of perjury to certify that he did not refuse to lease a unit because the applicant had a section 8 voucher (Regulations 2008, p. 54).
Colorado	• No.
Connecticut	• Requires at least annually for the 15 year compliance period the owner of the low-income housing project shall certify under penalty of perjury that... an owner cannot refuse to lease a unit in the project to an applicant because the applicant holds a voucher or certificate of eligibility under Section 8 (QAP 2008, p. 36); cited in 2006 Report: no change.
Delaware	• Requires pwner to certify under penalty of perjury that he has not refused to lease a unit in the project to an applicant because the applicant holds a Section 8 voucher or certificate (QAP 2008, p. 59).
Florida	• No.
Georgia	• Requires that the DCA monitor the tenant application process to see if the process is structured to avoid discrimination or if any actions are taken to discourage Section 8 Rental Assistance certificate or voucher holders from applying. All lease provisions must be compatible and not in conflict with Section 8 leases (QAP 2008 Draft, p. 7-8); cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.
Hawaii	• No.
Idaho	• No.
Illinois	• No.
Indiana	• No.
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• Requires owners of low-income housing tax credit properties to certify, under penalty of perjury, that an owner cannot and has not refused to lease a unit solely because a person has a Section 8 voucher (QAP 2008, p. 22-23).
Kentucky	• No.
Louisiana	• No.
Maine	• Requires owners to certify that they have not refused tenancy to people solely because of their status as Section 8 voucher holders (QAP 2008-2009, p. 40).
Maryland	• No.
Massachusetts	• No.
Michigan	• No.

Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to certify that they cannot and have not refused tenancy to people solely because of their status as Section 8 voucher holders (2008 QAP, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to certify that housing will be provided to people on public housing waiting lists (QAP 2007-2008, p. 30).</li> <li>• Requires owners to certify annually that they have not refused to lease a unit to people solely because of their status as Section 8 voucher holders (QAP 2007-2008, p. 64).</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>• 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>• Yes. Applicants converting Section 8 vouchers to a project-based subsidy may involve public housing authorities. NC 2008 QAP 11.</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>• Post 15-year compliance mandates that the owner not refuse to lease a unit to a Section 8 voucher holder solely because of the prospective tenant's status as a voucher holder. Or. 2007 QAP 62, 141.</li> <li>• The Agency reserves the right to take any action it deems appropriate if an applicant has been discriminated against because she is a Section 8 voucher holder. Pa. 2008 QAP 4.</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>• No.</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 an owner cannot refuse to lease a unit in the project to an applicant because the applicants holds a Section 8 voucher. Tenn. 2008 QAP 33.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

• Preference will be given to projects that use Section 8 Homeownership Vouchers in combination with Homeownership Tax Credit for deeper subsidy to very low income households. Vt. 2008 QAP 30.

• The owner and/or management agent is required to comply with a subsidy covenant, including the requirement that an owner cannot refuse to lease a unit in the project to an applicant because the applicant holds a voucher or certificate of eligibility under Section 8. The owner and/or management agent must demonstrate compliance at least annually through the end of the 15-year compliance period. Vt. 2008 QAP 27.

Vermont  
Virginia  
Washington  
West Virginia

• No.

• No.

• No.

• Yes. Each year the owner must demonstrate that the developments complies with the requirements for Section 8 housing. Wis. 2008 QAP 13.

Wisconsin  
Wyoming

• No.



State	<b>Scoring that promotes units designed for persons with disabilities</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded if projects provide more units than the minimum number required by federal or state law for disabled persons (QAP 2008, p. 16-7). cited in 2006 Best Practices report ("Report"): no change.</li> <li>• 15 points awarded to projects that principally (50% of units or more) serve special needs populations such as disabled persons (QAP 2008, p. 17-8).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects devoting at least 15% of the project to special needs populations (QAP 2008, p. 25). Set-Asides for 2008 include: "A total of \$1,000,000 is available for projects allocating 100% of their units to Special Needs Populations," but with "[no more than \$1,000,000 shall be allocated to Special Needs Populations Projects per Tax Credit Round." (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 13 points awarded if projects provide supportive housing for disabled persons or assisted living based on the percentage of units (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to Special Needs projects such as projects for disabled persons (Regulations 2008, p. 23).</li> <li>• 2 to 3 points awarded to Special Needs projects if the site is located within 1/2 mile to a facility that offers services appropriate to the population living in the development (Regulations 2008, p. 24).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 8 points awarded if projects set-aside at least 33% of units for populations with special needs such as disabilities (QAP 2008, p. 30).</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires sponsors of the project to undertake strong affirmative measures to ensure the activity funded promotes regional, economic, social and racial integration and the integration of persons with disabilities (QAP 2008, p. 6); cited in 2006 Report on p. 15 and 24: no change.</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to projects providing housing for special needs, which include mental and physical disabilities. (QAP 2008, p. 38).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points awarded to projects that set aside 3 units or 5%, whichever is greater, for disabled persons for two years; projects are not required to provide on site supportive services, but must partner with an experienced local service provider (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 12).</li> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects that set aside 51% or more of the total units to tenants with disabilities; projects are required to provide on site supportive services (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p.13).</li> </ul>
Georgia	

Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 2 points awarded to projects providing housing for special needs populations including those with disabilities; the number of points depends on the services provided for the tenants (QAP 2008, p. 9).</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 points awarded to projects designed for special needs populations (including disabilities) and/or which provide continuing supportive services to assist families in becoming more self-sufficient. (ID 2008 QAP, p. 17); cited in 2006 Best practices report (“Report”): no change.</li> <li>• Requires sponsors to provide a supportive services plan from a supportive services provider, and documentation as to their background and experience. The services to be provided must be offered on an on-going and regular basis.” (ID 2008 QAP, p. 18); cited in Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points awarded if projects set aside a minimum of 10% of units for supportive housing populations including those with disabilities, and if the project has support services available (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 38).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded if projects set aside 50% or more of units for supportive housing populations with supportive services (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 38).</li> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects that have enhanced mobility impairments exceeding the requirements under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 39).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to applicants who set aside a percentage of the units for the disabled (QAP 2007-2008, p. 21).</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers who seek a service enriched set-aside to reserve certain percentages of units for people with disabilities (QAP 2008, p. 2); cited in 2006 Report: provision modified.</li> <li>• Requires developers who seek a service enriched set-aside to implement a comprehensive supportive service plan if they build units for disabled people (QAP 2008, p. 2).</li> <li>• Graded scale of points awarded for projects that develop supportive services for residents with special needs (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> <li>• 5 points awarded if 100% of the low-income units are handicapped accessible (QAP 2008, p. 21).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 20 points awarded to applicants who provide 100% of units for tenants 55 and older and/or tenants with special needs (QAP 2008, p. 14).</li> <li>• 15 points awarded to projects that address priority housing needs, which include developments for special needs populations such as disabled persons (QAP 2008, p. 2 and 14).</li> </ul>

Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awards points to projects that set aside a certain percentage of units for one of the special needs populations, which includes people with mental and developmental disabilities (Guidelines, p. 6).</li> <li>• [ADD TO E] Awards points to projects with targeted supportive services, including: therapy, case management, drug counseling, transportation, job coaching, child care, and etc. (Guidelines, p. 7).</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graded scale of points awarded for a project that contains accessible units in excess of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (QAP 2007-2008, p. 62).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects that give preference in at least 20% of the units to people with mental or developmental disabilities and offers services appropriate to the needs of such people (QAP 2008-2009, p. 15).</li> <li>• Provision cited in Report has been deleted.</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires all developers to ensure that individuals with physical disabilities have priority for occupancy of any units qualified under the Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (Program Guide, p. 20).</li> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects that provide integrated housing opportunities for people with disabilities; the units must be made available only to individuals with disabilities (Program Guide, p. 38).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Eight points (out of possible 182). MA 2008 QAP 33.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to reserve a percentage of the units for people with serious and persistent mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, or permanent physical disabilities (2008 QAP, p. 7).</li> <li>• 3-10 points awarded if a percentage of the units are rented to people with serious and persistent mental illnesses, developmental disabilities, or permanent physical disabilities (Worksheet, p. 4).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects that have 100% of its units accessible for handicap people who meet the requirements for elderly housing (QAP 2007-2008, p. 37).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects are evaluated to identify the number of units accessible to people with physical disabilities (QAP 2008, p. 8).</li> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for people with physical or developmental disabilities will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 8).</li> <li>• Requires all projects with 12 or more units to have at least 5% of the units accessible to wheelchair users (QAP 2008, p. 9).</li> </ul>
Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Accessible doors, handles, outlets, and faucets, however, required. MT 2008 QAP 18.</li> </ul>

Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. The "Crane Program" mentions special needs populations. NE 2008 QAP 12.</li> </ul>
Nevada	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, because there are seven categories of eligible projects, including special needs housing. NV 2008 QAP 11.</li> </ul>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
New Jersey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Senior projects that that set aside 20% of the units for the "frail elderly" receive one point (out of ). NJ 2008 QAP 44.</li> </ul>
New Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Up to 15 points (out of 283) for projects that reserve at least 25% of all units for "special needs households." NM 2008 QAP 15.</li> </ul>
New York	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Ten points (out of 100) for "handicapped adaptable units" beyond the minimum required by the Americans with Disabilities Act and other applicable statutes or regulations. NY 2001 QAP 10.</li> </ul>
North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
North Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes. Twelve points (out of) are awarded for projects that set aside 15% or more of the units for residents who have mental illness, drug dependency, developmental disabilities, physical disabilities (accessible units), homeless, frail elderly. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Also, one additional point is awarded for each "physically accessible unit" that is has two bedrooms or more, up to a maximum of three points. ND 2008 QAP 20. Additional points are awarded for buildings with an elevator. ND 2008 QAP 21.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandatory requirement in all units of some universal design elements, including no-step entrances, wide doors, and bathroom or half bath on main floor with open space. OH 2008 QAP 23.</li> </ul>
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, ten points (out of) for facilities that are 100% dedicated to special needs populations. OK 2008 QAP 34.</li> </ul>
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A special Set-Aside of Tax Credits, in the amount of 5% of the state per capita allocation available, will be established for developments that meet the Agency's requirement for Supportive Housing. To qualify, the development must: provide at least 25% of the total units to eligible populations with mental, physical, sensory, or developmental disabilities. Pa. 2008 QAP 6.</li> <li>• Up to 15 points may be awarded for developments that provide service-enriched housing for populations with special needs where the development delivers and coordinates services that stabilize occupancy by improving residents' ability to uphold their lease obligations and enhance their quality of life through improved access to services. Pa. 2008 QAP 23-4.</li> </ul>

Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax credit projects must comply with all applicable federal and state statutes and regulations regarding the operation of adaptable and accessible housing for the handicapped. R.I. 2008 QAP 13</li> <li>• Priority will be given to developments that provide housing for special needs groups. R.I. 2008 QAP 21</li> <li>• Priority will be given to those projects that are responsive to housing needs in a particular community including tenant populations with special needs and families. R.I. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points will be given to developments where 80% of the units are designed for person(s) fifty-five years of age or older and the remaining 20% of units are designed for person(s) with special needs. S.C. 2008 QAP 7.</li> </ul> <p>Points will be given to developments where, at a minimum 10% of the total units are set-aside for disabled and special needs tenants.</p>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects involving more than four units must include 5% of the total units or one unit minimum for individuals with mobility impairments and 2% of the total units or one unit minimum setup for individuals with sensory impairments. S.D. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 15 points may be awarded for developments that have the greater of one unit or at least 5% of the total number of units in the development are fully equipped for persons with disabilities in accordance with the ADA and FHA. Tenn. 2008 QAP 20.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applications may receive four points where the development sets aside at least 10% of the Units for persons with special needs. Tex. 2008 QAP 55.</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 special needs and/or senior citizens. Utah 2008 QAP 57-8.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of the "top tier evaluation criteria" is: "f. Any project that incorporates a majority of Special Needs populations and provides service-enriched housing." The 2008-2009 QAP defines an individual who has "special needs" to include, among other things, "persons with physical, sensory, cognitive, developmental and/or mental disabilities." Vt. 2008 QAP 22.</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. However, from one to three points may be awarded for the provision of certain amenities to tenants who are physically disabled or elderly. Va. 2008 QAP 13.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points will be awarded based on the Applicant's commitment to provide a minimum of 20% (10 points) or 10% (5 points) to Large Households. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 63.</li> </ul>
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

Wisconsin

• Twenty-five points will be awarded to developments that provide units for special needs residents. Wis. 2008 QAP 7.

Wyoming

• 4 points awarded to projects that restrict occupancy of all units to a special needs population, including: people who are mentally ill, physically disabled, and developmentally disabled (QAP 2008, p. 24).

State	Scoring that promotes marketing to disabled persons
Alabama	• No.
Alaska	• No.
Arizona	• No.
Arkansas	• No.
California	• No.
Colorado	<p>• 8 points may be earned for the set-aside of at least 33% of the units for special needs tenant populations. Applicants must provide evidence of a client source (e.g. letters from referring agencies, <b>marketing plans</b>, etc.). (QAP 2008, p. 30); cited in 2006 Report: original provision was deleted, but replaced with the similar language here.</p> <p>• 2.5 points awarded to projects that set aside units for persons with disabilities and that actively market those units to disabled persons in waiting lists at local facilities (QAP 2008, p. 20).</p>
Connecticut	
Delaware	• No.
Florida	• No.
Georgia	• No.
Hawaii	• No.
Idaho	• No.
Illinois	• [ADD TO E] Requires project to have an affirmative marketing plan for persons with disabilities including a section on reasonable accommodations and modifications in applications for tenancy (QAP 2008 & 2009 Draft, p. 151).
Indiana	• No.
Iowa	• No.
Kansas	• No.
Kentucky	• No.
Louisiana	• No.
Maine	• No.
Maryland	<p>• Awards points to occupied rehabilitation projects that will market and hold units for individuals with disabilities (Program Guide, p. 38).</p> <p>• Not score, but part of "threshold requirement." See Appendix I, MA 2008 QAP 91.</p>
Massachusetts	
Michigan	• No.
Minnesota	• No.
Mississippi	• No.
Missouri	• No.
Montana	• No.
Nebraska	• No.
Nevada	• No.
New Hampshire	• No.
New Jersey	• No.
New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.

North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No.
Ohio	• Yes. "Applicants must also notify the appropriate statewide accesibility group at the time of application that accessible housing is being proposed, agree to accept referrals for potential residents, and agree to receive design suggestions for the property." OH 2008 QAP 38. Five additional points for projects that "agree to serve person with developmental disability or persons with severe and persistent mental illness." OH 2008 QAP 39.
Oklahoma	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No.
Rhode Island	• No.
South Carolina	• No.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No. However, as part of the site inspection, a review will be conducted of the owner's marketing efforts to attract special needs applicants. Tenn. 2008 QAP 34.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• Fifty points may be awarded to developments in which 10% of the units are, among other things, actively marketed to people with special needs. Va. 2008 QAP 13. • A reservation of credits may be given to any applicant that proposes a non-elderly development that, amond other things, will be actively marketed to people with disabilities in accordance with a plan submitted as part of the application for credits and approved by the executive director. Va. 2008 QAP p. 21.
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	• Yes. Up to 25 points will be awarded to properties that reserve at least 25% of the units for handicapped or disabled persons. W.Va. 2008 QAP 23-4.
Wisconsin	• No.
Wyoming	• No.



State	<b>Scoring that promotes family moves to low-poverty neighborhoods</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded if projects target low-income families with a minimum of 15% of units having 3 or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> <li>• Up to 12 points awarded if projects provide services or activities for tenants free of charge. 1 point each is awarded for computer training (monthly), tutoring assistance (weekly), after school program (weekly), etc. (QAP 2008, p. 26-7).</li> </ul>
Alaska Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded based on the percentage of total units with 3 or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded if projects have unique features; housing with substantive social services appropriate to the tenant population provided on an ongoing basis qualifies as a unique feature. (QAP 2008, p. 19); cited in 2006 Report: no change.</li> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded if the project operates a job training program where low and moderate income families are prepared for meaningful employment opportunities after program is completed (QAP 2008, p. 20-1); cited in 2006 Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Up to 13 points awarded if project provides housing for large families (3 bedrooms or more) based on the percentage of units (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> </ul>
California Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to large family projects (Regulations 2008, p. 23).</li> <li>• 2 to 3 points awarded to large family projects located within ¼ to 1 mile to a elementary, middle, or high school that the children in the development may attend (Regulations 2008, p. 24).</li> <li>• 5 points awarded if projects provide after school programs for school age children or licensed child care (can require a fee) providing more than 20 hours per week for residents in the development; services must be provided for a minimum of 10 years (Regulations 2008, p. 25).</li> <li>• 5 points awarded for educational classes such as ESL and computer training (Regulations 2008, p. 25).</li> <li>• Large family projects are required to have at least 30% of units to be 3 bedrooms or larger (Regulations 2008, p. 35).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 7.5 points awarded to projects based on the percentage of total units with three or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 20); cited in 2006 report: point values and percentages have changed.</li> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects based on the percentage of total units with two or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 20); cited in 2006 Report: point values and percentages have changed.</li> <li>• Up to 18 points awarded for enriched housing and community depending on the services offered such as on-site education opportunities, daycare facility, job training, resident services coordinator, etc (QAP 2008, p. 26-8).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 3 points awarded for on site social and support services such as parenting programs, literacy programs, job training, transportation, etc. (QAP 2008, p. 42); cited in 2006 Report: no change.</li> </ul>
Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects which address family housing will be targeted. (QAP 2008, p. 16)</li> <li>• Projects which offer resident services and programs will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 16).</li> <li>• Projects which have amenities and resident programs that service families with children are targeted (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> <li>• Up to 6 points awarded if the project has qualified resident programs serving the general population including welfare to work program, daycare, literacy program, job training, and home ownership seminars, etc (Universal Application 2008, p. 27).</li> <li>• Up to 8 points awarded for programs involving health and wellness, financial counseling, swimming lessons, etc. (Universal Application 2008, p. 29-30).</li> </ul>
Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires family projects include at least one basic ongoing service such as social and recreational programs planned and overseen by the project manager (semi-monthly birthday, potluck dinners, etc), semi-monthly classes conducted on site (exercise, computer tutoring, etc), after school or adult day care located on site (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix I p.5-6); cited in 2006 Report: modified the number of services.</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 4 points awarded if projects have units with 2 or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 8).</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 points awarded to family projects designating at least 5% of low-income units to three bedroom or larger units for households with less than 50% AMI; projects must include appropriate amenities for families (playground, laundry, etc.) (QAP 2008, p. 21) .</li> <li>• 5 points awarded for continuing supportive services to assist families in becoming more self sufficient. Services must be ongoing and on site; the goal is to reduce the reliance on government assistance (QAP 2008, p. 20, 21).</li> </ul>

Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects with 3 or more bedroom units for families with children; points awarded based on the percentage of total units with 3 bedrooms (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 47).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded if project has employer-direct assistance; assistance is provided by employer directly to employee such as monetary or in kind donation (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 44).</li> <li>• Up to 2 points awarded if projects have appropriate employers located within 5 miles (10 miles for rural areas) (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 43).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 points awarded to projects that have 20% or more of the units with three bedrooms OR 3 points awarded to projects that have 10% or more of the units with four bedrooms (QAP 2007-2008, p. 21-22); cited in Report: provisions have been deleted and modified.</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that consist entirely of single-family homes and/or duplexes (QAP 2007-2008, p. 22); cited in Report: provision modified.</li> <li>• 2 points awarded to projects with free, on-site services that are tailored to the needs of the targeted clients (QAP 2007-2008, p. 32) cited in Report: provision modified.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0 to 19 points awarded for family projects with 3 bedrooms or larger that contain 1.5 bathrooms (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> <li>• 0 to 10 points awarded for sites located near services, including: public schools and day care centers (QAP 2008, p. 19-20).</li> </ul>
Kansas Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point awarded for every 2% of 3 bedroom units; maximum of 10 points (QAP 2008, p. 11).</li> <li>• Up to 10 points awarded to projects that serve individuals with children (QAP 2008, p. 14).</li> <li>• High scoring for sites that are in close proximity to schools, day cares, and jobs (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Requires developers to show that educational facilities are available to school-age children (QAP 2007-2008, p. 10).</li> <li>• 4 points each awarded if any of the following are located within 1 mile of the site: elementary school and day care center (QAP 2007-2008, p. 59).</li> <li>• Graded scale of points awarded to projects with a certain percentage of units that have 4 or more bedrooms reserved for large family households (QAP 2007-2008, p. 61).</li> <li>• 25 points awarded for an on-site day care service (QAP 2007-2008, p. 61).</li> </ul>

Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 points awarded to projects that have at least 20% of the units as 3 or more bedrooms and an additional 30% of the units as 2 or more bedrooms (QAP 2008-2009, p. 15).</li> <li>• 4 points awarded if a project for families is constructed to provide a higher level of accessibility (QAP 2008-2009, p. 15).</li> <li>• 4 points awarded to projects that are within 2,500 feet of at least one destination important to the course of daily activities, such as a public school (QAP 2008-2009, p. 22).</li> <li>• 1 point awarded to projects that are within 1,500 feet of a public school or library (QAP 2008-2009, p. 23).</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded based on the percentage of units with two or more bedrooms available to households with children (Program Guide, p. 39).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not specifically families, but eight points for locating in areas where poverty rate is below 15%. MA 2008 QAP 37.</li> <li>• Also note requirement that 75% of projects generally should be two bedrooms or more. MA 2008 QAP 20.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to family projects that reserve at least 10% of the two or more bedroom units for households with children (Scoring Summary, p. 6).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires family housing projects to make at least 75% of the units contain two or more bedrooms and at least one-third of the 75% contain three or more bedrooms (QAP 2008, p. 7).</li> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects that provide family housing in which 75% of the units contain two or more bedrooms; the plan must give preference to families with minor children (Worksheet, 3).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 points awarded to projects that target large families by including three or more bedrooms in at least 25% of the units (QAP 2007-2008, p. 29); cited in 2006 Best Practices report: no change.</li> <li>• 15-20 points awarded to projects that offer at least 2 tenant community services from the following list: educational programs, job training programs, child care services, or service coordinator for elderly developments (QAP 2007-2008, p. 29).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for single parent families (especially with two or more children) will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 9).</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. There is an additional 10 points (out of 140) for the Family Project with the highest per unit square footage, and five points for the second highest. NV 2008 QAP 47.</li> </ul>
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>

New Jersey	• No, but seven points (out of ) are awarded for projects with 30% large family units. NJ 2008 QAP 37.
New Mexico	• No.
New York	• No.
North Carolina	• No.
North Dakota	• No. There is 2 points (out of ) for properties where 20% or more of the units have three bedrooms or more. ND 2008 QAP 22.
Ohio	• No.
Oklahoma	• No. Ten points (out of ) for developments with 50% of the units two bedrooms or larger and including amenities like picnic tables or playgrounds. OK 2008 QAP 34.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	• No. Up to 10 points may be awarded for those developments providing units with three or more bedrooms for large families. High rise developments and senior housing cannot qualify. Pa. 2008 QAP 25.
Rhode Island	• Priority will be given to those projects that are responsive to housing needs in a particular community including tenant populations with special needs and families. R.I. 2008 QAP 22.
South Carolina	• No. Points will be awarded to developments where 100% of the development is designed for individuals or families with children. To receive these points, at least 25% of the low-income units must contain 3 or more bedrooms. S.C. 2008 QAP 7.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• No. Up to 5 points may be awarded for developments with units designed and built for large families (three or more bedrooms). Tenn. 2008 QAP 20-21.
Texas	• No. A development may receive up to four points if the development provides housing for families with children outside of poverty areas, i.e. where the census tract has no greater than 10% poverty population. Tex. 2008 QAP 54.
Utah	• No. Projects may receive up to fifteen points if it provides units with three or more bedrooms. Utah 2008 QAP 52.
Vermont	• In order to be eligible, a development must be planned to "maintain the historic settlement pattern of compact village and urban centers separated by rural countryside; or, projects that are in downtown or village center, or projects that support downtowns or village centers by virtue of their location (i.e. that are within a reasonable walking distance from the town core)." Vt. 2008 QAP 30.
Virginia	• No.

Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points will be awarded based on the Applicant's commitment to provide a minimum of 20% (10 points) or 10% (5 points) to Large Households. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 63.</li> </ul>
West Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Up to 25 points will be awarded to properties that reserve at least 25% of the units for large families (one or more adults with three or more dependent children). W.Va. 2008 QAP 24.</li> </ul>
Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. Twelve points will be awarded to developments in which a minimum of 10% of the total units include three or more bedrooms. Wis. 2008 QAP 7.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 points awarded to projects that provide units for families or individuals with children (QAP 2008, p. 13).</li> </ul>

State	<b>Scoring that promotes units for lowest-income households outside high-poverty neighborhoods</b>
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No, provision in the 2006 Report has been deleted.</li> <li>• 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 ).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Alaska Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• 3 bonus points awarded to projects that set aside units for households with less than 30% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awards points if projects target households at 50%AMI based on the percentage of units set aside (QAP 2008, p. 25).</li> <li>• Up to 15 points awarded to projects that target households at 30% AMI depending on the percentage of units (QAP 2008, p. 26).</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 5 points awarded to projects that serve households below 25% of AMI depending on percentage of units reserved (QAP 2008, p. 15).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects which serve the lowest income families will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 20).</li> </ul>
Florida	

Georgia

- 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

- 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

- 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).
- 10 points awarded if projects have 1-50 units and set aside at least 5% of units for households at 50% AMI or if projects have 51 or more units and set aside at least 10% of units for households at 50% AMI (QAP 2008, p. 25).



Illinois Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 36).</li> <li>• 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 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 38).</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• 0 to 20 points awarded for units that are reserved for tenants with incomes at or below 40% of AMGI (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires developers to keep at least 60% of the total units occupied by people with very low income (QAP 2008-2009, p. 9).</li> </ul>

Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Up to 20 points awarded to projects that restrict units for households with incomes below 60% of the AMI (Program Guide, p. 36).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Up to 50 points awarded for low-income targeting (2008 Scoring Summary, p. 7).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</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>• 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.</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. Twenty points (out of), however, are possible for a project that "serves lowest income group possible." ND 2008 QAP 19.</li> </ul>

Ohio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</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>• No.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</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>• 5 points awarded to projects that provided homes to people with income levels between 41-50% of HUD median income (QAP 2008, p. 17).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>

State	Racial/demographic reporting requirements
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• “The record must include...evidence supporting that the project complies with the Fair Housing Act and does not discriminate in the provision of housing.” (QAP 2008, p. 27); cited in 2006 Report: no change.</li> <li>• The compliance record must include household demographic characteristics from HUD form #40097 which include race/ethnicity requirements. (QAP 2008, p. 27).</li> </ul>
Alaska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Arkansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires an owner to certify under penalty of perjury that no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act has occurred (QAP 2008, p. 54).</li> </ul>
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires at least annually for the 15 year compliance period the owner of the low-income housing project shall certify under penalty of perjury that...all units in the project for general public use and that no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act occurred (QAP 2008, p. 35).</li> </ul>
Connecticut	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owner to certify under penalty of perjury that there are no findings of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act (QAP 2008, p. 59).</li> </ul>
Delaware	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</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>• No.</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> <li>• Requires owners of low-income housing properties to keep records for each building, including: number and ages of occupants in each low-income unit and annual income certification for each low-income tenant (QAP 2008, p. 21-22).</li> </ul>
Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>
Kentucky	

Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to keep annual records for each low-income building, including: number of occupants in each unit if the rent is determined by the number of occupants and annual income certification of each low-income tenant (QAP 2007-2008, Exhibit III Compliance Monitoring Agreement (“Exhibit III”), Section X).</li> <li>• Requires owners to certify annually that no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act occurred for the project (QAP 2007-2008, Exhibit III, Section XII).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to keep records for each low-income building, including: number of occupants in each unit, annual income certification of each low-income tenant, and student status of the resident household (QAP 2008-2009, p. 37-38).</li> <li>• Requires owners to certify that there have been no findings of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act (QAP 2008-2009, p. 39).</li> </ul>
Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners of low-income projects to keep records for each building, including: number of occupants in each unit and annual income certification of each low-income tenant (QAP 2008, p. 13).</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to keep records for each building, including: number of occupants and income certification of each low-income tenant (QAP 2008-2009 draft, p. 29-30).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to keep records for each low-income unit, including: number of occupants and number of minors; household information concerning ethnicity; elderly or family household and student resident status; and annual income certification for each low-income tenant (QAP 2008, p. 16); cited in 2006 Best Practices report: no change.</li> <li>• Requires owners to certify that there has been no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act (QAP 2008, p. 17).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners to keep records for each low-income building, including: number of occupants in each unit and annual income certification of each low-income tenant (QAP 2007-2008, p. 32).</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>• 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	• No.
Oregon	• No.
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Market Study/Needs Assessment must be prepared addressing, among other things, "population statistics". Pa. 2008 QAP 12.</li> <li>• Sponsors will be required to report on local demographics (including income, age and any special needs characteristics). R.I. 2008 QAP 17 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Owner of every project shall certify whether all units in the project were for use by the general public, including the requirement that no finding of discrimination under the Fair Housing Act occurred.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Rhode Island	
South Carolina	• No.
South Dakota	• No.
Tennessee	• Yes. A market study must be performed describing the market area and neighborhood, including demographic information. Tenn. 2008 QAP 29.
Texas	• No.
Utah	• No.
Vermont	• No.
Virginia	• No.
Washington	• No.
West Virginia	• No.
Wisconsin	• No.
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires owners of low-income housing projects to keep records for each building, including: number of occupants, annual income certification, the Ethnicity of Head of Household, and the type of household (i.e. elderly, single parent, two parent, etc.) (QAP 2008, p. 41-42); cited in Report: no change.</li> </ul>

State	Other
Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 points awarded to projects which principally ( 50% of units or more) serve special needs populations such as the homeless. (QAP 2008, p. 17-8).</li> <li>• 5 points awarded to projects that commit to giving preference to homeless individuals/families in the tenant selection process (QAP 2008, p. 20).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 5 points awarded to projects designed and operated so that the units will eventually be sold to tenants (QAP 2008, p. 18-9).</li> </ul>
Alaska	
Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul> <p><b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to projects that submit a contract proposal for the right of first refusal for tenants, giving them a right to possible ownership (QAP 2008, p. 16).</p>
Arkansas	<p><b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 10 points awarded for special needs housing, including housing for the homeless (QAP 2008, p. 37).</p>
California	<p><b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> Up to 34 points awarded to projects that will convert units to tenant home ownership after required period (QAP 2008, p. 27).</p> <p><b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> Up to 8 points awarded to projects that set-aside at least 33% of units for special needs such as the homeless; the development must provide services such as job counseling, transportation, education, etc. in order to receive points (QAP 2008, p. 30).</p>
Colorado	<p><b>Promoting units for homeless:</b> one of the allocation priority classes is rental housing or service enhanced structures for homeless (QAP 2008, p. 10).</p>
Connecticut	<p><b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless/migrant farm workers:</b> 5 points awarded to projects providing housing for special needs, which includes homelessness and migrant and seasonal farm workers. (QAP 2008, p. 38).</p>
Delaware	<p><b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> projects designed to attract and serve the homeless will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 15, 16, 18).</p> <p><b>Projects targeting farm workers:</b> projects which are designed to attract and serve farm workers or commercial fishing workers will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 15,18).</p> <p><b>Projects favoring eventual tenant ownership:</b> projects which provide specific opportunities enabling residents to purchase a unit in the development will be targeted (QAP 2008, p. 19).</p>
Florida	

Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 3 points awarded to projects for submission of a tenant ownership plan at the end of the compliance period (QAP 2008 Draft, Appendix II p. 10-11).</li> </ul>
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to projects offering tenants a right of first refusal and giving the tenants a chance at future ownership (QAP 2008, p. 11).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> Up to 2 points awarded to projects providing housing for special needs populations including the homeless; the number of points depends on the services provided for the tenants (QAP 2008, p. 9).</li> </ul>
Idaho	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 5 points awarded to projects intended for home ownership after 15 year compliance (QAP 2008, p. 23).</li> </ul>
Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring promoting eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to developments intended for eventual tenant ownership (QAP 2008 &amp; 2009 Draft, p. 36).</li> </ul>
Indiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 5 points awarded to applicants who set aside a percentage of the units as permanent or transitional housing for the homeless (QAP 2007-2008, p. 20-21).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to projects that will offer homeownership opportunities to tenants after the 15-year compliance period (QAP 2007-2008, p. 30).</li> </ul>
Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 15 points awarded to projects that implement lease-to-own single family home programs (QAP 2008, p. 19).</li> </ul>
Kansas Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 5 points awarded to projects that have at least one unit reserved as temporary housing for a homeless family (QAP 2008, p. 11).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 10 points awarded to developers that create single-family housing intended for eventual tenant ownership (QAP 2008, p. 13).</li> </ul>
Louisiana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 50 points awarded to projects that are single room occupancy and satisfy the need for a homeless shelter (QAP 2007-2008, p. 62).</li> </ul>
Maine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 2 points awarded to projects that give preference in at least 20% of the units to people who are homeless and offers services appropriate to the needs of such people (QAP 2008-2009, p. 15).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to projects that provide for low-income tenant ownership (QAP 2008, p. 15).</li> </ul>



Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Massachusetts	
Michigan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 8 points awarded to projects that will offer homeownership opportunities to tenants after the 15-year compliance period (Scoring Summary, p. 9).</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 5 to 110 points awarded to projects that propose permanent housing for individuals experiencing long-term homelessness (Worksheet, p. 9).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> 1 point awarded to projects that will offer homeownership opportunities to tenants after the 15-year compliance period (Worksheet, p. 7).</li> </ul>
Minnesota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> under the selection criteria, projects that provide units for the homeless will be given extra consideration (QAP 2008, p. 8).</li> </ul>
Mississippi	
Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Montana	
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>• Homelessness: Twenty points (out of 262) for supportive housing. NH 2008 QAP 14.</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>• Three target pools for state money include one for "Permanent Supportive Housing for the Homeless." OH 2008 QAP 25.</li> </ul>
Oklahoma	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No.</li> </ul>
Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A special Set-Aside of Tax Credits, in the amount of 5% of the state per capita allocation available, will be established for developments that meet the Agency's requirement for Supportive Housing. To qualify, the development must: provide at least 25% of the total units to eligible populations that are homeless; or to those with mental, physical, sensory, or developmental disabilities; persons with substance abuse disorders; and persons diagnosed with AIDs and related diseases. Pa. 2008 QAP 6.</li> <li>• Up to 30 points will be awarded to developments located in areas that demonstrate large number of seniors eligible for affordable housing, limited affordable housing options and production, close proximity to amenities for the senior population, including health and retail establishments, home health agencies, and hospitals.</li> </ul>

Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing for the homeless. The portion of a building used to provide housing for the homeless may be included in the qualified basis. R.I. 2008 QAP 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All developers receiving funding under the Rental Production Program must use best efforts to (a) award at least 10% of the total construction contract dollar amount to minority and female owned businesses, and (b) ensure that at least 10% of labor hours for all trades are performed by minorities and/or women. R.I. 2008 QAP 13, 22.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two points will be awarded for projects that are compatible with the surrounding land use pattern. S.C. 2008 QAP 3.</li> </ul>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "All housing for which tax credits are received must be available to all persons regardless of race, color, national origin, religion, creed, sex, disability, or familial status." S.D. 2008 QAP 19.</li> <li>• Projects which can demonstrate participation by a minority - or woman-owned business enterprise will awarded 10 points. S.D. 2008 QAP 26.</li> </ul>
Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
Texas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant must include a certification that the Applicant will attempt to ensure that at least 30% of the construction and management businesses with which the Applicant contracts are Minority Owned Businesses. Tex. 2008 QAP 34. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each applicant must complete a "self-score" form. This form and the explanatory materials clearly indicates how many points may be awarded for a particular category. Tex. 2008 Competitive 9% HTC Application Supplement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20% of the tax credits are set aside for projects located in areas that are designated as areas of chronic, economic distress. Utah 2008 QAP 41. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to 84 points may be awarded for projects that participate in the Ten-Year Homeless Plan and serves the chronically homeless. Utah 2008 QAP 50.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Vermont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
Virginia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 points may be awarded to developments that provide 75% of the total housing units as Housing for the Homeless or as Farmworker Housing. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 58.</li> <li>• Points will be awarded based on the Applicant's commitment to provide a minimum of 10% (5 points), 20% (10 points) or 75% (35 points) of the total housing units for Homeless Households. Wash. 2008 LIHTC Policies 61.</li> </ul>

West Virginia Wisconsin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Properties that are managed or developed by women or minorities will receive three or four points. W.Va. 2008 QAP 22.</li> <li>• Up to 25 points will be awarded to properties that reserve at least 25% of the units for homeless, displaced, or elderly persons. W.Va. 2008 QAP 23.</li> <li>• Five points will be awarded to properties where the Architect and Contractor have completed Fair Housing Act and Americans with Disabilities Act training and certification. W.Va. 2008 QAP 35.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None.</li> </ul>
Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes units for the homeless:</b> 2 points awarded if at least 4% of the units are reserved for transitioning homeless households (QAP 2008, p. 18).</li> <li>• <b>Scoring that promotes eventual tenant ownership:</b> up to 35 points awarded to projects that allow eventual tenant ownership of rental properties at the end of the compliance period (QAP 2008, p. 20).</li> </ul>