

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 1. Regional, Rural, and Urban Funding Amounts

1	Lubbock	\$1,536,603	4.6%	\$1,536,216	100.0%	\$388	0.0%
2	Abilene	\$966,338	2.9%	\$941,598	97.4%	\$24,740	2.6%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$6,731,297	20.0%	\$2,233,525	33.2%	\$4,497,772	66.8%
4	Tyler	\$3,317,510	9.8%	\$2,580,608	77.8%	\$736,902	22.2%
5	Beaumont	\$1,783,798	5.3%	\$1,586,561	88.9%	\$197,238	11.1%
6	Houston	\$3,061,190	9.1%	\$1,038,028	33.9%	\$2,023,162	66.1%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$2,217,325	6.6%	\$997,017	45.0%	\$1,220,307	55.0%
8	Waco	\$1,293,881	3.8%	\$631,318	48.8%	\$662,563	51.2%
9	San Antonio	\$1,723,442	5.1%	\$1,106,072	64.2%	\$617,370	35.8%
10	Corpus Christi	\$2,042,012	6.1%	\$1,341,182	65.7%	\$700,830	34.3%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$6,655,318	19.7%	\$3,074,093	46.2%	\$3,581,225	53.8%
12	San Angelo	\$1,475,030	4.4%	\$707,147	47.9%	\$767,883	52.1%
13	El Paso	\$896,256	2.7%	\$672,221	75.0%	\$224,034	25.0%
	Total	\$33,700,000	100.0%	\$18,445,585	54.7%	\$15,254,415	45.3%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 2. Regional Measures of Affordable Housing Need

Total RAF Funding: **\$ 33,700,000**

Region	Poverty			Rental Cost Burden			Overcrowding			Substandard Housing			Combined Need Measures	
	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount	Measure Weight		Measure Funding Amount		
	50%		\$ 16,850,000	36%		\$ 12,132,000	12%		\$ 4,044,000	2%		\$ 674,000		
	# of Persons	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	# of Households	Region's Measure %	Region's Measure Funding Amount	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Need Based %
1	54,675	5%	\$ 823,965	17,995	4%	\$ 495,044	5,294	4%	\$ 181,471	775	3%	\$ 20,097	\$ 1,520,577	4.5%
2	39,975	4%	\$ 602,430	15,886	4%	\$ 437,015	2,324	2%	\$ 79,685	715	3%	\$ 18,558	\$ 1,137,688	3.4%
3	154,089	14%	\$ 2,322,152	115,121	26%	\$ 3,166,943	20,607	17%	\$ 706,433	3,368	13%	\$ 87,389	\$ 6,282,917	18.6%
4	115,834	10%	\$ 1,745,644	47,765	11%	\$ 1,314,002	8,059	7%	\$ 276,286	2,457	9%	\$ 63,745	\$ 3,399,677	10.1%
5	61,822	6%	\$ 931,678	24,363	6%	\$ 670,212	4,150	4%	\$ 142,259	1,331	5%	\$ 34,541	\$ 1,778,691	5.3%
6	107,332	10%	\$ 1,617,525	52,246	12%	\$ 1,437,263	14,336	12%	\$ 491,455	2,226	9%	\$ 57,754	\$ 3,603,996	10.7%
7	63,370	6%	\$ 954,998	47,681	11%	\$ 1,311,696	8,768	7%	\$ 300,593	1,665	6%	\$ 43,211	\$ 2,610,498	7.7%
8	48,707	4%	\$ 734,020	22,207	5%	\$ 610,914	4,491	4%	\$ 153,958	941	4%	\$ 24,418	\$ 1,523,310	4.5%
9	52,599	5%	\$ 792,676	23,780	5%	\$ 654,182	5,244	4%	\$ 179,765	1,407	5%	\$ 36,494	\$ 1,663,117	4.9%
10	74,994	7%	\$ 1,130,180	21,647	5%	\$ 595,506	6,631	6%	\$ 227,316	1,618	6%	\$ 41,969	\$ 1,994,971	5.9%
11	253,947	23%	\$ 3,827,038	30,026	7%	\$ 825,998	29,053	25%	\$ 995,971	7,254	28%	\$ 188,205	\$ 5,837,212	17.3%
12	46,452	4%	\$ 700,049	15,313	3%	\$ 421,242	4,345	4%	\$ 148,942	845	3%	\$ 21,933	\$ 1,292,166	3.8%
13	44,302	4%	\$ 667,644	6,979	2%	\$ 191,983	4,663	4%	\$ 159,866	1,375	5%	\$ 35,686	\$ 1,055,179	3.1%
Ttl.	1,118,098	100%	\$ 16,850,000	441,010	100%	\$ 12,132,000	117,966	100%	\$ 4,044,000	25,977	100%	\$ 674,000	\$ 33,700,000	100%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 3. Regional Distribution of Available Housing Resources

Region	HTF	HOPWA	PHA Capital	S8	USDA MF	USDA RA	HTC	MF Bond	HTC w/ Bond	USDA SF	SF Bond	HOME	Region's Resource Total	Region's Resource %
1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,463,519	\$ 3,554,623	\$ 2,686,430	\$ 1,085,268	\$ 13,498,616	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 163,652	\$ 105,820	\$ 2,730,000	\$ 25,287,928	4.3%
2	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ 3,943,224	\$ 2,557,294	\$ -	\$ 3,764,232	\$ 14,544,232	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,511,150	\$ 212,760	\$ 390,000	\$ 27,172,892	4.6%
3	\$ 576,750	\$ 105,000	\$ 3,672,042	\$ 28,771,242	\$ -	\$ 787,852	\$ 23,567,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,442,529	\$ 6,504,449	\$ 9,555,959	\$ 76,983,095	13.1%
4	\$ -	\$ 94,000	\$ 4,407,021	\$ 14,114,486	\$ 1,556,500	\$ 15,984,579	\$ 11,717,072	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,883,724	\$ -	\$ 8,788,495	\$ 60,545,876	10.3%
5	\$ -	\$ 149,000	\$ 2,520,046	\$ 12,927,985	\$ -	\$ 684,441	\$ 7,668,280	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 760,241	\$ 2,187,893	\$ 3,664,252	\$ 30,562,137	5.2%
6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,403,611	\$ 14,151,066	\$ -	\$ 2,934,796	\$ 40,146,832	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,065,230	\$ 21,035,735	\$ 11,420,179	\$ 94,157,449	16.1%
7	\$ 1,085,000	\$ -	\$ 2,455,943	\$ 5,801,698	\$ 3,699,700	\$ 218,941	\$ 39,672,512	\$ 10,230,000	\$ 8,269,640	\$ 3,615,198	\$ 19,780,577	\$ 9,320,528	\$ 104,149,737	17.8%
8	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ 2,664,454	\$ 11,811,541	\$ -	\$ 645,226	\$ 11,431,736	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 434,257	\$ 1,528,445	\$ 6,382,500	\$ 34,933,159	6.0%
9	\$ 29,950	\$ -	\$ 1,291,958	\$ 5,054,829	\$ -	\$ 4,654,607	\$ 8,491,704	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,773,520	\$ 490,216	\$ 1,791,480	\$ 24,578,264	4.2%
10	\$ 603,500	\$ 79,000	\$ 3,882,058	\$ 10,441,719	\$ -	\$ 391,215	\$ 9,914,288	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 884,416	\$ 938,763	\$ 4,170,000	\$ 31,304,959	5.3%
11	\$ 659,993	\$ 25,200	\$ 5,243,360	\$ 16,881,653	\$ -	\$ 80,947	\$ 8,000,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,988,545	\$ 960,176	\$ 3,783,000	\$ 42,622,875	7.3%
12	\$ 29,500	\$ 118,000	\$ 1,328,235	\$ 4,759,464	\$ 1,100,700	\$ 360,639	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 561,476	\$ -	\$ 1,050,400	\$ 9,308,414	1.6%
13	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 405,119	\$ 3,413,643	\$ 2,535,655	\$ 190,360	\$ 13,695,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,786,240	\$ 597,052	\$ 780,000	\$ 24,403,341	4.2%
Total	\$ 3,234,693	\$ 605,200	\$ 36,680,590	\$ 134,241,243	\$ 11,578,985	\$ 31,783,102	\$ 202,347,816	\$ 10,230,000	\$ 8,269,640	\$ 28,870,179	\$ 54,341,886	\$ 63,826,792	\$ 586,010,126	100%
% of Total Resources	0.6%	0.1%	6.3%	22.9%	2.0%	5.4%	34.5%	1.7%	1.4%	4.9%	9.3%	10.9%		

% of Resources not Regionally Allocated:

15.1%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 4. Regional Available Housing Resources Funding Adjustment

Region	Difference between Resources and Need			Over Allocated Regional Resource Differences						Under Allocated Regional Resource Differences				
	Region's Resource %	Region's Need Based %	Resource Difference	Over Allocated Resource Differences	Over Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Under Allocated Resource Differences	Under Allocation %	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	4.3%	4.5%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,520,577	-	-	0%	-1%	16,026	\$ 229,018	\$ 16,026
2	4.6%	3.4%	1.3%	1.3%	6.5%	(424,958)	1,137,688	(171,350)	(171,350)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
3	13.1%	18.6%	-5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	-	6,282,917	-	-	-6%	-28%	448,380	\$ 946,285	\$ 448,380
4	10.3%	10.1%	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	(82,167)	3,399,677	(512,034)	(82,167)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
5	5.2%	5.3%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,778,691	-	-	0%	0%	5,107	\$ 267,893	\$ 5,107
6	16.1%	10.7%	5.4%	5.4%	27.7%	(1,810,767)	3,603,996	(542,807)	(542,807)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
7	17.8%	7.7%	10.0%	10.0%	51.7%	(3,378,897)	2,610,498	(393,173)	(393,173)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
8	6.0%	4.5%	1.4%	1.4%	7.4%	(485,610)	1,523,310	(229,429)	(229,429)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
9	4.2%	4.9%	-0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,663,117	-	-	-1%	-4%	60,325	\$ 250,486	\$ 60,325
10	5.3%	5.9%	-0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,994,971	-	-	-1%	-3%	47,041	\$ 300,467	\$ 47,041
11	7.3%	17.3%	-10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	5,837,212	-	-	-10%	-52%	818,106	\$ 879,157	\$ 818,106
12	1.6%	3.8%	-2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,292,166	-	-	-2%	-12%	182,864	\$ 194,616	\$ 182,864
13	4.2%	3.1%	1.0%	1.0%	5.3%	(348,197)	1,055,179	(158,923)	(158,923)	0%	0%	-	\$ -	\$ -
Ttl.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	19.4%	100.0%	(6,530,596)	33,700,000	(2,007,716)	(1,577,850)	-19%	-100%	1,577,850	\$ 5,075,639	\$ 1,577,850

State Resource Difference: 19.4%
 Total RAF Funding: 33,700,000
 State Over Allocated Resource Amount: (6,530,596)
 Regional Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 15.1%

State Under Allocated Resource Amount



2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 5. Regional Funding Amounts

Region	Place for Geographic Reference	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Region's Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Funding Amount	Region's Funding Percentage
1	Lubbock	\$ 1,520,577	\$ 16,026	\$ 1,536,603	4.6%
2	Abilene	\$ 1,137,688	\$ (171,350)	\$ 966,338	2.9%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$ 6,282,917	\$ 448,380	\$ 6,731,297	20.0%
4	Tyler	\$ 3,399,677	\$ (82,167)	\$ 3,317,510	9.8%
5	Beaumont	\$ 1,778,691	\$ 5,107	\$ 1,783,798	5.3%
6	Houston	\$ 3,603,996	\$ (542,807)	\$ 3,061,190	9.1%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$ 2,610,498	\$ (393,173)	\$ 2,217,325	6.6%
8	Waco	\$ 1,523,310	\$ (229,429)	\$ 1,293,881	3.8%
9	San Antonio	\$ 1,663,117	\$ 60,325	\$ 1,723,442	5.1%
10	Corpus Christi	\$ 1,994,971	\$ 47,041	\$ 2,042,012	6.1%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$ 5,837,212	\$ 818,106	\$ 6,655,318	19.7%
12	San Angelo	\$ 1,292,166	\$ 182,864	\$ 1,475,030	4.4%
13	El Paso	\$ 1,055,179	\$ (158,923)	\$ 896,256	2.7%
Ttl.		\$ 33,700,000	\$ -	\$ 33,700,000	100%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 6. Measuring Affordable Housing Need in Rural and Urban/Exurban Places

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight: 50%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Persons	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Persons	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,536,603	\$ 768,302	41,503	100%	\$ 768,302	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 966,338	\$ 483,169	30,027	99%	\$ 476,599	91897306783	1%	\$ 6,570
3	\$ 6,731,297	\$ 3,365,649	51,459	44%	\$ 1,487,156	11324229672	56%	\$ 1,878,493
4	\$ 3,317,510	\$ 1,658,755	51,734	86%	\$ 1,418,544	50592695255	14%	\$ 240,211
5	\$ 1,783,798	\$ 891,899	31,929	93%	\$ 830,424	64865632957	7%	\$ 61,475
6	\$ 3,061,190	\$ 1,530,595	31,584	33%	\$ 504,274	8869084713	67%	\$ 1,026,321
7	\$ 2,217,325	\$ 1,108,662	16,309	43%	\$ 476,441	7780857791	57%	\$ 632,221
8	\$ 1,293,881	\$ 646,940	18,509	51%	\$ 329,033	81471488967	49%	\$ 317,907
9	\$ 1,723,442	\$ 861,721	27,006	78%	\$ 673,749	46595921716	22%	\$ 187,972
10	\$ 2,042,012	\$ 1,021,006	47,984	82%	\$ 840,029	7776060431	18%	\$ 180,977
11	\$ 6,655,318	\$ 3,327,659	123,916	55%	\$ 1,838,254	10577625734	45%	\$ 1,489,405
12	\$ 1,475,030	\$ 737,515	21,395	61%	\$ 448,349	87107090693	39%	\$ 289,166
13	\$ 896,256	\$ 448,128	17,189	47%	\$ 210,080	74413866178	53%	\$ 238,048
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	\$ 16,850,000	510,545	100%	\$ 10,301,236	-	0%	\$ 6,548,764

Cost Burden Measure

Measure Weight: 36%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,536,603	\$ 553,177	13,489	100%	\$ 552,983	27272727273	0%	\$ 194
2	\$ 966,338	\$ 347,882	11,471	99%	\$ 342,954	14919443027	1%	\$ 4,927
3	\$ 6,731,297	\$ 2,423,267	27,912	33%	\$ 800,579	8280377226	67%	\$ 1,622,688
4	\$ 3,317,510	\$ 1,194,304	21,362	87%	\$ 1,034,025	20391481422	13%	\$ 160,279
5	\$ 1,783,798	\$ 642,167	12,513	88%	\$ 565,226	28756506834	12%	\$ 76,941
6	\$ 3,061,190	\$ 1,102,028	12,929	27%	\$ 297,532	94692483558	73%	\$ 804,497
7	\$ 2,217,325	\$ 798,237	10,212	32%	\$ 256,422	99859536866	68%	\$ 541,815
8	\$ 1,293,881	\$ 465,797	7,222	44%	\$ 206,820	67643860008	56%	\$ 258,977
9	\$ 1,723,442	\$ 620,439	10,823	68%	\$ 421,887	65891246887	32%	\$ 198,552
10	\$ 2,042,012	\$ 735,124	11,751	70%	\$ 511,748	23226912564	30%	\$ 223,376
11	\$ 6,655,318	\$ 2,395,914	13,898	53%	\$ 1,269,509	9689690156	47%	\$ 1,126,405
12	\$ 1,475,030	\$ 531,011	6,016	51%	\$ 268,934	27977236976	49%	\$ 262,077
13	\$ 896,256	\$ 322,652	2,937	54%	\$ 175,504	65800878028	46%	\$ 147,148
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	\$ 12,132,000	162,533	100%	\$ 6,704,124	-	0%	\$ 5,427,876

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight: 50%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Persons	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Persons	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
--------	-------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------------------	--------------------	----------------	-----------------------

Over Crowding Measure

Measure Weight: 12%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,536,603	\$ 184,392	4,212	100%	\$ 184,392	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 966,338	\$ 115,961	1,763	99%	\$ 114,807	21943573668	1%	\$ 1,153
3	\$ 6,731,297	\$ 807,756	5,653	34%	\$ 276,814	5382151511	66%	\$ 530,942
4	\$ 3,317,510	\$ 398,101	3,748	88%	\$ 350,754	39150473106	12%	\$ 47,347
5	\$ 1,783,798	\$ 214,056	2,160	93%	\$ 198,951	9747545949	7%	\$ 15,105
6	\$ 3,061,190	\$ 367,343	3,467	26%	\$ 95,134	82549685744	74%	\$ 272,209
7	\$ 2,217,325	\$ 266,079	2,440	49%	\$ 130,852	83174326396	51%	\$ 135,227
8	\$ 1,293,881	\$ 155,266	1,614	46%	\$ 71,921	50012011589	54%	\$ 83,345
9	\$ 1,723,442	\$ 206,813	2,639	78%	\$ 161,044	02414374387	22%	\$ 45,769
10	\$ 2,042,012	\$ 245,041	4,064	80%	\$ 194,937	64518380517	20%	\$ 50,105
11	\$ 6,655,318	\$ 798,638	13,602	53%	\$ 425,423	76369081636	47%	\$ 373,215
12	\$ 1,475,030	\$ 177,004	1,873	56%	\$ 99,609	28552930414	44%	\$ 77,394
13	\$ 896,256	\$ 107,551	1,749	45%	\$ 48,829	88659396368	55%	\$ 58,722
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	\$ 4,044,000	48,985	100%	\$ 2,353,467	-	0%	\$ 1,690,533

Substandard Measure

Measure Weight: 2%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Households	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Households	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
1	\$ 1,536,603	\$ 30,732	543	100%	\$ 30,732	0	0%	\$ -
2	\$ 966,338	\$ 19,327	456	98%	\$ 18,901	15517241379	2%	\$ 426
3	\$ 6,731,297	\$ 134,626	1,158	48%	\$ 65,022	64114383253	52%	\$ 69,604
4	\$ 3,317,510	\$ 66,350	850	89%	\$ 59,353	14332476012	11%	\$ 6,998
5	\$ 1,783,798	\$ 35,676	456	91%	\$ 32,411	62601183844	9%	\$ 3,265
6	\$ 3,061,190	\$ 61,224	600	33%	\$ 20,254	77777470405	67%	\$ 40,969
7	\$ 2,217,325	\$ 44,346	513	67%	\$ 29,804	29190969873	33%	\$ 14,543
8	\$ 1,293,881	\$ 25,878	289	55%	\$ 14,220	97064490507	45%	\$ 11,657
9	\$ 1,723,442	\$ 34,469	530	79%	\$ 27,096	10112179211	21%	\$ 7,373
10	\$ 2,042,012	\$ 40,840	802	79%	\$ 32,285	88710496502	21%	\$ 8,555
11	\$ 6,655,318	\$ 133,106	4,112	65%	\$ 86,000	56388435515	35%	\$ 47,106
12	\$ 1,475,030	\$ 29,501	289	53%	\$ 15,645	87764376816	47%	\$ 13,856
13	\$ 896,256	\$ 17,925	513	48%	\$ 8,578	38197930857	52%	\$ 9,347
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	\$ 674,000	11,111	100%	\$ 440,302	-	0%	\$ 233,698

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Poverty Measure

Measure Weight:

50%

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Measure Funding Amount	# of Rural Persons	Measure Rural %	Rural Measure Funding Amount	# of Urban Persons	Measure Urb. %	Urban Measure Funding
--------	-------------------------	------------------------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------------------	--------------------	----------------	-----------------------

Overall Measure of Affordable Housing Need

Region	Region's Funding Amount				Rural Need Based Funding Amount	Rural Need Based %		Urban Need Based Funding Amount	Urban Need Based %
1	\$ 1,536,603				\$ 1,536,409	100.0%		\$ 194	0.0%
2	\$ 966,338				\$ 953,262	98.6%		\$ 13,076	1.4%
3	\$ 6,731,297				\$ 2,629,571	39.1%		\$ 4,101,726	60.9%
4	\$ 3,317,510				\$ 2,862,676	86.3%		\$ 454,834	13.7%
5	\$ 1,783,798				\$ 1,627,012	91.2%		\$ 156,786	8.8%
6	\$ 3,061,190				\$ 917,194	30.0%		\$ 2,143,995	70.0%
7	\$ 2,217,325				\$ 893,519	40.3%		\$ 1,323,805	59.7%
8	\$ 1,293,881				\$ 621,994	48.1%		\$ 671,887	51.9%
9	\$ 1,723,442				\$ 1,283,776	74.5%		\$ 439,666	25.5%
10	\$ 2,042,012				\$ 1,578,999	77.3%		\$ 463,013	22.7%
11	\$ 6,655,318				\$ 3,619,187	54.4%		\$ 3,036,131	45.6%
12	\$ 1,475,030				\$ 832,537	56.4%		\$ 642,493	43.6%
13	\$ 896,256				\$ 442,990	49.4%		\$ 453,266	50.6%
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000				\$ 19,799,128	58.8%		\$ 13,900,872	41.2%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 7. Measuring Available Housing Resources in Rural and Urban Places

Region	Reg All Res Rur	Reg All Res Urb	Reg All Res	Rural Resource %	Urban Resource %
1	\$ 25,287,928	\$ -	\$ 25,287,928	100.0%	0.0%
2	\$ 27,133,194	\$ 39,698	\$ 27,172,892	99.9%	0.1%
3	\$ 40,993,803	\$ 35,989,292	\$ 76,983,095	53.3%	46.7%
4	\$ 57,392,818	\$ 3,153,057	\$ 60,545,876	94.8%	5.2%
5	\$ 28,568,949	\$ 1,993,188	\$ 30,562,137	93.5%	6.5%
6	\$ 24,494,820	\$ 69,662,629	\$ 94,157,449	26.0%	74.0%
7	\$ 37,108,008	\$ 67,041,729	\$ 104,149,737	35.6%	64.4%
8	\$ 16,541,329	\$ 18,391,830	\$ 34,933,159	47.4%	52.6%
9	\$ 20,842,382	\$ 3,735,882	\$ 24,578,264	84.8%	15.2%
10	\$ 27,969,315	\$ 3,335,645	\$ 31,304,959	89.3%	10.7%
11	\$ 28,530,810	\$ 14,092,064	\$ 42,622,875	66.9%	33.1%
12	\$ 6,619,282	\$ 2,689,132	\$ 9,308,414	71.1%	28.9%
13	\$ 4,520,531	\$ 19,882,810	\$ 24,403,341	18.5%	81.5%
Ttl.	\$ 346,003,169	\$ 240,006,957	\$ 586,010,126	59.0%	41.0%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 8. Rural and Urban Resource Adjustment

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas							Urban Areas						
		Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Resource %	Area's Need %	Area's Resource Difference	Base Resource Funding Adjustment	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	Maximum Resource Funding Adjustment	Resource Funding Adjustment
1	\$ 1,536,603	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	\$ (194)	\$ 1,536,409	\$ (231,402)	\$ (194)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2	\$ 966,338	99.9%	98.6%	1.2%	\$ (11,664)	\$ 953,262	\$ (143,573)	\$ (11,664)	0.1%	1.4%	-1.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	\$ 6,731,297	53.3%	39.1%	14.2%	\$ (954,871)	\$ 2,629,571	\$ (396,046)	\$ (396,046)	46.7%	60.9%	-14.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	\$ 3,317,510	94.8%	86.3%	8.5%	\$ (282,068)	\$ 2,862,676	\$ (431,154)	\$ (282,068)	5.2%	13.7%	-8.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	\$ 1,783,798	93.5%	91.2%	2.3%	\$ (40,451)	\$ 1,627,012	\$ (245,048)	\$ (40,451)	6.5%	8.8%	-2.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	\$ 3,061,190	26.0%	30.0%	-3.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	74.0%	70.0%	3.9%	\$ (120,833)	\$ 2,143,995	\$ (1,501,611)	\$ (120,833)
7	\$ 2,217,325	35.6%	40.3%	-4.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	64.4%	59.7%	4.7%	\$ (103,498)	\$ 1,323,805	\$ (790,349)	\$ (103,498)
8	\$ 1,293,881	47.4%	48.1%	-0.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	52.6%	51.9%	0.7%	\$ (9,324)	\$ 671,887	\$ (348,897)	\$ (9,324)
9	\$ 1,723,442	84.8%	74.5%	10.3%	\$ (177,704)	\$ 1,283,776	\$ (193,353)	\$ (177,704)	15.2%	25.5%	-10.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	\$ 2,042,012	89.3%	77.3%	12.0%	\$ (245,430)	\$ 1,578,999	\$ (237,817)	\$ (237,817)	10.7%	22.7%	-12.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	\$ 6,655,318	66.9%	54.4%	12.6%	\$ (835,735)	\$ 3,619,187	\$ (545,095)	\$ (545,095)	33.1%	45.6%	-12.6%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12	\$ 1,475,030	71.1%	56.4%	14.7%	\$ (216,368)	\$ 832,537	\$ (125,390)	\$ (125,390)	28.9%	43.6%	-14.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	\$ 896,256	18.5%	49.4%	-30.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	81.5%	50.6%	30.9%	\$ (276,966)	\$ 453,266	\$ (229,231)	\$ (229,231)
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	59.0%	58.8%	0.3%	(2,764,485)	16,923,430	(2,548,879)	(1,816,429)	41.0%	41.2%	-0.3%	(510,621)	\$ 4,592,953	\$ (2,870,089)	(462,887)

Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 15.1%

2010 HOME Regional Allocation Formula

Table 9. Rural and Urban Area Funding Amount

Region	Region's Funding Amount	Rural Areas					Urban Areas				
		Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Need %	Area's Need Based Funding Amount	Area's Resource Funding Adjustment	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban
1	\$ 1,536,603	100.0%	1,536,409	\$ (194)	\$ 1,536,216	100.0%	0.0%	\$ 194	\$ 194	\$ 388	0.0%
2	\$ 966,338	98.6%	953,262	\$ (11,664)	\$ 941,598	97.4%	1.4%	\$ 13,076	\$ 11,664	\$ 24,740	2.6%
3	\$ 6,731,297	39.1%	2,629,571	\$ (396,046)	\$ 2,233,525	33.2%	60.9%	\$ 4,101,726	\$ 396,046	\$ 4,497,772	66.8%
4	\$ 3,317,510	86.3%	2,862,676	\$ (282,068)	\$ 2,580,608	77.8%	13.7%	\$ 454,834	\$ 282,068	\$ 736,902	22.2%
5	\$ 1,783,798	91.2%	1,627,012	\$ (40,451)	\$ 1,586,561	88.9%	8.8%	\$ 156,786	\$ 40,451	\$ 197,238	11.1%
6	\$ 3,061,190	30.0%	917,194	\$ 120,833	\$ 1,038,028	33.9%	70.0%	\$ 2,143,995	\$ (120,833)	\$ 2,023,162	66.1%
7	\$ 2,217,325	40.3%	893,519	\$ 103,498	\$ 997,017	45.0%	59.7%	\$ 1,323,805	\$ (103,498)	\$ 1,220,307	55.0%
8	\$ 1,293,881	48.1%	621,994	\$ 9,324	\$ 631,318	48.8%	51.9%	\$ 671,887	\$ (9,324)	\$ 662,563	51.2%
9	\$ 1,723,442	74.5%	1,283,776	\$ (177,704)	\$ 1,106,072	64.2%	25.5%	\$ 439,666	\$ 177,704	\$ 617,370	35.8%
10	\$ 2,042,012	77.3%	1,578,999	\$ (237,817)	\$ 1,341,182	65.7%	22.7%	\$ 463,013	\$ 237,817	\$ 700,830	34.3%
11	\$ 6,655,318	54.4%	3,619,187	\$ (545,095)	\$ 3,074,093	46.2%	45.6%	\$ 3,036,131	\$ 545,095	\$ 3,581,225	53.8%
12	\$ 1,475,030	56.4%	832,537	\$ (125,390)	\$ 707,147	47.9%	43.6%	\$ 642,493	\$ 125,390	\$ 767,883	52.1%
13	\$ 896,256	49.4%	442,990	\$ 229,231	\$ 672,221	75.0%	50.6%	\$ 453,266	\$ (229,231)	\$ 224,034	25.0%
Ttl.	\$ 33,700,000	58.8%	19,799,128	\$ (1,353,543)	\$ 18,445,585	54.7%	41.2%	\$ 13,900,872	\$ 1,353,543	\$ 15,254,415	45.3%