

**2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula**

**Table 1. Regional, Rural, and Urban Funding Amounts**

Region	Place for Geographical Reference	Regional Funding Amount	Regional Funding %	Rural Funding Amount	Rural Funding %	Urban Funding Amount	Urban Funding %
1	Lubbock	\$1,558,000	3.8%	\$603,804	38.8%	\$954,196	61.2%
2	Abilene	\$737,042	1.8%	\$519,826	70.5%	\$217,216	29.5%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$9,434,562	23.2%	\$974,403	10.3%	\$8,460,159	89.7%
4	Tyler	\$1,499,416	3.7%	\$839,696	56.0%	\$659,720	44.0%
5	Beaumont	\$1,113,019	2.7%	\$611,466	54.9%	\$501,552	45.1%
6	Houston	\$8,846,755	21.8%	\$822,918	9.3%	\$8,023,837	90.7%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$2,753,132	6.8%	\$574,058	20.9%	\$2,179,074	79.1%
8	Waco	\$2,103,405	5.2%	\$556,581	26.5%	\$1,546,825	73.5%
9	San Antonio	\$3,307,200	8.1%	\$588,962	17.8%	\$2,718,237	82.2%
10	Corpus Christi	\$1,388,922	3.4%	\$548,423	39.5%	\$840,499	60.5%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$5,058,743	12.4%	\$1,845,292	36.5%	\$3,213,451	63.5%
12	San Angelo	\$876,067	2.2%	\$523,566	59.8%	\$352,502	40.2%
13	El Paso	\$1,961,182	4.8%	\$552,755	28.2%	\$1,408,427	71.8%
	Total	\$40,637,446	100.0%	\$9,561,752	23.5%	\$31,075,694	76.5%

**2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula**

**Table 2. Regional Measures of Affordable Housing Need**

Total RAF Funding: \$ 40,637,446

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%		\$ 20,318,723	36%		\$ 14,629,481	12%		\$ 4,876,494	2%		\$ 812,749	Region's Need Based Funding Amount	
	# 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	111,390	4%	\$ 720,954	26,163	4%	\$ 550,919	6,072	2%	\$ 103,323	1,066	3%	\$ 26,490	\$ 1,401,686	3.4%
2	66,595	2%	\$ 431,022	13,948	2%	\$ 293,715	2,377	1%	\$ 40,443	627	2%	\$ 15,586	\$ 780,765	1.9%
3	597,641	19%	\$ 3,868,125	201,222	29%	\$ 4,237,154	82,627	29%	\$ 1,405,923	7,393	23%	\$ 183,784	\$ 9,694,986	23.9%
4	140,760	4%	\$ 911,041	24,325	4%	\$ 512,211	5,458	2%	\$ 92,873	1,407	4%	\$ 34,986	\$ 1,551,111	3.8%
5	107,638	3%	\$ 696,669	18,356	3%	\$ 386,525	4,185	1%	\$ 71,207	991	3%	\$ 24,645	\$ 1,179,045	2.9%
6	664,792	21%	\$ 4,302,744	160,715	23%	\$ 3,384,189	88,434	31%	\$ 1,504,732	7,237	22%	\$ 179,898	\$ 9,371,563	23.1%
7	159,707	5%	\$ 1,033,674	72,073	10%	\$ 1,517,655	17,786	6%	\$ 302,636	2,514	8%	\$ 62,489	\$ 2,916,453	7.2%
8	140,291	4%	\$ 908,005	39,027	6%	\$ 821,788	8,107	3%	\$ 137,945	1,223	4%	\$ 30,411	\$ 1,898,149	4.7%
9	270,157	9%	\$ 1,748,543	58,981	8%	\$ 1,241,974	21,127	7%	\$ 359,482	2,403	7%	\$ 59,742	\$ 3,409,741	8.4%
10	119,603	4%	\$ 774,106	19,704	3%	\$ 414,900	6,829	2%	\$ 116,191	1,004	3%	\$ 24,961	\$ 1,330,158	3.3%
11	520,737	17%	\$ 3,370,378	27,231	4%	\$ 573,402	28,674	10%	\$ 487,901	4,808	15%	\$ 119,518	\$ 4,551,199	11.2%
12	72,054	2%	\$ 466,354	11,892	2%	\$ 250,406	3,182	1%	\$ 54,142	695	2%	\$ 17,270	\$ 788,172	1.9%
13	167,963	5%	\$ 1,087,109	21,116	3%	\$ 444,642	11,736	4%	\$ 199,696	1,326	4%	\$ 32,969	\$ 1,764,417	4.3%
Ttl.	3,139,327	100%	\$ 20,318,723	694,753	100%	\$ 14,629,481	286,594	100%	\$ 4,876,494	32,695	100%	\$ 812,749	\$ 40,637,446	100%

## 2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

**Table 3. Regional Distribution of Available Housing Resources**

Region	HOME	HOPWA	PHA Capital	S8	USDA MF	USDA RA	HTC	MF BOND	HTC Bond	HTF	Total Resources	Region's Resource %
1	\$ -	\$ 243,500	\$ 2,184,738	\$ 19,858,255	\$ 2,686,430	\$ 1,085,268	\$ 25,897,319	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 51,955,510	3%
2	\$ 34,077	\$ 466,000	\$ 5,281,063	\$ 7,732,159	\$ -	\$ 3,794,096	\$ 20,610,170	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,917,565	2%
3	\$ 10,108,137	\$ 2,298,183	\$ 12,741,337	\$ 263,900,793	\$ -	\$ 1,151,464	\$ 102,696,643	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 960,000	\$ 393,856,557	24%
4	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 4,407,021	\$ 23,984,806	\$ 1,556,500	\$ 15,984,579	\$ 14,907,438	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,410,344	4%
5	\$ 2,386,570	\$ 272,000	\$ 4,469,129	\$ 38,137,742	\$ -	\$ 684,441	\$ 25,669,315	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,619,197	4%
6	\$ 14,001,003	\$ 4,000,649	\$ 9,544,615	\$ 135,417,560	\$ 2,279,000	\$ 3,206,354	\$ 239,679,629	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 408,128,810	25%
7	\$ 9,985,380	\$ 715,754	\$ 5,563,167	\$ 53,565,342	\$ 3,699,700	\$ 218,941	\$ 48,713,448	\$ 10,230,000	\$ 7,235,935	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 140,927,667	9%
8	\$ 4,397,181	\$ 180,000	\$ 5,467,205	\$ 33,575,990	\$ -	\$ 1,551,152	\$ 27,046,677	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 72,218,205	4%
9	\$ 690,569	\$ 1,152,518	\$ 12,099,950	\$ 88,871,527	\$ -	\$ 4,654,607	\$ 31,099,992	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 384,000	\$ 138,953,163	9%
10	\$ 3,047,236	\$ 429,800	\$ 6,678,822	\$ 17,852,752	\$ -	\$ 391,215	\$ 22,950,452	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450,000	\$ 51,800,277	3%
11	\$ 1,136,845	\$ 108,900	\$ 10,982,163	\$ 53,446,757	\$ -	\$ 164,228	\$ 22,904,084	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88,742,977	5.5%
12	\$ 225,582	\$ 170,000	\$ 1,690,808	\$ 12,222,020	\$ 1,100,700	\$ 360,639	\$ 8,764,343	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 24,534,092	2%
13	\$ -	\$ 534,900	\$ 10,698,660	\$ 30,002,381	\$ 2,535,655	\$ 280,363	\$ 19,584,887	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,636,846	4%
Total	\$ 48,012,580	\$ 11,142,204	\$ 91,808,678	\$ 778,568,084	\$ 13,857,985	\$ 33,527,347	\$ 610,524,397	\$ 10,230,000	\$ 7,235,935	\$ 2,794,000	\$ 1,607,701,210	100%
% of Total Resources	3.0%	0.7%	5.7%	48.4%	0.9%	2.1%	38.0%	0.6%	0.5%	0.2%	100%	

% of Resources not Regionally Allocated:

5.6%

## 2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	3.2%	3.4%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,401,686	-	-	-0.2%	-3.1%	\$ 38,101	\$ 156,314	\$ 156,314
2	2.4%	1.9%	0.4%	0.4%	6.3%	(177,667)	780,765	(43,723)	(43,723)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	24.5%	23.9%	0.6%	0.6%	9.3%	(260,424)	9,694,986	(542,919)	(260,424)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	3.9%	3.8%	0.1%	0.1%	1.8%	(51,695)	1,551,111	(86,862)	(51,695)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	4.5%	2.9%	1.6%	1.6%	22.4%	(631,255)	1,179,045	(66,027)	(66,027)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	25.4%	23.1%	2.3%	2.3%	33.6%	(944,603)	9,371,563	(524,808)	(524,808)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	8.8%	7.2%	1.6%	1.6%	22.9%	(645,739)	2,916,453	(163,321)	(163,321)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	4.5%	4.7%	-0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,898,149	-	-	-0.2%	-2.6%	\$ 31,330	\$ 211,679	\$ 205,256
9	8.6%	8.4%	0.3%	0.3%	3.6%	(102,542)	3,409,741	(190,946)	(102,542)	0.0%	0.0%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	3.2%	3.3%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,330,158	-	-	-0.1%	-0.7%	\$ 8,970	\$ 148,337	\$ 58,764
11	5.5%	11.2%	-5.7%	0.0%	0.0%	-	4,551,199	-	-	-5.7%	-82.0%	\$ 994,561	\$ 507,543	\$ 507,543
12	1.5%	1.9%	-0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	-	788,172	-	-	-0.4%	-6.0%	\$ 72,405	\$ 87,896	\$ 87,896
13	4.0%	4.3%	-0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	-	1,764,417	-	-	-0.4%	-5.5%	\$ 67,172	\$ 196,765	\$ 196,765
Ttl.	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	6.9%	100.0%	(2,813,925)	40,637,446	(1,618,605)	(1,212,539)	-6.9%	-100.0%	\$ 1,212,539	\$ 4,531,832	\$ 1,212,539

State Resource Difference: 6.9%  
 Total RAF Funding: 40,637,446  
 State Over Allocated Resource Amount: (2,813,925)  
 Regional Resource Funding Adjustment Limit: 5.6%

State Under Allocated Resource Amount



**2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	\$ 1,401,686	\$ 156,314	\$ 1,558,000	3.8%
2	Abilene	\$ 780,765	\$ (43,723)	\$ 737,042	1.8%
3	Dallas/Fort Worth	\$ 9,694,986	\$ (260,424)	\$ 9,434,562	23.2%
4	Tyler	\$ 1,551,111	\$ (51,695)	\$ 1,499,416	3.7%
5	Beaumont	\$ 1,179,045	\$ (66,027)	\$ 1,113,019	2.7%
6	Houston	\$ 9,371,563	\$ (524,808)	\$ 8,846,755	21.8%
7	Austin/Round Rock	\$ 2,916,453	\$ (163,321)	\$ 2,753,132	6.8%
8	Waco	\$ 1,898,149	\$ 205,256	\$ 2,103,405	5.2%
9	San Antonio	\$ 3,409,741	\$ (102,542)	\$ 3,307,200	8.1%
10	Corpus Christi	\$ 1,330,158	\$ 58,764	\$ 1,388,922	3.4%
11	Brownsville/Harlingen	\$ 4,551,199	\$ 507,543	\$ 5,058,743	12.4%
12	San Angelo	\$ 788,172	\$ 87,896	\$ 876,067	2.2%
13	El Paso	\$ 1,764,417	\$ 196,765	\$ 1,961,182	4.8%
Ttl.		\$ 40,637,446	\$ -	\$ 40,637,446	100%

## 2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	\$ 1,558,000	\$ 779,000	41,503	42%	\$ 329,171	56,715	58%	\$ 449,829
2	\$ 737,042	\$ 368,521	30,027	53%	\$ 193,926	27,034	47%	\$ 174,595
3	\$ 9,434,562	\$ 4,717,281	52,069	9%	\$ 438,248	508,395	91%	\$ 4,279,033
4	\$ 1,499,416	\$ 749,708	51,734	61%	\$ 454,056	33,686	39%	\$ 295,653
5	\$ 1,113,019	\$ 556,509	39,783	54%	\$ 300,475	33,899	46%	\$ 256,034
6	\$ 8,846,755	\$ 4,423,378	45,883	8%	\$ 347,296	538,512	92%	\$ 4,076,081
7	\$ 2,753,132	\$ 1,376,566	16,309	12%	\$ 167,183	117,979	88%	\$ 1,209,383
8	\$ 2,103,405	\$ 1,051,703	26,789	22%	\$ 234,235	93,493	78%	\$ 817,468
9	\$ 3,307,200	\$ 1,653,600	28,919	12%	\$ 202,434	207,309	88%	\$ 1,451,165
10	\$ 1,388,922	\$ 694,461	47,984	47%	\$ 323,745	54,946	53%	\$ 370,716
11	\$ 5,058,743	\$ 2,529,371	153,405	35%	\$ 877,235	288,914	65%	\$ 1,652,136
12	\$ 876,067	\$ 438,034	21,395	35%	\$ 154,152	39,400	65%	\$ 283,881
13	\$ 1,961,182	\$ 980,591	17,189	11%	\$ 105,132	143,138	89%	\$ 875,460
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 20,318,723	572,989	21%	\$ 4,127,288	2,143,421	79%	\$ 16,191,435

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	\$ 1,558,000	\$ 560,880	6,168	24%	\$ 137,113	19,064	76%	\$ 423,767
2	\$ 737,042	\$ 265,335	4,975	37%	\$ 98,827	8,382	63%	\$ 166,508
3	\$ 9,434,562	\$ 3,396,442	13,433	7%	\$ 233,435	182,009	93%	\$ 3,163,007
4	\$ 1,499,416	\$ 539,790	10,701	52%	\$ 282,104	9,775	48%	\$ 257,686
5	\$ 1,113,019	\$ 400,687	8,710	54%	\$ 216,690	7,396	46%	\$ 183,996
6	\$ 8,846,755	\$ 3,184,832	10,103	7%	\$ 215,263	139,375	93%	\$ 2,969,569
7	\$ 2,753,132	\$ 991,128	4,206	6%	\$ 61,899	63,141	94%	\$ 929,228
8	\$ 2,103,405	\$ 757,226	4,751	13%	\$ 95,005	33,116	87%	\$ 662,221
9	\$ 3,307,200	\$ 1,190,592	5,739	10%	\$ 122,694	49,947	90%	\$ 1,067,898
10	\$ 1,388,922	\$ 500,012	5,535	29%	\$ 146,224	13,392	71%	\$ 353,788
11	\$ 5,058,743	\$ 1,821,147	6,354	25%	\$ 449,839	19,371	75%	\$ 1,371,308
12	\$ 876,067	\$ 315,384	2,344	21%	\$ 65,172	9,001	79%	\$ 250,213
13	\$ 1,961,182	\$ 706,026	986	5%	\$ 34,003	19,493	95%	\$ 672,022
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 14,629,481	84,007	13%	\$ 2,158,268	573,463	87%	\$ 12,471,212

## 2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

### 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	\$ 1,558,000	\$ 186,960	2,195	40%	\$ 74,868	3,286	60%	\$ 112,093
2	\$ 737,042	\$ 88,445	868	40%	\$ 35,777	1,278	60%	\$ 52,668
3	\$ 9,434,562	\$ 1,132,147	3,539	4%	\$ 49,628	77,189	96%	\$ 1,082,519
4	\$ 1,499,416	\$ 179,930	2,198	53%	\$ 95,822	1,929	47%	\$ 84,108
5	\$ 1,113,019	\$ 133,562	1,730	49%	\$ 65,842	1,779	51%	\$ 67,720
6	\$ 8,846,755	\$ 1,061,611	3,640	4%	\$ 45,673	80,976	96%	\$ 1,015,937
7	\$ 2,753,132	\$ 330,376	1,317	8%	\$ 26,682	14,988	92%	\$ 303,693
8	\$ 2,103,405	\$ 252,409	1,375	18%	\$ 46,624	6,070	82%	\$ 205,785
9	\$ 3,307,200	\$ 396,864	1,504	8%	\$ 30,116	18,311	92%	\$ 366,748
10	\$ 1,388,922	\$ 166,671	2,269	36%	\$ 60,344	3,998	64%	\$ 106,327
11	\$ 5,058,743	\$ 607,049	6,092	23%	\$ 142,027	19,946	77%	\$ 465,023
12	\$ 876,067	\$ 105,128	826	30%	\$ 31,112	1,964	70%	\$ 74,016
13	\$ 1,961,182	\$ 235,342	484	4%	\$ 10,056	10,837	96%	\$ 225,286
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 4,876,494	28,036	10%	\$ 714,569	242,553	90%	\$ 4,161,924

### 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	\$ 1,558,000	\$ 31,160	263	27%	\$ 8,417	711	73%	\$ 22,743
2	\$ 737,042	\$ 14,741	238	43%	\$ 6,283	321	57%	\$ 8,458
3	\$ 9,434,562	\$ 188,691	733	11%	\$ 19,890	6,220	89%	\$ 168,802
4	\$ 1,499,416	\$ 29,988	465	50%	\$ 15,051	462	50%	\$ 14,937
5	\$ 1,113,019	\$ 22,260	333	48%	\$ 10,758	356	52%	\$ 11,502
6	\$ 8,846,755	\$ 176,935	436	7%	\$ 11,594	6,214	93%	\$ 165,341
7	\$ 2,753,132	\$ 55,063	262	12%	\$ 6,540	1,942	88%	\$ 48,523
8	\$ 2,103,405	\$ 42,068	191	20%	\$ 8,345	771	80%	\$ 33,723
9	\$ 3,307,200	\$ 66,144	276	14%	\$ 9,305	1,683	86%	\$ 56,839
10	\$ 1,388,922	\$ 27,778	326	40%	\$ 11,226	481	60%	\$ 16,553
11	\$ 5,058,743	\$ 101,175	1,595	40%	\$ 40,365	2,403	60%	\$ 60,810
12	\$ 876,067	\$ 17,521	125	20%	\$ 3,439	513	80%	\$ 14,082
13	\$ 1,961,182	\$ 39,224	103	9%	\$ 3,370	1,098	91%	\$ 35,854
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	\$ 812,749	5,346	19%	\$ 154,584	23,174	81%	\$ 658,165

## 2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula

### 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	\$ 1,558,000				\$ 549,569	35.3%		\$ 1,008,431	64.7%
2	\$ 737,042				\$ 334,812	45.4%		\$ 402,230	54.6%
3	\$ 9,434,562				\$ 741,201	7.9%		\$ 8,693,362	92.1%
4	\$ 1,499,416				\$ 847,032	56.5%		\$ 652,384	43.5%
5	\$ 1,113,019				\$ 593,765	53.3%		\$ 519,253	46.7%
6	\$ 8,846,755				\$ 619,826	7.0%		\$ 8,226,929	93.0%
7	\$ 2,753,132				\$ 262,305	9.5%		\$ 2,490,827	90.5%
8	\$ 2,103,405				\$ 384,209	18.3%		\$ 1,719,197	81.7%
9	\$ 3,307,200				\$ 364,549	11.0%		\$ 2,942,651	89.0%
10	\$ 1,388,922				\$ 541,539	39.0%		\$ 847,383	61.0%
11	\$ 5,058,743				\$ 1,509,466	29.8%		\$ 3,549,276	70.2%
12	\$ 876,067				\$ 253,875	29.0%		\$ 622,193	71.0%
13	\$ 1,961,182				\$ 152,561	7.8%		\$ 1,808,622	92.2%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446				\$ 7,154,708	17.6%		\$ 33,482,738	82.4%



**2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	\$ 17,915,732	\$ 34,039,778	\$ 51,955,510	34.5%	65.5%
2	\$ 22,909,916	\$ 14,571,785	\$ 37,481,701	61.1%	38.9%
3	\$ 30,705,941	\$ 349,581,681	\$ 380,287,622	8.1%	91.9%
4	\$ 46,023,436	\$ 17,386,907	\$ 63,410,344	72.6%	27.4%
5	\$ 42,464,006	\$ 35,527,627	\$ 77,991,633	54.4%	45.6%
6	\$ 32,967,870	\$ 403,778,842	\$ 436,746,711	7.5%	92.5%
7	\$ 23,283,359	\$ 103,644,308	\$ 126,927,667	18.3%	81.7%
8	\$ 14,675,659	\$ 57,542,547	\$ 72,218,205	20.3%	79.7%
9	\$ 15,916,223	\$ 127,254,131	\$ 143,170,355	11.1%	88.9%
10	\$ 24,284,629	\$ 27,515,648	\$ 51,800,277	46.9%	53.1%
11	\$ 21,753,813	\$ 66,989,164	\$ 88,742,977	24.5%	75.5%
12	\$ 8,567,100	\$ 19,304,214	\$ 27,871,314	30.7%	69.3%
13	\$ 1,615,750	\$ 61,931,092	\$ 63,546,843	2.5%	97.5%
<b>Ttl.</b>	<b>\$ 303,083,435</b>	<b>\$ 1,319,067,724</b>	<b>\$ 1,622,151,159</b>	<b>18.7%</b>	<b>81.3%</b>

**2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	\$ 1,558,000	34.5%	35.3%	-0.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	65.5%	64.7%	0.8%	\$ (12,326)	\$ 1,008,431	\$ (56,753)	\$ (12,326)
2	\$ 737,042	61.1%	45.4%	15.7%	\$ (115,690)	\$ 334,812	\$ (18,843)	\$ (18,843)	38.9%	54.6%	-15.7%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	\$ 9,434,562	8.1%	7.9%	0.2%	\$ (20,584)	\$ 741,201	\$ (41,714)	\$ (20,584)	91.9%	92.1%	-0.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	\$ 1,499,416	72.6%	56.5%	16.1%	\$ (241,249)	\$ 847,032	\$ (47,670)	\$ (47,670)	27.4%	43.5%	-16.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	\$ 1,113,019	54.4%	53.3%	1.1%	\$ (12,239)	\$ 593,765	\$ (33,416)	\$ (12,239)	45.6%	46.7%	-1.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6	\$ 8,846,755	7.5%	7.0%	0.5%	\$ (47,972)	\$ 619,826	\$ (34,883)	\$ (34,883)	92.5%	93.0%	-0.5%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	\$ 2,753,132	18.3%	9.5%	8.8%	\$ (242,724)	\$ 262,305	\$ (14,762)	\$ (14,762)	81.7%	90.5%	-8.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8	\$ 2,103,405	20.3%	18.3%	2.1%	\$ (43,230)	\$ 384,209	\$ (21,623)	\$ (21,623)	79.7%	81.7%	-2.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9	\$ 3,307,200	11.1%	11.0%	0.1%	\$ (3,112)	\$ 364,549	\$ (20,516)	\$ (3,112)	88.9%	89.0%	-0.1%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10	\$ 1,388,922	46.9%	39.0%	7.9%	\$ (109,606)	\$ 541,539	\$ (30,477)	\$ (30,477)	53.1%	61.0%	-7.9%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	\$ 5,058,743	24.5%	29.8%	-5.3%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	75.5%	70.2%	5.3%	\$ (269,403)	\$ 3,549,276	\$ (199,747)	\$ (199,747)
12	\$ 876,067	30.7%	29.0%	1.8%	\$ (15,411)	\$ 253,875	\$ (14,288)	\$ (14,288)	69.3%	71.0%	-1.8%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13	\$ 1,961,182	2.5%	7.8%	-5.2%	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	97.5%	92.2%	5.2%	\$ (102,695)	\$ 1,808,622	\$ (101,786)	\$ (101,786)
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	18.7%	17.6%	1.1%	(851,816)	4,943,113	(278,190)	(218,478)	81.3%	82.4%	-1.1%	(384,424)	\$ 6,366,329	\$ (358,286)	(313,860)

Resource Funding Adjustment Limit:

**2010 Housing Tax Credit 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	\$ 1,558,000	35.3%	549,569	\$ 12,326	\$ 561,895	36.1%	64.7%	\$ 1,008,431	\$ (12,326)	\$ 996,105	63.9%
2	\$ 737,042	45.4%	334,812	\$ (18,843)	\$ 315,970	42.9%	54.6%	\$ 402,230	\$ 18,843	\$ 421,073	57.1%
3	\$ 9,434,562	7.9%	741,201	\$ (20,584)	\$ 720,617	7.6%	92.1%	\$ 8,693,362	\$ 20,584	\$ 8,713,945	92.4%
4	\$ 1,499,416	56.5%	847,032	\$ (47,670)	\$ 799,363	53.3%	43.5%	\$ 652,384	\$ 47,670	\$ 700,053	46.7%
5	\$ 1,113,019	53.3%	593,765	\$ (12,239)	\$ 581,526	52.2%	46.7%	\$ 519,253	\$ 12,239	\$ 531,492	47.8%
6	\$ 8,846,755	7.0%	619,826	\$ (34,883)	\$ 584,944	6.6%	93.0%	\$ 8,226,929	\$ 34,883	\$ 8,261,812	93.4%
7	\$ 2,753,132	9.5%	262,305	\$ (14,762)	\$ 247,543	9.0%	90.5%	\$ 2,490,827	\$ 14,762	\$ 2,505,589	91.0%
8	\$ 2,103,405	18.3%	384,209	\$ (21,623)	\$ 362,586	17.2%	81.7%	\$ 1,719,197	\$ 21,623	\$ 1,740,819	82.8%
9	\$ 3,307,200	11.0%	364,549	\$ (3,112)	\$ 361,437	10.9%	89.0%	\$ 2,942,651	\$ 3,112	\$ 2,945,762	89.1%
10	\$ 1,388,922	39.0%	541,539	\$ (30,477)	\$ 511,062	36.8%	61.0%	\$ 847,383	\$ 30,477	\$ 877,860	63.2%
11	\$ 5,058,743	29.8%	1,509,466	\$ 199,747	\$ 1,709,214	33.8%	70.2%	\$ 3,549,276	\$ (199,747)	\$ 3,349,529	66.2%
12	\$ 876,067	29.0%	253,875	\$ (14,288)	\$ 239,587	27.3%	71.0%	\$ 622,193	\$ 14,288	\$ 636,480	72.7%
13	\$ 1,961,182	7.8%	152,561	\$ 101,786	\$ 254,347	13.0%	92.2%	\$ 1,808,622	\$ (101,786)	\$ 1,706,835	87.0%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	17.6%	7,154,708	\$ 95,381	\$ 7,250,090	17.8%	82.4%	\$ 33,482,738	\$ (95,381)	\$ 33,387,356	82.2%

Rural Pct of State Allocation 15%

**2010 Housing Tax Credit Regional Allocation Formula**

**Table 10. Rural and Urban Area Funding Amount Adjusted for Rural Minimum**

Region	Regional Allocation		Adjusted for Minimum Regional Rural Amount				Adjusted for Minimum Statewide Rural Amount				
			Rural Areas		Urban Areas		Funds Reapplied to Rural	Rural Areas		Urban Areas	
	Region's Funding Amount	Regional Funding %	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban		Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Rural	Area's Funding Amount	Allocation % Urban
1	\$ 1,558,000	3.8%	\$ 561,895	36.1%	\$ 996,105	63.9%	\$ 41,910	\$ 603,804	38.8%	\$ 954,196	61.2%
2	\$ 737,042	1.8%	\$ 500,000	67.8%	\$ 237,042	32.2%	\$ 19,826	\$ 519,826	70.5%	\$ 217,216	29.5%
3	\$ 9,434,562	23.2%	\$ 720,617	7.6%	\$ 8,713,945	92.4%	\$ 253,786	\$ 974,403	10.3%	\$ 8,460,159	89.7%
4	\$ 1,499,416	3.7%	\$ 799,363	53.3%	\$ 700,053	46.7%	\$ 40,334	\$ 839,696	56.0%	\$ 659,720	44.0%
5	\$ 1,113,019	2.7%	\$ 581,526	52.2%	\$ 531,492	47.8%	\$ 29,940	\$ 611,466	54.9%	\$ 501,552	45.1%
6	\$ 8,846,755	21.8%	\$ 584,944	6.6%	\$ 8,261,812	93.4%	\$ 237,974	\$ 822,918	9.3%	\$ 8,023,837	90.7%
7	\$ 2,753,132	6.8%	\$ 500,000	18.2%	\$ 2,253,132	81.8%	\$ 74,058	\$ 574,058	20.9%	\$ 2,179,074	79.1%
8	\$ 2,103,405	5.2%	\$ 500,000	23.8%	\$ 1,603,405	76.2%	\$ 56,581	\$ 556,581	26.5%	\$ 1,546,825	73.5%
9	\$ 3,307,200	8.1%	\$ 500,000	15.1%	\$ 2,807,200	84.9%	\$ 88,962	\$ 588,962	17.8%	\$ 2,718,237	82.2%
10	\$ 1,388,922	3.4%	\$ 511,062	36.8%	\$ 877,860	63.2%	\$ 37,361	\$ 548,423	39.5%	\$ 840,499	60.5%
11	\$ 5,058,743	12.4%	\$ 1,709,214	33.8%	\$ 3,349,529	66.2%	\$ 136,078	\$ 1,845,292	36.5%	\$ 3,213,451	63.5%
12	\$ 876,067	2.2%	\$ 500,000	57.1%	\$ 376,067	42.9%	\$ 23,566	\$ 523,566	59.8%	\$ 352,502	40.2%
13	\$ 1,961,182	4.8%	\$ 500,000	25.5%	\$ 1,461,182	74.5%	\$ 52,755	\$ 552,755	28.2%	\$ 1,408,427	71.8%
Ttl.	\$ 40,637,446	100.0%	\$ 8,468,620	20.8%	\$ 32,168,826	79.2%	\$ 1,093,132	\$ 9,561,752	23.5%	\$ 31,075,694	76.5%

Rural Pct of State Allocation            17.7%    Rural Pct of State Allocation (Readjust)            20.0%  
 Difference Below Mandated 20%            2.3%  
 Funds Reapplied to Rural \$    1,093,132