

**LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable  
1992-2014**

Variable	1992-1994		1995-2014	
	Percent of Projects with Missing Data	Percent of Units with Missing Data	Percent of Projects with Missing Data	Percent of Units with Missing Data
Project Address <sup>a</sup>	4.5%	5.0%	1.3%	0.9%
Owner Contact Data	8.1%	8.4%	8.2%	6.9%
Total Units	0.6%	-	0.4%	-
Low Income Units	1.8%	2.9%	5.9%	6.1%
Number of Bedrooms <sup>b</sup>	28.9%	33.6%	13.4%	13.7%
Allocation Year	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Construction Type (new/rehab)	14.9%	17.2%	7.2%	8.4%
Credit Type	39.2%	40.9%	14.3%	14.6%
Nonprofit Sponsorship	21.5%	20.9%	12.8%	13.0%
Increase in Basis	29.1%	26.6%	12.5%	10.2%
Use of Tax-Exempt Bonds	17.6%	20.1%	7.6%	7.4%
Use of RHS Section 515	20.8%	18.8%	11.7%	12.7%

LIHTC = low-income housing tax credit. RHS = Rural Housing Service.

<sup>a</sup> Indicates only that some location was provided. Address may not be a complete street address.

<sup>b</sup> For some properties, bedroom count was provided for most but not all units, in which case data are not considered missing. The percent of units with missing bedroom count data is based on properties where no data were provided on bedroom count.

**LIHTC Database: Percent Missing Data by Variable  
For 2006 New Data Elements  
2006-2014**

	<b>Percent of Projects with Missing Data</b>	<b>Percent of Units with Missing Data</b>
Annual LIHTC Allocation Amount	18.3%	18.2%
Elected Set-Aside (50 Percent or 60 Percent of AMGI)	17.1%	16.0%
Set-Aside of Units with Rents Below the Elected Set-Aside	21.7%	23.6%
Amount of HOME Funding <sup>a</sup>	16.1%	17.9%
Amount of CDBG Funding <sup>a</sup>	18.0%	18.9%
Amount of HOPE VI Funding <sup>a</sup>	39.1%	39.6%
FHA Loan Number <sup>b</sup>	100.0%	100.0%
Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract	24.6%	29.4%

<sup>a</sup> Percent missing funding amounts are based on the number of projects and number of units indicated to have received funding from that source (HOME, CDBG, or HOPE VI).

<sup>b</sup> Percent missing the FHA loan number is based on the projects and number of units indicated to have received an FHA-insured loan.

## Characteristics of LIHTC Projects 1995-2014

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	All Projects 1995-2014	
Number of Projects	1,567	1,440	1,382	1,373	1,617	1,415	1,499	1,425	1,598	1,621	1,662	1,640	1,665	1,438	1,178	1,167	1,607	1,352	1,117	685	28,448	
Number of Units	91,052	92,787	92,652	96,693	125,201	107,890	113,736	119,584	136,209	139,498	135,429	135,062	135,191	110,035	92,290	89,368	124,113	98,483	73,213	42,883	2,151,369	
Average Project Size Distribution																						
0-10 Units	13.1%	13.7%	7.8%	7.1%	5.7%	5.9%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	4.5%	4.8%	2.1%	3.2%	2.2%	3.3%	2.1%	4.9%	4.1%	1.9%	2.0%	5.2%	
11-20 Units	11.9%	11.5%	12.0%	10.9%	11.8%	11.0%	10.0%	9.3%	7.5%	8.2%	7.5%	6.1%	5.8%	5.7%	5.9%	5.8%	5.0%	4.8%	4.4%	4.1%	8.1%	
21-50 Units	40.8%	36.2%	40.3%	39.9%	36.6%	34.0%	39.5%	34.0%	33.6%	32.8%	33.8%	36.0%	36.0%	38.9%	36.8%	41.6%	38.3%	37.2%	43.7%	40.1%	37.2%	
51-99 Units	17.4%	18.4%	19.4%	21.0%	21.2%	23.3%	22.2%	23.8%	24.9%	23.2%	25.9%	28.0%	27.6%	31.6%	29.9%	28.9%	31.9%	32.5%	31.1%	30.9%	25.4%	
100+ Units	16.8%	20.2%	20.5%	21.0%	24.8%	25.9%	23.9%	28.8%	30.2%	31.3%	28.0%	27.7%	27.4%	21.6%	24.1%	21.6%	20.0%	21.4%	18.9%	22.8%	24.1%	
Average Qualifying Ratio Distribution																						
0-20%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
21-40%	0.9%	1.5%	1.1%	1.6%	1.2%	1.0%	0.8%	1.6%	0.8%	1.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.8%	1.2%	1.2%	1.8%	1.6%	1.6%	0.2%	0.4%	1.1%	
41-60%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%	2.6%	3.3%	3.1%	2.6%	3.7%	1.8%	2.8%	2.4%	3.1%	1.8%	1.2%	1.0%	0.7%	1.1%	0.9%	1.1%	1.0%	2.0%	
61-80%	1.6%	2.7%	4.4%	5.7%	7.1%	7.3%	9.8%	11.1%	11.5%	9.6%	8.5%	6.4%	5.0%	4.8%	6.3%	4.5%	2.6%	2.5%	2.5%	4.0%	6.1%	
81-90%	1.9%	1.3%	2.0%	2.4%	2.3%	3.6%	5.1%	6.9%	5.2%	6.1%	4.6%	4.8%	4.7%	3.3%	2.4%	2.8%	3.1%	3.2%	2.6%	3.6%	3.7%	
91-95%	1.9%	1.6%	1.5%	1.8%	3.0%	3.6%	3.3%	2.1%	2.2%	2.7%	2.4%	2.8%	2.8%	2.6%	2.7%	3.0%	2.1%	2.2%	2.5%	2.7%	2.5%	
96-100%	91.7%	90.7%	88.5%	85.8%	83.0%	81.3%	78.4%	74.5%	78.5%	77.3%	81.4%	84.5%	84.8%	86.9%	86.3%	87.3%	89.4%	89.7%	91.0%	88.4%	84.6%	
Average Bedrooms Distribution																						
0 Bedroom	3.9%	4.1%	4.7%	3.2%	4.3%	3.6%	3.2%	4.0%	5.5%	4.6%	4.6%	4.4%	4.8%	6.0%	7.0%	8.6%	5.7%	7.1%	7.2%	5.2%	4.9%	
1 Bedroom	30.5%	27.6%	29.8%	28.8%	27.5%	30.7%	29.1%	30.0%	32.2%	31.0%	33.1%	34.7%	37.2%	34.3%	36.1%	36.1%	34.2%	35.1%	37.9%	36.2%	32.4%	
2 Bedroom	43.0%	45.0%	42.1%	43.1%	43.3%	42.9%	43.2%	42.5%	40.6%	41.4%	39.0%	38.5%	37.7%	37.0%	36.9%	35.7%	39.7%	37.2%	36.6%	37.0%	40.3%	
3 Bedroom	20.4%	20.3%	20.1%	21.9%	21.3%	20.5%	21.2%	21.0%	19.3%	19.4%	20.0%	19.6%	17.7%	19.6%	17.0%	16.8%	17.6%	18.3%	15.8%	18.8%	19.4%	
≥4 Bedroom	2.1%	2.9%	3.3%	3.0%	3.6%	2.3%	3.3%	2.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	2.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.9%	2.8%	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%	2.9%	

Notes: The dataset includes 28,448 projects and 2,151,369 units placed in service between 1995 and 2014. The average number of units per property and the distribution of property size are both calculated based on the 28,321 properties with a known number of units, and not the full universe of 28,448 properties. The database contains missing data for number of units (0.5%), qualifying ratio percentage of tax credit units (7.4%) and bedroom count (13.5%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Additional Characteristics of LIHTC Projects  
1995-2014**

Year Placed in Service	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	All Projects 1995-2014
Construction																					
New	67.9%	63.2%	59.7%	63.1%	62.2%	60.8%	57.6%	61.5%	64.3%	63.1%	64.4%	61.1%	60.4%	61.1%	62.3%	60.4%	59.1%	60.8%	58.5%	57.6%	61.7%
Rehab	29.2%	32.9%	34.7%	33.5%	33.5%	36.5%	37.6%	33.9%	33.0%	32.7%	31.1%	34.6%	35.4%	34.8%	32.3%	36.1%	36.8%	33.1%	37.6%	40.1%	34.2%
Both	2.8%	3.8%	5.6%	3.5%	4.3%	2.7%	4.7%	4.6%	2.7%	4.2%	4.5%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	5.4%	3.5%	4.1%	6.1%	3.9%	2.3%	4.1%
Nonprofit Sponsor	13.9%	18.9%	24.0%	25.4%	25.9%	24.8%	27.4%	23.4%	23.0%	25.1%	24.4%	28.0%	29.2%	29.6%	30.8%	29.7%	29.3%	33.7%	40.6%	32.4%	26.4%
RHS Section 514, 515, or 538	17.5%	11.4%	10.4%	8.7%	8.2%	7.0%	7.6%	5.7%	4.2%	6.8%	3.6%	5.8%	7.1%	6.4%	6.6%	8.5%	8.1%	7.0%	8.3%	11.2%	7.9%
Tax-Exempt Bonds	4.0%	6.3%	8.9%	14.4%	18.5%	24.0%	21.2%	27.0%	26.2%	27.2%	26.5%	25.6%	28.9%	26.4%	28.0%	27.6%	17.2%	20.3%	23.0%	20.3%	21.0%
Credit Type																					
30 Percent	26.1%	23.0%	25.4%	27.7%	33.1%	34.0%	32.5%	36.3%	36.5%	35.0%	33.3%	32.6%	32.2%	32.9%	31.7%	27.7%	19.6%	28.7%	28.8%	26.1%	30.4%
70 Percent	64.6%	64.4%	62.7%	58.5%	56.1%	54.3%	53.4%	49.5%	50.3%	52.6%	55.8%	53.4%	50.7%	51.2%	48.8%	51.7%	47.3%	48.2%	51.2%	55.2%	54.1%
Both	9.3%	12.6%	11.9%	13.6%	10.8%	11.7%	14.1%	14.2%	13.2%	12.5%	10.9%	14.0%	14.0%	15.5%	17.3%	14.5%	16.8%	16.8%	18.5%	17.7%	13.7%

LIHTC = low-income housing tax credit. RHS = Rural Housing Service.

Notes: The analysis data set includes 28,448 projects and 2,151,369 units placed in service between 1995 and 2014. The database contains missing data for construction type (7.7%), nonprofit sponsor (14.7%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (13.2%), bond financing (8.3%), and credit type (16.7%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Credit Type  
1995-2014**

Credit Type	Projects			Units		
	30%	70%	Both	30%	70%	Both
Construction Type						
New	49.3%	75.7%	34.3%	49.2%	76.1%	30.3%
Rehab	45.6%	21.2%	58.8%	47.7%	21.5%	64.0%
Both	5.1%	3.1%	6.8%	3.1%	2.4%	5.7%
RHS Section 514, 515, or 538	12.7%	4.7%	16.0%	4.2%	3.0%	8.8%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	68.5%	2.3%	3.9%	85.2%	3.7%	7.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 28,448 projects and 2,151,369 units placed in service between 1995 and 2014. The database contains missing data for construction type (7.7%), nonprofit sponsor (14.7%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (14.5%), bond financing (8.3%), and credit type (16.7%). When data are presented in a cross tabulation of two variables, the percentage of missing data may increase. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Characteristics of Specific LIHTC Property Types  
1995-2014**

	Type of LIHTC Project			All LIHTC Projects 1995-2014
	Nonprofit Sponsor	Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	RHS Section 514, 515, or 538	
Average Project Size (units)	60.1	134.9	36.9	76.0
Distribution by Project Size				
0-10 units	3.9%	1.0%	2.4%	5.2%
11-20 units	11.9%	2.7%	15.6%	8.1%
21-50 units	43.4%	16.8%	68.3%	37.2%
51-99 units	25.9%	24.7%	10.8%	25.4%
100+ units	14.9%	54.8%	2.8%	24.1%
Construction Type				
New	57.2%	49.7%	42.6%	61.7%
Rehab	34.6%	48.0%	55.7%	34.2%
Both	8.1%	2.3%	1.7%	4.1%
Average Qualifying Ratio	96.6%	93.7%	98.7%	95.7%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 28,448 projects and 2,151,369 units placed in service between 1995 and 2014. The database contains missing data for construction type (7.7%), nonprofit sponsor (14.7%), RHS Section 514, 515, or 538 (14.5%), bond financing (8.3%), and credit type (16.7%). When data are presented in a cross tabulation of two variables, the percentage of missing data may increase. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Percent of Projects Using Subsidy Sources Other than the LIHTC  
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2014**

<b>Number of Non-LIHTC Subsidy Sources</b>	<b>Percent of Projects</b>
0	64.0%
1	29.5%
2	5.5%
3	0.9%
4 or more	0.01%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 7,897 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2014 with complete data on the use of tax-exempt bonds, Section 514 loans, Section 515 loans, Section 538 loans, HOME funds, CDBG funds, FHA-insured loans, and whether the project was part of a HOPE VI development. Total may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

**Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Use of Additional Financing Sources  
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2014**

	<b>Tax-Exempt Bonds</b>	<b>RHS Section 514, 515, or 538 Loans</b>	<b>HOME Funds</b>	<b>CDBG Funds</b>	<b>FHA- Insured Loans</b>	<b>Part of HOPE VI Development</b>
All 2003-2014 Projects	25.0%	6.6%	21.6%	3.8%	1.8%	0.8%
Average Project Size	128.1	42.0	53.2	54.7	105.1	76.5
Distribution by Project Size						
0-10 Units	1.0%	1.1%	7.3%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%
11-20 Units	2.9%	10.9%	10.2%	13.2%	3.9%	1.3%
21-50 Units	19.0%	68.4%	45.3%	42.6%	23.6%	27.6%
51-99 Units	25.8%	16.1%	27.1%	25.2%	31.0%	52.6%
100+ Units	51.3%	3.6%	10.0%	11.7%	41.5%	18.4%
Average Qualifying Ratio	95.6%	98.6%	93.7%	93.2%	94.0%	91.8%
Construction Type						
New	47.5%	34.8%	62.4%	55.5%	36.0%	84.9%
Rehab	49.7%	62.2%	34.4%	42.4%	59.5%	9.6%
Both	2.8%	3.0%	3.3%	2.2%	4.5%	5.5%
Projects by Credit Type						
30%	91.4%	28.4%	19.6%	27.7%	59.6%	14.3%
70%	6.0%	40.2%	65.5%	60.4%	34.7%	70.0%
Both	2.4%	30.1%	14.5%	11.5%	5.8%	15.7%
Units by Credit Type						
30%	93.4%	31.2%	28.0%	34.3%	69.1%	16.4%
70%	4.1%	39.7%	57.0%	56.8%	26.4%	68.3%
Both	2.3%	27.5%	14.5%	8.5%	4.4%	15.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 16,730 projects placed in service between 2003 and 2014 with data on the use of the additional financing sources. The dataset is missing data on tax-exempt bonds (9.5%) and RHS Section 514,515,538 loans (14.5%). Data are missing or incomplete on the use of HOME funding (14.6%), CDBG funding (25.8%), FHA-Insured loans (25.9%), and whether or not an LIHTC project was part of a HOPE VI development (43.4%).—Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.



**Characteristics of LIHTC Projects by Specified Targeted Populations  
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2014**

	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
All 2003-2014 Projects	59.6%	32.9%	19.7%	8.9%	10.4%
Average Project Size	81.0	73.4	66.4	61.7	66.7
Distribution by Project Size					
0-10 units	1.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.8%	2.8%
11-20 units	6.4%	5.1%	5.3%	6.4%	5.5%
21-50 units	38.4%	40.3%	47.7%	46.6%	43.6%
51-99 units	29.5%	30.4%	28.9%	33.4%	28.9%
100+ units	24.7%	23.6%	17.3%	12.8%	19.3%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.0%	97.4%	98.4%	97.2%	96.9%
Construction Type					
New	64.0%	65.1%	69.7%	66.6%	61.1%
Rehab	31.7%	31.0%	26.1%	27.9%	32.4%
Both	4.3%	3.9%	4.2%	5.5%	6.5%
Projects by Credit Type					
30%	29.8%	31.0%	18.5%	20.3%	21.4%
70%	55.5%	50.6%	59.6%	72.2%	58.7%
Both	13.5%	17.4%	18.3%	6.7%	16.6%
Units by Credit Type					
30%	45.6%	43.5%	30.5%	32.3%	29.2%
70%	41.1%	40.0%	48.9%	60.0%	51.3%
Both	12.1%	15.6%	17.3%	7.1%	15.0%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 16,730 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2014 with data on whether or not the project was targeted for a specific population. Of these, 15,149 projects were targeted to a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

**LIHTC Projects Targeted to Specific Populations and  
Additional Financing Sources Use  
Projects Placed in Service 2003-2014**

Additional Financing Used	Project Targeted to:				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	25.5%	26.3%	13.4%	14.2%	17.3%
RHS Section 514, 515, or 538	7.2%	7.1%	6.3%	3.7%	5.5%
HOME Funds	21.4%	24.7%	22.1%	27.1%	22.5%
CDBG Funds	4.7%	4.2%	2.3%	5.6%	2.9%
FHA-Insured Loans	2.0%	2.4%	1.6%	1.4%	1.3%
Part of a HOPE VI Development	1.2%	0.5%	1.4%	1.3%	0.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 15,149 projects placed in service from 2003 to 2014 targeted for a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

**Distribution of Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit  
Projects Placed in Service 2006-2014**

	<b>Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated</b>	<b>Amount of HOME Funds</b>	<b>Amount of CDBG Funds</b>	<b>Amount of HOPE VI Funds</b>
Number of Projects with Funding	8,956	1,798	239	39
Number of Qualifying Units	648,844	91,545	12,268	2,861
Minimum	\$13	\$1	\$324	\$4,444
10th Percentile	\$2,740	\$6,033	\$2,500	\$7,173
25th Percentile	\$5,314	\$10,593	\$6,667	\$11,050
50th Percentile (Median)	\$9,731	\$18,750	\$13,703	\$26,117
Mean	\$10,987	\$33,861	\$18,810	\$45,807
75th Percentile	\$14,830	\$41,667	\$24,150	\$65,850
90th Percentile	\$20,000	\$89,286	\$36,429	\$97,483
Maximum	\$99,591	\$284,135	\$243,867	\$333,333

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 11,849 projects placed in service from 2006 to 2014. Qualifying units are the number of reported low income units. The dataset contains missing data for the number of low-income units (9.7%). These projects were excluded in this analysis.

**Average Funding Amount Per Tax Credit Qualifying Unit, By Project Characteristics  
Projects Placed in Service 2006-2014**

	Annual Amount of Tax Credits Allocated	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOME Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of CDBG Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects	Amount of HOPE VI Funds	Number of Projects	Pct of Projects
<b>Project Size</b>												
0-10 units	\$20,902	189	2.2%	\$109,815	119	5.5%	\$34,048	11	3.7%	-	0	0.0%
11-50 units	\$15,309	3,959	45.5%	\$32,306	1,172	54.1%	\$20,067	173	58.8%	\$37,639	18	28.1%
51-99 units	\$12,165	2,628	30.2%	\$28,260	652	30.1%	\$16,644	78	26.5%	\$51,197	34	53.1%
100+ units	\$7,188	1,931	22.2%	\$19,154	222	10.3%	\$17,498	32	10.9%	\$29,153	12	18.8%
<b>Construction</b>												
New	\$14,803	5,021	59.9%	\$31,571	1,305	63.2%	\$19,269	175	61.0%	\$43,262	55	87.3%
Rehab	\$8,726	2,973	35.5%	\$42,378	687	33.3%	\$19,314	107	37.3%	\$36,381	4	6.3%
Both	\$12,417	387	4.6%	\$27,835	73	3.5%	\$22,885	5	1.7%	\$71,514	4	6.3%
<b>Nonprofit Sponsor</b>												
Yes	\$12,604	2,556	32.8%	\$33,551	852	44.0%	\$18,055	190	66.9%	\$28,717	21	35.6%
No	\$12,897	5,239	67.2%	\$34,002	1,084	56.0%	\$17,953	94	33.1%	\$52,347	38	64.4%
<b>RHS Section 514, 515, or 538</b>												
Yes	\$12,449	641	8.1%	\$20,990	143	8.0%	\$23,323	23	8.1%	0	1	1.7%
No	\$12,665	7,282	91.9%	\$31,007	1,649	92.0%	\$19,194	260	91.9%	\$45,807	57	98.3%
<b>Tax-Exempt Bonds</b>												
Yes	\$6,950	2,295	28.0%	\$50,497	408	21.1%	\$22,720	79	27.6%	\$69,282	5	8.9%
No	\$14,893	5,903	72.0%	\$30,292	1,527	78.9%	\$17,835	207	72.4%	\$41,451	51	91.1%
<b>Credit Type</b>												
30 Percent	\$7,316	2,567	31.7%	\$45,967	421	20.5%	\$23,406	75	25.9%	\$69,055	8	13.1%
70 Percent	\$16,123	4,261	52.6%	\$36,067	1,340	65.2%	\$17,612	178	61.4%	\$41,011	44	72.1%
Both	\$11,329	1,277	15.8%	\$18,257	295	14.3%	\$19,166	37	12.8%	\$13,441	9	14.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 11,849 projects placed in service in 2006-2014. The dataset contains missing data for the number of units (0.9%), low-income units (9.7%), construction type (8.6%), nonprofit sponsor (16.7%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (15.2%), bond financing (10.9%), and credit type (14.9%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Additional Project Characteristics  
Projects Placed in Service 2006-2014**

	Percent of Projects
<b>Elected Rent/Income Ceiling</b>	
50% AMGI	9.3%
60% AMGI	90.7%
<b>Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling</b>	
Yes	63.0%
No	37.0%
<b>Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (Among Projects with Such Units)</b>	
Average	51.6%
0-10 percent	7.0%
10-25 percent	26.3%
25-50 percent	21.2%
50-75 percent	14.6%
75-90 percent	8.5%
90-100 percent	22.3%
<b>Federal or State Project-Based Rental Assistance Contract</b>	
Yes	33.2%
No	66.8%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 11,849 projects placed in service between 2006 and 2014. The dataset contains missing data for the designation of elected rent/income ceiling for low-income units (17.1%), whether there are units set aside with rents lower than elected rent/income ceiling (21.8%), and whether there is a federal/state projected-based rental assistance contract (24.7%). Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.

**Additional Project Characteristics, by Targeting Characteristics  
Projects Placed in Service 2006-2014**

	Project Targeted to				
	Families	Elderly	Disabled	Homeless	Other
Number of Projects	9,496	8,681	8,029	8,516	7,766
Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
50% AMGI	9.8%	9.2%	7.7%	11.9%	9.9%
60% AMGI	90.2%	90.8%	92.3%	88.1%	90.1%
Any Units Set Aside for Rents Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling					
Yes	69.4%	65.5%	69.9%	79.9%	71.4%
No	30.6%	34.5%	30.1%	20.1%	28.6%
Percent of Low-Income Units Set Aside Below Elected Rent/Income Ceiling (among Projects with Such Units)					
Average	52.6%	54.7%	56.9%	48.6%	65.0%
0-10 percent	6.8%	6.4%	3.1%	5.7%	3.1%
10-25 percent	27.4%	22.0%	26.2%	27.5%	19.2%
25-50 percent	18.5%	23.1%	20.4%	24.4%	12.3%
50-75 percent	14.4%	15.0%	11.9%	15.3%	18.0%
75-90 percent	9.8%	7.1%	10.0%	12.9%	7.9%
90-100 percent	23.2%	26.5%	28.3%	14.0%	39.5%
Federal or State Project-Base Rental Assistance Contract					
Yes	33.7%	36.9%	35.6%	53.4%	30.6%
No	66.3%	63.1%	64.4%	46.6%	69.4%

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 11,849 projects placed in service between 2006 and 2014. Of these, 10,722 projects were targeted to a specific population. Projects may be listed as targeted to more than one specified population.

**Percentage of Projects Placed in Service from Different Allocation Years  
1995-2014**

Year Tax Credit Allocated	Year Placed in Service																				
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	1993-2014
Pre-1993	1.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.07%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	2.7%	0.4%	0.0%	5.4%
1993	33.8%	2.3%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.09%	0.1%	0.4%	0.09%	0.3%	4.6%
1994	46.3%	42.1%	1.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.1%	0.07%	0.1%	0.06%	0.2%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09%	0.0%	0.8%	0.09%	0.0%	5.5%
1995	16.0%	38.3%	37.9%	2.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.07%	0.07%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.09%	0.0%	4.4%
1996	1.7%	13.5%	38.9%	35.3%	4.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.07%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.1%	4.3%
1997	0.0%	1.7%	16.5%	37.9%	35.9%	3.0%	0.1%	0.07%	0.06%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
1998	0.1%	0.3%	2.5%	16.6%	36.5%	34.4%	1.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.1%	4.5%
1999	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%	4.0%	14.3%	39.9%	33.6%	2.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.06%	0.0%	0.06%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.09%	0.3%	4.6%
2000	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.9%	5.6%	15.1%	39.7%	32.0%	1.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%
2001	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	1.1%	3.9%	16.0%	38.5%	38.8%	3.0%	0.8%	0.06%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.09%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
2002	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	1.9%	5.9%	17.0%	31.0%	37.6%	4.2%	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
2003	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	6.0%	14.3%	32.9%	39.6%	6.8%	0.3%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.09%	0.0%	5.3%
2004	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	1.4%	10.3%	13.4%	32.1%	37.9%	3.9%	0.6%	0.08%	0.3%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%
2005	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.1%	1.1%	7.3%	11.3%	28.8%	34.4%	5.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%
2006	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	0.3%	1.0%	4.8%	12.5%	31.1%	35.5%	7.8%	1.7%	0.5%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	4.7%
2007	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.1%	1.7%	7.8%	15.1%	31.9%	31.3%	6.9%	1.2%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	4.3%
2008	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.06%	0.2%	2.8%	2.4%	9.7%	12.5%	36.1%	32.0%	8.7%	0.8%	0.09%	0.0%	4.4%
2009	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	2.3%	8.1%	11.4%	32.7%	36.3%	3.9%	0.3%	0.0%	4.3%
2010	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	6.8%	14.5%	32.9%	35.2%	4.8%	1.9%	4.3%
2011	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.3%	1.1%	6.2%	8.7%	32.5%	35.3%	5.7%	3.5%
2012	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.08%	0.7%	6.8%	8.1%	36.3%	41.2%	3.0%
2013 skip	0.0%	0.0%	0.07%	0.07%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	5.3%	9.0%	32.1%	1.3%
2014 or later	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.06%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.06%	0.3%	4.6%	13.1%	0.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Notes: The analysis dataset includes 28,448 projects and 2,151,369 units placed in service between 1995 and 2014. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding. Projects with allocation year later than placed in service year are primarily bond projects that allocating agencies have reported received tax credits after being placed in service.

**Characteristics of LIHTC Properties Over Time:  
1992-1994 Compared to Subsequent Years**

Year Place in Service	1992-1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Annual Number of Projects <sup>a</sup>	4,065	1,567	1,440	1,382	1,373	1,617	1,415	1,499	1,425	1,598	1,621	1,662	1,640	1,665	1,438	1,178	1,167	1,607	1,352	1,117	685
Annual Number of Units <sup>a</sup>	171,338	91,052	92,787	92,652	96,693	125,201	107,890	113,736	119,584	136,209	139,498	135,429	135,062	135,191	110,035	92,290	89,368	124,113	98,483	73,213	42,883
Annual Number of Low Income Units <sup>a</sup>	157,227	83,599	84,535	81,886	83,435	111,378	97,014	100,662	104,256	120,876	120,552	120,488	121,234	121,262	93,514	77,310	74,225	105,137	82,376	62,725	36,977
Average Project Size (units)	42.3	58.2	64.5	67.2	70.4	77.6	76.5	76.0	84.0	85.3	86.2	81.6	82.5	81.4	76.5	78.5	76.8	77.6	73.7	66.6	67.4
Distribution by Size																					
0-10 Units	22.0%	13.1%	13.7%	7.8%	7.0%	5.7%	5.8%	4.3%	4.0%	3.8%	4.5%	4.8%	2.1%	3.2%	2.2%	3.3%	2.1%	4.9%	4.1%	1.8%	2.0%
11-50 Units	54.9%	52.7%	47.7%	52.3%	50.8%	48.4%	45.0%	49.6%	43.4%	41.1%	41.0%	41.2%	42.1%	41.8%	44.6%	42.7%	47.4%	43.2%	42.0%	48.1%	44.2%
51-99 Units	13.2%	17.4%	18.4%	19.4%	21.0%	21.2%	23.3%	22.2%	23.8%	24.9%	23.2%	25.9%	28.0%	27.6%	31.6%	29.9%	28.9%	31.9%	32.5%	31.2%	30.9%
100+ Units	9.9%	16.8%	20.2%	20.5%	21.0%	24.8%	26.0%	23.9%	28.8%	30.2%	31.3%	28.0%	27.7%	27.4%	21.6%	24.1%	21.6%	20.0%	21.4%	18.9%	22.8%
Average Bedrooms	1.85	1.91	1.96	1.92	1.96	1.95	1.90	1.92	1.90	1.87	1.95	1.91	1.90	1.85	1.84	1.81	1.77	1.80	1.77	1.77	1.77
Distribution																					
0 Bedrooms	5.8%	3.9%	4.1%	4.7%	3.2%	4.3%	3.6%	3.2%	4.0%	5.5%	4.6%	4.6%	4.4%	4.8%	6.0%	7.0%	8.6%	5.7%	7.1%	7.2%	5.2%
1 Bedroom	38.1%	30.5%	27.6%	29.8%	28.8%	27.5%	30.7%	29.1%	30.0%	32.2%	31.0%	33.1%	34.7%	37.2%	34.4%	36.1%	36.1%	34.2%	35.1%	37.9%	36.2%
2 Bedrooms	39.0%	43.0%	45.0%	42.1%	43.1%	43.3%	42.9%	43.2%	42.5%	40.6%	41.4%	39.0%	38.5%	37.7%	37.0%	36.9%	35.7%	39.7%	37.2%	36.6%	37.0%
3 Bedroom	15.7%	20.4%	20.3%	20.1%	21.9%	21.3%	20.5%	21.2%	21.0%	19.3%	19.4%	20.0%	19.6%	17.7%	19.6%	17.0%	16.8%	17.6%	18.3%	15.8%	18.8%
4+ Bedrooms	1.4%	2.1%	2.9%	3.3%	3.0%	3.6%	2.3%	3.3%	2.7%	2.5%	3.6%	3.4%	2.7%	2.6%	2.9%	3.1%	2.9%	2.9%	2.3%	2.4%	2.7%
Average Qualifying Ratio	97.5%	97.4%	96.7%	96.2%	95.4%	94.8%	94.8%	94.4%	92.8%	94.4%	93.8%	95.2%	96.5%	96.1%	96.4%	96.1%	96.3%	96.8%	96.9%	97.8%	97.3%
Distribution of Projects by Construction Type																					
New	63.9%	67.9%	63.2%	59.7%	63.1%	62.2%	60.8%	57.6%	61.5%	64.2%	63.1%	64.4%	61.1%	60.4%	61.1%	62.3%	60.4%	59.1%	60.8%	58.5%	57.6%
Rehab	32.9%	29.2%	32.9%	34.7%	33.5%	33.5%	36.5%	37.6%	33.9%	33.0%	32.7%	31.1%	34.6%	35.4%	34.8%	32.3%	36.1%	36.8%	33.1%	37.6%	40.1%
Both	3.2%	2.8%	3.8%	5.6%	3.5%	4.3%	2.7%	4.7%	4.6%	2.7%	4.2%	4.5%	4.4%	4.2%	4.0%	5.4%	3.5%	4.1%	6.1%	3.9%	2.3%
Nonprofit Sponsor	13.7%	13.9%	18.9%	24.0%	25.4%	25.9%	24.8%	27.4%	23.4%	23.0%	25.1%	24.4%	28.0%	29.2%	29.7%	30.8%	29.7%	29.3%	33.7%	40.6%	32.4%
RHS Section 514, 515, or 538	26.6%	17.5%	11.4%	10.4%	8.7%	8.2%	7.0%	7.6%	5.7%	4.2%	6.8%	3.6%	5.8%	7.1%	6.3%	6.6%	8.5%	8.1%	7.0%	8.3%	11.2%
Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2.5%	4.0%	6.3%	8.9%	14.4%	18.5%	24.0%	21.2%	27.0%	26.2%	27.2%	26.5%	25.6%	28.9%	26.4%	27.9%	27.6%	17.2%	20.3%	23.0%	20.3%

<sup>a</sup> Average for 1992, 1993, and 1994.

Notes: For projects placed in service between 1992 and 1994, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (28.9%), qualifying ratio (2.3%), construction type (14.9%), nonprofit sponsor (21.5%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (26.2%), and bond financing (17.6%). For projects placed in service between 1995 and 2014, the database contains missing data for bedroom count (13.5%), qualifying ratio (7.4%), construction type (7.7%), nonprofit sponsor (14.7%), RHS Section 514, 515, 538 (13.0%), and bond financing (8.3%). Qualifying ratio is a simple average of the qualifying ratio of projects. Totals may not sum to 100 percent because of rounding.