

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
<b>AL</b>							
Birmingham	formerly homeless, disabled, vets	47	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Birmingham	ACC	200	\$23,000,000	\$32,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Yes
Mobile	Not specified	92	\$10,400,000	\$13,000,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Mobile	ACC	87	\$13,500,000	\$15,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Yes
Selma	Family	12	\$685,000	\$720,000	80%	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>\$54,585,000</b>	<b>\$67,720,000</b>			
<b>AR</b>							
Mountain View	Senior Housing	37	\$1,800,000	\$3,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Mountain View	Senior Housing	48	\$1,600,000	\$3,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>\$3,400,000</b>	<b>\$6,700,000</b>			
<b>AZ</b>							
Nogales	Senior Housing	40	\$10,361,500	\$10,966,500	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Superior	Senior Housing	42	\$2,500,000	\$4,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>\$12,861,500</b>	<b>\$15,266,500</b>			
<b>CA</b>							
Alameda	homeless	168	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Anaheim	Family	46	\$8,262,743		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Anaheim	Family	146	\$6,486,480	\$11,108,693	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Anaheim	Large Family	53		\$18,810,192	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Anaheim	Large Family	33		\$11,659,285	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Anderson	Not specified	159	\$32,900,000	\$32,900,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Arvin	Family	51		\$8,213,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Atascadero	Senior	95	\$17,700,000	\$17,700,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Avenal	Family	40	\$5,100,000	\$5,100,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Azusa	Family	66	\$2,032,560	\$3,411,721	Unknown	No	Unknown
Bakersfield	Family	45	\$12,300,000	\$12,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Bakersfield	Large Family	65		\$14,886,642	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Bakersfield	Family	70	\$2,000,000	\$18,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Banning	Large Family	49		\$15,038,802	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Barstow	Large Family	73		\$15,769,911	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Berkeley	Rehab, Family	19		\$1,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Berkeley	Senior	60	\$1,100,000	\$2,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Berkeley	Formerly Homeless	35	\$1,250,000	\$2,340,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Berkeley	Homeless Youth	17		\$6,200,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Berkeley	Senior	42		\$13,400,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Berkeley	Rehab, Family	75		\$2,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Berkeley	Family	262	\$8,120,323	\$9,621,804	Unknown	No	Unknown
Berkeley	Rehab, Family	57		\$6,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Blythe	Senior	81	\$12,375,801		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Brawley	Senior	76	\$6,000,000	\$13,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Brawley	Large Family	61		\$12,408,298	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Calexico	Family	61	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Capitola	Senior	90	\$400,000	\$500,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Capitola	low, mod family	69	\$3,000,000	\$7,500,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Carson	Senior	85	\$2,917,406	\$29,026,304	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Castroville	Family	58	\$1,100,000	\$21,888,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Cathedral City	Large Family	60		\$15,214,254	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chico	Large Family	38		\$9,229,316	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chico	Large Family	90		\$21,562,088	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chino	Family	135	\$37,600,000	\$37,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chowchilla	Large Family	81		\$13,224,050	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chula Vista	Family	147	\$4,400,000	\$46,800,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Cloverdale	Large Family	45		\$15,993,474	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Concord	Family	48	\$1,600,000	\$8,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Crescent City	Large Family	63		\$13,995,538	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Davis	Family	69	\$929,551	\$961,049	Unknown	No	Unknown
Delano	Large Family	70		\$13,840,750	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Dinuba	Large Family	20		\$4,358,244	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Dinuba	Large Family	64		\$11,286,857	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
East Palo Alto	Family	55	\$2,064,160	\$19,569,258	Unknown	No	Unknown
El Centro	Family	72	\$1,000,000	\$16,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
El Centro	Family	275	\$47,000,000	\$47,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
El Cerrito	Family/Disabled	57	\$4,333,333	\$17,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
El Monte	Family	550	\$17,000,000	\$306,498,180	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Emeryville	Family	206	\$7,840,000	\$138,493,432	Unknown	No	Unknown
Escondido	Disabled/Family	8	\$1,700,000	\$2,200,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Escondido	Senior	61		\$16,377,935	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Fairfield	Family	91	\$3,152,240	\$9,029,791	Unknown	No	Unknown
Ferris	Family	76	\$10,700,000	\$10,700,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fresno	Family	133	\$2,704,530	\$5,039,696	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fresno	Family	61	\$10,000,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fresno	Family	120	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fresno	Family, Special Needs	464	\$15,000,000	\$95,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Fresno	Family	144	\$4,009,467	\$26,502,028	Unknown	No	Unknown
Fresno	Family	113	\$1,644,911	\$1,644,911	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fullerton	Family	68	\$2,030,400	\$22,224,562	Unknown	No	Unknown
Galt	Senior	81		\$20,480,461	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Gilroy	Family	81	\$27,500,000	\$27,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Grass Valley	Family	32	\$1,150,000	\$1,788,300	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Gridley	Senior	56	\$5,800,000	\$5,800,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Hanford	Large Family	49		\$10,505,065	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Healdsburg	Family	64	\$867,208	\$867,208	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Hercules	Family	300	\$2,271,968	\$118,306,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Hesperia	Family	67	\$3,500,000	\$18,365,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Huntington Park	Family	242	\$10,080,000	\$88,871,220	Unknown	No	Unknown
Huron	Large Family	81		\$14,777,285	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Inglewood	Large Family	20		\$8,643,896	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Irvine	Family	408	\$15,020,720	\$24,240,237	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Jackson Hill	80% Senior	86	\$1,900,000	\$5,622,480	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
La Quinta	Family	150	\$39,600,000	\$39,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lafayette	Senior	48	\$1,500,000	\$1,783,850	Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Lake Elsinore	Family	64	\$7,800,000	\$7,800,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lake Elsinore	Family	88	\$11,400,000	\$11,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lake Elsinore	Family	90	\$1,732,803	\$22,650,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lakeside	Family	80		\$24,900,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lemon Grove	Family	52	\$2,551,651	\$7,436,269	Unknown	No	Unknown
Linda	Large Family	69		\$14,620,022	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Lindsay	Family	19	\$7,866,988	\$14,468,240	Unknown	No	Unknown
Live Oak	Family	40	\$1,551,312	\$1,551,312	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Livermore	Family	804	\$23,771,689	\$34,491,920	Unknown	No	Unknown
Long Beach	Family	361	\$17,000,000	\$63,322,149	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Homeless, At risk, Low Income, co-occurring disorders, Mentally Ill	72	\$10,000,000	\$22,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Homeless, At risk, Low Income, co-occurring disorders, Mentally Ill	99	\$12,000,000	\$34,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Emancipated Foster Youth	27	\$5,700,000	\$11,300,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	60	\$1,800,000	\$27,426,224	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Large Family	29		\$5,980,399	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Los Angeles	Senior	104	\$6,529,408	\$33,335,015	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Not specified	51	\$12,712,392	\$22,818,702	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Los Angeles	Single Room	103		\$19,167,222	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	635	\$30,000,000	\$31,880,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	309	\$12,194,503	\$43,695,368	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Special Needs	4	\$350,000	\$1,500,000	35%	No	Unknown
Los Angeles	Not specified	24	\$6,992,569	\$10,362,903	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Los Angeles	Emancipated Foster Youth	40	\$6,700,000	\$15,200,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Homeless, Disabled	70	\$3,600,000	\$21,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Senior Housing	67	\$6,500,000	\$21,500,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Not specified	42	\$9,807,861	\$14,602,407	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	111	\$5,180,000	\$8,828,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	45	\$11,800,000	\$18,600,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Homeless, At risk, Low Income, co-occurring disorders	106	\$1,000,000	\$35,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	35	\$5,000,000	\$11,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Supportive housing for singles	231	\$6,000,000	\$38,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Los Angeles	Family	265	\$5,000,000	\$111,438,576	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	83	\$9,400,000	\$14,500,000	40%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	45	\$7,100,000	\$18,100,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	45	\$9,800,000	\$18,600,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Special Needs	20	\$1,470,000	\$3,100,000	30%	No	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	471	\$15,600,000	\$19,068,535	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	78	\$12,000,000	\$29,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	34	\$8,300,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	50	\$1,749,280	\$4,381,296	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Los Angeles	Family	400	\$10,006,573	\$10,006,573	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Manteca	Developmentally Disabled	10	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Marina	Low and very-low-income families	108	\$8,000,000	\$17,219,992	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Martinez	Senior/Disabled	49	\$1,550,000	\$10,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Menifee	Senior	81		\$21,326,468	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Menlo Park	Family	108	\$4,020,000	\$8,690,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Milpitas	Large Family	93		\$32,826,394	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Milpitas	Family	123	\$5,808,943	\$7,312,943	Unknown	No	Unknown
Monrovia	Family	876	\$3,500,000	\$152,666,360	Unknown	No	Unknown
Monrovia	Family	694	\$17,068,000	\$24,659,169	Unknown	No	Unknown
Moreno Valley	Large Family	26		\$8,530,812	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Moreno Valley	Large Family	71		\$21,694,179	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Morgan Hill	Family	50	\$15,400,000	\$15,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Morgan Hill	Senior	49		\$17,810,923	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Mt. Shasta	Not specified	28	\$8,700,000	\$8,700,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Newark	Senior	150	\$1,500,000	\$3,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Newman	Family	48	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	Unknown	No	Possible
North Highlands	Disabled/Family	15	\$1,200,000	\$3,000,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakdale	Not specified	41	\$5,600,000	\$5,600,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	80	\$7,761,644	\$19,606,650	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Family/Disabled	55	\$2,000,000	\$15,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Senior	65		\$17,746,497	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Oakland	Supportive Housing	103	\$29,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Oakland	Family	14	\$1,800,000	\$1,900,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	40	\$1,900,000	\$2,550,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	TOD, Senior	73	\$9,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Oakland	Family	175	\$4,767,000	\$10,155,844	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	201	\$10,000,000	\$15,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Oakland	work-live (family)	25	\$1,500,000	\$11,200,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	20	\$1,000,000	\$1,685,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	30	\$790,000	\$1,725,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Family	119	\$5,950,000	\$51,824,500	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Family	23	\$4,400,000	\$4,800,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Oakland	Senior	63		\$17,673,837	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Oakland	Family	58	\$1,999,800	\$28,742,399	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Senior	84	\$2,036,934	\$40,157,424	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Family	167	\$5,775,030	\$35,856,611	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakland	Senior	150	\$2,000,000	\$3,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oakley	Large Family	44	\$880,000	\$9,468,694	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ojai	Family, farmworker	21	\$750,000	\$4,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Olivehurst	Large Family	17		\$5,080,161	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Olivehurst	Family	50		\$8,708,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ontario	Senior	76		\$19,295,447	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Family	163	\$3,423,931	\$5,898,989	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Orange	Family	45	\$11,000,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oroville	Large Family	57		\$17,144,918	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Oxnard	Farmworker	18	\$1,200,000	\$5,323,850	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Oxnard	Family	42	\$14,400,000	\$14,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Panorama City	Senior	98		\$23,737,820	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Pasadena	Family	42	\$2,364,480	\$4,310,184	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Patterson	Family	279	\$11,950,392	\$17,435,717	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburg	Family	80	\$1,260,000	\$10,760,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pleasanton	Family	350	\$17,000,000	\$114,052,109	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Redding	Senior	21		\$4,469,580	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rialto	Family	42	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Richmond	Family	237	\$8,850,000	\$10,620,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
Riverbank	Large Family	65		\$21,510,468	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Riverside	Family	144	\$25,000,000	\$27,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Sacramento	Individuals	104	\$7,800,000	\$12,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Sacramento	Family	110	\$5,000,000	\$27,800,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sacramento	homeless	75	\$12,000,000	\$24,000,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Sacramento	Family	108	\$4,110,000	\$34,435,914	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Sacramento	Disabled	17	\$1,445,606	\$5,920,803	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sacramento	Family	70	\$19,342,772	\$21,883,772	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Sacramento	Large Family	14		\$5,230,206	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sacramento	Senior & Disabled	153	\$6,725,000	\$10,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Salinas	Large Family	81		\$23,248,110	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Bernardino	Family	42	\$8,000,000	\$8,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	140	\$18,573,746	\$56,489,582	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	83	\$8,700,000	\$31,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	112	\$22,800,000	\$22,800,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	312	\$8,928,800	\$13,883,428	Unknown	No	Unknown
San Diego	Senior	70	\$900,310	\$25,367,501	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	735	\$30,000,000	\$31,111,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
San Diego	Disabled	18	\$250,000	\$2,000,000	Unknown	No	Unknown
San Diego	Family/Senior	180	\$35,000,000	\$66,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Diego	Family	80		\$31,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	428	\$12,818,960	\$41,791,993	Unknown	No	Unknown
San Francisco	HIV/Aids Housing	59	\$1,000,000	\$9,000,000	30%	No	Unknown
San Francisco	Senior	31	\$300,000	\$300,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	Senior	150	\$12,070,436	\$52,907,442	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	HIV/Aids Housing	109	\$10,000,000	\$50,000,000	30%	No	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	24	\$60,000	\$60,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	HIV/Aids Housing	7	\$1,000,000	\$3,500,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	1,372	\$25,021,079	\$112,310,221	Unknown	No	Unknown
San Francisco	HIV/Aids Housing	12	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	30%	No	Unknown
San Francisco	Senior	100	\$20,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
San Francisco	Senior	82	\$5,000,000	\$10,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	homeless	120	\$18,900,000	\$38,038,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	22	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	71	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	130	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Senior	36	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	12	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family / Childcare	16	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Francisco	Family	41	\$500,000	\$500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	SRO	65	\$150,000	\$150,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	homeless	152	\$10,500,000	\$39,600,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
San Francisco	homeless individual	175	\$20,000,000	\$51,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Jose	Large Family	37		\$15,694,660	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Jose	Senior	185			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Jose	Senior	29		\$9,587,614	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Jose	Large Family	53		\$23,895,017	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
San Jose	Family	93	\$36,200,000	\$36,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Leandro	Family	100	\$2,108,628	\$28,985,444	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Marcos	Family	106	\$1,705,508	\$2,734,508	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Mateo	Family	68	\$8,537,737	\$37,025,768	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Ramon	Senior	105	\$1,500,000	\$2,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Ysidro	Family	80	\$27,800,000	\$27,800,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Santa Barbara	Homeless/Youth Aging Out of Foster Care	55	\$15,966,508	\$17,343,831	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Santa Clarita	Family	67	\$700,000	\$1,300,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Santa Maria	Special needs	47	\$2,000,000	\$15,612,643	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Santa Paula	Family, farmworker	150	\$3,000,000	\$39,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Santa Rosa	Family	53	\$3,800,000	\$20,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Santa Rosa	Family	96		\$33,700,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Santa Rosa	Family/TAY	83	\$5,400,000	\$19,900,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Santa Rosa	Large Family	71		\$23,726,280	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Santa Rosa	Family	150	\$70,000,000	\$70,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Santee	Family	48	\$4,500,000	\$13,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Selma	Large Family	81		\$14,829,087	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
St. Helena	Family	45	\$1,440,000	\$4,062,725	Unknown	No	Unknown
Stockton	Large Family	47		\$12,336,809	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Stockton	Family	93	\$10,500,000	\$43,700,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Stockton	Senior	108	\$1,950,000	\$20,288,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Sunnyvale	Sr/spec needs	124	\$1,800,000	\$45,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Tehachapi	Large Family	81		\$15,767,450	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Temecula	Not specified	39	\$8,900,000	\$8,900,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ukiah	Family	32	\$4,750,000	\$8,798,290	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Unincorporated	Farmworker	66	\$1,500,000	\$12,936,666	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Unincorporated Sacramento	Senior	166	\$13,500,000	\$14,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Unincorporated Sacramento	Family	119	\$5,799,000	\$6,774,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Unincorporated Sacramento	Family	120	\$3,287,000	\$5,608,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Unincorporated Sacramento	Disabled	14	\$1,778,700	\$2,914,042	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Unincorporated Sacramento	Homeless	90	\$14,901,172		Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Union City	Family	547	\$22,126,640	\$50,270,075	Unknown	No	Unknown
Upland	Senior/Disabled	72	\$16,688,377	\$52,094,424	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Upland	Family Public Housing	97		\$650,000	Unknown	No	Yes
Upland	Senior	72		\$10,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Van Nuys	Family	52	\$2,386,120	\$8,477,413	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ventura	Family, farmworker	60	\$8,700,000	\$31,700,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ventura	Senior	50		\$13,263,404	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ventura	Family	172	\$6,550,560	\$71,222,629	Unknown	No	Unknown
Ventura	Large Family	25		\$9,635,612	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ventura	Family	82	\$2,424,182	\$4,158,928	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Victorville	Large Family	57		\$12,309,286	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Visalia	Large Family	20		\$3,986,287	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Visalia	Senior, HUD 202, Green	43	\$6,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Vista	Family	50	\$2,110,000	\$26,581,246	Unknown	No	Unknown
Vista	Family	315	\$8,890,000	\$101,834,115	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Walnut Creek	Family	522	\$10,000,000	\$148,926,003	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Watsonville	Large Family	88		\$13,378,635	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
West Sacramento	Family	62	\$21,600,000	\$21,600,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
West Sacramento	Senior	39		\$635,650	Unknown	No	Possible
West Sacramento	Senior	24		\$119,200	Unknown	No	Possible
Winchester	Family	100	\$28,400,000	\$28,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Windsor	Not specified	65	\$1,500,000	\$25,700,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Winters	Multi Family	140		\$445,000	Unknown	No	Possible
Woodland	Family	164	\$4,655,000	\$10,937,824	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Woodland	Senior	47		\$1,603,784	Unknown	No	Possible
Woodland	family	44		\$500,000	Unknown	Yes	Possible
Woodland	Fam/disabled	48	\$100,000	\$4,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Yountville	Family	35	\$50,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Yreka	Large Family	81		\$15,146,832	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Yuba City	Multi-Family	64		\$2,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Yucca Valley	Family	42	\$6,300,000	\$6,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>10,932</b>	<b>\$1,844,418,825</b>	<b>\$5,869,912,291</b>			

### CO

Boulder	Not specified	50	\$600,000	\$12,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Boulder	Family	79	\$672,000	\$19,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Denver	Not specified	80	\$1,000,000	\$16,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Denver	Special Needs & Homeless	98	\$5,000,000	\$16,000,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Denver	Families and Homeless	92	\$1,000,000	\$16,500,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Denver	Family	75	\$500,000	\$11,250,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
El Paso	Family	48	\$550,000	\$1,750,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Jefferson	Family	90	\$500,000	\$16,000,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Larimer	Family	50	\$500,000	\$2,500,000	50%	Yes	Yes
Larimer	Family	82	\$900,000	\$9,956,674	60%	Yes	Possible
Otero	Special Needs & Homeless	30	\$400,000	\$3,600,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Pueblo	Farmworker	35	\$600,000	\$5,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>\$12,222,000</b>	<b>\$129,556,674</b>			

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
<b>CT</b>							
Ansonia	Family	37			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bridgeport	Elderly	118	\$3,000,000	\$15,000,000	60%	Yes	Yes
Danbury	Family	12			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Enfield	Family	9			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Hartford	Family	30			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Hartford	Mixed-income, mixed-use	100	\$6,500,000	\$27,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Hartford	HIV/Aids Housing	12			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Jewett City	Veterans	18			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Manchester	Family	20			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Manchester	Family	15			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
New Haven	Family	17			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
New Haven	HIV/Aids Housing	10			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
New Haven	Family	42			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Norwalk	Family	57	\$5,000,000	\$12,000,000	50%	No	No
Seymour	Family	30			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Southington	Adults, Elderly	36			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Stamford	Seniors & Families	220	\$20,000,000	\$65,000,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Waterbury	Family	72			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Willimantic	Supportive housing for singles	60	\$3,750,000	\$12,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Willimantic	Families	75	\$4,500,000	\$20,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Windham	Family	47			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,037</b>	<b>\$42,750,000</b>	<b>\$151,000,000</b>			
<b>DC</b>							
Washington	Family	95	\$9,500,000	\$19,500,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Washington	Family	20	\$187,500	\$4,747,355	30%	No	No
Washington	Family	160	\$4,000,000	\$29,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Washington	Family	15	\$1,422,883	\$3,793,083	30%	No	No
Washington	Supportive housing for singles	120	\$2,000,000	\$23,500,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Washington	Senior Housing	100	\$8,500,000	\$27,000,000	60%	Unknown	Yes
Washington	Family		\$450,655	\$36,391,562	30%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Washington	Senior Housing	302	\$5,000,000	\$66,000,000	60%	Unknown	Yes
Washington	Families	12	\$2,300,000	\$2,445,000	30%	No	No
<b>State Totals</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>\$33,361,038</b>	<b>\$212,377,000</b>			
<b>DE</b>							
Sussex County	Manufactured Housing/ Modular Homes	50			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Wilmington	Rental property for homeless + supportive services	31			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>81</b>				
<b>FL</b>							
Apopka	Families	100	\$8,800,000	\$10,500,000	50%	No	Yes
Avon Park	Farmworker	52	\$6,168,474	\$9,213,025	40%	Yes	Unknown
Brooksville	Families	60	\$1,250,000	\$3,700,000	50%	No	Yes
Defuniak Springs	Family	48	\$958,177	\$7,057,199	40%	Yes	Yes
Delray Beach	Families	326	\$35,208,000	\$35,208,000	50%	No	No
Eustis	Family	68	\$603,267	\$4,611,684	33%	Yes	Yes
Ft. Myers	Families	68	\$3,740,000	\$5,640,000	50%	No	Yes
Graceville	Family	50	\$393,079	\$2,924,839	40%	Yes	Yes
Green Cove Springs	Families	12	\$50,000	\$380,000	35%	No	No
Immokalee	Farmworkers	48	\$5,000,000	\$8,320,000	50%	No	No
Jacksonville	Families & Homeless	83	\$2,500,000	\$10,500,000	30%	Yes	No
Jacksonville	Homeless	48	\$1,450,000	\$9,000,000	30%	Yes	No
Marianna	Family	82	\$747,524	\$4,470,192	40%	Yes	Yes
Miami	Homeless Families	100	\$3,400,000	\$28,500,000	30%	Yes	No
Miami	Family	204	\$6,785,000	\$33,000,000	50%	Yes	No
Miami	Families	60	\$1,000,000	\$12,000,000	60%	Yes	No
Miami	Not specified	770			Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Miami	Family	116	\$5,000,000	\$21,600,000	60%	Yes	No
Miami Beach	Senior Housing	39	\$750,000	\$5,094,243	60%	No	Unknown
Miami Beach	Not specified	33	\$2,652,207		65%	No	Unknown
Miami Beach	Frail Elderly	34	\$1,500,000	\$7,694,028	33%	No	Yes

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Miami Beach	Frail Elderly	34	\$2,000,000	\$8,564,194	33%	No	Yes
Miami Beach	Not specified	36	\$1,000,000	\$7,669,262	60%	No	Unknown
Miami Gardens	Family	118	\$5,000,000	\$20,000,000	60%	Yes	No
Not specified	Senior Housing		\$107,242	\$107,242	Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Senior Housing		\$75,069	\$75,069	Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Senior Housing	280	\$661,500	\$661,500	Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Senior Housing	195	\$750,000	\$750,000	Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Senior Housing		\$265,306	\$265,306	Unknown	No	No
Orlando	Family	94	\$2,888,577	\$8,907,652	60%	Yes	Yes
Pahokee	Not specified	24	\$400,000	\$4,000,000	60%	No	No
Palatka	Family	108	\$840,943	\$5,781,599	50%	Yes	Yes
Panama City	Family	100	\$2,412,322	\$7,983,272	60%	Yes	Yes
Panama City	Family	100	\$2,726,476	\$8,283,966	60%	Yes	Yes
Panama City	Family	72	\$1,551,923	\$9,513,694	35%	Yes	Yes
Pensacola	Not specified	100	\$12,400,000	\$16,400,000	35%	No	Unknown
St Petersburg	Senior Housing	82	\$12,169,770	\$15,579,381	33%	Yes	Unknown
St. Petersburg	Special Needs	24	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000	50%	No	No
Tampa	Family	160	\$22,217,923	\$26,617,923	30%	Yes	Yes
Tampa	Family	203	\$27,809,424	\$36,809,424	30%	Yes	Yes
Winter Haven	Families	33	\$1,400,000	\$2,500,000	50%	No	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>4,164</b>	<b>\$187,032,203</b>	<b>\$402,282,694</b>			

### GA

Atlanta	Senior Housing	97	\$887,101	\$12,354,115	60%	Yes	Yes
Atlanta	Family	192	\$2,250,000	\$22,100,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Family	109	\$500,000	\$500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Family	216	\$1,750,000	\$1,750,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Not specified	16	\$438,000	\$602,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Not specified	40	\$1,240,000	\$1,240,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Not specified	8	\$185,000	\$685,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Atlanta	Senior Housing	78	\$745,653	\$10,262,661	60%	Yes	Unknown
Scottsdale	Family	150	\$1,573,288	\$20,135,272	60%	Yes	Yes

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Stone MT	Senior Housing	187	\$1,500,000	\$25,520,519	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Tennille	Family	54	\$500,000	\$10,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Tifton	Family	34	\$500,000	\$6,400,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	12	1,181	\$12,069,042	\$111,749,567			
<b>HI</b>							
Oahu	Not specified	140	\$1,935,000	\$60,000,000	30%	Yes	No
Oahu	Not specified	389	\$26,000,000	\$95,000,000	60%	Yes	No
<b>State Totals</b>	2	529	\$27,935,000	\$155,000,000			
<b>IA</b>							
Ames	Family	60	\$2,327,266	\$6,649,330	50%	Yes	Unknown
Ames	Family	62	\$4,441,581	\$12,690,230	40%	Yes	Unknown
Bettendorf	Senior Housing	116	\$10,376,002	\$29,645,720	60%	Yes	Unknown
Bettendorf	Family	13	\$826,207	\$2,360,590	40%	Yes	Unknown
Cedar Rapids	Senior Housing	45	\$2,539,128	\$7,254,650	40%	Yes	Unknown
Cedar Rapids	Family	24	\$1,977,773	\$5,650,780	50%	Yes	Unknown
Cedar Rapids	Family	96	\$7,065,762	\$20,187,890	60%	Yes	Unknown
Cedar Rapids	Family	97	\$2,018,233	\$5,766,380	60%	Yes	Unknown
Council Bluffs	Family	38	\$2,902,638	\$8,293,250	40%	Yes	Yes
Council Bluffs	Senior Housing	36	\$3,155,530	\$9,015,800	50%	Yes	Unknown
Creston	Senior Housing	24	\$1,541,012	\$4,402,890	60%	Yes	Yes
Davenport	Family	144	\$7,156,422	\$20,446,920	40%	Yes	Unknown
Davenport	Senior Housing	41	\$3,374,861	\$9,642,460	40%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	34	\$2,220,117	\$6,343,190	40%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	150	\$7,636,203	\$13,996,076	60%	Yes	Yes
Des Moines	Family	150	\$7,809,073	\$15,114,381	60%	Yes	Yes
Des Moines	Family	84	\$3,835,724	\$10,959,210	60%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	111	\$4,292,915	\$12,265,470	60%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	54	\$3,944,640	\$11,270,400	60%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	94	\$2,544,472	\$7,269,920	40%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	48	\$4,777,336	\$13,649,530	60%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Des Moines	Family	66	\$4,666,550	\$13,333,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Family	58	\$1,372,340	\$3,920,970	60%	Yes	Unknown
Des Moines	Men	140	\$8,765,000	\$9,000,000	40%	Unknown	Unknown
Iowa City	Family	22	\$2,089,521	\$5,970,060	40%	Yes	Unknown
Keokuk	Family	72	\$2,843,117	\$8,123,190	50%	Yes	Unknown
Muscatine	Senior Housing	40	\$3,202,360	\$9,149,600	50%	Yes	Yes
Oskaloosa	Family	44	\$150,000	\$2,100,382	60%	Yes	Unknown
Sioux City	Family	18	\$576,072	\$1,645,920	40%	Yes	Unknown
Waterloo	Family	40	\$3,377,290	\$9,649,400	40%	Yes	Unknown
Waterloo	Senior Housing	56	\$946,789	\$2,705,110	60%	Yes	Unknown
Waterloo	Family	96	\$4,251,993	\$12,148,550	60%	Yes	Unknown
Waterloo	Senior Housing	53	\$4,035,791	\$11,530,830	60%	Yes	Unknown
West Des Moines	Family	95	\$3,974,383	\$11,355,380	60%	Yes	Unknown
West Des Moines	Senior Housing	55	\$2,342,200	\$6,692,000	40%	Yes	Unknown
West Des Moines	Family	208	\$10,500,000	\$30,000,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>2,584</b>	<b>\$139,856,293</b>	<b>\$370,199,459</b>			

### IL

Belvidere	Elderly	120	\$1,610,458	\$20,685,219	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Blue Island	Elderly	90	\$390,000	\$19,870,063	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Broadview	Seniors	84			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Byron	Elderly	131	\$4,094,495	\$8,228,211	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Carbondale	Family	20	\$4,900,000	\$5,063,662	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Carbondale	Elderly	48	\$202,837	\$6,228,514	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Carthage	Elderly	20	\$213,442	\$4,699,286	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Caseyville	Seniors	50			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Charleston	Family	48	\$248,000	\$7,870,246	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Homeless People with HIV/AIDS	23		\$4,500,000	Unknown	Yes	No
Chicago	Senior Housing	70	\$9,000,000	\$18,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chicago	Families	50			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Seniors	89	\$2,250,000	\$20,031,750	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Families	29			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Chicago	Families	140			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Family	45	\$4,147,500	\$13,906,238	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Seniors	68			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Families	33			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Family	75	\$2,039,796	\$22,566,663	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	homeless singles and working poor adults	100	\$1,000,000	\$20,500,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Seniors	120			Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Chicago	Seniors	136			Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Chicago	Elderly	72	\$1,007,238	\$17,045,772	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Seniors	85	\$1,500,000	\$19,867,108	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chicago	Families	75			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Countryside	Elderly	70	\$1,199,971	\$14,300,240	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Crete	Seniors	125			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Crete	Senior Housing	125	\$6,129,749	\$24,807,065	60%	Yes	Unknown
Crete	Senior Housing	45	\$153,725	\$6,827,896	60%	Yes	Unknown
Decatur	Elderly	156	\$999,871	\$13,743,567	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Decatur	Elderly	64	\$4,928,592	\$7,587,131	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
East Moline	Elderly	82	\$98,557	\$11,739,656	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
East St. Louis	Family	30	\$979,200	\$8,080,246	50%	Yes	No
Granite City	Family	20	\$3,712,419	\$4,807,238	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Hopkin Park	Family	29	\$193,092	\$8,889,337	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Jerseyville	Elderly	50	\$2,897,297	\$6,323,835	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Lake Zurich	Elderly	95	\$8,967,762	\$20,585,270	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Litchfield	Seniors	32			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Maywood	Seniors	137			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Moline	Family	69	\$1,616,694	\$11,642,036	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Mt. Sterling	Seniors	24			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Normal	Seniors	50			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Paris	Families	50	\$500,000	\$7,501,547	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Peoria	Special Needs	30	\$654,967	\$3,577,534	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rock Island	Families	87			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rock Island	Family	70	\$2,251,276	\$12,264,693	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Rockford	Elderly	49	\$3,500,000	\$6,765,071	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Shelbyville	Family	30	\$3,442,856	\$5,720,177	60%	Yes	Possible
Shorewood	Senior Housing	50	\$5,941,228	\$11,088,182	60%	Yes	Unknown
Springfield	Families	30			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Taylorville	Families	24			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Urbana	Family	70	\$370,585	\$13,792,677	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Waterloo	Family	44	\$247,830	\$3,111,072	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Waterloo	Elderly	32	\$204,571	\$2,810,787	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Wilmington	Seniors	40	\$2,123,908	\$7,727,867	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Woodstock	Family	107	\$7,500,000	\$18,040,286	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Zion	Special Needs Populations	20			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Zion	Families	200			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>3,957</b>	<b>\$91,217,916</b>	<b>\$440,796,142</b>			

### IN

Bluffton	Family	32	\$1,498,997	\$2,876,650	60%	Yes	Unknown
Brookville	Senior Housing	35	\$389,308	\$4,848,708	30%	Yes	Unknown
Columbia City	Senior Housing	35	\$2,039,159	\$3,725,090	60%	Yes	Unknown
Columbus	Not specified	100	\$800,000	\$10,872,000	80%	Unknown	Unknown
Corydon	Family	28	\$1,945,409	\$3,467,661	60%	Yes	Unknown
Evansville	Family	35	\$3,419,140	\$4,405,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Fort Wayne	Senior Housing		\$250,000	\$1,000,000	40%	Unknown	Yes
Greenfield	Senior Housing	30	\$2,216,968	\$3,926,258	60%	Yes	Unknown
Greensburg	Family	64	\$3,981,834	\$6,931,939	60%	Yes	Unknown
Huntington	Senior Housing	35	\$688,524	\$7,651,945	30%	Yes	Unknown
Indianapolis	Family	18	\$2,132,418	\$3,316,739	60%	Yes	Unknown
Indianapolis	Family	62	\$500,000	\$7,200,000	60%	Yes	Yes
Indianapolis	singles, families, elderly	65	\$400,000	\$7,100,000	30%	Unknown	Yes
Indianapolis	families	62	\$350,000	\$4,800,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Indianapolis	singles, families, elderly	72	\$3,000,000	\$20,000,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Monticello	Senior Housing	35	\$380,381	\$4,852,819	30%	Yes	Unknown
Muncie	Family	35	\$474,979	\$6,654,484	30%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Orleans	Family	16	\$1,456,152	\$2,459,890	60%	Yes	Unknown
Sheridan	Senior Housing	25	\$1,755,890	\$3,159,766	60%	Yes	Unknown
South Bend	Family	76	\$4,746,521	\$6,755,245	60%	Yes	Unknown
Vincennes	Senior Housing	35	\$363,434	\$6,419,597	30%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>895</b>	<b>\$32,789,114</b>	<b>\$122,423,791</b>			

### KS

Bird City	Rural, Large Families	6	\$651,512	\$1,087,926	50%	Yes	No
Kansas City	Family	30	\$500,000	\$1,400,000	60%	Yes	No
Wamego	Senior Housing	32	\$650,000	\$5,200,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Wichita	Homeless Veterans	5	\$25,000	\$50,000	30%	Unknown	Yes
Wichita	Homeless Veterans	3	\$17,000	\$20,000	30%	Unknown	Yes
Wichita	Homeless Veterans	3	\$20,000	\$45,000	30%	Unknown	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>\$1,863,512</b>	<b>\$7,802,926</b>			

### KY

Erlanger	Family			\$6,500,000	50%	Yes	Unknown
Florence	Family			\$9,500,000	50%	Yes	Unknown
Highland Heights	Family			\$11,600,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>3</b>			<b>\$27,600,000</b>			

### LA

New Orleans	Family	18	\$1,000,000	\$9,152,898	60%	Yes	Unknown
New Orleans	Senior Housing	98	\$24,000,000	\$24,000,000	50%	Unknown	Yes
New Orleans	Supportive housing for singles	108	\$5,000,000	\$6,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
New Orleans	Supportive housing for singles	43	\$6,650,000	\$7,700,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
New Orleans	Supportive housing for singles	42	\$1,800,000	\$5,500,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>\$38,450,000</b>	<b>\$52,352,898</b>			

### MA

Amherst	Family	26	\$6,330,390	\$8,806,043	30%	Yes	No
---------	--------	----	-------------	-------------	-----	-----	----

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Beverly	Family	43	\$5,176,854	\$9,135,801	30%	Yes	Yes
Billerica	Senior Housing	41	\$2,599,439	\$11,241,180	30%	Yes	No
Boston	Individuals	28	\$4,087,188	\$6,506,063	30%	Yes	Yes
Boston	Individuals	37	\$5,175,000	\$8,819,009	30%	Yes	Yes
Boston	Family	36	\$6,930,000	\$13,760,900	30%	Yes	No
Boston	Family	30	\$5,395,860	\$13,698,693	30%	Yes	Unknown
Boston	Family	103	\$9,900,000	\$18,696,126	30%	Yes	Yes
Boston	Family	48	\$7,447,712	\$17,225,864	30%	Yes	Yes
Boston	Family	50	\$10,837,500	\$16,313,522	30%	Yes	Yes
Boston	Family	38	\$5,232,600	\$11,451,514	30%	Yes	Yes
Cambridge	Family	19	\$2,693,250	\$7,370,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Charlton	Family	38	\$6,677,685	\$9,032,769	30%	Yes	Yes
Framingham	Senior Housing	150	\$9,868,645	\$46,343,907	30%	Yes	No
Greenfield	SRO	55	\$4,564,026	\$7,617,025	30%	Yes	Yes
Haverhill	Family	33	\$6,549,318	\$11,337,931	30%	Yes	Yes
Holliston	Family	30	\$4,252,500	\$8,953,625	30%	Yes	Yes
Ipswich	Family	48	\$6,804,000	\$14,517,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Lakeville	Family	56	\$6,855,064	\$8,480,068	30%	Yes	No
Lunenburg	Family	66	\$7,174,890	\$12,989,945	30%	Yes	Yes
New Bedford	Family	67	\$9,888,399	\$14,270,345	30%	Yes	No
New Bedford	Family	111	\$17,725,380	\$26,555,904	30%	Yes	No
Plymouth	Family	35	\$6,356,250	\$11,219,528	30%	Yes	No
Salem	Family	15	\$2,466,000	\$5,394,076	30%	Yes	Yes
Springfield	Family	57	\$11,210,331	\$13,677,947	30%	Yes	Yes
Springfield	Family	109	\$16,462,500	\$19,888,000	30%	Yes	No
Springfield	Individuals	92	\$7,372,017	\$15,781,902	30%	Yes	Yes
Wareham	Family	49	\$7,708,158	\$11,899,661	30%	Yes	Yes
West Boylston	Family	26	\$4,304,223	\$7,845,663	30%	Yes	Yes
Westfield	Family	19	\$4,030,668	\$6,632,827	30%	Yes	No
Worcester	Family	25	\$3,543,750	\$6,859,893	30%	Yes	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>1,580</b>	<b>\$215,619,597</b>	<b>\$402,322,731</b>			

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
<b>MD</b>							
Aberdeen	Family	184	\$3,000,000	\$23,000,000	50%	Unknown	Yes
Anapolis	Family	156	\$1,000,000	\$28,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Baltimore	Family	104	\$5,400,000	\$21,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Columbia	Family	158	\$1,450,000	\$15,798,136	50%	Unknown	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>602</b>	<b>\$10,850,000</b>	<b>\$87,798,136</b>			
<b>ME</b>							
Alfred	Family	20	\$1,321,000	\$4,220,713	50%	Yes	Unknown
Auburn	Senior Housing	17	\$483,736	\$3,720,644	50%	Yes	Unknown
Augusta	Family	83	\$1,932,000	\$8,028,773	50%	Yes	Yes
Boothbay Harbor	Family	36	\$340,000	\$3,787,180	50%	Yes	Unknown
Ellsworth	Special Needs	8	\$250,000		30%	No	Unknown
Lewiston	Senior Housing	20	\$400,000	\$4,480,000	50%	Yes	Unknown
Lewiston	Family	10	\$54,000		50%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Family	25	\$570,000	\$7,892,689	50%	Yes	Unknown
Vinalhaven	Family	6	\$300,000	\$1,267,093	50%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>\$5,650,736</b>	<b>\$33,397,092</b>			
<b>MI</b>							
Big Rapids	Family	48	\$2,278,168	\$4,192,120	60%	Yes	Unknown
Big Rapids	Senior Housing	20	\$969,946	\$1,746,904	60%	Yes	Unknown
Cadillac	Family	64	\$1,125,037	\$3,173,672	60%	Yes	Unknown
Caledonia	Senior Housing	48	\$1,281,439	\$4,961,406	60%	Yes	Unknown
Calumet	Senior Housing	18	\$3,766,808	\$4,608,710	60%	Yes	Unknown
Cedar Springs	Family	48	\$909,488	\$2,194,439	60%	Yes	Unknown
Croswell	Family	24	\$406,386	\$1,588,386	60%	Yes	Unknown
Crystal Falls	Family	25	\$1,161,360	\$3,113,522	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family/Senior	352	\$9,321,960	\$37,610,809	60%	Yes	Yes
Detroit	Family	38	\$7,866,113	\$8,938,982	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family/Senior	194	\$3,990,150	\$14,595,685	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Senior Housing	190	\$8,554,613	\$13,406,626	60%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Detroit	Senior Housing	48	\$6,508,441	\$8,303,228	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family	71	\$2,836,908	\$5,478,086	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family	45	\$7,105,223	\$8,592,882	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family	24	\$4,202,496	\$4,780,610	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family/Special Needs	18	\$2,531,072	\$3,409,100	60%	Yes	Unknown
Detroit	Family	45	\$7,105,223	\$8,592,882	60%	Yes	Unknown
Ferndale	Family/Senior	60	\$1,633,684	\$6,956,547	60%	Yes	Unknown
Garfield Township	Special Needs	24	\$2,240,414	\$3,561,581	60%	Yes	Unknown
Gaylord	Senior Housing	94	\$1,573,672	\$7,510,356	60%	Yes	Unknown
Grand Rapids	Special Needs	16	\$2,404,682	\$3,597,675	60%	Yes	Yes
Grand Rapids	Family	133	\$8,403,467	\$14,220,304	60%	Yes	Unknown
Grayling	Family	32	\$643,878	\$2,417,378	60%	Yes	Unknown
Hancock	Family/Special Needs	24	\$3,424,427	\$4,925,542	60%	Yes	Unknown
Hart	Senior Housing	25	\$1,936,275	\$3,264,787	60%	Yes	Unknown
Holland	Family	126	\$1,762,863	\$8,473,477	60%	Yes	Unknown
Ironwood	Family	49	\$1,176,932	\$4,799,410	60%	Yes	Unknown
Lansing	Senior Housing	44	\$8,089,805	\$12,263,157	60%	Yes	Unknown
Lansing	Family/Special Needs	18	\$858,183	\$1,809,105	60%	Yes	Yes
Linden	Family	32	\$1,092,873	\$2,248,369	60%	Yes	Unknown
Mayville	Family	20	\$331,970	\$1,330,344	60%	Yes	Unknown
Petoskey	Family	128	\$2,373,122	\$6,353,122	60%	Yes	Unknown
Pontiac	Family	201	\$8,614,149	\$15,570,849	60%	Yes	Unknown
Pontiac	Family	250	\$8,423,071	\$16,325,696	60%	Yes	Unknown
Rockford	Senior Housing	34	\$1,413,617	\$3,829,367	60%	Yes	Unknown
Sault Ste Marie	Not specified	80	\$3,451,034	\$6,776,969	60%	Yes	Unknown
Sault Ste Marie	Family	27	\$5,241,895	\$5,791,419	60%	Yes	Unknown
Shelby	Family/Special Needs	32	\$803,186	\$3,519,663	60%	Yes	Unknown
Shelby	Family	24	\$565,122	\$2,203,122	60%	Yes	Unknown
Springport	Family	24	\$892,209	\$1,799,326	60%	Yes	Unknown
St. Charles	Senior Housing	48	\$1,009,271	\$2,749,057	60%	Yes	Unknown
St. Joseph	Family	122	\$2,410,867	\$10,732,574	60%	Yes	Unknown
Three Rivers	Family	126	\$2,673,045	\$11,857,707	60%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Traverse City	Family	72	\$5,663,163	\$9,091,966	60%	Yes	Unknown
Traverse City	Family	18	\$2,761,189	\$3,562,823	60%	Yes	Unknown
Webberville	Family	24	\$654,740	\$1,408,066	60%	Yes	Unknown
Yale	Family	24	\$406,869	\$1,616,869	60%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>3,251</b>	<b>\$154,850,506</b>	<b>\$319,854,676</b>			

### MN

Big Lake	Not specified	30	\$1,000,000	\$3,500,000	60%	No	Unknown
Cannon Falls	Senior Housing	40	\$1,079,003	\$4,919,269	30%	Yes	Yes
Duluth	Not specified	47	\$6,500,000	\$7,600,000	30%	No	Unknown
Eagan	Not specified	27	\$3,300,000	\$3,300,000	60%	No	Unknown
Forest Lake	Not specified	36	\$4,300,000	\$5,600,000	60%	No	Unknown
Lake City	Senior & Family	40	\$1,171,920	\$5,463,752	30%	Yes	Yes
Maplewood	Not specified	60	\$7,600,000	\$8,500,000	60%	No	Unknown
Minneapolis	Not specified	46	\$5,300,000	\$5,300,000	30%	No	Unknown
Minneapolis	HIV/Aids & Homeless	45	\$4,000,000	\$7,991,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Minneapolis	Workforce, Singles, Families	46	\$6,000,000	\$8,055,277	30%	Yes	Unknown
Minneapolis	Not specified	36	\$4,400,000	\$4,400,000	30%	No	Unknown
Monticello	Senior Housing	38	\$970,598	\$4,421,918	30%	Yes	Yes
North Branch	Not specified	36	\$5,600,000	\$6,600,000	30%	No	Unknown
Rochester	Not specified	64	\$6,600,000	\$10,400,000	60%	No	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>\$57,821,521</b>	<b>\$86,051,216</b>			

### MO

Avondale	Family	10	\$100,000	\$1,000,000	50%	Yes	No
Jennings	elderly	50	\$300,000	\$9,582,000	60%	Yes	No
Kansas City	Family	163	\$1,250,000	\$30,000,000	60%	Yes	Yes
Kansas City	Family	4	\$20,000	\$400,000	50%	Yes	No
Lee's Summit	Family	14	\$150,000	\$1,300,000	50%	Yes	No
St. Louis	family	40	\$700,000	\$12,780,000	60%	Yes	No
St. Louis	Family	28	\$1,040,000	\$3,790,000	50%	No	Yes
St. Louis	family	31	\$450,000	\$7,872,000	60%	Yes	No

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
<b>State Totals</b>	8	340	\$4,010,000	\$66,724,000			
<b>MT</b>							
Lewistown	Not specified	24	\$3,700,000	\$4,900,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	1	24	\$3,700,000	\$4,900,000			
<b>NC</b>							
Charlotte	Supportive Housing	90	\$2,900,000	\$4,420,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Mecklenburg County	Supportive Housing	6	\$129,050	\$520,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Nashville	Family			\$4,000,000	50%	Yes	Yes
Not specified	Family	48	\$3,417,258	\$4,687,783	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	28	\$1,880,891	\$2,823,491	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	60	\$4,615,038	\$7,114,841	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	60	\$4,415,558	\$7,055,940	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	60	\$3,923,036	\$5,738,698	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	48	\$3,225,660	\$5,626,589	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	48	\$3,455,654	\$5,122,491	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	36	\$2,562,944	\$3,517,233	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	41	\$2,656,452	\$4,778,843	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	32	\$2,311,769	\$3,376,711	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Supportive Housing	9	\$154,000	\$220,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Supportive Housing	24	\$1,051,000	\$2,117,900	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Supportive Housing	18	\$743,400	\$1,062,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Supportive Housing	6	\$430,000	\$620,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Family	48	\$3,455,654	\$4,985,725	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	64	\$4,863,514	\$7,286,422	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	63	\$4,835,081	\$8,221,366	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	92	\$6,532,722	\$10,561,269	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	42	\$2,053,310	\$4,178,468	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	48	\$2,068,392	\$3,462,014	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	44	\$2,627,954	\$4,218,860	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	36	\$2,562,944	\$3,588,923	Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Not specified	Senior Housing	24	\$1,089,984	\$1,479,984	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	100	\$7,230,218	\$9,977,430	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Family	125	\$2,540,942	\$8,275,356	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	48	\$3,423,658	\$5,426,675	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	40	\$2,719,959	\$4,423,227	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Person County	Supportive Housing	3	\$129,150	\$184,500	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rocky Mount	Family			\$8,500,000	60%	Yes	Yes
Union County	Supportive Housing	4	\$372,400	\$532,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Wilson	Supportive Housing	12	\$1,120,000	\$1,600,000	30%	No	No
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>1,407</b>	<b>\$85,497,592</b>	<b>\$149,704,739</b>			

### NJ

Burlington	Supportive housing	8	\$200,000	\$955,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Eastampton, NJ	Family	4			50%	Unknown	Unknown
Hainesport, NJ	Family	4			50%	Unknown	Unknown
Jersey City	Not specified	56	\$7,965,237	\$22,434,208	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Medford	Senior Shared Housing	5	\$388,000	\$849,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Newark	Not specified	175	\$10,000	\$55,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Paterson	Not specified	40	\$5,319,856	\$13,563,982	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Riverside	Senior Housing	108	\$2,800,000	\$25,480,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>\$16,683,093</b>	<b>\$118,282,190</b>			

### NM

Albuquerque	Supportive Housing	48	\$6,000,000	\$8,000,000	30%	Yes	No
Gallup	Supportive Housing	12	\$3,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Santa Fe	Supportive housing	40	\$2,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$11,000,000</b>	<b>\$8,000,000</b>			

### NV

Henderson	Senior housing, disability	60	\$7,600,000	\$12,000,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Henderson	Senior Housing	80	\$1,500,000	\$13,500,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Las Vegas, Clark	Housing and services for homeless vets	228	\$3,000,000	\$22,700,000	50%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Reno	Senior Housing	60	\$2,000,000	\$10,350,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Reno	Senior Housing	146	\$770,000	\$20,400,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Sparks	Senior Housing	41	\$200,000	\$9,600,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>\$15,070,000</b>	<b>\$88,550,000</b>			

### NY

Albany	Supportive Housing	22	\$2,710,000	\$2,710,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Albany	Supportive Housing	80	\$3,818,200	\$3,818,200	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Allegany	Supportive Housing	28	\$2,199,013	\$2,199,013	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Binghamton	Supportive housing for singles	200	\$5,000,000	\$27,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	HIV/Aids Housing	89			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive Housing	31	\$620,000	\$620,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive housing for veterans	159	\$2,500,000	\$38,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive Housing	57	\$4,250,000	\$4,250,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive Housing	56	\$3,320,000	\$3,320,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive Housing	51	\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	Supportive Housing	29	\$2,324,303	\$2,324,303	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Bronx	HIV/Aids Housing	62			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Brooklyn	HIV/Aids Housing	21	\$6,500,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Brooklyn	HIV/Aids Housing	12	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Brooklyn	Supportive housing for families and singles	180	\$6,000,000	\$58,000,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Brooklyn	HIV/Aids Housing	88			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cattaraugus	Supportive Housing	34	\$2,706,101	\$2,706,101	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cayuga	Supportive Housing	70	\$3,012,796	\$3,012,796	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chautauqua	Supportive Housing	28	\$2,627,540	\$2,627,540	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chautauqua	Supportive Housing	48	\$3,121,044	\$3,121,044	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Chenango	Supportive Housing	28	\$1,667,116	\$1,667,116	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Columbia	Supportive Housing	32	\$2,625,332	\$2,625,332	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Cortland	Supportive Housing	56	\$3,045,500	\$3,045,500	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Delaware	Supportive Housing	28	\$2,129,126	\$2,129,126	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Delaware	Supportive Housing		\$2,698,889	\$2,698,889	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Dutchess	Supportive Housing	73	\$3,482,187	\$3,482,187	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Erie	Supportive Housing	24	\$2,670,750	\$2,670,750	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Erie	Supportive Housing	94	\$1,940,323	\$1,940,323	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Erie	Supportive Housing	60	\$3,600,000	\$3,600,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Erie	Supportive Housing	35	\$2,490,676	\$2,490,676	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Genesee	Supportive Housing	42	\$2,845,448	\$2,845,448	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Greene	Supportive Housing	48	\$3,160,000	\$3,160,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kings	Supportive Housing	23	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kings	Supportive Housing	24	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kings	Supportive Housing	21	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kings	Supportive Housing	14	\$1,535,100	\$1,535,100	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Livingston	Supportive Housing	25	\$1,956,216	\$1,956,216	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	80	\$3,513,000	\$3,513,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	28	\$1,871,831	\$1,871,831	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	110	\$2,023,258	\$2,023,258	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	82	\$3,744,604	\$3,744,604	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	42	\$2,886,188	\$2,886,188	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	25	\$2,672,573	\$2,672,573	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	20	\$1,520,027	\$1,520,027	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Monroe	Supportive Housing	30	\$262,497	\$262,497	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Nassau	Supportive Housing		\$1,950,000	\$1,950,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
New York	HIV/Aids Housing	22			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
New York	HIV/Aids Housing	118			Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Niagara	Supportive Housing	25	\$121,517	\$121,517	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Niagara	Supportive Housing	80	\$2,630,384	\$2,630,384	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Supportive Housing	24	\$1,409,161	\$1,409,161	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Supportive Housing	48	\$2,854,293	\$2,854,293	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Supportive Housing	50	\$2,871,396	\$2,871,396	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Supportive Housing	45	\$2,927,133	\$2,927,133	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Orange	Supportive Housing	20	\$1,944,339	\$1,944,339	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Orange	Supportive Housing	16	\$2,020,000	\$2,020,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Orleans	Supportive Housing	12	\$953,123	\$953,123	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Oswego	Supportive Housing	58	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Otsego	Supportive Housing	24	\$1,731,147	\$1,731,147	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Queens	Supportive Housing		\$7,945,000	\$7,945,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Rochester	Families	12	\$1,100,000	\$1,200,000	30%	No	Yes
Rochester	Not specified	20	\$336,000	\$4,726,280	30%	Yes	Yes
Rochester	Supportive housing for singles	80	\$2,000,000	\$15,500,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Rockland	Supportive Housing	30	\$3,218,507	\$3,218,507	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Saratoga	Supportive Housing	70	\$3,228,933	\$3,228,933	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Seneca	Supportive Housing	37	\$740,000	\$740,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Seneca	Supportive Housing	36	\$1,446,943	\$1,446,943	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Steuben	Supportive Housing	23	\$2,348,057	\$2,348,057	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Suffolk	Supportive Housing	45	\$3,460,000	\$3,460,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sullivan	Supportive Housing	28	\$2,395,606	\$2,395,606	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ulster	Supportive Housing	60	\$3,488,922	\$3,488,922	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ulster	Supportive Housing	47	\$2,779,103	\$2,779,103	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Ulster	Supportive Housing	53	\$3,421,157	\$3,421,157	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Westchester	Supportive Housing	60	\$3,889,400	\$3,889,400	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>3,532</b>	<b>\$181,439,759</b>	<b>\$302,930,039</b>			

### OH

Cincinnati	Family			\$8,500,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Cleveland	Not specified	81	\$1,482,458	\$19,287,204	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Dayton	elderly and disabled	204	\$1,000,000	\$9,000,000	50%	Unknown	Yes
Franklin County	Supportive Housing	100		\$12,546,927	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Hilliard	Family			\$7,850,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Lucas County	Supportive Housing	40		\$5,895,159	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Middletown	Senior Housing	40	\$3,500,000	\$5,300,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Reynoldsburg	Family			\$15,600,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Stark County	Supportive Housing	40		\$5,523,288	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Wayne	Supportive Housing	64		\$6,529,163	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Youngstown	MR/DD special needs	173			Unknown	Unknown	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>742</b>	<b>\$5,982,458</b>	<b>\$96,031,741</b>			

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
OR							
Albany	Not specified	26	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Astoria	Not specified	33	\$4,119,206	\$7,563,540	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Beaverton	Not specified	44	\$900,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Beaverton	Not specified	62	\$5,250,000	\$12,088,963	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Bend	Not specified	52	\$2,896,761	\$7,883,500	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Bend	Not specified	52	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Bend	Not specified	70	\$2,000,000	\$9,800,000	60%	Unknown	No
Boardman	Not specified	12	\$612,000	\$1,224,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Boardman	Not specified	24	\$1,224,000	\$2,448,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Canby	Not specified	24	\$1,224,000	\$2,448,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Cascade Locks	Workforce Housing	19	\$600,000	\$3,504,000	Unknown	No	Yes
Clackamas	Families, Seniors, Disabled	32	\$2,900,000	\$4,900,000	50%	No	Yes
Coos Bay	Senior & Disabled Housing	33	\$2,856,000	\$2,856,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Corvallis	Workforce, Senior, & Domestic Violence	62	\$8,810,254	\$12,849,449	30%	Yes	No
Corvallis	Not specified	6	\$1,580,000	\$1,610,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Corvallis	Supportive Housing	12	\$1,380,000	\$1,410,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Curry County	Workforce Housing	8	\$40,000	\$1,555,000	50%	No	No
Downtown Portland	Supportive Housing, Mixed Income, Students	84	\$3,000,000	\$16,000,000	30%	Yes	No
Dundee	Not specified	28	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Estacada	Not specified	48	\$1,530,000	\$3,060,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Eugene	Workforce & Supportive Housing	35	\$500,000	\$7,500,000	30%	Yes	Unknown
Florence	Not specified	4	\$750,000	\$750,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Gresham	Family	72	\$1,000,000	\$3,023,000	50%	Yes	Yes
Hermiston	Not specified	90	\$4,590,000	\$9,180,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Hermiston	Not specified	46	\$600,000		60%	Yes	Unknown
Hood River	Farmworker & Low Income	40	\$4,900,000	\$7,888,930	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Hood River	Not specified	48	\$2,448,000	\$4,896,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Hood River	Workforce & Farmworker	40			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Klamath Falls	Not specified	37	\$4,528,860	\$6,840,129	50%	Unknown	Unknown
La Grande	Supportive Housing	11	\$568,195		Unknown	Unknown	Yes
La Pine	Not specified	26	\$2,641,618	\$4,003,514	40%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Lake Oswego	Not specified	45	\$1,000,000		40%	Yes	Unknown
Lebanon & Sweet Home	Workforce and Senior Housing	52	\$1,271,244	\$2,451,244	Unknown	No	Unknown
Lincoln City	Not specified	48	\$1,530,000	\$3,060,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Madras	Agriculture Worker	24	\$716,000	\$5,100,000	50%	No	No
Madras	Not specified	50	\$5,000,000	\$10,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
McMinnville	Not specified	48	\$2,448,000	\$4,896,000	50%	Unknown	Yes
Medford	Not specified	56	\$1,326,000	\$2,652,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Newberg	Not specified	40	\$2,040,000	\$4,080,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Newport	Not specified	45	\$1,530,000	\$3,060,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
North Bend	Not specified	41	\$1,659,238	\$4,105,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Not specified	40	\$2,040,000	\$4,080,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Not specified	24	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Ontario	Not specified	24	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Senior & Disabled Housing	37	\$500,000	\$4,874,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Portland	Senior & Disabled Housing	51	\$1,200,000	\$2,805,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Portland	Senior Housing	22	\$1,900,000	\$2,525,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Not specified	61	\$6,300,000	\$12,404,511	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Senior & Disabled Housing	71	\$1,854,000	\$4,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Portland	Not specified	20	\$1,000,000		30%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Family & Supportive Housing	60	\$2,500,000	\$17,000,000	30%	Yes	No
Portland	Supportive Housing	54	\$1,100,000	\$4,400,000	30%	No	No
Portland	Supportive Housing	80	\$800,000	\$10,874,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Portland	Not specified	40	\$4,956,000	\$9,962,723	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Working Families	100	\$23,500,000	\$23,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Not specified	144	\$14,400,000	\$28,800,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Not specified	47	\$5,031,600	\$12,635,050	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Homeless & Workforce Housing	176	\$2,000,000	\$24,000,000	50%	Yes	No
Portland	Not specified	31	\$200,000		Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Portland	AIDS Housing	36	\$850,000	\$2,000,000	50%	No	Yes
Portland	Working Families, Seniors, & Supportive Housing	85	\$22,133,517	\$22,133,517	60%	Yes	Yes
Portland	Not specified	40	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Not specified	30	\$1,275,000	\$2,550,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Portland	Not specified	72	\$7,000,000	\$14,000,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Working Families	28	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Portland	Senior & Disabled Housing	38	\$500,000	\$2,162,000	Unknown	Unknown	Yes
Prineville	Workforce Rentals & SF Homeownership	60	\$1,400,000	\$8,450,000	120%	Unknown	No
Redmond	Supportive Housing	6	\$500,000	\$1,100,000	30%	Unknown	No
Redmond	Not specified	28	\$2,767,296	\$6,844,122	40%	Unknown	Unknown
Redmond	Senior Housing	50	\$1,600,000	\$6,600,000	60%	Unknown	No
Roseburg	Senior & Disabled Housing	50	\$500,000	\$2,178,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Roseburg	Family	33	\$500,000	\$8,054,000	Unknown	Yes	No
Roseburg	Not specified	36	\$3,686,452	\$6,823,846	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Roseburg	Supportive Housing	15	\$300,000	\$2,100,000	50%	No	No
Salem	Not specified	10	\$510,000	\$1,020,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Sandy	Not specified	24	\$918,000	\$1,836,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Scappoose	Not specified	8	\$35,000	\$1,760,000	80%	Unknown	Unknown
Seaside	Not specified	32	\$1,475,000	\$4,385,001	60%	Yes	Unknown
Seaside	Not specified	9	\$180,000	\$1,980,000	80%	Unknown	Unknown
Sherwood	Not specified	24	\$765,000	\$1,530,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Sherwood	Not specified	44	\$2,244,000	\$4,488,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Sherwood	Not specified	24	\$1,224,000	\$2,448,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
St. Helens	Supportive Housing	6	\$147,000	\$591,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sweet Home	Senior, Disabled, & Workforce Housing	51	\$2,976,781	\$5,002,728	50%	Yes	No
The Dalles	Not specified	40	\$2,040,000	\$4,080,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
The Dalles	Homeless	6	\$28,000	\$818,000	50%	No	No
The Dalles	Not specified	60	\$3,060,000	\$6,120,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
The Dalles	Not specified	20	\$2,935,177	\$4,379,931	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Tigard	Supportive Housing	119	\$2,300,000	\$3,570,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Tigard	Senior & Supportive Housing	48	\$9,343,173	\$10,123,173	50%	Yes	Unknown
Tilamook	Not specified	30	\$1,224,000	\$2,448,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Toledo	Senior Housing	4	\$600,000	\$750,000	60%	No	No
Toledo	Working Families & Seniors	9	\$500,000		60%	No	No
Troutdale	Family	44	\$700,000	\$5,500,000	50%	Yes	No
Uninc. Clackamas Co	Not specified	52	\$4,431,000	\$9,443,313	50%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Veneta	Not specified	27	\$2,786,000	\$5,441,684	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Veneta	Senior Housing	58	\$300,000	\$7,650,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Vernonia	Not specified	26	\$200,000	\$800,000	55%	Unknown	Unknown
Wilsonville	Not specified	50	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Wilsonville	Not specified	34	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Wilsonville	Not specified	24	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Wilsonville	Senior Housing	84	\$7,100,000	\$14,500,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Woodburn	Not specified	28	\$1,020,000	\$2,040,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Woodburn	Farmworker Family Housing	40	\$500,000		50%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>4,353</b>	<b>\$262,965,372</b>	<b>\$551,566,868</b>			

### PA

Allentown	Not specified	50			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Altoona	Not specified	53			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Baden	Not specified	23			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Beaver Falls	Not specified	32			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Berwick	Not specified	24			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chambersburg	Not specified	40			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chambersburg	Not specified	32			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chester	Not specified	87			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chester	Not specified	70			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Chester Twp	Not specified	71			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Duquesne	ACC Family Units	53	\$3,015,000	\$15,830,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
East Stroudsburg	Not specified	42			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Easton	Family	56	\$1,328,992	\$17,834,994	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Easton	Senior Housing	40	\$1,146,864	\$12,115,883	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Elverson	Not specified	72			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Fairview	Not specified	28			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Friendsville	Not specified	24			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Gettysburg	Not specified	46			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Hermitage	Not specified	40			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lancaster	Not specified	264			Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Lebanon	Not specified	20			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lewistown	Not specified	50			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Lock Haven	Not specified	20			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
New Castle	Not specified	46			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Northumberland	Not specified	24			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Supportive Housing	6	\$68,462	\$1,230,462	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	32			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	49			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Supportive Housing	6	\$118,312	\$2,461,824	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	44			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	45			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Supportive Housing	29	\$6,913,385	\$9,695,076	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	50			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	39			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	16			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Not specified	62			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Philadelphia	Supportive Housing for Homeless Adults	79	\$1,934,044	\$25,428,423	30%	Yes	Unknown
Phoenixville	Not specified	48			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Senior Housing	53	\$327,000	\$13,100,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Not specified	56			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Not specified	90			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Not specified	45			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Senior Housing	60	\$1,673,133	\$12,745,837	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Not specified	100			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Pittsburgh	Not specified	84			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Red Lion	Not specified	102			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Ross	Not specified	60			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Shippensburg	Not specified	50			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Slippery Rock	Not specified	50			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Somerset	Not specified	100			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Turtle Creek	Not specified	72			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Uniontown	Not specified	30			Unknown	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
West Chester	Senior Housing	60	\$1,500,000	\$13,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	53	2,824	\$18,025,191	\$123,942,499			
<b>RI</b>							
East Providence	Homeless Families	6	\$260,000		40%	No	Unknown
Not specified	Families	2	\$100,000		Unknown	No	Unknown
Not specified	Not specified	11	\$675,000		60%	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Homeless Families	3	\$150,000		Unknown	No	Unknown
Not specified	Not specified	47	\$545,000		50%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	5	69	\$1,730,000				
<b>SC</b>							
Berkeley	Senior Housing	42	\$600,000	\$6,500,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Charleston	Family	64	\$900,000	\$7,600,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
Charleston	Senior Housing	71	\$650,000	\$8,457,000	30%	Yes	Yes
Not specified	Unknown	50		\$5,770,327	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	40		\$4,065,000	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	40		\$4,075,000	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	50		\$6,121,834	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	42		\$5,452,222	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	44		\$3,775,103	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	32		\$4,095,962	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	64		\$7,294,007	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	64		\$6,579,516	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	104		\$8,433,011	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	50		\$6,919,671	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	24		\$2,559,452	30%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	109		\$8,485,994	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	40		\$5,115,192	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	100		\$8,086,064	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	32		\$4,501,210	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Unknown	60		\$7,217,970	50%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Orangeburg	Family	64	\$900,000	\$7,600,000	60%	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>1,186</b>	<b>\$3,050,000</b>	<b>\$128,704,535</b>			
<b>TN</b>							
Loudon	Family	82	\$1,200,000	\$9,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>\$1,200,000</b>	<b>\$9,000,000</b>			
<b>TX</b>							
Amarillo	Senior Housing	111	\$1,500,000	\$11,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Austin	Not specified	60	\$1,710,000	\$12,998,697	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Austin	Family	64	\$750,000	\$4,500,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Dallas	Family	35	\$2,800,000	\$3,200,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Georgetown	Family	188	\$3,000,000	\$25,500,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
La Marque	Senior Housing	141		\$14,352,036	30%	Yes	Unknown
Liberty Hill	Family	76	\$800,000	\$9,000,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
San Antonio	Senior Housing	57	\$400,000	\$6,200,000	Unknown	Yes	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>732</b>	<b>\$10,960,000</b>	<b>\$86,950,733</b>			
<b>UT</b>							
Davis County	homeless families & chronically homeless	125	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Salt Lake City	homeless individuals	100	\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Salt Lake County	homeless veterans	154	\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Weber County	chronically homeless	125	\$15,000,000	\$15,000,000	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>\$59,000,000</b>	<b>\$59,000,000</b>			
<b>VA</b>							
Alexandria	Family	34	\$3,860,000	\$10,743,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Alexandria	Family	44	\$3,831,000	\$15,979,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Alexandria	Family	41	\$4,039,000	\$10,843,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Blacksburg	Family	20	\$7,117,480	\$7,117,480	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Christiansburg	Family	70	\$11,500,000	\$11,500,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Fairfax County	Workforce	30	\$9,200,000	\$11,200,000	80%	Unknown	Unknown
Fairfax Cty	Family	74	\$5,000,000	\$20,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Fairlawn	Family	57	\$9,500,000	\$9,500,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Falls Church	Senior Housing	174	\$9,000,000	\$49,000,000	40%	Yes	Unknown
Madison Heights	Disabled	22	\$2,700,000	\$3,700,000	40%	Unknown	Yes
Madison Heights	Disabled		\$2,700,000	\$3,700,000	60%	Unknown	Yes
Montross	Disabled	20	\$1,968,000	\$2,468,000	40%	Unknown	Unknown
Petersburg	Disabled	38	\$4,577,000	\$7,541,000	40%	Unknown	Unknown
Portsmouth	Supportive Housing	60	\$6,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Roanoke	Family	48	\$11,250,000	\$11,250,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	15	732	\$92,242,480	\$174,541,480			

### VT

Alburgh	Family	13	\$325,000		Unknown	Yes	Yes
Burlington	Senior Housing	108	\$400,000		Unknown	Yes	No
Chester	Not specified	12			Unknown	No	No
Enosburg	Not specified	24	\$150,000		Unknown	No	No
Enosburg Falls	Senior Housing	30	\$496,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Hardwick	Senior Housing	16			Unknown	Yes	Yes
Morrisville	Not specified	13			Unknown	Yes	No
Newark	Senior Housing	10			Unknown	No	No
Newport	Not specified	24			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Family	13			Unknown	Yes	Yes
Not specified	Not specified	24			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Not specified	19			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Not specified	14			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Not specified	12			Unknown	No	Unknown
Not specified	Not specified	74			Unknown	No	Unknown
Not specified	Senior Housing	27			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Not specified	47			Unknown	Yes	Yes
Not specified	Not specified	10			Unknown	Yes	Possible
Not specified	Senior Housing	10			Unknown	No	No

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Not specified	Senior Housing	24			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Senior Housing	15			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Not specified	24			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Not specified	24			Unknown	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Mobile Home Park	40			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Not specified	45			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Not specified	80			Unknown	No	No
Not specified	Not specified	16			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Not specified	23			Unknown	Yes	No
Not specified	Senior Housing	10			Unknown	No	No
Rutland	Not specified	20			Unknown	Yes	No
Rutland	Not specified	2			Unknown	No	No
Shrewsbury	Not specified	2			Unknown	No	No
South Burlington	Not specified	40			Unknown	Yes	No
Swanton	Family	16	\$400,000		Unknown	Yes	No
Tinmouth	Not specified	3			Unknown	No	No
Troy	Senior Housing	10			Unknown	No	No
Vergennes	Senior Housing	23	\$470,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	37	917	\$2,241,000				

### WA

Monroe	Homeless	14	\$1,917,230	\$3,584,273	50%	Yes	Unknown
Not specified	Seniors and Families	507	\$32,100,125	\$33,874,625	60%	Yes	Unknown
Omak	Supportive Housing	15	\$2,000,000	\$2,700,000	30%	No	Unknown
Pullman	Not specified	26	\$1,121,719	\$4,436,455	50%	Yes	Unknown
Seattle	Not specified	68	\$4,000,000	\$18,242,856	80%	Yes	Unknown
Seattle	Not specified	30	\$1,400,000	\$6,616,000	50%	Yes	Yes
Spokane	Senior Housing	124	\$7,627,017	\$7,627,017	50%	Yes	Unknown
Spokane	Not specified	29	\$6,000,000	\$6,600,000	30%	No	Unknown
Tacoma	Not specified	26	\$1,560,000	\$3,220,000	50%	Yes	Yes
Tacoma	Not specified	60	\$6,400,000	\$12,190,353	60%	Yes	Yes
Tacoma	Senior Housing	73	\$12,657,287	\$20,873,687	60%	Yes	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Tacoma	Senior Housing	23	\$2,057,259	\$2,057,259	50%	No	Unknown
Walla Walla	Homeless Families	12	\$2,000,000	\$2,780,000	30%	No	Unknown
Walla Walla	Homeless Families & Individuals	16	\$2,500,000	\$3,100,000	30%	No	Unknown
Walla Walla	Family	25	\$2,081,700	\$4,050,000	60%	Yes	Possible
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1,048</b>	<b>\$85,422,337</b>	<b>\$131,952,525</b>			

### WI

Appleton	Family/Special Needs	12	\$1,000,000	\$1,750,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Burlington	Family	36	\$794,945	\$2,337,420	60%	Yes	Unknown
Hartford	Special Needs	32	\$624,516	\$1,909,565	60%	Yes	Unknown
Madison	Family	296	\$5,327,498	\$21,968,722	60%	Yes	Unknown
Manawa	Family	20	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000	60%	Unknown	Unknown
Milwaukee	Family	20	\$4,358,439	\$4,991,930	60%	Yes	Unknown
Milwaukee	Family	48	\$4,065,557	\$6,118,698	60%	Yes	Unknown
Ripon	Senior Housing	24	\$1,681,416	\$2,799,515	60%	Yes	Unknown
Ripon	Senior Housing	40	\$2,599,655	\$5,469,056	60%	Yes	Unknown
Spring Valley	Senior Housing	20	\$1,339,876	\$3,027,609	60%	Yes	Unknown
Sun Prairie	Family	84	\$1,465,475	\$6,108,555	60%	Yes	Unknown
Waukesha	Senior Housing	172	\$3,169,274	\$13,187,378	60%	Yes	Unknown
Weyauwega	Senior Housing	18	\$1,500,000	\$2,500,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
WI Rapids	Senior Housing	20	\$1,500,000	\$2,500,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Winnebago County	Senior Housing		\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	50%	Unknown	Yes
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>842</b>	<b>\$33,426,651</b>	<b>\$82,668,448</b>			

### WV

Berkeley County	Family	36	\$698,344		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
East Wheeling	Not specified	2	\$100,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Fayette County	Not specified	28	\$600,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Fayette County	Not specified	4	\$300,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Greenbrier County	Family	5	\$1,112,150		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kanawha County	Not specified		\$150,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Kanawha County	Not specified	6	\$145,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.

## Examples of Affordable Multifamily Rental Projects in the Development Pipeline

Updated 2/6/2009

by the National Low Income Housing Coalition

<u>City</u>	<u>Target Population</u>	<u>Total Units</u>	<u>Gap Financing</u>	<u>Total Proj. Cost</u>	<u>Lowest % AMI Targeted</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>LIHTC?</u>	<u>PB Sec. 8 or Public Housing?</u>
Mingo County	Supportive Housing		\$311,403		Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Mingo County	Not specified	4	\$240,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Mullens	Senior Housing	27	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	50%	Unknown	Unknown
Not specified	Not specified		\$2,000,000		Unknown	Unknown	Possible
Not specified	Supportive Housing	80	\$500,000	\$3,130,000	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Pendleton County	Homeownership	15	\$292,285	\$1,312,500	30%	Unknown	Unknown
Randolph County	Not specified	12	\$1,320,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Randolph County	Not specified		\$1,600,000		Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
<b>State Totals</b>	15	219	\$11,369,182	\$9,442,500			
<b>Grand Totals</b>	1,062	74,903	\$3,884,618,918	\$11,265,056,090			
<b>Grand Totals</b> (average used for projects missing data)	1,062	76,486	\$4,911,022,653	\$13,367,813,089			

<sup>1</sup> This represents the maximum percent of Area Median Income of the most deeply targeted units. For example, 50% indicates that the most deeply targeted units serve households earning <=50% of AMI.